

Final Evaluation

UNDP “Improvement of Infrastructure and Support to Urban Upgrading and Socio-Economic Revitalization of northern part of Cyprus”

UNDP PFF

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

Study of Cultural Heritage

UNDP ACT

Cultural Heritage

Final Version

27 February 2012

Roderick Ackermann

Evalutility Ltd
socio-economic evaluation

The views expressed in this report are those of the evaluator and do not necessarily reflect the views of UNDP PFF, or UNDP ACT.

Contents

Acronyms.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Overview of the evaluation and background.....	3
Conclusions.....	5
Recommendations.....	6
Main report.....	8
Overview of the evaluation.....	8
Background.....	16
Overview of the programmes.....	19
Evaluation.....	25
Conclusions.....	54
Recommendations.....	55
Annexes.....	57
UNDP Cyprus Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011 Outcome 5 Indicators.....	58
List of stakeholders consulted.....	60
List of documents referred to.....	62
Terms of Reference.....	69

Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ACT	United Nations Development Programme Action for Cooperation and Trust in Cyprus
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUPSO	European Union Project Support Office
GIS	Geographic Information System
KTMMOB	Union of the Chambers of Cyprus Turkish Engineers and Architects
NMP	Nicosia Master Plan
PFF	UNDP Partnership for the Future
SBN	Sewerage Board of Nicosia
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFICYP	United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WWTP	Waste Water Treatment Plant

Executive Summary

Overview of the evaluation and background

The evaluation has been carried out between 29 October and 17 November, and this included a mission to Cyprus from 29 October to 11 November. The evaluation is based on site visits, feedback from meetings with stakeholders, a review of project and other relevant documentation, and analysis of data.

The evaluation covers approximately €56 million of activities under Outcome 5 of United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) work programme for Cyprus. Activities are implemented by UNDP's two programme offices in Cyprus, namely UNDP Partnership for the Future (PFF) and UNDP Action for Cooperation and Trust in Cyprus (ACT). The majority of funding and projects covered by this evaluation are implemented by UNDP PFF. The evaluation covers approximately €50 million in funding managed by UNDP PFF, comprising 38 projects with funding of €47 million, and additional costs of approximately €4 million.¹ UNDP PFF funding includes €2 million from the Republic of Cyprus, and €660,000 from USAID via UNDP for the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road improvement project, and €21 the million contribution of the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (SBN) (south) to the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant. The evaluation also covers seven UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage projects with funding of approximately €5.7 million.

	Projects	Funding (€)
UNDP PFF	38	50,542,586
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I	16	8,299,869
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II	18	9,834,225
Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement ²	1	2,660,000 ³
Nicosia Wast Water Treatment Plant	1	29,348,492
Study of Cultural Heritage	1	€400,000

¹ The total funding for Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I and Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II include € 1.9 million and €2 million respectively for other costs such as human resources, visibility , travel, action costs, etc.

² Project documents do not refer specifically to "Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement", although it is covered by Objective 3 of Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II, "To enable the opening of new crossing points". It is listed separately here in accordance with the ToR for this assignment, and Outcome 5 of UNDP's work programme for Cyprus.

³ €2 million from Republic of Cyprus, and €660,000 from USAID via UNDP ACT.

	Projects	Funding (€)
UNDP ACT	7	5,700,000
Cultural Heritage	7	5,700,000

Approximately 53% (€ 26,722,586) of UNDP PFF funding covered here is provided by the EU from the €259 million allocated under the 2006 aid package to the Turkish Cypriot community.⁴ Approximately €21 million is provided by the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (south) for the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant, to which UNDP itself has contributed €160,000. The government of the Republic of Cyprus contributed €2 million, and USAID €660,000 to the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement project.

UNDP ACT funding is provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

The support evaluated here follows many years of support delivered by UNDP to Cyprus. From 1998 to 2005, USAID funded UNDP-implemented support through UNDP's Bi-Communal Development Programme.⁵ This focussed primarily on urban infrastructure, agriculture, environment and education. Since 2005, USAID has funded UNDP's ACT programme, which has focussed on people to people contact and civil society development.

UNDP PFF was established as a separate programme in 2001 as a channel for EU support to the northern part of Cyprus. This has focussed primarily on infrastructure development and business sector development, as well as de-mining in the Buffer Zone (implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)), and the Committee for Missing Persons.

Separation of the two programmes has been maintained at the request of their respective donors, in order to ensure the visibility of each donor and programme. UNDP ACT notes that while both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have undertaken cultural heritage activities, this does not automatically imply that there could or should have been close co-ordination between the two programmes, as they have different mandates and goals.

Cyprus is different from other countries in which UNDP operates. Cyprus is an EU member state, and has no overall country office. While the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is the internationally recognised government for the entire island, it does not have de-facto authority in the northern part of the island. The authorities in the northern part of the island have de-facto control there but are not internationally recognised, with the exception of Turkey. The status of the authorities in the northern part of the island is thus unclear and it is therefore not possible for either programme to engage with them in the way that UNDP would engage with central authorities in other countries. In particular, direct engagement with the authorities in the northern part of the island is a highly sensitive issue with regard to the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. This is another reason for maintaining a clear separation between the two programmes.

⁴ Council Regulation (EC) No 389/2006 of 27 February 2006 establishing an instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

⁵ UNDP PFF notes that this support was executed by UNOPS.

Conclusions

Relevance

UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT activities covered by this evaluation are generally relevant to the objectives of their respective donors, and to the needs of Cyprus.

UNDP PFF's activities covered by this evaluation in the areas of crossing points, villages and minor towns, and Study of Cultural Heritage are particularly relevant.

The need to improve and enlarge Nicosia's sewage treatment is evident, and from this perspective the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant project is highly relevant. Consideration of whether or not the chosen solution is the best/ most appropriate solution is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

The Nicosia Master Plan Area Scheme is highly relevant, as it aims to introduce a coherent strategic approach to the development of the walled city of Nicosia (northern and southern parts), and it includes, among other things, elements relating to public consultation. However, the status of this project is currently "cancelled" owing to a disagreement between key actors.

Some of the ongoing and completed projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia may be too ambitious, given the constrained capacities of key actors, and the absence of a coherent strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area. It is unclear to what extent some of these projects address the most urgent development needs. UNDP notes, however, that these projects are not designed for this purpose.

Efficiency

UNDP PFF has a small, highly experienced and motivated core staff. This evaluation covers 38 projects and sub-projects (which are just a part of UNDP PFF's portfolio). While there have been some cancellations (e.g. due to property ownership issues, lack of beneficiary commitment, etc.), UNDP PFF has done well to implement these projects in circumstances that are often challenging, while at the same time maintaining the quality of outputs and attention to issues such as health and safety, environment, access for the disabled, etc. However, there are some indications that the core staff may be over-stretched, and UNDP PFF data management and reporting arrangements could be improved in some respects, as there are gaps in reporting and UNDP PFF was unable to provide a comprehensive list of its 38 projects covered by this evaluation, including funding, project status, beneficiary, etc.

While there is limited scope for synergies between UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF, there are nevertheless areas where some limited additional co-ordination would possibly have been useful (e.g. addressing common issues in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia).

Outcomes

For UNDP PFF activities, site visits and stakeholder feedback suggest that the biggest impact has been delivered by:

- Village and minor town projects;
- The Study of Cultural Heritage;
- Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos crossing point.

In the northern part of the walled city Nicosia, significant improvements to the Municipal Market are likely to attract more shoppers and visitors. The internationally acknowledged restoration of the Bedestan has significantly enhanced the immediate area and is attracting visitors and hosting an increasing number of events. However, the impact of both UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF support appears to be constrained by the lack of an overall strategy amongst key actors⁶ for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area, as well as limited proactivity on the part of the two main counterparts.⁷

Neither programme has tracked indicators to assess outcome (changes in performance/ behaviour/ perceptions/ attitudes of target systems/ organisations/ groups etc.). As a result, both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have difficulty identifying and communicating the outcomes of their activities. UNDP PFF considers that collection of such indicators are unnecessary, too ambitious, and beyond its mandate.

Sustainability

Both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have sought to ensure the sustainability of projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia e.g. through support with the development of business plans. Nevertheless sustainability is the main area of concern for UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT, as well as both donors. For UNDP PFF this concerns relates specifically to administrative sustainability, since, according to UNDP PFF, structures such as EVKAF and the municipality of Nicosia (north) have funds, but they lack the necessary administrative structures.

UNDP contribution

The involvement of UNDP PFF in the projects covered by this evaluation is considered essential by a representative of European Commission (EC) Directorate General Enlargement and by a senior advisor of United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). These reasons include the recognised neutrality of UNDP PFF, its sensitive approach in such a complicated political environment, its ability to mobilise quickly, its emphasis on key issues such as environment, health and safety, etc.

The successful implementation of numerous projects, often under difficult circumstances, is an indication of the experience and perseverance of the UNDP PFF core staff and project teams.

There has been limited opportunity for leveraging UNDP's experience and expertise in areas such as public administration, and civic engagement.

Recommendations are provided on the following page

⁶ Namely, the municipality of Nicosia (north), tourism authorities (north), "department of antiquities" (north), EVKAF, etc.

⁷ e.g., according to UNDP PFF, reluctance/ slowness of EVKAF to operate assets on an income generating basis, and slowness or absence of commitment by the municipality to fulfil project obligations.

Recommendations

The impact and sustainability of projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia would benefit from the development of a clear overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area, taking into account the needs of all sectors of the community. UNDP PFF could use its influence to mobilise relevant actors to develop such a strategy.

Project design should put more emphasis on outcomes. Systems should be put in place to track indicators, and these should be reviewed from time to time to ensure their continuing relevance. Enhanced understanding and/ or application of UNDP's guidelines on results based management and project planning, monitoring and evaluation would be helpful.

All projects and sub-projects should have some kind of planning document incorporating the general principles of the standard project document (e.g. stating justification, outcomes, outputs, indicators, start and finish dates, budgets, locations, counterparts/ promoters, etc.).⁸

Projects should incorporate more systematic dissemination and networking. This is particularly important for projects with a potentially high demonstration value.

Local strategic management and reporting, in particular for UNDP PFF, would be greatly facilitated by the implementation of a simple relational database to track basic project data, and to record regular monitoring information.

Programme-level implementation reports should be systematically produced at regular intervals and should include some tabular information covering each project, such as budget, commitments, disbursements, counterparts, start and end dates, status, etc.

Independent external review should be carried out on a more regular basis.

⁸ UNDP PFF notes that some projects include such documentation, but others ("predetermined" and pilot projects) do not.

Main report

Overview of the evaluation

Scope and approach

The evaluation covers approximately €56 million of activities under Outcome 5 of United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) work programme for Cyprus. Activities are implemented by UNDP's two programme offices in Cyprus, namely UNDP Partnership for the Future (PFF) and UNDP Action for Cooperation and Trust in Cyprus (ACT). The majority of funding and projects covered by this evaluation are implemented by UNDP PFF. The evaluation covers approximately €50 million in funding managed by UNDP PFF, comprising 38 projects with funding of €47 million, and additional costs of approximately €4 million.⁹ UNDP PFF funding includes €2 million from the Republic of Cyprus, and €660,000 from USAID via UNDP for the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road improvement project, and €21 the million contribution of the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (SBN) (south) to the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant. The evaluation also covers seven UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage projects with funding of approximately €5.7 million.

	Projects	Funding (€)
UNDP PFF	38	50,542,586
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I	16	8,299,869
Objective 1	3	3,170,000
Objective 2	2	630,000
Objective 3	1	470,000
Objective 4	10	2,163,000
Other costs		1,866,869
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II	19	9,834,225
Objective 1	11	3,195,000
Objective 2	7	1,995,000
Objective 3	1	2,595,000
Other costs		2,049,225
Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement ¹⁰	1	2,660,000

⁹ The total funding for Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I and Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II include € 1.9 million and €2 million respectively for other costs such as human resources, visibility , travel, action costs, etc.

¹⁰ Project documents do not refer specifically to "Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement". However, this is covered by Objective 3 of Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II, "To enable the opening of new

	Projects	Funding (€)
Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant	1	29,348,492
Study of Cultural Heritage	1	€400,000
UNDP ACT	7	5,700,000
Cultural Heritage	7	5,700,000

The total cost of the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant is approximately €29 million, of which the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (south) is providing €21 million. The remainder is provided by the European Union (EU) (approximately €8 million), with a small contribution from UNDP (approximately €160,000).

Approximately 53% (€26,722,586) of UNDP PFF funding covered here is provided by the EU from the €259 million allocated under the 2006 aid package to the Turkish Cypriot community. Approximately €21 million is provided by the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (south) for the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant, to which UNDP itself has contributed €160,000. The government of the Republic of Cyprus contributed €2 million, and USAID €660,000 to the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement project. The following table provides a summary of UNDP PFF funding sources.

Funding source	€
EC	26,722,586
Sewerage Board of Nicosia (contribution to Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant)	21,000,000
Government of the Republic of Cyprus (contribution to Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos road improvement/ crossing point)	2,000,000
USAID (contribution to Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos road improvement/ crossing point)	660,000
UNDP (contribution to Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant)	160,000
	50,542,586

The €400,000 for the UNDP PFF Study of Cultural Heritage, which is covered by this evaluation, is not funded from €259 million 2006 aid package, but is provided through a special EC line, following a request from the European Parliament in 2008 to support cultural heritage in Cyprus.¹¹

The evaluation has been carried out between 29 October and 17 November, and this included a mission to Cyprus from 29 October to 11 November.

crossing points". It is listed separately here in accordance with UNDP's Outcome 5 work plan for Cyprus, and the ToR for this evaluation.

¹¹ €800,000 was allocated to this, while €400,000 has actually been utilised.

This evaluation included the following elements:

- Review of project and other relevant documentation
- Meetings with project and strategic stakeholders¹²
- Site visits
- Analysis of data

The proposed report structure follows the main points listed in the terms of reference (ToR). In some cases, where there was felt to be an element of duplication, two ToR points are covered in a single section. For the purposes of the evaluation report, the points listed in the ToR have been re-ordered in order to enhance the logic, consistency, and readability of the report.

The ToR refer explicitly to relevance, effectiveness, and impact. Since it is often difficult to make a clear distinction between effectiveness and impact, this report focuses on outcomes; effectiveness can be considered as immediate outcomes, while impact can be considered as longer-term impact.

Effectiveness refers to the utility of an intervention in bringing about desired outcomes, and outcomes refer to sustained changes in the performance/ behaviour/ perceptions/ attitudes of target groups directly addressed by the assistance (institutions, systems, groups, communities, etc.). Donor-funded projects cannot be expected to achieve all development goals in any country and therefore have to be seen as pump-priming projects (a point made on several occasions in Cyprus) that provide a basis for local stakeholders to build on the benefits of such assistance, for example, by identifying and addressing follow-on development goals for themselves (albeit with some form of external funding). Assessment of effectiveness therefore also takes into account the extent to which project counterparts have been able to take things further on their own initiative.

Evaluation question No.1 refers to the extent that '*programme and project goals and outputs been achieved*'. The ToR define goals as outcomes, and objectives as outputs. Project documents for UNDP PFF assistance use the terms outcomes, objectives, and outputs interchangeably. For the most part, there are no expected outcomes in the generally accepted sense of sustained changes in performance/ behaviour/ attitudes, etc. Rather the primary focus of these documents is on outputs, such as completion of civil works. Therefore, in answering this question, the report will review the extent to which the planned outputs have been delivered.

Although expected outcomes for UNDP ACT have not been provided, they can be inferred from the call for proposals as: *building long-term cooperation across the Green Line for the benefit of the local community as a whole as well as its past, current and future residents*. While the seven UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage projects do involve works, these are seen as a vehicle for achieving outcomes, rather than as being the outcomes themselves.

Although not specifically mentioned in the ToR, efficiency and sustainability are implied, and points on these two issues are raised where relevant (e.g. SWOT analysis, best practices, lessons learned, etc.). Separate sections on efficiency and sustainability are not envisaged, except in the conclusions, which is structured as follows;

¹² UNDP PFF staff were present at all meetings with stakeholders regarding PFF projects, for interpretation and/ or as observers. They took an active part as participants in some of these meetings.

Conclusions

- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Outcomes
- Sustainability
- UNDP contribution

The assessment of relevance considers the relevance of the assistance with respect to:

- The objectives of the respective donors;
- Overall UNDP objectives for Cyprus as indicated in the UNDP Cyprus— Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011;
- Identified needs;
- Absorption capacities, and risks;
- Feedback from stakeholders.

Evaluation questions

This evaluation aims to answer the following questions:

- To what extent have programme and project goals and outputs been achieved?
- What are the outcomes (effectiveness and impact) of the programmes and their components?
- What factors have influenced performance and achievement of outcomes?
- Have the programmes and projects contributed to the overall change for a more positive environment? If so, has it been a key factor in improvements?
- How relevant is each component? In particular considering the systems and capacities that were developed and the effective use of project resources?
- How and to what extent has the UNDP added value to project outcomes? i.e. what has UNDP brought to the programmes and their projects that other organisations would not have been able to, at least to the same extent?
- What were the best practice of and lessons learned during project implementation?
- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats of the project's implementation process.
- Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?

The following matrix is used as a general framework for assessing the assistance covered by this evaluation, in particular, outcomes, the sustainability of outcomes, and the value added by UNDP in the delivery of these outcomes.

	Capacity	Economic	Environmental	Social	Confidence building/ reconciliation
Authorities	Outcomes Sustainability UNDP added value				
Counterparts/ promoters					
Businesses					
Residents					
CSOs					

While the term "component" is mentioned in the ToR, it is not defined in the ToR, these are understood as follows:

UNDP PFF

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

- Objective 1 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Nicosia
- Objective 2 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Famagusta
- Objective 3 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Kyrenia
- Objective 4 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

- Objective 1 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.)
- Objective 2 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus.
- Objective 3 Enable the opening of new crossing points (including Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos).

Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

Study of Cultural Heritage

UNDP ACT

Cultural Heritage

Evaluation components/ grouping

In order to avoid repetition and to enhance logic and readability, this report groups the Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I and Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure

Phase II objectives according to the structure of Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II. Therefore, the projects have been grouped into the following “evaluation components”:

UNDP PFF

- **Evaluation Component 1** Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.), consisting of:
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I Objectives 1, 2, and 3;
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II Objective 1;

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I		
Municipal Market (retailers' section) (1)	Nicosia	Ongoing
Restoration and re-use of the Bedestan (formerly St. Nicholas Church)	Nicosia	Completed
Famagusta - Desdemona – Canbulat Gate Project	Famagusta	Completed
Narrow streets upgrading	Famagusta	Cancelled
Ziya Rizki Avenue Upgrade and Rehabilitation	Kyrenia	Completed
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II		
Cultural Events		Ongoing
Emergency Medical Equipment for the General Hospital	Nicosia	Ongoing
Famagusta Cultural Heritage Project (Othello Tower)	Famagusta	Ongoing
Infrastructure activities in Famagusta (Moat)	Famagusta	Proposal
Infrastructure activities in Kyrenia (phase II Ziya Rizki Avenue Upgrade and Rehabilitation)	Kyrenia	Proposal not endorsed (dropped) ¹³
Medical Waste Facility	Nicosia	Completed
Municipal Market (retailers' section) (2)	Nicosia	Ongoing
Nicosia Master Plan Area Schemes	Nicosia	Cancelled
Replacement Water Pipes in Nicosia	Nicosia	Ongoing
Upgrading & rehabilitation of Asmaalti area and adjacent street	Nicosia	Cancelled

- **Evaluation Component 2** Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus, consisting of:
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I Objective 4;
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II Objective 2;

¹³ This activity was not endorsed by the project steering as the Municipality of Kyrenia was slow to implement commitments relating to the first phase Ziya Rizki Avenue Upgrade and Rehabilitation, funded under Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I		
Akincilar / Louroukina	Akincilar / Louroukina	Completed
Alanici / Piyi-Peristerona	Alanici / Pi-Peristerona	Cancelled
Building capacity on Environmental Impact Assessment		Completed
Doganci / Elia	Doganci / Elia	Cancelled
Erdemli/Tremetoussia	Erdemli/Tremetoussia	Completed
Gonyeli Infrastructure Master Plans	Gonyell	Completed
Hisarkoy / Kampyli	Hisarkoy / Kampyli	Completed
Kalavac / Kalyvakia	Kalavac / Kalyvakia	Completed
Kaleburnu / Galinoporni	Kaleburnu / Galinoporni	Completed
Kormacit / Kormacitis	Kormacit / Kormacitis	Completed
Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II		
Buyukkonuk/ Komikebir: Reinforcing the Eco-village status with eco-friendly actions	Buyukkonuk/ Komikebir	Completed
Gecitkale/Lefkoniko Upgrading of the road to the High School	Gecitkale/Lefkoniko	Completed
Introducing Green Building concepts in the Turkish Cypriot Community		Terminated
Iskele/Trikomo: Rehabilitation of the municipal market	Iskele/Trikomo	Cancelled
Lapta/Lapethos: Road and pedestrians safety — construction of pavements	Lapta/Lapethos	Phase 1 completed, Phase 2 ongoing
Lefke/Lefka: Upgrade and rehabilitation of the historical centre	Lefke/Lefka	Ongoing
Road Safety (Black Spots)		Ongoing (procurement)

- **Evaluation Component 3** Enable the opening of new crossing points, consisting of:
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II Objective 4 (Limnitis/ Yesilirmak);
 - One project from Objective I of Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I, Ledra/ Lokmaci crossing point in Nicosia.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II		
Ledra-Lokamci crossing point	Nicosia	In progress
Limnitis — Kato Pyrgos road improvement	Limnitis — Kato Pyrgos	Completed

- **Evaluation Component 4** Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant
- **Evaluation Component 5** Study of Cultural Heritage

UNDP ACT

Evaluation Component 6 Cultural Heritage Grant Scheme

UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage Grant Scheme		
Armenian Monastery	Nicosia	In progress
Kontea Cultural Heritage Circle Preservation	Kontea	In progress
Paphos Gate Day Care Centre	Nicosia	Completed
Peristerona House	Peristerona	Completed
Prophet Elias Monastery		Completed
Restoration of Ayios Neophytos Chapel	Troulli	Completed
Restoration of Turkish Bath	Nicosia	Completed

Background

Brief history of the two programmes

UNDP's country office in Cyprus closed in 1997. USAID has been a UNDP donor in Cyprus since 1998, when UNHCR's Bi-communal Humanitarian Programme in Cyprus closed. From 1998 to 2005, UNDP delivered its support through the Bi-Communal Development Programme. This focussed primarily on urban infrastructure (including major support to the Nicosia Master Plan (NMP), which is responsible for developing a strategy for the walled city of Nicosia), agriculture, environment education, and cultural heritage restoration.

UNDP ACT is funded by USAID. UNDP ACT's website notes that ACT (Action for Cooperation and Trust) was established in October 2005 to *"create opportunities for Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to work together on projects which will benefit all people on the island, while at the same time promoting inter-communal tolerance and mutual understanding"*.¹⁴ Since 2008, ACT has focused increasingly on *"strengthening civil society's capacity to actively participate in the process of reconciliation."*

In 2001, EU funding became available to the northern part of Cyprus. Discussions between the EC and USAID led to the establishment a separate UNDP programme office, UNDP PFF, specifically for the implementation of EU-funded projects, as the two donors wished to ensure a clear separation between the two sources of funding.

The website of UNDP PFF¹⁵ states that the *"PFF aims at contributing to the peace-building process in Cyprus through different levels of intervention ranging from urban infrastructure rehabilitation to assistance to small and medium-sized enterprises as well as the de-mining of the Buffer Zone."*

UNDP PFF projects are funded from the €259 million EU aid package for the Turkish Cypriot community of 2006.¹⁶ UNDP PFF effectively functions as the implementing agency for specific EU-funded activities, such as pilot projects, small works projects, projects where rapid mobilisation is required, and projects requiring an experienced "neutral" party (e.g. crossing points, and the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant).

UNDP ACT is located at the United Nations (UN) protected areas, which is part of the UN administered Buffer Zone. UNDP PFF also maintains an unmanned office in the UN protected area, which it describes as its main office, while its operations are managed from what it describes as its support office, in the north of Nicosia.

The two programmes are co-ordinated by UNDP at divisional level. In-country, the two programme offices function largely independently of each other, co-ordinating closely with their respective donors.

The project document for Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II lists a range of support that was provided under the Under the 2003 EU Special Aid Package to support the

¹⁴ <http://www.undp-act.org/default.aspx?tabid=147&it=0&mid=0&itemid=0&langid=1>

¹⁵ http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=2

¹⁶ Council Regulation (EC) No 389/2006 of 27 February 2006 establishing an instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

economic and social development of the Turkish Cypriot Community via infrastructure and rehabilitation projects, primarily in Nicosia, Famagusta, and Kyrenia. The project document notes that assistance was provided in particular for infrastructure and urban upgrading including improvement of public facilities and the modernisation of water and sanitation systems.

The aim of these projects was *“to improve the quality of life and services for the residents, making the cities more attractive, preserving their cultural heritage and to boost the economy by launching local works tenders.”*

The project document notes that since 2001, UNDP PFF has been also responsible for the EU-funded programme aimed at the rehabilitation of the old city of Nicosia within the framework of the Nicosia Master Plan (NMP).

The project document for Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II notes lists a number of EU-funded activities that it has carried out since 2001. These include:

Project	€
Revitalisation of old Nicosia	9,300,000
Infrastructure & rehabilitation for the main cities of northern Cyprus	6,150,000
Business Support Projects & Small Project Funds	2,600,000
Feasibility Studies Phase I/Phase 2	2,100,000
Business Support Project 2	1,300,000
Private Sector Development in northern Cyprus	2,080,000
Business Support Project IIAA	512,000
De-mining	5,000,000
	29,042,000

Besides Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure, the 2006 aid package also covers other UNDP PFF activities, namely private sector development, demining, and the Committee for Missing Persons.

UNDP does not operate in Cyprus the way it does in other countries. Cyprus is an EU member state, and is classified as having high human development. The UNDP mandate has been tailored accordingly. As a result, there is no UNDP no country office and there is no single management team at the country level. Rather there are two independent programme offices.

UNDP ACT notes that its mission in Cyprus is unique as far as UNDP is concerned. This is to empower civil society to play a meaningful role in the peace process on the island. The work of UNDP ACT can therefore not be compared with the traditional development work of UNDP country offices around the world. UNDP ACT has delivered its mission through different thematic areas, including cultural heritage. Similarly, UNDP PFF considers that its work in

Cyprus is also unique, noting that its “...*urban upgrading and cultural heritage project[s], ...are not found in other contexts*”.

The fact that both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have undertaken cultural heritage activities does not automatically imply that there could or should have been close co-ordination between the two programmes, as they have different mandates and goals. UNDP ACT notes that it implements cultural heritage projects only because Cypriot partners have deemed it a good way to build the capacity of civil society organisations and local communities to build trust and cooperation between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots.

In general UNDP ACT does not and cannot partner with the Government or authorities, nor provide policy advice due to the conflict and political dynamics in Cyprus. Thus organisations such as EVKAF are seen by UNDP-ACT as implementers, not as authorities to whom UNDP ACT should provide advice, and the relationship between UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF with various local partners is not necessarily the same. UNDP PFF notes that it is also unable to enter into formal agreements with beneficiaries in the northern part of Cyprus owing to the issue of political recognition.

Overview of the programmes

EU objectives

Council Regulation (EC) No 389/2006 lists the following objectives regarding the aid package for the Turkish Cypriot community:¹⁷¹⁸

- The promotion of social and economic development including restructuring, in particular concerning rural development, human resources development and regional development;
- The development and restructuring of infrastructure, in particular in the areas of energy and transport, the environment, telecommunications and water supply;
- The reconciliation, confidence building measures, and support to civil society;
- Bringing the Turkish Cypriot community closer to the Union, through inter alia information on the European Union's political and legal order, promotion of people to people contacts and Community scholarships;
- Preparation of legal texts aligned with the *acquis communautaire* for the purpose of these being immediately applicable upon the entry into force of a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem;
- Preparation for implementation of the *acquis communautaire* in view of the withdrawal of its suspension in accordance with Article 1 of Protocol No 10 to the Act of Accession.

The EU Project Support Office in Nicosia summarises the main objectives as:

- To build confidence and support reconciliation; and
- To improve living conditions, the built environment, and service provision.

Cultural heritage activities are considered important for confidence building, since, in the past, the two sides criticised each other for misusing/ neglecting/ destroying each others' cultural heritage. Other measures in this category include the removal of physical barriers (e.g. removal of mines, opening of new crossing points), and the removal of psychological barriers (e.g. the Committee for Missing Persons).

¹⁷ COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 389/2006 of 27 February 2006 establishing an instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community and amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2667/2000 on the European Agency for Reconstruction.

¹⁸ Part I of the aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community committing €38.1 million of the overall total of €259 million was approved on 27 October 2006. It focuses on three main objectives: developing physical infrastructure, promoting economic and social development and bringing the Turkish Cypriot community closer to the European Union. Six projects are supported under Part I of the aid programme: 1) Solid waste sector programme for the Turkish Cypriot community; 2) Feasibility study for the rehabilitation of the Lefke mining area; 3) Upgrading the management of the energy sector; 4) Upgrading of urban and local infrastructure; 5) Supporting private sector development within the Turkish Cypriot community; 6) Information on the European Union political and legal order. (Commission Decision C/2006/5000).

Part II committing €197.550.000 was approved on 15 December 2006 (Commission Decision C/2006/6533). It focuses on five main objectives: 1) developing and restructuring of infrastructure, 2) promoting social and social development, 3) fostering reconciliation, confidence building measures, and support to civil society, 4) bringing the Turkish Cypriot community closer to the European Union; 5) Preparing the Turkish Cypriot community to introduce and implement the *acquis communautaire*. Additionally, the programme comprises an Unallocated Technical Assistance and Programme Reserve Facility.

USAID Objectives

Since 1998, USAID support to Cyprus has moved increasingly away from infrastructure, to people to people contact, and more recently to civil society development. This move has been partly motivated by an effective reduction in its Cyprus budget over a number of years, and a recognition that reconciliation and peace-building would be better served by focusing more on “soft” activities.

USAID support to Cyprus is being phased out, and as a consequence, the UNDP ACT programme is due to close in September 2013.

UNDP Cyprus— Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011

The UNDP’s Cyprus— Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011 lists six outcomes:

Outcome 1 - Turkish Cypriot small and medium enterprises increase their competitiveness through greater awareness on related EU legislation and policies;

Outcome 2 Civil society strengthened to effectively support and contribute to the peace process;

Outcome 3 Multiculturalism and dialogue promoted through information, communication and education;

Outcome 4 All land mines and UXOs in the Buffer Zone cleared;

Outcome 5 Infrastructure improved and urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalization advanced;

Outcome 6 Peacebuilding and reconciliation processes reinforced through the development of Inter-communal partnerships.

This evaluation covers Outcome 5, Infrastructure improved and urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalization advanced.

Outcome 5 outputs

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

- Nicosia
 - Bedestan restoration project completed
 - Design/ restoration of the Municipal Market completed
 - Safety measure for Ledra/ Lokmanci crossing point completed
 - Famagusta Desdemona project completed
- Kyrenia
 - Urban upgrading of phase 2 of the main avenue completed
- Minor towns/ villages
 - 5 pilot urban upgrading projects completed

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

- Nicosia
 - Asmalti project completed
 - Area scheme completed
- Famagusta
 - Famagusta project completed and supported by the Famagusta Project Advisory Group
- Kyrenia
 - Phase 2 of the infrastructure upgrading of the main avenue completed
 - Green building activities and training completed
 - Other municipalities: projects for 5 municipalities completed
- Ledra phase 2 completed
- Cultural year – identified activities completed

Cultural Heritage

- Number of inter-communal cooperative processes leading to the restoration of important cultural heritage sites

New Nicosia Waste Water TP

- New WWTP is designed
- New WWTP is constructed
- Defect Liability period of the design-build contract of the WWTP is successfully completed
- Joint entity is created and fully functional
- Transfer of new WWTP to the joint entity is performed and at least 10 years of O&M contract is signed

Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Upgr [sic]

The opening of the Limnitis/ Yesilirmak crossing point is intended to enhance further collaboration between the two communities and support a confidence building measure for the peace settlement in Cyprus.

- Supervision team is recruited
- Contractor selected and contracted following approval of ACP committee
- Site office established
- DB report completed
- Road is opened and fully functional

Study of Cultural Heritage

- Contribution to the management of cultural heritage in Cyprus by undertaking a study on the restoration of cultural heritage in Cyprus with particular emphasis on the northern part of Cyprus

UNDP PFF

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

The overall purpose of the project is to upgrade the living environment of the Turkish Cypriot community through infrastructure/ urban revitalisation projects. The direct beneficiaries are the inhabitants of the northern part of Cyprus.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I has four sub-objectives, which are given as:

- Objective 1: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Nicosia;
- Objective 2: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Famagusta;
- Objective 3: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of Kyrenia;
- Objective 4: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and revitalisation of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

The overall objective is to support the economic and social development of the Turkish Cypriot community thereby contributing to the reduction of the existing socio-economic differences between the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities.

The overall purpose of the project is to upgrade the living environment of the Turkish Cypriot community through infrastructure/ urban revitalisation projects.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II has three sub-objectives:

- Objective 1: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.);
- Objective 2: To improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus;
- Objective 3: To enable the opening of new crossing points.

Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

The expected outcome is enhanced cooperation between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities to build and manage a new sewerage treatment facility for the Greater Nicosia area, which is able to meet projected demand for the next 10 years, in line with EU requirements and standards on waste water treatment, and water conservation.

Output No. 1: Construction of new waste water treatment plant at Mia Milia/ Haspolat including sludge treatment facilities. This will expand the treatment capacity to 269,115 population equivalents and produce an average daily flow of 30,000 m³. The investment will upgrade the level of treatment to comply with the standards specified in Annex I of the Council Directive 271/91/EC on urban waste water treatment, for discharge into receiving waters.

Output No. 2: The two communities assume joint responsibility for the operation and maintenance part of the contract, through the implementation of a joint entity.

Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos Road Improvement

This project comes directly within the scope of Objective 3, 'to enable the opening of new crossing points'. The project document does not refer specifically to this project since the political agreement that enabled the crossing point to be opened was reached some time after the project document was issued.

However, the project is included in UNDP's integrated 2010-2011 work plan for Cyprus, which states that the "*opening of the Limnitis/ Yesilirmak crossing point is intended to enhance further collaboration between the two communities and support a confidence building measure for the peace settlement in Cyprus.*"

A UNDP PFF report¹⁹ notes that the project involves two distinct sections of road:

- Section A is 1.9km stretch within the the United Nations controlled Buffer Zone;
- Section B is a 4.8km stretch in the northern part of Cyprus. This involves the construction of 1km of new road, and improvement of 3.8km of existing asphalt and dirt road.

The report notes that the "*existing road stretches are a narrow road of an average width of asphalt surface of some 3 meters from the 1930s-40s. Some sections of the road are dirt roads. These roads have not been used for regular and normal vehicular traffic since 1974 except for agricultural purposes and the military.*"

Study of Cultural Heritage

The project document does not specify an expected outcome. Rather, it lists three expected outputs:

- Review of the existing inventories already carried out by other donors;
- Ranking methodology in order to prioritise monuments for which a detailed assessment would be carried out;
- Detailed assessment of the built heritage consisting of:
 - Overall assessment of the cultural heritage monuments in the northern part of Cyprus;
 - Ad hoc assessment of the built heritage of the Walled City of Famagusta;
 - Ad hoc assessment of the immovable heritage in Cyprus built during the Ottoman period (1571-1914).

UNDP ACT

Cultural Heritage

No project document is available for this. The call for proposals invited *qualified* organisations to submit proposals that met the following criteria:²⁰

- Alignment to the overall goal of UNDP ACT

¹⁹ Yearly Technical Report – Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (November 2007 – June 2010).

²⁰ <http://www.undp-act.org/default.aspx?tabid=149&it=1&mid=800&itemid=0&langid=1&extrald=234>

- Alignment with one or more of the expected results associated with priority areas of Sustainable Development²¹ and Education.²² Thus proposals should focus not only preservation, but rather should focus on *'how such acts of preservation and celebration of cultural heritage can be utilized as a means for building long-term cooperation across the Green Line for the benefit of the local community as a whole as well as its past, current and future residents'*.
- Proposals were expected to address one or more of the following issues:
 - Preservation (including rescue) of a culturally significant site;
 - Rescuing an object or collections of objects, which are of cultural and/or monumental value, at risk (except for private collections);
 - Learning and networking activities for cultural heritage preservation involving Cypriots from across the island;

Furthermore, proposals for the preservation or rescue of significant sites or objects were required to include the following:

- Detailed plans for maintenance and sustainability, including funding sources;
- Public education, outreach and participation, to raise public awareness of the history and significance of the site(s)/object(s) and of the benefits of preserving cultural heritage;
- Detailed plans to record the work through a technical publication or in a scholarly journal.

²¹ Expansion and/or establishment of inter-communal partnerships for sustainable development.

²² Networking and education initiatives that promote multi-culturalism and dialogue.

Evaluation

To what extent have programme and project goals and outputs been achieved?²³

Most projects are being delivered, although with significant delays in some cases (e.g. Nicosia Municipal Market – UNDP PFF reports delays due largely to the municipality).

UNDP PFF implementation reports indicate that of the 35 Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I and Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II projects, eight have been cancelled/ not started or terminated, including:

- Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I
 - Narrow streets upgrading - Famagusta
- Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II
 - Infrastructure activities in Kyrenia
 - Nicosia Master Plan Area Schemes
 - Upgrading & rehabilitation of Asmaalti area and adjacent street (Nicosia)

It was not been possible to establish a complete picture, as there were gaps in the information provided by both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT and information requested by the evaluator was not available during the mission to Cyprus. A large amount of additional documentation was provided by UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT more than two weeks after the mission. However, it has not been possible to review this information in detail. While UNDP PFF did provide two Excel tables covering works and services contracts respectively, up to date information regarding a number of UNDP PFF projects was not available at the time of the mission, and there was some difficulty in the provision of basic project data for both programmes. In particular, a number of Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I projects were still under implementation at the time of the cut-off date of the last available report (October 2009) and no further information has been provided.²⁴

Evaluation Component I Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.)

Nicosia

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

The second phase of the restoration of the Bedestan was completed. This is the final phase, the first phase having been undertaken prior to the assistance evaluated here. The project was one of four Europa Nostra research laureates in 2009 for the study, assessment, and design for the

²³ As noted earlier in the report, the ToR define goals as outcomes, and objectives as outputs. Project documents for UNDP PFF assistance use the terms outcomes, objectives, and outputs interchangeably. For the most part, there are no expected outcomes in the generally accepted sense of sustained changes in performance/ behaviour/ attitudes, etc. Rather the primary focus of these documents is on outputs, such as completion of civil works. Therefore, in answering this question, the report will review the extent to which the planned outputs have been delivered.

²⁴ In an email of 24 November 2011, UNDP PFF indicated that a report on these projects would be submitted to the EC by the end of December.

structural and architectural restoration of the building.²⁵ The Europa Nostra website notes that the “Bedestan is one of the most important historical buildings in Nicosia, reflecting the multicultural life and many historical periods of the city. Contained within the city walls, the Bedestan was originally a 12th century Byzantine church, later used as a covered market place.”

The project covering the rehabilitation of the Municipal Market in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia was endorsed by the Project Steering Committee in December 2006. The market is nearing completion, following a major structural overhaul and renovation. The project has been subject to numerous delays and will have taken some five years to complete following endorsement by the Project Steering Committee. There were problems in procuring the services of a design consultant.²⁶ A tender in 2009 was inconclusive due to errors on the part of the municipality, and the second tender was delayed by lack of progress on the part of the municipality regarding the temporary relocation of market traders. UNDP PFF stresses that none of these delays were in any way due to UNDP PFF itself.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

The envisaged Upgrading & Rehabilitation of Asmaalti Area and Adjacent Streets, and Nicosia Master Plan Area Schemes were cancelled.

The Asmaalti Area project was cancelled in April 2010 due to a lack of commitment on the part of the municipality. It revoked an earlier decision to close the area to traffic following complaints from a small number of shop owners. Project reports note that the municipality had also failed to prepare a satisfactory design and technical specifications, despite the support of consultants provided by UNDP PFF.

After a year of preparatory work and facilitation by UNDP PFF, the Areas Schemes project was cancelled in April 2010, following its rejection by the mayor of Nicosia (north). UNDP PFF reports that the mayor was unwilling to accept the authority of the relevant local responsible bodies.

Medical Waste Facility. Yearly Technical Report – Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 – June 2011) indicates that works were in progress and expected to be completed in July 2011. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that its involvement was limited to works, which were completed in October 2010, while equipping the facility is the responsibility of European Union Project Support Office (EUPSO).

Emergency Medical Equipment for the General Hospital. Following floods in February 2010, the Project Steering Committee allocated €120,000 for the replacement of damaged equipment. Yearly Technical Report – Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 – June 2011) notes that a contract for €170,000 was eventually signed in 2011, and delivery of the equipment was expected in July 2011. UNDP PFF notes that when the equipment was installed, it was found that two components were not in line with the contractor’s offer, and were returned. Replacement components are currently awaited.

Replacement Water Pipes. Information provided by the municipality during the course of this evaluation indicates that a single contract was signed on 12 September for €1,348,551, covering

²⁵ <http://www.europanostra.org/laureates-2009/>

²⁶ The tender had to be repeated twice (three tenders in all), as responses to the first two tenders did not offer value for money.

three lots to supply 34,570 metres of pipe, and 3,061 water meters. The contract is expected to be completed within eight months of commencement.

Famagusta

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

The Narrow Streets Upgrading project in Famagusta was cancelled (“*withdrawn by the municipality*” in October 2007).

The Desdemona – Canbulat Gate project was completed in September 2009 and involved general physical and aesthetic upgrading of the of the area and enhancement for pedestrian use.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

Famagusta Moat. One implementation report²⁷ notes that in April 2010, the Project Steering Committee decided to take up this project after the local elections in June 2010. However, there is no mention of this project in the subsequent report.²⁸ In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that Famagusta walls and moat were transferred to the auspices of the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage, although ownership and overall responsibility remains with the “department of antiquities” (north).

Othello Tower. At the time of the most recent report, this project was under preparation, having been accepted by the Project Steering Committee in February 2011. In its comments on a draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that a contractor has been selected and that signature of the contract is expected in December 2011.

Kyrenia

Ziya Rizki Avenue Upgrade and Rehabilitation involved safety and aesthetic enhancements to the street, in particular, lowering and widening the sidewalk. This project was an extension of an earlier project that enhanced the environment around the central square and the start of Ziya Rizki Avenue. A follow on grant was envisaged to further extend the latest works but this was not approved by the Project Steering Committee, as the municipality was slow to implement commitments relating to the latest works.

Evaluation Component 2 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I

The main objective of projects under this evaluation component was to carry out projects in a number of villages as pilots/ examples for grant schemes that were subsequently launched by the EUPSO. However, it also includes two other projects: Gonyeli Infrastructure Master Plans, and Building capacity on Environmental Impact Assessment.

- Gonyeli Infrastructure Master Plans. Master plans for water supply, waste water, and storm water were completed in February and March 2008. These included a list of priority projects

²⁷ Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2007 - November 2009).

²⁸ Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 - June 2011).

to be implemented between 2008 and 2012, as well as an institutional analysis. Project reports do not indicate to what extent these have been followed through. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that the town is implementing these plans and that, according to the mayor, it is the only town that requires the necessary infrastructure to be installed before permitting new construction. UNDP PFF also notes that the town has implemented a water project (with EU funds), and sewerage and drainage projects (with Turkish funds).

- Building capacity on Environmental Impact Assessment. The only information available about this is that the project was completed in November 2007.

Implementation reports note that seven villages were identified following a systematic appraisal of villages across the northern part Cyprus. The project in Doganci / Elia had to be cancelled due to a disagreement between local stakeholders, and it was replaced with a project in Kormacit / Kormacitis. The village of Alanici / Piyi-Peristerona also had to be removed from the list due to property ownership issues. The final list of villages is:

- Hisarkoy / Kampyli
- Kalavac / Kalyvakia
- Kormacit / Kormakitis
- Akincilar / Louroukina
- Erdemli/Tremetoussia
- Kaleburnu / Galinoporni

The aim of the project was to upgrade village infrastructure, in particular, communal areas and facilities, in order to strengthen community cohesion and generally enhance the environment and quality of life. At the same time, the project aimed to do this in a way that retained the original character of the buildings and the area in which they are located. All projects have been completed, although in Kormakitis, the project counterpart still has to carry out landscaping around the renovated building, almost one and half years after the contractor handed back the site.

Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II

Seven projects are included in this group:

- Gecitkale/Lefkoniko Pedestrian and Road Safety Improvement
- Lapta/Lapethos: Road and pedestrians safety — construction of pavements
- Lefke/Lefka: Upgrade and rehabilitation of the historical centre
- Iskele/Trikomo: Rehabilitation of the municipal market
- Buyukkonuk/ Komi: Reinforcing the Eco-village status with eco-friendly actions
- Introducing Green Building Concepts in the Turkish Cypriot Community
- Road Safety (Black Spots)

Gecitkale/Lefkoniko Upgrading of the road to the High School. This project was completed in late 2009. It included improvements to the road surface, and the establishment of 350 metres of sidewalk.

Lapta/Lapethos: Road and pedestrians safety — construction of pavements. This project is part of the master plan for Lapta and surrounding villages, which was carried out by the UNDP. The project is providing 3km of sidewalks along the main street, and links the high school with the

kindergarten. The first 1.5km phase has been completed, and the second phase is under implementation.

Lefke/Lefka: Upgrade and rehabilitation of the historical centre. This project is in the process of restoring a group of old commercial buildings along two small streets in the centre of the town. These will be used for retail and catering activities, as well as small workshops/ studios. These are privately owned buildings that are rented out or unused.

Iskele/Trikomo: Rehabilitation of the municipal market. The project aimed to restore this historic building, which had closed in the early 1990s following the growth of the town and expansion of other markets. Project documentation was prepared in the second half of 2009, under contract to UNDP PFF, and works procurement was expected to take place in December of that year. It was subsequently decided that tendering would take place in mid 2010 due the work load of UNDP PFF and to avoid overlapping with municipal elections in June.²⁹ Ultimately, the project was cancelled in mid 2011, as it was not possible to reach agreement with the original, Greek Cypriot, owner.

Buyukkonuk/ Komi: Reinforcing the Eco-village status with eco-friendly actions. During 2008 and 2009, the village was supplied with solar lighting systems, a shredder (for composting), and 14 domestic composters, and 500 water taps. There was an information campaign relating to water saving, and training was provided on composting.

Road Safety (Black Spots) was one of several projects that originally intended to be contracted by the EC, but which were transferred to UNDP PFF at a meeting December 2009. The most recent implementation report³⁰ notes that implementation was delayed by a contractors' boycott, and by property issues, and that UNDP PFF plans to launch contracts for the three black spots not affected by property issues. No further information is available, although the evaluator was shown the location of one of the black spots, between Kyrenia and Nicosia, where work had not yet commenced. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that a tender procedure took place between June and August 2011, but that only one offer was submitted. UNDP PFF further notes that it is making every effort to ensure that at least one project lot is implemented.

Green Building Concepts: an implementation report³¹ notes that following an initial seminar in May 2008 attended by 60 people, the project was terminated as it was considered premature to establish the envisaged structure to take the project forward.

Evaluation Component 3 Enable the opening of new crossing points

This evaluation component includes two projects:

- Limnitis - Kato Pyrgos road improvement
- Ledra - Lokmaci crossing point

²⁹ In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that the real reason for the postponement was to allow more time to seek agreement from the Greek Cypriot owner, and that this could not be openly stated to the beneficiary.

³⁰ Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 - June 2011).

³¹ Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (November 2007 - June 2010).

The Limnitis - Kato Pyrgos road improvement project was carried out between January and October 2010. The stretch of road in question had been unused since 1974 and was unfit for normal road traffic. Upgrading was urgently required to give effect to a political decision to a decision by the leaders of the two communities to open a crossing point here. This was a particularly complicated project, as it involved works in the UN administered Buffer Zone as well as on territory controlled by the authorities in the northern part of Cyprus, and in the Turkish forces 'security area' in the north.

UNDP PFF contracted a joint venture, comprising Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot companies, to prepare the designs, which were finalised in January 2010. A works contract was signed in March 2010 with a joint venture including a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot company. A joint venture was contracted to supervise the works. This included an Italian company, a Greek Cypriot company, and a Turkish Cypriot company.

UNDP PFF undertook intensive facilitation and mediation throughout the project in order to ensure that the crossing point could be opened on time. The crossing point between the two villages has remained open since then.

- Ledra - Lokamci crossing point. The Ledra street crossing point was opened on 02 April 2008. Since the buildings at the crossing point were in poor condition, it was necessary to erect safety barriers to keep pedestrians at a safe distance. This project covers the stabilisation of the buildings to make them safe, and refurbishment of their exteriors to make the environment more pleasant for people using the crossing point. This work has largely been completed. One building on the Greek Cypriot side currently being repaired, and one on the north has not been started due to concerns regarding the possibility of unexploded munitions.

Evaluation Component 4 Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

The existing sewage treatment plant at Haspolat/ Mia Milia to the north east of Nicosia serves all of Nicosia. However, it does not comply with EU requirements regarding waste water discharge, it has insufficient capacity, and it causes severe odour problems in the surrounding areas. A new plant is under construction immediately adjacent to the existing plant. It will address all of these problems. Moreover, water from treated effluent will be of a sufficient quality to enable it to be used for the irrigation of food crops, and the project document indicates that the treated solid waste will be used for fertiliser.

The construction of the new plant is 70% funded by the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (which provides services in the south of Nicosia), and 30% by the Municipality in the north of Nicosia, with the EU funding the contribution of the Municipality in the north of Nicosia. UNDP PFF's involvement as the contracting authority enables funding from both sources to be brought together for construction of the plant, which would otherwise be problematic.

Construction of the plant is behind schedule, although it is still expected to be completed in 2012. The civil works contractor (a local contractor) is over-stretched, having also won other EU-funded tenders. As a result, installation of equipment has not commenced, and UNDP PFF expects this to begin in January 2012.

It is envisaged that the future operation of this advanced plant will be contracted to the same joint venture that has been contracted to design and build the plant. It was originally envisaged that the operator would be contracted by a management company established jointly by the Sewerage Board of Nicosia and the Municipality in north Nicosia. However, according to

feedback from the Sewerage Board of Nicosia, the constitutional court of the Republic of Cyprus has ruled that the Sewerage Board of Nicosia can not enter into such an arrangement, and a new solution is being sought.

Evaluation Component 5 Study of Cultural Heritage

The project effectively commenced in April 2010 and was concluded in December 2010.

52 people were involved in various capacities in the implementation of the project.

The project was implemented in four phases:

Review of nine existing inventories;

Development of a ranking methodology to produce a list of prioritised sites to be subject to a detailed technical assessment in Phase 3;

Detailed technical assessment of prioritised tangible cultural heritage assets;

Development of a Web-based geographic information system (GIS) as a repository for the information gathered in Phases 1 and 3. The GIS server is located in Italy.

Phase I of the project produced an inventory of some 2,800 cultural heritage sites divided into three chapters:

- Northern Cyprus
- Famagusta Walled City
- Ottoman Architecture

Subsets of the sites in each chapter were then covered by detailed data collection, a subset of these were then ranked, and finally a subset of these (according to ranking) were then subject to a technical assessment, including costings.

	Phase I, inventory	Detailed data collection (inventory charts)	Ranked sites	Technical assessment (Phase 3)	Inclusion in web-based GIS (Phase 4)
Northern Cyprus	*NA	225	153	47	NA
Famagusta Walled City	NA	251	33	31	NA
Ottoman Architecture	NA	147	70	10	NA
Bi-communal list	40	All included in the three main chapters	List provided separately and is not part of ranking	33	NA
	2,816	623	256	121	1,000

*NA – not available

It is expected that a short-list of 40 priority sites will be identified from the 121 sites subject to technical assessment, and that of these, 10 sites will be selected for restoration or stabilisation with future EU funding.

A summary of assets by type of asset, location, condition, etc., was not available. The evaluator was informed that this type of report can be produced by the GIS, although this currently lists only 36% of the assets listed in the inventory. The evaluator was unable to access the GIS, although UNDP PFF did provide login details.

Evaluation Component 6 UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage Grant Scheme

The UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage grant scheme has funded the seven projects listed below. These were approved between January and October 2006. It is understood that six of the projects have been completed. The restoration of the Armenian Monastery and Church is one or two months away from completion.

	Project	Location	Initial estimate \$	Actual cost €
1	Peristerona House	Peristerona	437,668	Not given
2	Kontea Cultural Heritage Circle Preservation	Kontea	63,330	Not given
3	Paphos Gate Day Care Centre	Nicosia	318,907	Not given
4	Prophet Elias Monastery		93,312	Not given
5	Armenian Monastery and Church	Nicosia	2,000,000	Not given
6	Restoration of Turkish Bath	Nicosia	333,000	Not given
7	Restoration of Ayios Neophytos Chapel	Troulli	100,606	Not given
Note: initial estimates (\$) are taken from project information memoranda, while the actual cost (€) is taken from the UNDP ACT "Fast Facts" sheet.			3,346,823	5,700,000

Peristerona House. Peristerona is village just to the south of Buffer Zone and close to the crossing point at Astromeritis. Prior to 1974 the village was inhabited primarily by Turkish Cypriots. Since 1974 the inhabitants are Greek Cypriots. The house was given to the Bishopric of Morphou by a Turkish Cypriot family but had stood empty for a number of years. The project covered the restoration of the house for use as an administrative centre, and bi-communal cultural centre.

Kontea Cultural Heritage Circle Preservation. Kontea is village formerly inhabited by Greek Cypriots and now inhabited by Turkish Cypriots. This project is implemented jointly by Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot partners, including former and current residents of the village. The project aims to promote reconciliation and improve the livelihoods of the current inhabitants through a series of actions. A carob plantation has been restored for use as a gathering place (e.g. picnics), and plans have been drawn up for the preservation and/ or restoration of a series of cultural assets spanning several centuries.

The Paphos Gate Day Care Centre is run by the Association for Welfare of People with Mental Handicap. The building had fallen into disrepair and had been unused for a number of years. The project enabled this old building to be renovated in keeping with its original

character and to be brought back into use. The Association operates several centres and provides services to Turkish Cypriot as well as Greek Cypriot clients, and this means that it also employs Turkish Cypriot carers. The Paphos Gate Day Care Centre has capacity for 12 clients, and four of these places are reserved for Turkish Cypriot clients, although these four places are currently not used due to lack of funding.

Prophet Elias Monastery. The project covered the cost of site cleaning, basic repairs, and security to prevent further damage to this deserted structure.

Armenian Monastery and Church. This project is restoring a large complex in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia adjacent to the Green Line. Works are expected to be completed soon.

Restoration of Turkish Bath covered the restoration of the Büyük Hamam in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia. Following completion of the project, the bath was rented by EVKAF to a commercial operator but is currently not in use, as the operation was commercially unviable.

Restoration of Ayios Neophytos Chapel. No additional information is available about this project other than that it involved a “*coordinated effort to restore the church to its former beauty*”.³²

What are the outcomes (effectiveness and impact) of the programmes and their components?

General points

Neither UNDP PFF or UNDP ACT are able to provide more than limited, mainly anecdotal, evidence of the planned or actual benefits of their projects (e.g. social, economic, and/ or reconciliation – only the latter is relevant to UNDP ACT). For UNDP PFF, project documents and stakeholder feedback indicate that such objectives seem to have been subordinated to the works themselves, and this is especially the case for the larger projects.

However, UNDP PFF and other stakeholder feedback indicates that UNDP PFF activities have led to changes in attitude and approach in areas such as:

- Compliance with the acquis and other rules and guidelines in areas such as health and safety, environment, access for the disabled, food hygiene for caterers and retailers, etc.;
- Tendering, contracting, and contract management;
- Contractors' compliance with works protocols;
- Conservation and restoration of buildings, including the layout and utilisation of public spaces, maintaining the original character of buildings, conservation building techniques, etc., although this seems to be more evident in smaller towns and villages than in Nicosia, for example;
- Public spaces in towns and villages have been enhanced for use by pedestrians and for community purposes, thus improving safety and enjoyment, as well as enhancing community cohesion;

The impact of UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT support in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia is constrained by the fact that although the renovated structures are in themselves very

³² Fast Facts, UNDP ACT, www.undp-act.org/data/fast_facts_cultural_heritage.pdf

important, there appears to be no overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the centre of the old city, and the renovated structures remain, essentially, islands within a largely neglected, or at least under-utilised area. Of course, there are significant challenges in this regard. For example the city is politically and physically divided, and the status and legal authority of relevant counterparts in the north is unclear. Nevertheless, a member of the Cultural Heritage Technical Committee in the north did indicate during a meeting with the evaluator that there is a need for the authorities to develop a strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the centre of the old city in the north. Both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT note that it is not within their mandates to develop strategies for the authorities. Nevertheless, this is a significant constraint on impact and sustainability and can not be ignored.

It is important to bear in mind that UNDP provided support for the rehabilitation of the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia for a number of year prior to the support covered by this evaluation. In the absence of systematic outcome data, it is difficult to disaggregate the impacts of assistance delivered at different times and through different programmes.

Of course, a major constraining factor is the Buffer Zone, which cuts across a number of roads in the city centre. This has a two-fold negative impact: firstly, people have been understandably reluctant to live in and/ or invest in areas adjacent to the Buffer Zone. Although this is evidently changing in some areas to the south of the Green Line, it remains a problem to the north of the Green Line and these areas have become home to low-income immigrant communities; secondly, cutting roads creates dead ends on both sides, and it is inevitable that such areas do not benefit from through traffic, which again limits economic activity and discourages investment. UNDP PFF notes that prior to the opening of the Ledra Street crossing in Nicosia, the area immediately to the north of the Green Line was neglected, with little economic activity. UNDP PFF notes that many shops were opened following opening of this crossing point, and that increased activity was evident even before the crossing point was actually opened.

For several UNDP PFF projects, the support does enable the relevant authorities to provide better services (medical, water supply, road safety) but these are purely procurement arrangements, with no developmental, capacity building, or know-how transfer elements envisaged.³³ Indeed, UNDP PFF's involvement appears to be more a matter of convenience for the EUPSO, rather than due to any intention or opportunity to add value. UNDP PFF does note, however, that capacity building takes place during the preparation of technical specifications, as UNDP PFF works closely with beneficiaries. It also notes that beneficiary "attendance" at tender evaluations

Evaluation Component I Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.)

Nicosia

The physical environment has been and/ or is being significantly improved and the renovated areas benefit from increased utilisation and commercial activity.

As a result of the restoration of Bedestan, the immediate area has been transformed. This monument is reported to be attracting, on average, 200 visitors per day. Information provided

³³ UNDP PFF notes, however, that such projects do contribute to compliance the aquis.

EVKAF (via UNDP PFF) indicates that, since its opening in late 2009, the Bedestan has been used to host 33 events over 38 days. More detailed statistical information would help UNDP PFF to demonstrate the impact of this major restoration project.³⁴ However, feedback from a survey carried out by UNDP PFF suggests that the Bedestan is considered under-utilised.

The following table indicates the number of events held in the Bedestan in 2010 and 2011, and the total number of days.³⁵ This indicates a significant increase in activity in 2011 compared with 2010.

	Events	Days
2010	9	10
2011	21	23

UNDP PFF notes that economic activity has visibly increased in areas immediately adjacent to the Bedestan since it was restored, but there are no statistics to confirm this (e.g. changes in the number and types of businesses, number of people employed, etc.).

However, there is limited evidence of capacity building in areas such as public engagement, strategic planning, financial sustainability, etc. UNDP PFF notes that, through the restoration of the Bedestan, it has transferred significant know-how to EVKAF in areas such structural stabilisation, restoration, and sustainable exploitation. UNDP PFF notes that the Bedestan project was something new for EVKAF, as this is the first time that a cultural heritage monument was converted for use as a cultural centre. UNDP PFF considers that it has given EVKAF additional impetus, and inputs to learn from and to perform better. A senior representative of EVKAF was less emphatic on this point, noting that EVKAF is an old foundation, and is custodian and/ or owner of some 5,000 monuments and properties across Cyprus with the implication that it already had significant experience in these areas. This suggests that while UNDP PFF may well have brought new concepts to the project, EVKAF itself may not have absorbed them. This seems to be the case, in particular, regarding the operation of major assets in a financially sustainable manner.

In this regard, it is important to bear in mind that the provision of training and/ or consultancy does not in itself indicate that capacity has been enhanced. Moreover, Phase I of the restoration of the Bedestan was carried out between 2004 and 2006, before the support covered by this evaluation, and it is likely that if there has been capacity building, this must already have taken place to some extent in the previous period. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that training is part of capacity building and that if trainees do not absorb from the provided training, then UNDP PFF can do no more. UNDP PFF notes that it can not enforce a change in the administrative culture of EVKAF, or its rules and regulations. It is evident from this that while this type of intervention may have other benefits, it can not address underlying institutional capacity issues, and this in itself may well be a constraint on impact and

³⁴ For example, while UNDP PFF notes that the Bedestan is reported by EVKAF to have, on average, 200 visitors per day, every day, there are no objectively verifiable data to support this. Information regarding the number of people participating in events hosted at the Bedestan (some of which have been organised by UNDP PFF itself) would be helpful. UNDP PFF notes that it is not in charge of events at the Bedestan and does not register the number of participants for each event. Detailed feedback on various issues from different groups would be also be useful, for example visitors and members of the public in both communities. UNDP PFF also notes that it is not responsible for seeking feedback from the events organised by EVKAF.

³⁵ This includes activities that have not yet taken place but are planned in December 2011.

sustainability. In order to address its concerns regarding sustainability, UNDP PFF carried out an assessment and prepared a strategy for EVKAF regarding the sustainable operation of the Bedestan.

EVKAF is the owner or custodian of many historic buildings in and around the Selimiye area, where the Bedestan is located. UNDP PFF staff themselves consider that there is no overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of this area, which is consequently under-utilised and falling far short of its potential to transform the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia. This is of course not only an issue for EVKAF, but also for the municipality, the “department of antiquities”, the tourism authorities, etc. Nevertheless, as the owner of numerous significant cultural assets in the area, EVKAF should be a central actor in this.

The other major UNDP PFF project in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia is the Municipal Market, which dates from 1932 and is immediately adjacent to the Bedestan. Although the market is some way away from completion, it is evident from stakeholder feedback that the renovated market will provide greatly improved conditions for both retailers and shoppers, and it is expected that this in itself will lead to increased economic activity. The structure has been strengthened to meet earthquake requirements, but the original character of the market has been retained and architectural features have been exposed (e.g. complex wooden roof structure and stone facades). The space within the market has been rationalised so that it can be used and managed more efficiently.

The Municipal Market is immediately adjacent to the Buffer Zone and the Turkish Forces military area, and at one end of the market there is an entrance, currently closed, that until 1963 led directly into the south of the city. The impact of the renovations would be significantly enhanced if a crossing point were to be opened here, allowing pedestrians to walk from the south directly into the market, and through to other attractions in the Selimiye area, such as the Bedestan, the Semiliye Mosque and adjacent square, and other nearby historic attractions.

The renewal of some 35km of new water pipes (and related works) will enable the municipality to reduce water losses in the relevant areas from around 50% to around 5%. Moreover, reduced maintenance requirements will save money and will greatly reduce contamination of water supplies.

Famagusta

The evaluator did not have the opportunity to visit Famagusta, or to meet with stakeholders from there. Little information was available regarding the outcomes of the projects there, although it is assumed that the benefits of the Desdemona – Canbulat Gate project are similar to those of the street improvement project in Kyrenia (see below). The 2011 project survey report indicates that the municipality considers that the main benefits are physical improvements to the area (street lighting is specifically mentioned), and increased tourism. The report notes that after a gap of 40 years, the municipality has reintroduced an annual event in the street covered by the project.

Kyrenia

UNDP PFF notes that street improvements in Kyrenia have enhanced the environment for pedestrians, making it significantly safer and more enjoyable, and enabling more pedestrians to peruse the shops along the street. The 2011 project survey report indicates that the municipality has observed an overall increase in the use of the street by pedestrians, noting in particular more use by people with disabilities and mothers with baby carriages.

Impact is somewhat undermined by the fact that the municipality has allowed numerous obstructions to be placed on the new sidewalk (signs, goods, etc.), and it has allowed the cycle lane to be used for parking. While the municipality's wish to promote cycling is in itself a most welcome development, UNDP PFF did express concerns during the design phase that the proposed cycle lane was not part of a longer cycle route and was unlikely to attract cyclists.

As far as capacity building and know-how transfer are concerned, it is not evident to what extent this has taken place, bearing in mind the project covered by this evaluation was a continuation of a previous project focusing on the central square and the start of the main street. Thus it is probable that capacity building would already have taken place prior to the project evaluated here, and it is unclear what additional capacity has been developed with this project. UNDP PFF notes that all projects are developed in close collaboration with beneficiaries.

Cultural events

Little information is available about what cultural events have taken place, where they took place, how many people were involved, or from which groups. No information is available regarding the outcome of these activities.

Evaluation Component 2 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus

The physical environment has been and/ or is being significantly improved in the "pilot" small towns and villages, and the renovated areas benefit from increased utilisation, or are likely to when the works are completed (Lefka/ Lefke).

Stakeholder feedback regarding the village pilot projects highlights the following outcomes:

- Enhanced communal spaces are used more for community activities (instead of parking, for example), and this has contributed to improved community cohesion;
- Conservation techniques are being applied by residents to their own properties. As one stakeholder put it, village residents have learned how to "live well in old houses";
- Mukhtars, communities, and municipal authorities have learned about improving local infrastructure in a way that makes the environment better for people, rather than considering only vehicles;
- In some cases, the village projects have clearly developed the capacity of mukhtars to engage with, and mobilise the community. Community involvement in the projects was essential, not only because of the proposed refurbishment to public spaces, but also because the projects extended to the exteriors of private properties around the communal spaces. In one case the community was mobilised, with some difficulty, by the project itself, in the absence of interest on the part of two successive mukhtars. In this particular case, the municipality of Lapta/ Lapethos stepped in when responsibility for villages was transferred to municipalities as part of a local government reorganisation, and it carried out additional works in support of the project, extensive repaving the village streets with paving blocks provided by the project.
- Pilot villages are receiving more visitors at weekends, and some former residents are returning to renovate their properties;
- Capacity building at village level is evident in areas such as public engagement and mobilisation, project planning and implementation;
- The support has had a demonstration effect. For example, two mukhtars reported they have developed new project ideas, although they are not sure where to find funding to implement them. As well as carrying out additional work in the pilot village Hisarköy/ Kampyli, the Municipality of Lapta/ Lapethos is transferring the experience to other villages for which it is

responsible, and the mayor reports that several new village projects are at various stages of planning and implementation with funding from various sources. The municipality of Lapta/ Lapethos is responsible for 14 villages, the largest number for any municipality in the north of Cyprus, which improves the prospects for dissemination;

- Following the works in Kalavac / Kalyvakia, there has been private investment in the area of catering and recreation;
- A private “arts house” is to be established in Hisarköy/ Kampyli.

Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that there is no control group against which the pilot villages can be compared. For example, there may be other reasons for increased numbers of visitors, and former residents returning to renovate their properties, and such trends may also apply to other villages.

Stakeholder feedback suggests that the outcome with regard to minor towns is likely to be mixed.

For example, the Mayor of Lapta/ Lapethos has a broad and proactive approach and has built on UNDP PFF support. He reports that sidewalk improvements, to which the municipality has made a contribution, have made it safer and more enjoyable to walk along a busy street, and that more pedestrians are taking advantage of this. Perhaps more importantly, the municipality has plans to extend the network of sidewalks to link the town centre with the sea shore, and it has 20 projects at various stages of development, including other EU-funded projects, and a €1.2 million cultural complex, and a new waste water treatment plant. Clearly, the municipality is in the process of implementing a strategic development plan. The mayor notes that the municipality has adopted the systematic approach to contracting and contract management introduced by UNDP PFF, and UNDP PFF itself notes that the municipality has learned how to work with bilateral and multilateral donors as a result of the project.

The eventual outcome of the ongoing restoration in Lefke/ Lefka is less clear. The works are being undertaken to a high standard. However, at the time of the evaluation mission, there appeared to be no clear plan for the future use of the refurbished buildings and communal space.³⁶ In its comments on the revised draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that the Municipality of Lefke/ Lefka is in the process of establishing a committee to manage and supervise the empty buildings. This committee will include NGOs, the University of Lefke/ Lefka, associations, and local authorities. The committee will establish operating principles, the type of activities to be prioritised, and the average rents (in order to avoid excessive rents).

The communal impact has already been undermined to some extent, as one of the buildings included in the restoration plan was not listed and shortly before restoration works were due to commence, it was demolished and replaced by a large apartment building that now dominates the area, thus undermining the objective of the project.³⁷ This was of course beyond

³⁶ The buildings are privately owned, and there is no obligation or commitment of any kind on the part of the owners regarding their subsequent use. For example, now the buildings have been renovated, there is a possibility that rents could be raised to unaffordable levels. Alternatively, some of the buildings could be left empty, as they were before the restoration. Or they could be let out for purposes that are no longer in keeping with the upgraded area. Any of these could limit the communal impact of the project.

³⁷ Listing refers to inclusion on a register of protected buildings maintained by the authorities in north responsible for antiquities. Feedback from the municipality of Lefke/ Lefka indicate that while some of the buildings in the town have been listed, others that should be, have not. It is not clear why this is so, but UNDP PFF feedback suggests that this in part due to the limitations of the “department for antiquities” in the north and lack of effective cooperation between the municipality and this department.

the control of UNDP PFF and reflects one of the challenges that UNDP PFF has to contend with, namely the weak regulatory environment.

It also has to be noted that, while the UNDP PFF village and minor town projects were intended as pilots for subsequent grants schemes managed directly by the EUPSO, there was in fact considerable overlap, and the EUPSO notes that “*everything happened at the same time*”. This implies that the outcomes describe above may in part be due to EUPSO activities.

The eco-village project at Buyukkonuk/ Komikebir was also presumably intended as a demonstration project. However, no information is available regarding the outcome of this project (e.g. reduced water consumption, reduced electricity consumption, and reduced waste disposal), which included equipment for solar energy, water conservation, and composting, as well as training, and information dissemination within the village. There is no information on how or to what extent project benefits have been sustained, and it is not evident that there has been any systematic dissemination to other communities.

In general, there is little evidence of systematic capacity building and dissemination activities in the context of the village and minor towns projects. UNDP PFF notes that this was not, however, envisaged in the project documents, and that any capacity building and dissemination that has taken place should be considered as additional value added.

Evaluation Component 3 Enable the opening of new crossing points

It is understood that since the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos crossing point opened in October 2010, there have been approximately 80,000 crossings, mainly from south to north. As UNFICYP and the EUPSO have pointed out, the removal of any barrier is likely to promote confidence and reconciliation, although it is not known if any research has been done to verify this, and specifically regarding this crossing point. However, the opening of the crossing point is primarily the outcome of a political agreement, to which the UNDP PFF project gave effect, in a timely manner, and despite significant complications and administrative obstacles.

Works at the Ledra/ Lokmaci crossing point in Nicosia have enhanced the walk across the Green Line for pedestrians, and the experience will be further enhanced when works on the remaining buildings are completed. UNDP PFF notes that research carried out by PRIO indicates that 700,000 people used the crossing point in the eight months after its opening in April 2008.³⁸ This suggests that a large number of people will benefit from the enhanced crossing experience.

Evaluation Component 4 Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

The Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant will replace an existing plant in the northern part of Cyprus that serves both communities and is operated by the municipality of Nicosia (north). The new plant is needed as the existing plant does not have sufficient capacity at times of peak demand, recycled water does not fully comply with EU requirements, and there is a significant odour problem.

The new plant will also serve both communities. The new plant is complex and it is envisaged that it will be operated by a commercial operator for 10 years upon commissioning. It was

³⁸ <http://www.prio.no/>

envisaged that the commercial operator would be contracted to a management company, a joint venture between the Sewerage Board of Nicosia and the municipality of Nicosia (north).

The expected outcome is "*Enhanced cooperation between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities to build and manage a new sewerage treatment facility for the Greater Nicosia area, which is able to meet projected demand for the next 10 years, in line with EU requirements and standards on waste water treatment, and water conservation*".

The construction of the plant is delayed by three months due to the slow performance of one of the consortium partners, which is involved in other EC funded contracts at the same time. Completion is expected sometime in 2012. Thus the envisaged environmental benefits have not yet materialised.

However, it could be argued that, even during this development phase, the project is having a positive effect by keeping the two sides engaged, rather than encouraging them to seek separate solutions. On the other hand, it is difficult to conclude that the process is actually enhancing confidence and reconciliation, as it is understood that technical co-operation between the project counterparts (the Municipality of Nicosia (north) and the Sewerage Board of Nicosia (SBN) (south)) has always been good.³⁹ The envisaged management joint venture will not be formed. A representative of SBN indicated that the two sides are investigating the possibility of concluding separate contracts with the plant operator. Furthermore, uncertainties remain as to how, when, and to what extent treated water will be made available to the south, which is an important consideration for the SBN's investment in the plant.

Perhaps less significant, but nevertheless worth noting, is that the one of the outputs of the new plant was to be solid waste that could be used as fertiliser. While it is understood that the plant will indeed deliver solid waste of the appropriate quality for use as fertiliser, feedback from the municipality of Nicosia (north) indicates that the solid waste will be disposed of in landfill sites in the north.⁴⁰

There is no evidence that the project has developed capacity in any way, or that this was actually intended. Rather, the involvement of UNDP PFF appears to be primarily as a "neutral" contracting agent and site supervisor, although UNDP PFF notes that it was instrumental in initiating the project.⁴¹

Evaluation Component 5 Study of Cultural Heritage

In 2008, the European Parliament requested the EC to carry out a study on the condition, and estimated costs of restoring, cultural heritage in the northern part of Cyprus.

³⁹ UNDP PFF notes since 1979.

⁴⁰ The Sewerage Board of Nicosia envisaged that a significant proportion of the recycled water from the new plant will eventually be pumped to the south (e.g. for irrigation). However, it considers that transportation of quantities of solid waste across the Buffer Zone on a daily basis is not feasible. Thus utilization and/ or disposal of the solid waste will take place only in the northern part of Cyprus.

⁴¹ In its comments on a draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes that the capacity of the municipality of Nicosia (north) to operate the plant will be developed over the 10 years following commissioning, while the plant is operated by a commercial operator.

A Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage was established in 2008. This was one of a number of committees and working groups established in preparation for a new round of negotiations on a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem.

On 28 January 2009 the two leaders in Cyprus agreed to establish an "Advisory Board for the Preservation, Physical Protection and Restoration of the Immovable Cultural Heritage of Cyprus". This provided the necessary political backing for the Study of Cultural Heritage to be launched.

This has produced a significant confidence building/ reconciliation effect. Under the guidance of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage, the project has developed an inventory of nearly 3,000 cultural heritage assets covering all parts of Cyprus. It has developed an agreed, objective methodology for identifying and prioritising cultural assets in most need of stabilisation and/ or restoration. This is one of the few UNDP PFF projects involving both sides working directly together to achieve a common goal (as opposed to working in parallel).

Evaluation Component 6 UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage Grant Scheme

UNDP ACT was unable to provide any information regarding the outcomes of the seven Cultural Heritage projects. Meetings were, however, held with three of the project promoters.

Several projects demonstrate effective joint working (and thus confidence building/ reconciliation).

However, the Bishopric of Morphou (Peristerona House restoration project - cultural centre) notes that Turkish Cypriot participation in bi-communal activities has recently diminished, for reasons that are not clear. The Cultural Institute of the Bishopric of Morphou, which owns the cultural centre does have committee made up of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot members, and while they have not met recently, they do keep in regular telephone contact. Nevertheless, the cultural centre is used for many cultural and related activities, which are open to all communities.

The bi-communal impact of the Paphos Gate Day Care Centre is currently limited due the lack of funding for Turkish Cypriot clients, although the Centre has capacity allocated specifically for this group.

The Kontea Cultural Heritage Circle Preservation project is implemented jointly by the Kontea Heritage Foundation⁴² and Union of the Chambers of Cyprus Turkish Engineers and Architects (KTMMOB).⁴³ The Kontea Heritage Foundation includes both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot members. The project promoters note that many activities take place in the village, and that the restored carob plantation is used every weekend for leisure purposes, such as picnics.

The restoration of the old bath (Büyük Hamam) is no doubt a worthwhile end in itself. However, like a other EVKAF cultural assets in the old city centre, it is currently closed,⁴⁴ and it is not evident what peace building/ reconciliation activities were incorporated into the project.

⁴² <http://www.konteaheritage.com/en/index.html>

⁴³ The Union of the Chambers of Cyprus Turkish Engineers and Architects. <http://ktmmob.org/>

⁴⁴ UNDP ACT notes that the operator is being changed.

As a large historical complex near the centre of old Nicosia, restoration of the Armenian Church and Monastery is a worthwhile end in itself. However, it is unclear at this stage what impact this will have on the area, or on reconciliation and peace building. It is not evident to what extent, if at all, the project involves joint working between different communities, although UNDP ACT notes that the Armenian community has been closely consulted at all stages, and that the employment of Turkish Cypriot contractors on the project has itself made a contribution to reconciliation. This \$2 million restoration project was undertaken apparently without a clear plan as to how the complex would be utilised and sustained. However, there is now a business plan and UNDP ACT is considering promoting this as a as an educational/ cultural centre, and has contacted several international educational institutes to this effect. However, another nearby EVKAF cultural asset, the Bedestan, was also restored by UNDP PFF with a similar purpose in mind. Like the Municipal Market, the long-term contribution of this complex to the area and to the entire community will be significantly enhanced, if/ when the barriers across a nearby street can be removed to make a new crossing point between north and south.

What factors have influenced performance and achievement of outcomes?

The weak regulatory and administrative framework in the northern part of Cyprus and the fact that the authorities there are not formally recognised, are perhaps the most important constraints. This means, for example, that there is no overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia. It also means that it is difficult to address some underlying, more general, capacity issues and this in turn is likely to constrain impact and sustainability (e.g. capacity of the “department for antiquities” in the north).

For the UNDP PFF, the main factors have been:

- Poor contractor performance (e.g. Hisarköy/ Kampyli, and Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant);
- Property clearance issues have caused significant delays and in some cases the cancellation of projects;
- UNDP PFF initially faced suspicion, and opposition from village residents regarding the village upgrading projects;
- Lack of counterpart commitment and/ or capacity (e.g. Municipality of Nicosia (north));
- Administrative and security issues (e.g. Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos, Ledra/ Lokmaci, Akincilar/ Louroukina);
- Contractors' boycott for several months throughout the northern part of Cyprus;
- Between 2004 and 2009, UNDP PFF had to work with three different EVKAF directors and executive boards.

Have the programmes and projects contributed to the overall change for a more positive environment? If so, have they been a key factor in improvements?

Most, if not all UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT projects have made, or are highly likely to make a contribution the overall change for a more positive environment.

As far as UNDP PFF is concerned, the picture is mixed. Infrastructure support provided in Nicosia, Famagusta, and Kyrenia, over many years, when taken together, does represent a significant contribution to the development of a more positive environment. However, for the purposes of this evaluation, it is important to differentiate between UNDP's contribution in previous programming periods, and the support covered by this evaluation.

The projects in Nicosia covered by this evaluation, when considered alone, are of limited significance to Nicosia as a whole, although of course they are significant for the immediate areas in which they have been or are being implemented. It is important to bear in mind, however, that there are residential areas close to major works of both UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF that remain neglected and do not appear to have benefited to any great extent. UNDP PFF does note, however, that private owners have made improvements and changed the use of buildings in the vicinity of project locations.

In Kyrenia, the street upgrading project has made an obvious difference, but general changes in central Kyrenia are clearly also attributable to previous work in the area.

The village and minor town projects, however, are perhaps more significant, although they are smaller. This is because, especially for the villages, they have provided support in locations where little, if any previous support has been provided. The projects, have probably had a relatively greater impact in terms of both physical environment and demonstration effect than some larger projects.

UNDP PFF's contribution to the opening of the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos crossing point was significant. It enabled the political decision to open the crossing point to be effectively implemented and in a timely manner, which in itself was essential for the credibility of the agreement between the two leaders.

UNDP PFF's participation in the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant project is key in the sense that a neutral party was required to act as contracting authority in order to combine funds from north and south (which the EUPSO is unable to do). UNDP PFF notes that its track record in Cyprus over 10 years are of critical importance for this project, and that this is demonstrated by the fact that *"both sides asked the UNDP to be the umbrella"*. From a purely technical perspective, its role could possibly have been performed by another organisation, however, it is not clear that another organisation would have been able to move the project forward in such a complicated political environment. Although UNDP PFF is understood to be performing well as supervising engineer, stakeholder feedback suggests that this role could have been performed equally well by a corporate engineer. Indeed UNDP PFF's role as both client and supervising engineer blurs the normal lines between these two functions. On the one hand it gives the UNDP PFF more direct control over works, on the other hand, it places significantly more responsibility on it. This should not be an issue, as long as there are no significant problems. However, it could stretch the resources of UNDP PFF should any significant problems arise. UNDP PFF notes, however, that it is *"...fully supported by UNDP HQ legal – procurement etc."* It also notes that, in the interests of cost minimisation, stakeholders were strongly in favour of an individual engineer, as opposed to a corporate engineer.

The UNDP PFF Study of Cultural Heritage is highly significant in terms of reconciliation and confidence building, as well as the preservation of physical assets. Moreover, UNDP PFF's participation has been an important factor in ensuring that this sensitive project reached a satisfactory conclusion, and that it has delivered a series of outputs that form the basis for future practical co-operation between the two communities.

While no doubt contributing to changes for the better, is difficult to conclude that UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage activities have been or will be a key factor the development of a more positive environment. The number of grants is small, and while the final volume of grants is not insignificant (approximately €5 million), much have this has been allocated to one project in Nicosia. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP ACT questions whether greater impact could have been achieved by limiting grant size and increasing the number of grants.

How relevant is each component? In particular considering the systems and capacities that were developed and the effective use of project resources?

General

While restoration of cultural assets is of course important, the justification, from a development perspective, for prioritising structures such as the Bedestan, the Büyük Hamam, and the Armenian church and monastery is unclear, given that nearby residential areas are in a poor state, and that there appears to be no overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia.⁴⁵ This applies to the relevant strategic stakeholders (e.g. the municipality, EVKAF, and authorities responsible for tourism, and for cultural assets. However, UNDP PFF notes that besides development, these projects are important for confidence building.

Despite having benefited from support over a number of years prior to the assistance evaluated here, it is not clear that the main actors in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia have the capacity, and in some cases, commitment to sustain and build on project benefits. This is reflected in the by the fact that, due to a lack of agreement between key actors in the north of Nicosia, the NMP Area Schemes project was cancelled in 2010. This was intended to address the need for a coherent strategic approach to the development of the northern part of central Nicosia. It is therefore possible that the projects evaluated here were too ambitious.

Evaluation Component I Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation of the main cities of the northern part of Cyprus (Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia etc.)

The Bedestan has been restored in two phases. Phase I was UNDP PFF notes that the Bedestan is a project of major significance. However, this is not reflected in the Project Document.⁴⁶ UNDP PFF also stresses the importance of the Bedestan in the context of the NMP, noting that it is one of the NMP priority projects.⁴⁷ However, this is not mentioned in the

⁴⁵ For Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I (under which Phase II of the Bedestan restoration was funded, the overall purpose is to "...upgrade the living environment of the Turkish Cypriot community through infrastructure/ urban revitalisation projects. The direct beneficiaries are the inhabitants of the northern part of Cyprus."

⁴⁶ The Project Document states only that additional funds were required for the completion of the restoration of the Bedestan and that "The completion of these projects will complement all the interventions in the Selimiye area, funded by the EC and this historical building will be brought back to its original splendour and to public use."

⁴⁷ A press release (link provided by UNDP PFF) describes the Nicosia Master Plan (NMP) as "a bi-communal project formed by Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot professionals. The NMP consists of planning and development policies for the wider area of Nicosia, as well as for specific projects that promote the revitalization of the walled city as a whole. The NMP is used as a framework that guides and sets out the overall planning strategy for Nicosia." While the press release was downloaded from the website of Europa Nostra, the author (according to the document properties) appears to be the Municipality of Nicosia (south)
<http://www.europanostra.org/UPLOADS/FILS/press%20relase%20award%20ceremony.doc>

Project Document. Another document provided by UNDP PFF does, however, identify the Bedestan as one of a “very large number of projects have been identified [in the NMP] as priority interventions, aiming at implementing a strategy for the conservation, revitalization and development of proposed areas.”⁴⁸ The expected outcome of the restoration is not clearly described, although the above-mentioned document does indicate that it “is expected that the Bedestan, re-functioning as cultural pole after the completion of the restoration, will become an important landmark for the city of Nicosia and attracting cultural tourism enhancing the vision for the urban revitalization of the walled city”.⁴⁹

The Municipal Market is relevant both as an identified priority of the NMP, and as an active commercial centre that was in urgent need of significant improvement.

Projects in Kyrenia and Famagusta are relevant to the need to improve safety and enhance the general urban environment, in particular for pedestrians.

Evaluation Component 2 Improve the infrastructure and to support the urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalisation minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus

Stakeholder feedback indicates that these projects are generally highly relevant to the needs and capacities of the target communities. Moreover, these projects are relevant to UNDP’s core business areas, such as enhancing local government service delivery, and improving accountability and citizen participation.⁵⁰

Evaluation Component 3 Enable the opening of new crossing points

The improvement of the road between Limnitis and Kato Pyrgos was necessary to give effect to a political agreement between the leaders of the two communities to facilitate movement between north and south. While road construction is perhaps not so obviously relevant to UNDP’s core business, UNDP PFF’s involvement was considered essential as a neutral party and facilitator, without which this important political agreement might not have been put into effect as planned. UNDP PFF considers that no other organisation could have implemented the project in such a short time, taking into account the property and political issues.

Evaluation Component 4 Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

The new Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant will provide increased capacity and environmental benefits and is therefore relevant. Consideration as to whether or not the chosen solution is the most relevant/ appropriate is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

UNDP PFF’s role in the project is highly relevant to the EUPSO, and to the counterparts, as a neutral party enabling funding from different sources to be combined for this large project and politically complicated project.

.Another web page (link provided by UNDP PFF) describes the UNDP as the banker for the NMP, and the EU as broker. <http://www.cyprus44.com/nicosia/master-plan.asp>

⁴⁸ The document is an untitled, undated technical study/ report.

⁴⁹ In its comments on a draft of this report, UNDP PFF notes more specifically that the Bedestan is identified as a priority project in Phase II of the NMP, Phase I having been completed

⁵⁰ <http://europeandcis.undp.org/>

There are indications that in order to seek a solution the problem of establishing a management company, the project counterparts have sought to institutionalise the involvement of UNDP, or another UN agency on a long terms basis, as a result of the political recognition issue. This would, of course, undermine one of the EU's main objectives for this project, namely to encourage to the two communities to work together.

Evaluation Component 5 Study of Cultural Heritage

This project is highly relevant to the EU's goals of promoting confidence and reconciliation, as it has involved experts from both communities in addressing a sensitive issue. Moreover, it has produced important outputs that provide a basis for future work in this area. In particular, the project developed methodologies for objectively ranking and technically assessing cultural assets. In this sense the project has also included a valuable capacity development element, applicable equally to both communities.

Evaluation Component 6 Cultural Heritage Grant Scheme

Several of the seven funded projects are clearly relevant to the objectives of the grant scheme, which emphasise that projects should demonstrate *"how such acts of preservation and celebration of cultural heritage can be utilized as a means for building long-term cooperation across the Green Line for the benefit of the local community as a whole as well as its past, current and future residents"*.

However, both UNDP ACT and USAID acknowledge that some projects have lacked the envisaged joint working, as there was a desire to ensure "balance" (spread of locations and communities). Thus it seems that the UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage grant scheme has in some cases interpreted peace building and co-operation as ensuring a spread of funds across locations and communities, rather than on bringing people from different communities together to work towards a common goal. In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP ACT notes while it was sometimes politically impossible to involve both sides in project implementation, it has sought at least to build trust by getting the two communities to become *"keepers of each others' heritage."*

How and to what extent has the UNDP added value to project outcomes?

Stakeholder feedback is mainly very positive about the UNDP's involvement.

For example the EUPSO notes that it has found UNDP PFF's involvement valuable for a number of reasons, including:

- UNDP PFF is able to mobilise quickly (i.e. react quickly to developments, and to requests from the EUPSO);
- UNDP PFF is able to undertake smaller projects, which the EUPSO is not set up to handle;
- UNDP PFF is seen as neutral party, which is important for the implementation of projects involving both communities, such as the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant and crossing points;
- UNDP PFF has reviewed applications for two EUPSO calls for proposals, on the basis of which the EUPSO has made its funding decisions;
- UNDP PFF has helped to promote alignment with the acquis in areas such the environment, health and safety, and access for people with disabilities.

UNFICYP notes the importance of UNDP PFF's involvement in crossing point projects (Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos, and Ledra/ Lokmaci) as a neutral party, and patient and skilled facilitator.

A representative of the central authorities in the north of Cyprus noted that UNDP PFF is easier to work with than the EC. This suggests that UNDP PFF absorbs some of the administrative burden associated with the management and implementation of EU funds. This is clearly helpful to beneficiaries but may also imply an element of capacity substitution. The same representative also noted that having worked with UNDP PFF municipality capacity has increased, and municipalities are more actively engaged in the development process.

Project counterparts, mainly those involved in the village and minor towns projects, note the importance of UNDP PFF's support, and the new ideas and know-how that it has brought to their communities.

It is evident from discussions with UNDP PFF staff and other stakeholders that the UNDP PFF's core staff and project teams have demonstrated considerable perseverance and thoroughness in achieving high quality outputs, often in the face of numerous administrative and other obstacles, and at times under significant time pressure. This points to an experienced and motivated staff.

It unclear to what extent UNDP PFF projects evaluated here have been able to leverage UNDP's experience in its core activity areas, such as public administration, local governance, and civic engagement.⁵¹ UNDP PFF notes that such activities are beyond its mandate due to the "Cyprus problem". UNDP also notes that it is constrained in what it can do in this regard, since UNDP PFF projects are part of the overall EU programme of support to the Turkish Cypriots. While the projects covered by this evaluation relate primarily to works, it might nevertheless have been possible to incorporate some aspects of these themes as desired project outcomes. However, as both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT note, Cyprus is a special case. The unclear legal status and authority of key actors in the north means that it is not possible to engage with them in the normal way and it constrains the type of project that can be delivered, and the way that projects are delivered.

Regarding UNDP ACT, project counterparts note that it was helpful and its support was much appreciated. However, its contribution, or value added, is generally difficult to determine, although one counterpart did note that UNDP ACT had put it in touch with institutional contacts in the north, which it otherwise would not have been able to reach.

What were the best practice of and lessons learned during project implementation?

Best practices

UNDP PFF has undertaken two surveys, one in 2010 and a follow-up survey in 2011 covering all projects except those that were terminated or cancelled. However, these surveys were of limited utility for the purposes of this evaluation, as neither the methodology nor the results are clearly presented, and the raw data were not available to the evaluator. Nor was any part of the of the 2010 survey.

⁵¹ http://www.beta.undp.org/undp/en/home/ourwork/democraticgovernance/focus_areas.html

UNDP PFF provides post-project follow-up to help counterparts sustain and build on project benefits.

Prior to all works UNDP PFF wrote to affected businesses and residents apologising for any inconvenience.

UNDP PFF has issued a series of technical leaflets on taking care of historical buildings.⁵²

UNDP PFF procedures appear to have been highly systematic, for example:

- The selection of pilot villages for support under Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I;
- Development of village upgrading ideas with mukhtars;
- Development and application of the ranking methodology for cultural heritage assets, and development and application the detailed technical analysis procedures;
- Application of site protocols and procedures.

UNDP PFF has insisted on the correct application of health and safety rules at works sites. It notes that on occasion, it has suspended works when contractors have repeatedly failed to use the correct safety equipment (e.g. helmets).

UNDP PFF has stressed the importance of incorporating access and facilities for people with disabilities.

Lessons learned

The experience of the project in Iskele/Trikomo demonstrates the importance of completing property ownership enquiries before investing significant time or money in any project. UNDP PFF notes that no money was invested, although one of UNDP PFF's implementation reports notes that technical assistance was contracted by UNDP PFF in June 2009 to prepare the project design and tender dossiers for the rehabilitation of the market, and that these were finalised in late 2009.⁵³

The municipality of Lapta/ Lapethos stressed the importance of looking at the big picture when undertaking any works. For example, when replacing sidewalks, it is important to consider drainage, entrenchment of cables, and the stability of nearby structures. UNDP PFF notes that it was already taking this approach. This is therefore a lesson learned by the municipality.

Another point raised by the mayor of Lapta/ Lapethos was the need to stagger different activities in order to avoid simultaneous execution of conflicting works (e.g. laying side walks and entrenching cables).

The experience of Lefke/ Lefka indicates the importance of working with all relevant authorities to ensure that historical areas properly protected at an early stage.

A representative of the central authorities in the northern part of Cyprus stressed that importance fully involving beneficiaries in project planning and implementation, noting that they were sometimes left on the sidelines. UNDP PFF notes that the programme steering

⁵² http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=46&Itemid=14

⁵³ Yearly Technical Report – Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 – June 2011).

committee decides on which project to fund. Once the decision has been taken, UNDP PFF always fully involves counterparts in all subsequent decision making (design, tendering, and implementation).

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats of the project's implementation process.

UNDP PFF has an experienced and highly motivated team, which has enabled it to complete a considerable number of projects in often challenging circumstances.

UNDP PFF's considerable experience has enabled it to undertake potentially problematic projects involving stakeholders from both communities. Other organisations (UNFICYP and EUPSO) rely on it for precisely this reason.

General project design

Project documents tend to confuse outcomes, outputs, and activities. In practise, the emphasis appears to be on delivering outputs, rather than on achieving outcomes, (i.e. sustainable changes in the performance/ behaviour/ attitudes of target systems/ institutions/ groups etc.).

The project documents for Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I and Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II list numerous indicators, as it was unclear at the time exactly what kind of projects would be undertaken. However, there was no subsequent review/ fine tuning of indicators, no systems were envisaged to collect them, and no attempt has been made to collect any, even where they may be readily available.

There appears to have been little, if any, systematic networking and dissemination between projects, or with other programmes, and none between the two UNDP programmes.

The set up of the two programmes, the political environment in which they operate, and their largely different focus areas, means that there is limited scope for synergies between the two programmes. As examples of co-ordination, UNDP PFF notes that:

- There have been many exchanges between UNDP Programme Officers/ Programme Managers on many issues;
- The Bedestan project utilised the services of an architect engaged by UNDP ACT in the restoration of the Armenian church and monastery;
- Members of the team that supervised the restoration of the Bedestan are now part of the team supervising the works at the Armenian Church and Monastery;
- There were many visits by the team restoring the Armenian Church and Monastery to the works at the Bedestan;
- The UNDP PFF Programme Officer participated in the evaluation of the tender for the works at the Armenian Church and Monastery.

Nevertheless, there does appear to be some scope for improving co-ordination between the two programmes. This is demonstrated by the fact UNDP ACT (and indeed USAID) questioned the inclusion of the seven UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage projects in this evaluation and, according to UNDP ACT, there was no consultation with UNDP ACT on the terms of

reference for the evaluation. UNDP PFF, however, notes that the terms of reference for the evaluation of Outcome 5 were initiated by UNDP ACT, and subsequently reviewed and modified by UNDP ACT, and that UNDP ACT was represented on the panel that selected the evaluator.

Both programmes have restored cultural heritage assets in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia. There appeared to be some uncertainty on the part of UNDP PFF regarding plans to use parts of the Armenian church and monastery complex (a few hundred metres from the Bedestan) as a cultural/ educational centre.

To some extent, the impact and sustainability of projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia are likely to be constrained by the same issues, namely the capacity of key actors, and the absence of a coherent strategy between these actors regarding the sustainable development and exploitation of the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia. A member of the Cultural Heritage Technical Committee in the north noted the desirability of establishing such a strategy. As far as sustainability is concerned, both programmes have worked hard to ensure this for specific projects, but independently of each other, even when there is a common counterpart. While a strategy is in itself not the responsibility of either programme (although UNDP PFF has helped with the development of town master plans and is closely involved in the NMP), it is possible that the impact of both programmes in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia could have been enhanced if there had been greater co-ordination regarding these issues. This is not to suggest that the two programmes should have carried out joint projects, as this would not have been possible bearing in mind the different sources of funding and requirements of the respective funders. Rather, they could perhaps have jointly identified key challenges to impact and sustainability, and then developed a co-ordinated plan for addressing them, albeit separately.

Basic data management and reporting systems

There were significant gaps in the information provided to the evaluator. Both UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF had difficulty in responding to requests for information during the evaluation mission. A large amount of documentation was provided more than two weeks after the end of the evaluation mission. However, it has not been possible to review this documentation in detail.

UNDP PFF notes that it has an intranet data system. However, neither programme was able to provide a simple list of projects with key data such as counterparts, project locations, project implementation status, budgets, commitments, disbursements, key dates, etc. The evaluator requested this information from UNDP PFF for the 38 projects covered by this evaluation, and provided a spreadsheet template. However, UNDP PFF informed the evaluator that in order to compile such a list, it would be necessary to extract relevant information from numerous project documents. While UNDP PFF did provide the evaluator with two lists of contracts (one covering works, and the other services), it has been unable to provide a comprehensive list of the 38 UNDP PFF projects covered by this evaluation and the evaluator was obliged to compile a list by extracting relevant information from implementation reports as they became available during the course of the evaluation. While a list of the seven UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage projects is available on its web page in the form of a one page brochure (Fast Facts),⁵⁴ this has limited information, is out of date, and does not provide a complete picture.

⁵⁴ Fast Facts, UNDP ACT, www.undp-act.org/data/fast_facts_cultural_heritage.pdf

Samples of individual project implementation reports provided by UNDP PFF indicate that it keeps detailed systematic records. However, while the narrative reports provided by UNDP PFF are informative and of a generally high quality, these do not appear to have been produced at regular intervals (e.g. one year, two years, two and a half years).⁵⁵ There are significant gaps in reporting (e.g. apparently no final reporting on Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I projects that had not been completed by the time that the most recent report was issued).⁵⁶ In its comments on the draft of this report, UNDP PFF noted that it would report to the EC on these projects by the end of the year (2011) and that it provides monthly reports (presumably to the EUPSO) and that narrative reports are provided only when funding replenishments are requested.

UNDP ACT was unable to provide any individual project implementation reports or substantive planning documents during the evaluation mission.

A simple relational database (regularly updated) would have addressed these issues, as well as providing an important strategic management tool, and greatly facilitating regular reporting.

UNDP PFF directly employs some site engineers as UNDP staff

This is understandable for small projects, however, it is less obvious why this has been done for the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant project, where the resources and backstopping of a corporate site engineer may have been desirable. UNDP PFF notes that site engineers for the Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos road project and the Municipal Market are provided by companies.

UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF appear to be highly reactive to donor requirements

From the perspectives of the two donors, this is no doubt highly desirable. However, this probably limits the development of an effective strategic approach on the part of UNDP and likely contributes to the limited incorporation of real capacity building as an end in itself.

There appears to have been little direct employment generation at village and minor town level, or direct involvement of local enterprises in works

UNDP PFF notes that it always follows standard open and fair tendering procedures, and selects the lowest cost compliant bidder. It is understood that local rules (i.e. in the north of Cyprus) require bidders to be registered and of a certain category, with the aim of eliminating unreliable/irregular operators. One stakeholder indicated that a village project could have been implemented at significantly lower cost by using skilled local builders and craftsmen for works in the village, but that local rules made it difficult for them to participate. UNDP PFF notes that ensuring the participation of local builders and craftsmen is not feasible, although there is nothing to stop contractors utilising their services. UNDP PFF also notes that anyone may participate in a procurement process as long as they meet the eligibility criteria. Contractors

⁵⁵ Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2006 - October 2007), Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2007 - November 2009), Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (November 2007 - June 2010), Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 - June 2011).

⁵⁶ The latest report covering Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I that was made available to the evaluator is Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2007 - November 2009).

appear to have come primarily from Nicosia. UNDP PFF notes significant difficulties with one contractor from Nicosia.⁵⁷

UNDP PFF notes that while there was limited employment generation at village level, villages did benefit from the presence of construction workers during implementation. It also notes that several sub-contractors were involved in village projects. UNDP PFF also notes that construction activity "...generates activities in numerous sub-sectors and these need not be necessarily in the location of the project only." While this is no doubt true, there is no basis upon which to assess this kind of impact, as the necessary data are not available. It is also important to bear in mind that these projects are intended to benefit specific locations. UNDP PFF notes, however, that it can not force contractors to employ workers from villages where there is no available workforce.

Although project documents do refer to employment generation as an indicator, this does not appear to have been an objective in practice, as UNDP PFF has not collected relevant monitoring data.

Opportunities

New crossing points in Nicosia

The impact of UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF activities in would be greatly enhanced if one or two more crossing points were to be opened, for example at the entrance to the Municipal Market adjacent to the security zone, and near the Armenian Church and Monastery. Such developments would also be likely stimulate economic and social development in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia by facilitating the movement of residents and visitors alike.

Threats

Sustainability is probably the most important threat to the work of both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT.

This is evident in continuing concerns over the sustainability of the Bedestan,⁵⁸ the Municipal Market and the Büyük Hamam in Nicosia, as well as the old Wholesale Market (near to the Municipal Market), which was renovated by UNDP PFF during a previous phase of assistance to the municipality (north). While in principle these structures should be financially sustainable, some difficulties have been encountered in introducing new management structures, tools, and techniques within the beneficiary institutions.

While the village projects have been welcomed, it is not obvious that the benefits can be maintained, bearing in mind that these are small communities. This is most evident in the case of some renovated buildings that are currently unutilised.

Due to the sensitivity of property ownership issues, it has not been possible to place any obligations on the owners of private property that has been renovated with project funding. This is not a matter of concern with regard to individual houses. However, it may be a matter

⁵⁷ UNDP PFF indicates that one contractor from Nicosia provided untrained workers, who were frequently changed and not properly supervised. As a result, the work was reportedly of a low quality, and UNDP PFF had to insist that it be redone.

⁵⁸ UNDP PFF notes that EVKAF itself is a financially secure organisation.

of concern where the value of commercial property may have been significantly increased, for example in Lefke/Lefka.

The poorly functioning regulatory framework and limited enforcement capacities undermine project activities and benefits, for example in the areas of health and safety, and the conservation of historic buildings. UNDP PFF stresses, however, that it rigorously applies relevant rules and principles during project implementation. The concern expressed here relates more to what extent improvements (e.g. use of appropriate safety equipment) are maintained when UNDP PFF's involvement ends.

Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?

There is no partnership between the two UNDP programmes. UNDP PFF works closely with the EUPSO, while UNDP ACT works closely with USAID. This is understandable, given the political background to the emergence of two programmes. Such a strategy has probably been appropriate and effective from the perspective of each office, but it is not clear that this necessarily applies to the UNDP at corporate level.

UNDP PFF notes that it has worked closely with all project counterparts in planning and implementing projects. This is particularly evident with regard to the village pilot projects.

UNDP PFF appears to have a difficult relationship with the municipality of Nicosia (north). It notes that the municipality has difficulty reconciling its own approach with the systematic rules, procedures, etc. of UNDP. Some stakeholder feedback indicates that UNDP PFF's perception of its approach does not always coincide with the perceptions of its partners.

The northern part of the walled city of Nicosia is now home to concentrations of immigrants, who live in areas (some neglected) near and around structures that have been, or are being, renovated by UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT. It is unclear if and to what extent the views and needs of these groups have been incorporated by the authorities into strategies and plans that guide the projects evaluated here.

UNDP PFF notes that these issues are not relevant to the type of projects it is implementing.

.

Conclusions

Relevance

UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT activities covered by this evaluation are generally relevant to the objectives of their respective donors, and to the needs of Cyprus.

UNDP PFF's activities covered by this evaluation in the areas of crossing points, villages and minor towns, and Study of Cultural Heritage are most relevant.

The need to improve and enlarge Nicosia's sewage treatment is evident, and from this perspective the Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant project is highly relevant. Consideration of whether or no the chosen solution is the best/ most appropriate solution is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

The Nicosia Master Plan Area Scheme project is highly relevant, as it aims to introduce a coherent strategic approach to the development of the northern part of central Nicosia, and it includes elements relating to public consultation. However, the status of this project is currently "cancelled" owing to a disagreement between key actors. Another project, the Asmaali Area Scheme, has also been cancelled due to a lack of commitment on the part of the municipality. Thus some of the ongoing and completed projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia may be too ambitious, given the constrained capacities of key actors, and the absence of a coherent strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area. It is unclear to what extent some of the completed and ongoing projects address the most urgent development needs.

Efficiency

UNDP PFF has a small, highly experienced and motivated core staff. This evaluation covers 38 projects and sub-projects (which are just a part of UNDP PFF's portfolio). While there have been some cancellations (e.g. due to property ownership issues, lack of beneficiary commitment, etc.), UNDP PFF has done well to implement these projects in circumstances that are often challenging, while at the same time maintaining the quality of outputs and attention to issues such as health and safety, environment, access for the disabled, etc. However, there are some indications that the core staff may be over-stretched, and UNDP PFF data management and reporting arrangements could be improved in some respects.

While there is limited scope for synergies between UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF, there are nevertheless areas where some limited additional co-ordination would possibly have been useful in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia.

Outcomes

For UNDP PFF activities, site visits and stakeholder feedback suggest that the biggest impact has been delivered by:

- Village and minor town projects;
- The Study of Cultural Heritage;
- Limnitis-Kato Pyrgos crossing point.

In the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia, significant improvements to the Municipal Market are likely to attract more shoppers and visitors. The internationally acknowledged

restoration of the Bedestan has significantly enhanced the immediate area and is attracting visitors and hosting an increasing number of events. However, the impact of both UNDP ACT and UNDP PFF support appears to be constrained by the lack of an overall strategy amongst key actors for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area, as well as limited proactivity on the part of the two main counterparts.

Neither programme has tracked indicators to assess outcome (changes in performance/ behaviour/ perceptions/ attitudes of target systems/ organisations/ groups etc.). As a result, both UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have difficulty identifying and communicating the outcomes of their activities.

Sustainability

UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT have sought to ensure the sustainability of projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia e.g. through support with the development of business plans. Nevertheless sustainability is the main area of concern for UNDP PFF and UNDP ACT, as well as both donors. For UNDP PFF this concerns relates specifically to administrative sustainability, namely the lack of appropriate structures and management approach to ensure that assets are operated in a financially sustainable manner.

UNDP contribution

For various reasons, the involvement of UNDP PFF in the projects covered by this evaluation is considered essential by the EUPSO and UNFICYP.

The successful implementation of numerous projects, often under difficult circumstances, is an indication of the experience and perseverance of the UNDP PFF core staff and project teams.

There has been limited opportunity for leveraging UNDP's experience and expertise in areas such as public administration, civic engagement.

Recommendations

The impact and sustainability of projects in the northern part of the walled city of Nicosia would benefit from the development of a clear overall strategy for the sustainable development and exploitation of the area, taking into account the needs of all sectors of the community. UNDP PFF could use its influence to mobilise relevant actors to develop such a strategy.

Project design should put more emphasis on outcomes. Systems should be put in place locally to track outcome and impact indicators, and these should be reviewed from time to time to ensure their continuing relevance. Enhanced understanding and/ or application of UNDP's guidelines on results based management and project planning, monitoring and evaluation would be helpful.

All projects and sub-projects should have some kind of planning document incorporating the general principles of the standard project document (e.g. stating justification, outcomes, outputs, indicators, start and finish dates, budgets, locations, counterparts/ promoters, etc.).

Projects should incorporate more systematic dissemination and networking. This is particularly important for projects with a potentially high demonstration value.

Strategic management and reporting, in particular for UNDP PFF, would be greatly facilitated by the implementation of a simple relational database to track basic project data, and to record regular monitoring information.

Implementation reports should be systematically produced at regular intervals and should include some tabular information covering each project, such as budget, commitments, disbursements, counterparts, start and end dates, status, etc.

Independent external review should be carried out on a more regular basis.

Annexes

UNDP Cyprus Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011 Outcome 5 Indicators

UNDP Cyprus— Integrated Work Plan 2010-2011 lists the following indicators for Outcome 5:

- Outcome indicators
 - Cultural Heritage Sites completely renovated for tourism attraction
 - Study of Cultural Heritage in the northern part of Cyprus completed on the GIS platform
- Output Projects
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase I
 - Nicosia
 - Bedestan restoration project completed
 - Design / restoration of the Municipal Market completed
 - Safety measures for Ledra/Lokmanci crossing completed
 - Famagusta
 - Desdemona project completed
 - Kyrenia
 - Urban upgrading of phase 2 of the main avenue completed
 - Minor towns/ villages
 - 5 pilot urban upgrading projects completed
 - Upgrading Local and Urban Infrastructure Phase II
 - Nicosia
 - Asmalti project completed
 - Area scheme completed
 - Famagusta
 - Famagusta project completed by the Famagusta Project Advisory Group
 - Kyrenia
 - Infrastructure upgrading of the main avenue completed
 - Green building: activities and training completed
 - Other municipalities
 - Projects for 5 municipalities completed
 - Ledra Phase 2 completed
 - Cultural Year
 - Identified activities completed
 - Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant
 - New WWTP is designed
 - New WWTP is constructed
 - Defect liability period of the design-build contract of the WWTP successfully completed
 - Joint entity is created and fully functional
 - Transfer for the new WWTP to the joint entity is performed and at least 10 years O&M contract is signed
 - Limnitis/ Kato Pyrgos Road Upgrading
 - Supervision team recruited
 - Contractor selected and contracted following approval of ACP committee
 - Site office established
 - Works monitored and repaired as necessary
 - DB report completed
 - Road is opened and fully functional

- UNDP ACT Cultural Heritage
- Number of inter-communal cooperative processes leading to the restoration of important cultural heritage sites.

List of stakeholders consulted

An asterisk (*) denotes information awaited from UNDP PFF.

First name	Last name	Position	Organisation	Date
Charalam-bos	Palantzis	Director, Project Management Unit	Sewerage Board of Nicosia	1 Nov 2011
Paul	Naylor	Project Manager (Engineer), Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant project	UNDP PFF	1 Nov 2011
*		Mukhtar	Village of Erdemli/ Tremetoussia	1 Nov 2011
*		Mayor	Municipality of Akincilar/ Louroukina	1 Nov 2011
Mehmet	Zafer	Mayor (Civil Engineering)	Lefke Minicity	2 Nov 2011
*		Mayor	Municipality of Lapta	2 Nov 2011
Sefik	Isik	Manager, Real Estate Department	EVKAF Administration	3 Nov 2011
*		Architect	EVKAF Administration	3 Nov 2011
*			Municipality of Nicosia (north) (Ledra/ Lokmaci crossing point)	3 Nov 2011
*			Municipality of Nicosia (north) (Municipal Market)	3 Nov 2011
*			Municipality of Nicosia (north) (Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant)	3 Nov 2011
*			Municipality of Nicosia (north) (Water Pipes)	3 Nov 2011
*			Public Works Department, Republic of Cyprus	3 Nov 2011
Nicolas	Jarraud	Programme Analyst, Environmental/ Pandemic Focal Point	UNDP ACT	3 Nov 2011
Christopher	Louise	Programme Manager	UNDP ACT	3 Nov 2011
Pelin	Maneoglu		UNDP ACT	3 Nov 2011
Orhan	Atasoy		"EU coordination office" (north)	4 Nov 2011
Emine	Pilli		"department of antiquities, ministry of tourism environment & culture" (north)	4 Nov 2011
*		Senior Engineer	"roads department" (north)	4 Nov 2011

First name	Last name	Position	Organisation	Date
Ali	Tuncay	Member	Cultural Heritage Technical Committee (north)	4 Nov 2011
Petros	Markou	Chairman	Cyprus Organisation For Standardisation (ACT Paphos Gate project)	8 Nov 2011
Kimberly	Foukaris	Senior Program Advisor	USAID Cyprus	8 Nov 2011
Savvas	Yianni	Accountant	Bishopric of Morphou (ACT Peristerona Project)	9 Nov 2011
Marion	Lalisse	Task Manager	ELARG A.3 Task Force - Turkish Cypriot Community	9 Nov 2011
Alessandra	Viezzler		ELARG A.3 Task Force - Turkish Cypriot Community	9 Nov 2011
Wlodek	Cibor	Senior Advisor	UNFICYP	9 Nov 2011
Charalambos	Pericleous	Human Resources Manager	Electricity Authority of Cyprus (ACT Kontea project)	10 Nov 2011
Athina	Papadopoulou	Architect/ Planning Officer	Nicosia Municipality (south)	10 Nov 2011
Agni	Petridou	City Engineer	Nicosia Municipality (south)	10 Nov 2011
Selcan	Akye		Union of the Chambers of Cyprus Turkish Engineers and Architects (ACT Kontea project)	10 Nov 2011
Antonis	Roussos	Parliamentary Representative, Maronite Community of Cyprus	(Kormacit / Kormacitis project)	10 Nov 2011
Fatma	Terlik		UNDP PFF	1-2 Nov 2011
Tiziana	Zennaro	Programme Manager	UNDP PFF	31 Oct - 10 Nov 2011
Ali	Caglar		UNDP PFF	Several days between 31 Oct and 11 Nov 2011

List of documents referred to

Programme & Project Reports

UNDP PFF

Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2006 - October 2007)

Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase I] (November 2007 - November 2009)

Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (November 2007 - June 2010)

Yearly Technical Report - Upgrading of Urban Infrastructure [Phase II] (June 2010 - June 2011)

Final Report - Study of Cultural Heritage in the Northern Part of Cyprus (01 April 2010 - 10 December 2010)

Yearly Technical Report, New Mia Milia/ Haspolat Waste Water Treatment Plant (December 2009 - December 2010)

Untitled, undated document (study/ report) on the Bedestan provided by PFF (author not indicated)

Weekly Records – Kormacit/ Korucam Project, UNDP PFF, 13 November 2009

Final Report, Introducing “Green Buildings” Concepts in the Turkish-Cypriot Community, PGUM, 20 May 2008

UNDP ACT

Building Lasting Relationships Islandwide, UNDP ACT, 2008

Fast Facts, UNDP ACT, undated

Armenian Church and Monastery Sustainability Matrix, March 2009, provided by UNDP ACT (author not indicated)

Historical Grand Hamam Business Plan 2008-2014, October 2007, provided by UNDP ACT (author not indicated)

Project Documents & proposals

UNDP PFF

Upgrading of local and urban infrastructure [Phase I], United Nations Development Programme Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS (undated)

Upgrading of local and urban infrastructure Phase 2, United Nations Development Programme Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS (undated)

New Mia Milia/ Haspolat Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), United Nations Development Programme Cyprus (undated)

Nicosia Master Plan Area Schemes project proposal form, UNDP PFF, undated.

Asmaalit Area Improvement project proposal form, UNDP PFF, June 2007

Ledra/ Lokmaci Phase 2 Additional Information, undated document provided by UNDP PFF

Replacement of the Existing Asbestos-Cement water pipes with HDPE project proposal, UNDP PFF, undated

UNDP ACT

Cultural Heritage Preservation Grant Scheme call for proposals web page:
<http://www.undp-act.org/default.aspx?tabid=149&it=1&mid=800&itemid=0&langid=1&extrald=234>

Project Proposal Format, UNDP ACT, undated

Armenian Monastery project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, 15 June 2006

Restoration of the Grand Turkish Bath project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, 14 December 2006

Kontea – Cultural Heritage Circle Preservation project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, 23 August 2007

“Restoration of the premises of the Day Care Centre at Paphos Gate for severely multi-handicapped persons from both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities” project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, 27 February 2007

Prophet Elias Monastery Fencing and Cleaning project fact sheet, UNDP ACT, undated

New Vision for the Core of Nicosia – Phase II (Turkish Cypriot Component) project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, undated

New Vision for the Core of Nicosia – Phase II (Greek Cypriot Component) project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, undated

Restoration of Ayios Neophytos Chapel project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, undated

Nicosia is Calling, project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, undated

Restoration of Peristerona House project identification memorandum, UNDP ACT, 30 November 2006

“Ottoman Monuments of Cyprus” Book Project – Translation and Publication of English version, UNDP ACT, undated

Study of Cultural Heritage documents (UNDP PFF)

Study of Cultural Heritage Revised version - February 11, 2011, UNDP Partnership For the Future

Inventory sheet Inventory No: SCH-I-001-0003

Technical Assessment Report, Inventory Reference Number: SCH-I-001-0013

Other UNDP PFF-related documents

Nicosia Master Plan Executive Summary, UNDP UNHCS (HABITAT) July 1984

CW-contracts.xls (list of civil works contracts provided by UNDP PFF on 01 November 2011)

PS-lists.xls (list of design/ supervision contracts provided UNDP PFF on 01 November 2011)

Management of the Municipal Market: Current situation and proposed framework after restoration, Final Version:26.04.2009, Lucia Coletti, UNDP-PFF office. (Including 10 attachments)

Technical conservation brochures (undated, author not given, but understood to be UNDP PFF) Downloaded from:

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=96&Itemid=160

1. Masonary
- 2.Plaster & Mortar
3. Wood
4. Roofs
5. Architectural Metal
6. Openings & Structural Systems

Other documents

Buffer Zone Monuments Survey, Conor M. Power and William C. S. Remsen for UNDP ACT, September 2005

Building Trust across the Cyprus Divide, INTRAC, September 2011

Participatory Development Model They Cyprus Experience (draft), Prologue Consulting Ltd and CYMAR Market Research Ltd, undated

Press release of the Scientific council of Europa Nostra, 04 October 2011

UNDP PFF web pages

Bedestan (St. Nicholas Church)

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=92&Itemid=252

Urban upgrading of villages and towns in the northern part of Cyprus

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=222&Itemid=251

Kampyli / Hisarkoy: urban upgrading

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=254

Kalyvakia / Kalavac

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=252

Komi / Buyukkonuk: eco-village

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=258

Kormakitis / Kormacit: restoration of the old school and conversion into a community center

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=262

Urban upgrading of the village of Lefkonoiko / Gecitkale

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=256

Louroukina / Akincilar: urban upgrading

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=263

Galipomi / Kaleburnu Restoration of the old school and its conversion into a community center

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=261

Tremetousia / Erdemli: urban upgrading

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=264

Lapithos / Lapta: infrastructure upgrading

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=255

Upgrade and rehabilitation of Lefka / Lefke's historical centre

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=253

Rehabilitation of Old Nicosia

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=13&Itemid=22

Cultural Events

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=75&Itemid=134

Nicosia Master Plan

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=80&Itemid=140

On-going Projects

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=82&Itemid=141

Omeriye Area

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=83&Itemid=147

Selimiye Area

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=87&Itemid=151

Phaneromeni Area

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=91&Itemid=155

Bedestan (St. Nicholas Church)

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=92&Itemid=252

Samanbahce Area

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=94&Itemid=158

Walled City Info Point

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=95&Itemid=159

Taking Care of Historical Buildings

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=96&Itemid=160

Other Restoration Activities

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=26

Construction of New Roads in the UN Buffer Zone

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=15&Itemid=27

Limnitis/Yesilirmak road improvement project

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=314

Ledra - Lokmaci Street Crossing Point

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=313

Zodia - Astromeritis Road

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_zoom&Itemid=10&catid=91

Infrastructure and rehabilitation project for the main cities in the northern part of Cyprus

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16&Itemid=28

Nicosia

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=102&Itemid=163

Upgrading of Sewage System July 2004 - April 2005

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_zoom&Itemid=10&catid=41

Kyrenia

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=104&Itemid=164

Famagusta

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=105&Itemid=165

Other rehabilitation and Infrastructure Projects

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=17&Itemid=29

Improvement of hospital infrastructure and provision of new medical equipment

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=311

Preparation of Infrastructure Master Plans for the town of Kioneli/Gonyeli

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=312

Green Buildings

http://www.undp-pff.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=315

UNDP ACT web pages

Past Projects - ACT Phase I, <http://www.undp-act.org/default.aspx?tabid=116&it=0&mid=0&itemid=0&langid=1#Cultural%20Heritage>

Other web pages

Kontea Heritage Foundation

<http://www.konteaheritage.com/en/index.html>

“Nicosia Master Plan Study Wins Europa Nostra Award” web article, 04 April 2011, <http://www.cyprusnewsreport.com/?q=node/3975>

“The Nicosia Master Plan”, web article, <http://www.whatson-northcyprus.com/towns/nicosia/nmp.htm>

“The Nicosia Master Plan: A bi-communal urban development and regeneration project” web article,

http://www.eukn.org/Cyprus/cy_en/E_library/Urban_Environment/Land_Use/Urbanisation/The_Nicosia_Master_Plan_A_bi_communal_urban_development_and_regeneration_project

“North Nicosia Master Plan” web article, <http://www.cyprus44.com/nicosia/master-plan.asp>

“Restoring the Heart of Nicosia” web article,

<http://www.stwing.upenn.edu/~durduran/master.html>

Boundaries as bridges or barriers for urban development? The Cases of Salzburg (Austria) and Nicosia (Cyprus), presentation,

<http://www.qub.ac.uk/ep/research/costc10/findoc/confpres/stadel-17-3-6.pdf>

“Nine projects receive 2007 Aga Khan Award for Architecture,” Aga Khan Development Network press release, http://www.akdn.org/press_release.asp?id=240

Terms of Reference



Position Information

Job Title: **International Consultant for the final evaluation of "Improvement of infrastructure and support to urban upgrading and socio-economic revitalization of northern part of Cyprus" outcome**

Duty Station: Cyprus

Supervisor: UNDP - PFF Programme Manager

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Starting Date: 28 October 2011

Duration: approximately 23 working days

Background

UNDP has been responsible for the implementation of the EU funded Programme Partnership for the Future since 2001. UNDP-PFF aims at contributing to the peace-building process in Cyprus through different levels of intervention including urban infrastructure rehabilitation, community development, cultural heritage and private sector development initiatives.

Since 2006 the UNDP Partnership for the Future (PFF) in Cyprus has been responsible for the implementation of the following projects:

Upgrading of local and urban infrastructure

The programme "Upgrading of local and urban infrastructure" aims to: i) support the upgrading of main and minor towns via various projects: infrastructure, urban upgrading, rehabilitation/restoration projects; ii) support the local economy by launching local works tenders; and iii) to improve the living environment of the residents of the areas involved. This project supports the economic and social development of the northern part of Cyprus via large infrastructure and rehabilitation projects for the upgrading of the main and minor towns of the northern part of the island.

The programme "Upgrading of local and urban infrastructure" has been realized in two phases: Infrastructure I (2006-Present) and Infrastructure II (2007 – Present).

The first phase "*Infrastructure I*" included the following:

- To improve the infrastructure and support the urban upgrading and revitalization of Famagusta, Kyrenia and Nicosia
- To improve the infrastructure and support the urban upgrading and revitalization of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus

The second phase "*Infrastructure II*" focused on:

- Continue to improve the infrastructure and support the urban upgrading and revitalization of the

- main cities of Famagusta, Kyrenia and Nicosia
- To improve the infrastructure and support the urban upgrading and revitalization of minor towns and villages in the northern part of Cyprus
- To enable the opening of new crossing points.

Limnitis/Yesilirmak Road Upgrading

The opening of the Limnitis/Yesilirmak crossing point is intended to enhance further collaboration between the two communities and support a confidence building measure for the peace settlement in Cyprus. UNDP-PFF was entrusted by the EU to conduct a feasibility study and a survey for the improvement of the road in Cyprus. After a procurement process, a joint venture between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot engineering companies was contracted. The feasibility study of the project focused on the investigation, assessment and survey needed to prepare the road designs and the preparation of the tendering documents for the upgrading of the existing two sections of the road. The final project encompassed the upgrading of a section of approximately 6.1 Km, of which 1.8 km are located in the United Nations controlled buffer zone – section A -, and the remaining 4.3 km are located in the northern part of the island – section B.

Study of Cultural Heritage

Contribution to the management of cultural heritage in Cyprus by undertaking a study on the restoration of cultural heritage in Cyprus with a particular emphasis on the Northern part of Cyprus

number of activities were implemented to achieve the objectives through three folded strategy including:

- Review of the existing inventories already carried out by other donors.
- Ranking methodology in order to prioritize monuments for which the detailed assessment would be carried out.
- Detailed assessment of built heritage: Northern part of Cyprus/ Famagusta/ Ottoman Architecture

Nicosia Waste Water Treatment Plant

The project aims to provide services to Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities for the construction of a new Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) to enhance the communities' well-being and to protect the shared environment and natural resources. The new WWTP, will have a total capacity of 30,000 m³/day, and will help resolve existing environmental problems and at the same time provide both communities with a modern, high-tech plant with the capacity to accommodate the future needs of the two communities. The project will foster cooperation between the two communities at different levels, through the transfer of knowledge, operation and maintenance as well as public awareness. The WWTP will be developed in two phases: Design and Build, for which UNDP will be responsible, and Operation and Maintenance, for which UNDP will hand over responsibility to a Joint Entity to be established between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities.

Cultural Heritage (UNDP-ACT)

Through various partnerships, UNDP-ACT has supported seven cultural heritage restoration projects, which contribute to mutual understanding, cooperation and respect between peoples. These projects incorporate the active involvement and participation of individuals and organizations in the local communities.

The following link provides a fact sheet that lists all projects:

http://www.undp-act.org/data/fast_facts_cultural_heritage.pdf

Duties and Responsibilities

Objective and scope of the work

The evaluation will assess all phases of the above 6 output projects and measure their in relation to the outcome. Specifically, the evaluation intends to achieve the following specific objectives:

- To assess the extent to which the project goal (outcome) and objectives (outputs) have been met;
- To determine the relevance and effectiveness of each component, in particular considering the systems and capacities that were developed and the effective use of project resources;
- To evaluate the impact of the programme and its components;
- To determine best practice of and lessons learned in the project implementation;
- To determine the factors that have influenced performance and success of the programme as well as factors that have constrained the programme from achieving its intended outcome;
- To evaluate if the project was key to the achievement and / or has contributed to the overall change for a more positive environment. Point out the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats of the project's implementation process

Evaluation questions

The evaluation should address the following questions:

- Were stated outcomes or outputs achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
- To what extents have UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
- Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Final products or Deliverables/Outputs

Outputs and tentative dates

- Output 1- Preliminary Draft of the evaluation Report – **31 October 2011**
- Output 2 - Draft evaluation report containing the results of the outcome evaluation – **7 November 2011**
- Output 3 - Final evaluation report incorporating eventual comments/clarifications required by UNDP-PFF by **18 November 2011**

The evaluation will be conducted within a period of total estimated **of 23 days**, incorporating field and desk work, and allowing sufficient time for feedback and review, according to the timeframe below:

- Preparation – (Desk review of relevant document not considered as deliverable) - (estimated 3 days) – from place of recruitment of consultant
- In-country evaluation mission and presentation of preliminary findings – Preliminary Draft of the evaluation Report (estimated 10 days) – in Cyprus
- Draft evaluation report containing the results of the outcome evaluation (estimated 7 days) - from place of recruitment of consultant
- Final evaluation report incorporating eventual comments/clarifications required by UNDP (estimated 3 working days) - from place of recruitment of consultant

<p>Institutional Arrangement:</p> <p>UNDP – PFF/ACT will work closely with the consultants to facilitate the process including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Providing relevant documents related to the project activities for the literature review; – Identifying stakeholders and sources of information; – Assisting in organizing meetings with stakeholders; – Assisting in arranging field visits (transport and formal invitations when required); – Identifying key issues that may emerge during the consultancy period and assisting to resolve these wherever possible. – The consultant shall work independently and with his/her personal equipments (IT and Communication) and office arrangements. Interpretation and translation will only be facilitated through the support of the national consultant/assistant. Only transportation to project sites will be provided under UNDP rules. <p>In addition to analysis of existing materials, the evaluator will meet with a wide range of stakeholders including (non-exhaustive list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Donor’s representatives – Local authorities – UNDP-PFF/ACT partners – UNDP – PFF/ACT – Beneficiaries (in Nicosia and outside) <p><u>Monitoring and Progress Controls</u></p> <p>The Consultant will work under the supervision of the UNDP-PFF Programme Manager. The evaluation work should start no later than 12 October 2011. Initial findings and a draft report should be presented by 7 November 2011. The final evaluation report must be submitted (revised with comments) to the UNDP- PFF Office by November 18th 2011.</p> <p>The evaluation should cover the period ranging from the beginning of the project (November 2006) to September 2011.</p> <p>The evaluation will be the result of an analysis of project documents, literature reviews, project reports and individual interviews.</p> <p>It is expected that the consultant will work approximately 23 days.</p> <p><u>Payment Milestones</u></p> <p>UNDP will contract the consultant according to the Organization’s IC rules and regulations. Payment will be made as a lump sum after formal approval of expedited deliverables (in 3 installments: 30% after completion of output 1; 30% after completion of output 2 and 40% after completion of output 3) and shall cover all expenditures (incl. consultancy fees, international travel, cost of living, etc). DSA are not applicable.</p> <p>UNDP reserves the right to hire more than one person for the same position. In this case the number of working days will be recalculated accordingly and communicated to the shortlisted candidates prior to the submission of their financial proposals.</p>
<p>Competencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ability to lead formulation and evaluation of development programs and projects; – Strong analytical skills – Strong communication and experience in drafting evaluation reports – Good understanding of the Cyprus context or experience in working in a similar environment – Ability to lead formulation and evaluation of development programs and projects.

Required Skills and Experience	
Education:	Advanced university degree in Public management, business administration, project management or any other relevant field of expertise
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 7 years of experience in conducting independent evaluations – Proven experience in conducting evaluations for similar projects preferably in the field of infrastructure / urban upgrading / restoration etc. – Good knowledge of UN system, procedures and operational activities for development is an asset.
Language Requirements:	Strong spoken and written English

Application Submission Process:

Interested candidates must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal

Explaining why the candidate the most suitable for the work. Short statement outlining their experience undertaking similar work.

2. UNDP Personal History Form and Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

Interested individual consultants must submit their applications online through the UNDP Online Recruitment System. Correspondence (either in hard or soft format) will not be considered until the advance stage of the selection process. Applicants are required to fill and sign a P11 Form and submit it together with Curriculum Vitae on the online application. The P11 Form can be obtained at http://sas.undp.org/Documents/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

3. How to Submit Application

To submit your application online, please follow the steps below:

- Download and complete the UN Personal History Form (P11);
- Merge your P11, Personal CV, Proposals and other relevant documents into a single file;
- Click on the Job Title;
- Click "Apply Now" button, fill in necessary information on the first page, and click "Submit Application";
- Upload your application;
- You will receive an automatic response to your email confirming receipt of your application by the system.

Application Evaluation Process:

The candidates will be evaluated based on the Cumulative Analysis methodology [weighted scoring method], where the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/acceptable application, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

- Technical Criteria weight; [70%]
- Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

The following criteria and allocated points will be used in the Technical Evaluation:

- Relevant experience in conducting assessments for similar projects/programmes (40 points)
- Relevant experience in conducting evaluations (40 points)
- Knowledge of the Cyprus context (20 points)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the obtainable points of 100 points in technical evaluation will be invited to submit the financial proposal and considered for the Financial Evaluation.

UNDP is applying fair and transparent selection process that would take into account both the technical qualification of candidates as well as their price proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores.

UNDP retains the right to contact references directly.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

Request for Clarification Process:

The interested candidates requiring any clarifications regarding this consultancy vacancy may notify the UNDP_PFF in writing to e-mail address: vacancies@undp-pff.org The Procurement Unit will respond in writing to any request for clarification that it receives earlier than the application submission deadline.

Other Information:

This is a non-staff contract under the Individual Contract (IC) modality of hiring of the UNDP. Individuals engaged under an IC serve in their individual capacity and not as representative of a government institutions, corporate body or other authority external to UNDP. The incumbent shall not be considered as staff of UNDP, the UN common system or the government and are therefore not entitled to any diplomatic privileges or any other special status or conditions. The General Conditions of Contracts for IC is available on UNDP website at http://www.undp.org/procurement/documents/UNDP_GCC_IC_Final_English.pdf

The candidates will be evaluated based on the Cumulative Analysis methodology [weighted scoring method], where the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/acceptable application, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

- Technical Criteria weight; [70%]
- Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

The following criteria and allocated points will be used in the Technical Evaluation:

- Relevant experience in conducting assessments for similar projects/programmes (40 points)
- Relevant experience in conducting evaluations (40 points)
- Knowledge of the Cyprus context (20 points)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the obtainable points of 100 points in technical evaluation will be invited to submit the financial proposal and considered for the Financial Evaluation.

UNDP is applying fair and transparent selection process that would take into account both the technical qualification of candidates as well as their price proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores.

UNDP retains the right to contact references directly.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

Request for Clarification Process:

The interested candidates requiring any clarifications regarding this consultancy vacancy may notify the UNDP_PFF in writing to e-mail address: vacancies@undp-pff.org. The Procurement Unit will respond in writing to any request for clarification that it receives earlier than the application submission deadline.

Other Information:

This is a non-staff contract under the Individual Contract (IC) modality of hiring of the UNDP. Individuals engaged under an IC serve in their individual capacity and not as representative of a government institutions, corporate body or other authority external to UNDP. The incumbent shall not be considered as staff of UNDP, the UN common system or the government and are therefore not entitled to any diplomatic privileges or any other special status or conditions. The General Conditions of Contracts for IC is available on UNDP website at http://www.undp.org/procurement/documents/UNDP_GCC_IC_Final_English.pdf