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|  **TERMS OF REFERENCE for National Consultant for Independent Final Evaluation** |
| **Project Name** | Capacity Development Facility (00076557) |
| **Short title of Assignment:** | National Consultant for Independent Final Evaluation |
| **Contract Type:** | Individual Contract |
| **Duty station:** | Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic  |
| **Duration of Contract:** | 40 days (October – November 2014) |
|  |
| **BACKGROUND** |
| UNDP in the Kyrgyz Republic is implementing the project “Capacity Development Facility” co-funded by the Foundation Open Society Institute. Capacity Development Facility project (CDF) was initiated with support of UNDP RBEC immediately after the revolution and ethnic conflicts of 2010. CDF was designed as a flexible, rapidly responsive and a proactive facility to provide capacity development to the Government and CSOs of Kyrgyzstan through the following three-fold strategy:* strengthening capacities for policy -making and coordination;
* enhancing public sector organizations and staffing capacities at organizational and individual levels, and
* promoting transparent, inclusive and efficient public and municipal services delivery.

In February 2013 the CDF internal midterm review was held with assistance of BRC Capacity Development Experts, which recommended revised scope of the project focused more on a Public Administration Reform while remaining the elements of flexible CD assistance to the key partner institutions. This revision reflects these recommendations and envisages two outputs for a project: 1. Professionalism, efficiency, transparency and accountability of public administration improved through policy support and capacity development
2. - Internal operations of identified state institutions improved leading to strengthened policy development and implementation

CDF project is generally aimed at getting the government structures operational and support advisory services to the Government to allow the effective and efficient delivery of services to population based principles of respect for human rights and gender equality.The project ‘s goal is to support to the Prime-Minister Office, the President’s Office and key public institutions to secure stability and good governance, envisaging two components: i) "Change-agent support", seeking to flexibly (and urgently) address capacity bottlenecks in the Government’s and President's effort to secure stability and good governance throughout the elaboration and implementation of the ongoing constitutional reform.ii) Long-term capacity development support to key institutions that emerge in the ongoing reform, and in particular to the overhaul of the civil service administration. |
| **OBJECTIVE** |
|  |
| An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the Cost-sharing Agreement between the Foundation Open Society Institute – Zug and the UNDP as well as the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm>. The final evaluation will look at relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, including evaluation of project’s contribution to the UNDAF/CDP Outcome #3 “By 2016, national and local authorities apply rule of law and civic engagement principles in provision of services with active participation of civil society”. The Final Evaluation should provide recommendations for follow-up activities; assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.  |
| **SCOPE OF WORK - EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project final evaluation of UNDP supported projects have been developed over time. The Evaluation Team will consist of two consultants: one independent international consultant and one national expert. The international expert will hired by the Open Society Foundation (Team Leader) and the national consultant by UNDP. The national consultant will work closely with the International Consultant and coordinate all activities with the responsible staff of UNDP Country Office in Kyrgyzstan. The evaluation team is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-supported Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex B). The evaluation team is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report. The evaluation report should include assessment on gender responsiveness of key project results. The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with Government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team and key stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:* Project team;
* UNDP Country Office;
* Soros Foundation –Kyrgyzstan;
* Prime-minister Office of the KR;
* President’s Office of the KR;
* Ministry of Economy of the KR;
* Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the KR;
* Ministry of Interior of the KR;
* Coordination Council of Public Advisory Councils of the KR;
* Joint EU – UN project “Operationalizing Good Governance for Social Justice”.

The evaluation team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including AWP, project budget revisions, midterm review mission report, progress reports, project files, national strategic, government and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluators for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.The evaluators should make an analysis on Project’s achievements:* Analyse the Project’s results against the planned ones;
* Identify achievements undertaken by the Project and review their sustainability;
* Assess impact made by the Project in building national capacity;
* Identify areas for improvement and lessons learnt;
* Review and assess partnership with the government bodies, civil society and international organizations in Project’s implementation;
* Review the links/joint activities with other UNDP Programmes/Projects, UN Agencies and other donors.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against targets set out in the Project Results And Resources Framework. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex C.

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementaton |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Aency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implemenation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Institutional framework and governance:  |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political: |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Financial resources: |       |
| Overall Project utcome Rating |       | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |       |

**PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE**The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. The evaluator will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the final evaluation report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(source) | Planned | Actual  |
| OSI |  |  |
| UNDP |  |  |
| Non-UNDP sources |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

 |
| **IMPACT**The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in capacity development of key government institutions such as the Prime-minister Office, President’s Office and other selected government units, and civil society organizations, particularly Public Advisory Councils, b) verifiable improvements in the area of public administration, optimization of public services system and ICT for Development (e-governance), and/or b) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements. **CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS**The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.**IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kyrgyzstan. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits (if needed), and coordinate with the Prime-minister Office, President’s Office, etc.**EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**The total duration of the evaluation will be 40 days according to the following indicative plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing (indicative)** | **Completion Date (indicative)** |
| **Preparation (desk review)** | 9 days  |  |
| **Evaluation Mission – interviews** | 10 days  |  |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 11 days  |  |
| **Final Report** | 10 days  |  |

 |
|  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**  |
|

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Responsibilities |
| Draft methodology of evaluation | Scope & methodology of evaluation | Draft methodology of evaluation should be discussed and agreed by evaluator with UNDP CO, Prime-minister Office and Project management  |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, Prime-minister Office and Project management.  |
| Presentation | Initial Findings  | Evaluator submits to project management, UNDP CO, Prime-minister Office and key stakeholders |
| Final Report\* | Revised report. Integrating all comments.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, Prime-minister Office and Project management. |

When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**National consultant will be submitting the reports based on the results achieved in agreed format stating all actions taken during the assignment (Annex E). Report to be submitted after each deliverable result achieved according to schedule. All information should be presented in typed and electronic versions. Upon completion of the assignment the Consultant will submit final report for the whole assignment to be agreed with the Prime-minister Office and approved by UNDP ARR (Annex F) will serve as a justification for final payment.**QUALIFICATION AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS*** University degree in social/technical sciences; master’s degree is an asset;
* At least 3 years of professional experience in implementation of development projects/ strategic planning/ M&E/ public administration;
* Experience in conducting independent evaluations of development projects (preferably 1 evaluation);
* Experience in development of different manuals and publications (preferably at least 2 publications);
* Language proficiency in both written and oral Russian. English is an asset.

**EVALUATOR ETHICS**Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**The evaluator will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract. The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 1 installment, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP ARR of all deliverables, including the Final Evaluation Report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *100%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of the final evaluation report  |

**SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS**The following documents should be submitted:1. Duly filled/signed current and complete P.11 form (the template can be downloaded from the next web link: http://www.kg.undp.org);
2. Duly filled/signed Confirmation of Individual Contractor Interest and Financial Proposal (the template can be downloaded from the next web link: http://www.kg.undp.org);
3. At least two recommendation letters;
4. Copy of passport;
5. Copy of bank details.
 |

 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOMMENDED CONTRACTORS** |

 |
| **Statement of Medical Fitness for Work**Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from an UN - approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment. Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.**Inoculations/Vaccinations**Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP. |
| **TRAVEL REQUIREMENTS** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| The assignment does not require any travel. **SECURITY CLEARANCE**The Consultant/Contractor will be requested to undertake the Basic Security in the Field II (BSIF-II) training and Advanced Security in the Field (ASIF) training.  |
| **UNDP INPUT**UNDP will provide the National Consultant with organizational & logistical support in organization of events. |
|  |

 |

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

**General documentation**

* UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP);
* UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results;

**Project documentation**

* Project document;
* Cost-sharing Agreement between the Foundation Open Society Institute – Zug and the UNDP;
* Annual Work Plans;
* Annual Project Progress Reports;
* Midterm Review Mission Report;
* Management response to Midterm Review Mission Report;
* Revised Project documents;
* Project Steering Committee Meeting minutes.

Annex B: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by UNDP CO based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNDP focal area, and to the good governance and sustainable development priorities at the national level?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and outputs of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there political, institutional, social-economic, and/or financial risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, a) development of capacities of key government institutions such as the Prime-minister Office, President’s Office and other selected government units, and civil society organizations, particularly Public Advisory Councils, b) improvements in the area of public administration, optimization of public services system and ICT for Development (e-governance)? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex C: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution | Sustainability ratings:  | Relevance ratings |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | Impact Ratings:3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| Additional ratings where relevant:Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex D: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex E: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported project
* UNDP project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation consultant
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[5]](#footnote-5))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
* Co-financing table
 |

Annex F: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)