

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR
SHORT TERM EXPERT ON PROJECT EVALUATION
WITHIN THE SCOPE OF
BORDER SURVEILLANCE CAPACITY BETWEEN TURKEY AND THE EU- PHASE II PROJECT**

1) BACKGROUND

Accession Partnership for Turkey Document adopted by the Council of the European Union (EU), under the Chapter 24: Justice, Freedom and Security, specifically refers to strengthen and enhance the judicial and administrative capacity of all law enforcement institutions and align their status and functioning with European standards, including through developing inter-agency cooperation as one of the priorities.

Accordingly, IPA II Indicative Strategy Paper for Turkey sets “capacity building to combat cross-border crimes and manage borders in an effective and sustainable manner, focusing on efficient use of equipment, risk analysis, information exchange and integrated border management practices, complemented by upgraded software and hardware” as an action.

In line with the EU requirements and policies, the Government of Turkey in the course of progress towards accession to the EU is actively implementing a National Programme for the Adoption of the EU Acquis and a National Action Plan for EU Accession (2016-2019). The objective of the legal harmonization is not only about the amendments in relevant existing legislation; but also about strengthening institutions responsible for the enforcement and implementation of the new procedures and further development of high-level border management and border surveillance systems and standards in line with the EU’s integrated border management policies and strategies. Therefore, the process of “Institution Building and Reform” is considered as crucial in ensuring Turkey’s successful transition to the standards, norms, expectations and obligations of similar EU Member State administrations. Within the process of “Institution Building and Reform”, border management is evaluated as one of the high priority areas under the Chapter 24. To this end, the Government of Turkey is following a reform programme targeting a decrease in irregular migration through developing an effective Integrated Border Management (IBM) system, strengthening institutional capacities and raising awareness on matters related to border management.

UNDP’s Country Program Document (CPD) for 2016-2020 also makes a clear case for improving IBM in Turkey. CPD “Output 2.1.6 ***Capacities, structures and means enhanced for secure borders and integrated border management***” has an indicator specifically on IBM¹ and argues in its baseline that *Institutional infrastructure and coordination for IBM in Turkey is not in line with EU and international norms on IBM*.

To this end, the project named “Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and the EU - Phase II” aims to respond to the above referred needs in the field of border management.

The Overall objective of the Project is “to contribute to the prevention of irregular migration, human trafficking, cross-border crimes, and smuggling and ensure further development and implementation of border management and standards in line with EU’s Integrated Border Management (IBM) policies and strategies”.

The Specific objective of the Project is “to support border security and surveillance through increasing individual capacity of relevant border units (professional personnel of Land Forces Command)”.

¹ Indicator 2.1.6.2: Existence of integrated capacities for border management in line with EU/international norms.

In line with the above objectives, the Project is expected to deliver two important results²:

Expected Result 1: Development of a human resource capacity having the know-how on border management procedures and fundamental rights on migrants and international protection and combatting human trafficking.

Expected Result 2: Enhanced capacity of the Land Forces Command (LFC) to realize its responsibilities and adopt particular distance learning trainings in line with the needs for border surveillance for apprehension of irregular migrant/smugglers at the borders and deliverance of them to the relevant border authorities in line ensuring the principles of IBM.

The project commenced on 21 December 2018, following the signature of the Grant Contract (TR2014/RL/08/A7-02/001). Inception period (21 December 2018 – 21 March 2019) has been utilized with due efficiency for the mobilisation of Technical Assistance Team (TAT), designing of upcoming project activities and a work plan in agreement with the Project Beneficiaries. From 21 March 2019 until 20 June 2020 the Project has been and will be carrying out its activities in line with agreed workplans and deliverables set out in the inception report.

The Project is composed of 2 components which are in line with Expected Results one and two stated above:

Component 1 – Enhancing Individual Capacity Through Face-to-Face Trainings: This component focused on face-to-face training modules on Border Management (BM), Border Surveillance and Human Rights developed on the procedures and practices regarding irregular migration in line with international law and practices under the Phase I of the Project. Hence, training program for 200 professional staff of border units working on the procedures and practices regarding irregular migration, human trafficking, cross-border crimes, smuggling and border management, EU's IBM policies and strategies were delivered.

Component 2 – Enhancing Individual Capacity Through Distance Learning Process: The objective of this component is to support border security and surveillance through increasing individual capacity of relevant border units (professional personnel of LFC) by use of distance learning. Development of distance learning system in the field of IBM and human rights is an innovative and sustainable training method aiming at enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency in the efforts for increasing the individual capacity of LFC professional personnel to deal with apprehension of irregular migrants/smugglers at the borders and deliverance of them to the relevant authorities. This was achieved through acquaintance with international standards and European practices developed by leading specialists working in these areas, sharing their expertise and assessing the areas open to strengthening in the local context.

Ministry of Interior (MoI) is the main beneficiary and the **Land Forces Command (LFC)** is the co-beneficiary of the Project.

According to Turkish Law, the overall supervision of Border Management is exercised by the MoI. Specifically, at central level, General Directorate of Provincial Administrations - Border Management Department under MoI coordinates the border management activities.

The LFC is responsible for border surveillance activities on land borders and delivers the criminals seized at the borders to law enforcement units (Police/Gendarmerie).

UNDP is the Implementing Agency of the Project through the Direct Grant contract signed between **Central Finance and Contracts Unit (CFCU)** as the contracting authority. **Delegation of European Union to Turkey** represents the Donor.

² This is a Project designed in accordance with EU Delegation format, since EUD is the donor. EUD utilizes a different terminology and framing style when it comes to its logical framework. "Overall objective" corresponds to "impact" in UNDP terminology. "Specific objective" is UNDP's "outcome", "expected results" correspond to "outputs" of UNDP. The independent evaluator should keep these in mind, while analyzing the logical framework of the Project.

2) SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

Short Term Expert on Project Evaluation will be mobilized as Individual Consultant for preparing an independent evaluation report that measures the expected results and specific objectives achieved against those stated in the Project Document and identifying the lessons learned which are relevant to the planning, preparation and implementation phases of a possible subsequent project through the conduct of an evaluation mission.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is understood to be the set of components, specific objectives (outcomes), expected results (outputs), activities and inputs that were detailed in the project document(s) and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

- To measure to what extent the joint project has contributed to solve the needs identified in the design phase.
- To measure project's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on expected results (outputs) and specific objectives (outcomes), against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
- To measure the project contribution to the objectives set in the Country Program Document (CPD) of UNDP as well as relevant sections of "Institution Building and Reform" under "Chapter 24: Justice, Freedom and Security" for Turkey's EU Accession.
- To generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability) and also to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components.

3) EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

In the light of the evaluation parameters, the Individual Consultant is expected to analyze data and share his/her findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by this analysis. As a reference point for the evaluation, the Consultant is provided with indicative evaluation questions below; which are expected to be amended, elaborated and submitted as part of the evaluation methodology and shall be included as an annex to the final report described below.

Relevance:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyze the extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and EU and international norms:

1. To what extent was the design and strategy of the development intervention relevant to national priorities (including clear linkage to CPD, EU and international norms)?
2. How much and in what ways did the project contribute to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase?
3. To what extent was this project designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated as rights based and gender sensitive? (See Gender Equality related documents to be reviewed under Annex C.)
4. To what extent does the project create synergy/linked with other projects and interventions in the country?

Effectiveness:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyze to what extent the Project objectives have been achieved or how likely they are to be achieved:

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of the development outputs and outcomes initially expected/stipulated in the project document? (The Individual Consultant is expected to provide detailed analysis of: 1) planned activities and outputs and 2) achievement of results).
2. What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement? To what extent have UNDP's assistance contributed to the outcomes? How might this be improved in the future?
3. Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
4. To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress of EU Accession agenda, UNDCS and CPD goals?
5. To what extent has the project contributed to the well-being of marginalized groups, including irregular migrants, trafficked individuals, women and girls and contributed to an effective combat of human trafficking and smuggling. Did the project effectively contribute to leave no one behind agenda?

Efficiency:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyze to what extent the resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results and the results have been delivered with the least costly way possible:

1. To what extent did the project's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
2. To what extent was the implementation of this project intervention more efficient in comparison to what could have been in the absence of such an intervention?
3. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency?
4. What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the project face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?
5. What was the progress of the project in financial terms, indicating amounts committed and disbursed (total amounts & as percentage of total) by agency?

Sustainability:

Under this parameter, the Individual Consultant will analyze to what extent the project's positive actions are likely to continue after the end of the project:

1. To what extent have the project decision making bodies and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the project? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
2. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes in place for sustaining project benefits?
3. To what extent will the project be replicable or scaled up?

4. To what extent will the benefits and outcomes continue after external donor funding ends? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the donor assistance ends?
5. What can be done to maximize the likelihood of sustainable outcomes?

Cross-Cutting Issues:

All the above mentioned evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

1. To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress in women's empowerment as well as mainstreaming gender equality? (to be elaborated in relation to the UNDP Gender Mainstreaming strategies and guidelines, along with other relevant strategies and guidelines)
2. To what extent has the project contributed to the advancement and the progress in women's empowerment, as well as mainstreaming gender equality?

4) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The Individual Consultant will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in this Terms of Reference and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, Individual Consultant is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements which are indicatively listed in **Annex C** of this Terms of Reference. Individual Consultant is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. The Individual Consultant will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of target audience/participants of the project are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the evaluation methodology report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality.

In addition, the Individual Consultant has to assure that information and data are gathered and reported in a gender sensitive approach. To that extent, specific methodological tools should be used and sex disaggregated data should be provided in every project site, irrespective of it being directly related with gender equality and women's empowerment.

5) KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be actors involved in the implementation of monitoring and evaluation:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst of UNDP will have the following functions:

- Supervise the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of the evaluation (preparation of the ToR, implementation and dissemination)
- Ensure the evaluation deliverables meet the required quality
- Provide clear specific advice and support to the Individual Consultant throughout the whole evaluation process

- Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the Individual Consultant
- Review the reports and give necessary approvals on behalf of UNDP

2. Project Team of UNDP will have the following functions:

- Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the Individual Consultant by making sure that UNDP undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the Individual Consultant
- Provide executive and coordination support to the Individual Consultant
- Provide the Individual Consultant with administrative support and required data
- Facilitating the Individual Consultant's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
- Connect the Individual Consultant with the key stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation

3. The Individual Consultant will conduct the evaluation study by fulfilling his/her contractual duties and responsibilities in line with the ToR, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes submission of all deliverables stipulated within Article 7 to the satisfaction of UNDP. Individual Consultant's functions do not include any managerial, supervisory and/or representative functions. All documents and data provided to the Individual Consultant are confidential and cannot be used for any other purposes or shared with a third party without any written approval from UNDP.

4. Evaluation Reference Group: Ministry of Interior, Land Forces Command and EU Delegation to Turkey will function as the evaluation reference group. This group is composed of the representatives of the major stakeholders in the project and will review and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation process, as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the draft report and final report) and options for improvement.

6) EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The Individual Consultant is expected to submit the following deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP:

- **Evaluation Methodology Report: (to be submitted within 5 days starting from the submission of all programme documentation by UNDP to the Individual Consultant)**

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. The report should justify why the said methods are the most appropriate given the set of evaluation questions identified in the ToR. It will also include a mission programme which indicates proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. This document will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Individual Consultant and UNDP. In principle, the report is expected to contain the outline stated in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

- **Draft Evaluation Report: (to be submitted within 10 days after the completion of the field visits)**

The draft evaluation report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. UNDP will disseminate the draft evaluation report to the reference group in order to seek their comments and suggestions.

- **Final Evaluation Report: (to be submitted within 5 days after receiving UNDP's comments on the draft report)**

The final evaluation report will be approximately 20 to 30 pages in length. The final evaluation report will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques following high level of research ethics and impartiality. In addition, the Final Evaluation Report should contain clear recommendations that are concrete, feasible and easy to understand. The Final Evaluation Report will be shared with UNDP to be disseminated to the key stakeholders. In principle, this report is expected to contain the sections stated in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

Reporting Line

The Individual Consultant will be responsible to the UNDP's Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned throughout this Terms of Reference. All of the reports are subject to approval from Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, in order for the payments to be affected to the Individual Consultant.

Reporting Conditions

The reporting language will be English. All information should be provided in electronic version in word format. The Individual Consultant shall be solely liable for the accuracy and reliability of the data provided, along with links to sources of information used.

Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

7) TIMING AND DURATION

The Assignment will be non-consecutively undertaken by the Individual Consultant throughout the time-frame below;

Contract Start Date : 24 April 2020

Contract End Date : 19 June 2020

Following the mobilization of the Individual Consultant; submission of the documents, access to reports and archives and briefing on project, the following timeframe will be followed:

| Activity of the Implementation Phase | Responsible Party | Due Date |
|---|---|----------------|
| Draft Evaluation Methodology Report | Individual Consultant | 1 May 2020 |
| Providing the feedbacks to the report on methodology | UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst | 7 May 2020 |
| | | |
| Finalized Evaluation methodology report based on the feedbacks received | Individual Consultant | 11 May 2020 |
| | | |
| Data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders * | Individual Consultant | 18-22 May 2020 |
| Delivery of Draft Evaluation Report | Individual Consultant | 1 June 2020 |
| | | |
| Review the Draft Evaluation Report and provide feedback | UNDP IDG Portfolio Manager, UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, Reference Group | 8 June 2020 |
| Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report | Individual Consultant | 15 June 2020 |
| Total Evaluation Process (days) | | 30 Days |
| Estimated Maximum Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC | | 20 Days |

Expected Field Visits

| Partners/ Stakeholder(s) to be Visited | Location | Estimated Day(s) of Visit |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|
| UNDP | Ankara, Turkey | 2 |
| Ministry of Interior | Ankara, Turkey | 1 |
| Land Forces Command | Ankara, Turkey | 1 |
| CFCU | Ankara, Turkey | 0.5 |
| Delegation of EU to Turkey | Ankara, Turkey | 0.5 |
| ESTIMATED TOTAL | | 5 |

8) INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

UNDP will provide background materials for the IC's review, reference and use. Neither UNDP nor any of the project partners are required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection, etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP and/or the relevant project partners, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC. UNDP and/or the relevant project partners will facilitate meetings between the IC and other stakeholders, when needed.

9) ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Individual Consultant and the heads of the Project in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them must be noted.
- **Integrity.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The Individual Consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to UNDP. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by UNDP in this Terms of Reference.
- **Validation of information.** The Individual Consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the Consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is lower than of the quality desired by UNDP, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

10) PLACE OF WORK

Place of work for the Assignment is Home-based (estimated 13 person/days) and Ankara, Turkey (estimated 7 person/days).

Travel, accommodation and living expenses (terminal expenses, inter-city, intra-city travels, living costs such as breakfast, lunch, dinner, etc.) in the Duty Stations will be borne by the Individual Consultant and should be factored by the Individual Consultant into his/her price proposal. The Individual Consultant shall travel to Ankara, Turkey in order to participate in meetings, collect data and conduct interviews. During the whole assignment period, **only one economy class round-trip** flight ticket from the residential city of the Individual Consultant to Ankara, Turkey shall be borne by UNDP.

Assignment-related travel and accommodation costs outside of the Duty Stations, which are pre-approved by UNDP, will be borne by UNDP in line with UNDP's corporate rules and regulations. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the Consultant, through UNDP's official Travel Agency or,

- Reimbursed to the Consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table or,
- Covered by the combination of both options.

The following guidance on travel compensation is provided as per UNDP practice:

| Cost item | Constraints | Conditions of Reimbursement |
|---|---|---|
| Travel (intercity transportation) | Full-fare economy class tickets | 1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipt, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form. |
| Accommodation | Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location | |
| Breakfast | Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location | |
| Lunch | Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location | |
| Dinner | Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the location | |
| Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.) | Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location | |

11) TERMS AND PAYMENTS

• Contracting Authority

Contracting Authority for this Assignment is UNDP, and the contract amount will be provided through the project budget.

• Contracting Modality

IC – Individual Contract of UNDP.

• Payment Schedule

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of corresponding deliverables by UNDP on the basis of payment terms indicated below, along with the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the Individual Consultant and approved by the M&E Analyst.

The maximum total amount to be paid to the Individual Consultant within the scope of this assignment cannot exceed equivalent of 20 person/days. The payments will be made according to the below table:

| Deliverable | Due Date | Estimated Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC³ | Payment |
|--|-----------------|---|--|
| Draft Evaluation Methodology Report | 1 May 2020 | 5 | N/A |
| Draft Evaluation Report compiling findings of the field assessment level | 1 June 2020 | 12 | N/A |
| Final Evaluation Report after all the revisions and feedback of UNDP have been reflected | 15 June 2020 | 3 | Upon submission and approval of all three deliverables (100% of the total contract amount) |
| Estimated Maximum Total Number of Person/Days to be Invested by the IC | | 20 days | |

Without submission and approval (by UNDP) of the above listed deliverables in due time and quality, the Consultant shall not be entitled to receive any payment from the UNDP even if he/she invests time in this assignment. While the IC may invest less or more than estimated number of person/days for each deliverable different than the estimated person/days stipulated in the above table, the total amount of payment to be affected to the IC within the scope of this Assignment cannot exceed equivalent of 20 person/days throughout the contract validity.

In cases where the Consultant may need to invest additional person/days to perform the tasks and produce the deliverables listed and defined in this Terms of Reference, the Consultant shall do so without any additional payment.

If any of the deliverables stipulated in this Terms of Reference are not produced and delivered by the IC in due time and to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the IC has invested person/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TRY through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN Operational Rate of Exchange applicable on the date of money transfer.

The amount paid to the consultant shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax, etc. The daily fee to be paid to the Consultant is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. The daily fee amount should be indicated in gross terms and hence should be inclusive of costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa (if needed) etc. UNDP will not make any further clarification on costs related to tax, social security premium, pension, visa etc. It is the applicants' responsibility to make necessary inquiries on these matters.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

³ While the number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change, the total number of days invested by the individual consultant cannot exceed 20 days for this assignment (i.e. for submission of the deliverables) as defined in the ToR.

12) QUALIFICATION AND SKILLS REQUIREMENTS

| | Minimum Qualification Requirements | Assets |
|--|---|--|
| General Qualifications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor's Degree in public administration, law, economics, security studies, police/military academy or any other relevant field. • Good command of spoken and written English. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's or Ph.D. Degree in public administration, law, economics, security studies, police/military academy or any other relevant field. |
| General Professional Experience | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 10 years of professional experience in conducting evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of projects/programmes. | |
| Specific Professional Experience | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 5 years of professional international experience in conducting and managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of development projects, programmes, countries or thematic areas. • Having thematic expertise in security sector and/or border management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in evaluation of border management projects. • Experience in evaluation of EU funded projects in Turkey. • Experience in evaluation of EU funded projects. • Authorship of article(s) / research paper(s) on programme/project evaluation. |
| <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience. • Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience. • Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience. • Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience. | | |

13) ANNEXES

Annex A - Outline of the report on evaluation methodology

0. Introduction

1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach
2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research
3. Main substantive and financial achievements of the project
4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information, including evaluation questions
5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including field visits to Ankara for data collection and interviews with UNDP and key stakeholders

Annex B - Outline of the draft and final reports

1. Introduction

- Background, goal and methodological approach
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Methodologies used in the evaluation
- Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

2. Project description

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Description of the intervention areas/main activities
- Baseline indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)

- Project design/formulation (indicators, risks and assumptions, lessons from other relevant projects, linkages between project and other interventions, management arrangements)
- Project Implementation (adaptive management, partnership arrangements, project finance, Monitoring & evaluation, UNDP's execution)
- Project Results (attainment of objectives, relevance, efficiency, ownership, gender mainstreaming and rights-based approach, sustainability, impact)

4. Conclusions, good practices and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear including major achievements and strengths)

5. Recommendations (actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project and proposal future directions underlining main objectives)

6. Annexes

- Mission Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Questions Matrix

Annex C – Documents to be Reviewed

Background Documents on Country and UNDP Priorities

- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- Handbook on Planning M&E Evaluation for Development Results
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- UNDP Guidelines on “Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit”
- UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2014-2017)
- UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (14 July 2014)
- UNDCS 2016-2020 and UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2020
- National Programme for the Adoption of the EU Acquis and a National Action Plan for EU Accession (2016-2019).
- Chapter 24: Justice, Freedom and Security under the Accession Partnership for Turkey Document adopted by the Council of the European Union (EU)

Project Documents

- Project Document
- Grant Agreement and its Annexes (including Description of the Action, budget, communication and visibility plan)
- Inception and Progress reports
- Annual work plan and budget
- Steering Committee and Management Meeting Minutes
- Independent Evaluation Report of Border Surveillance Capacity between Turkey and the EU - Phase I Project