



Terms of Reference

Title:	Terminal Evaluation of the Project: Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management to Manage Expected Impacts of Climate Change in Swaziland.
Country of Assignment:	Swaziland
Duty-station:	Home-based with an in-country mission
Contract/Level:	International ICA, Level 3, National SB 9
Duration of Contract:	3 months (25 April to 30 July 2016)
Quality Assurance:	UNDP Regional Service Centre, Regional Technical Advisor: Akiko Yamamoto: E-mail address akiko.yamamoto@undp.org.

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a full and medium-sized UNDP supported GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the UNDP-GEF project titled: **Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management in Swaziland to Manage the Expected impacts of Climate Change**, (PIMS 3603).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Title:	Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management in Swaziland to Manage the Expected impacts of Climate Change			
GEF Project ID:	4255 (GEF PMIS) 3603 (UNDP PIMS)		At Endorsement (US\$)	At Completion (US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00077723	GEF Financing:	1,670,000.00	1,670,000.00
Country:	Swaziland	UNDP SWZ CO:	200,000.00	200,000.00
Region:	Southern Africa	Government of Swaziland:	4,520,900.00	4,520,900.00
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	KOBWA:	34,000.00	34,000.00
Implementing Agency (IA):	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	4,754,900.00	4,754,900.00
Executing Agency (EA):	Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy – Department of Water Affairs (DWA)			
Other Partners involved:	KOBWA SWADE MOA	Pro-doc signature (date project began):	08 th June 2012	
		(Operational) Closing date:	30 th August 2016	

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Swaziland's sustained socio-economic growth is premised on the availability of water for agriculture and energy production. The 2010 to 2012 national consultations resulting in the development of the, *Adapting National and Transboundary Water Resources Management to Manage Expected Impacts*

of Climate Change in Swaziland Project Document, advocated for the national capacities to climate related risks with focus on water resources management. This was in line with the Swaziland's First National Communication FNC (2002) which highlights that water resources, particularly those in river basins shared with neighbouring countries are highly vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change.

The government prioritized supporting policy interventions and strategies that address climate change (CC) through an Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) approach. In addition, the review of the outstanding 2003 National Water Policy, need for amendment of the IWRM Master Plan to integrate climate change, and inadequate data to inform a National Climate Change Policy were gaps pointed key to ensure national development. The emerging CC impacts were observed not only challenging national growth but also the riparian states of the Incomati, Maputo and Umbeluzi river basins shared with South Africa and Mozambique. This required national capacity for data collection; dialogues and integration of CC into national and sectoral frameworks; pilots to generate lessons for vulnerable communities to embark on CC-adaptive undertakings, and; a strengthened national team for better articulation of CC-Reform in the negotiations platform with neighbouring countries.

The project contributes to minimising the expected adverse impacts of climate change on the country's water resources as well as on the livelihoods of local communities. This is implemented through a set of activities that promote the adoption and implementation of climate change adaptation (CCA) policy reforms and practices at national and trans-boundary levels, summarised into the three outcomes **1:** Institutional capacity for climate change adaptation strengthened through the integration of climate change risks into national water resources management policies and establishment of inter-sectoral coordination mechanism based on inclusive and informed national dialogue; **2:** Climate Change risk management integrated into national water and agricultural programmes and implemented in pilot projects to promote adaptation on the ground, and; **3:** Negotiations on transboundary water management for Incomati, Usuthu/Maputo and Umbeluzi river basins informed by climate change risks analysis.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The project was designed to ensure that the management of Swaziland water resources is adapted to take into account the anticipated impacts of climate change. The principles of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) are used in the project and climate change risks incorporated into the water resources management approach. The projects promotes national and regional dialogue and enables piloting of climate change adaptation for lessons to inform policy and legislation operationalisation for effective adaptation planning and climate risk management in the water sector. National transboundary negotiator's capacity are improved for influencing the integration of climate-related into policies and programmes effective management of the shared resource.

The logical framework of the Project is elaborated in the Project Document with more information on project goal, objectives, expected outcomes and indicators appearing also in the Inception Report, quarterly progress reports and the Annual Work Plans.

4. TERMINAL EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

- The objectives of the evaluation are to 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.
- The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.
- The TE is intending to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation strategy and come up with future recommendation to address identified gaps.

5. EVALUTION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator 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 Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Swaziland, and visit the following project sites:

- Rainwater harvesting (10 Schools) – Timphisini High School, Mbasheni Primary School, Cetjwayo Primary School, Bulandzeni Primary School , Malamlela Primary School, Gundvwini Primary School, Mhlabeni Primary School, Bekezela Primary School, Bekezela Secondary School, Etjeni Primary School.
- Sand dams (5 sites) – Matsanjeni, Sigwe, Sitilo, Kabhudla, and Sidvokodvo
- Automatic Weather Station (2 sites) – Sihhoye and Siphofaneni
- Ecosystem restoration and livelihoods development (1 site) – Mbelebeleni Manzini Region)

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: *Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy – Department of Water Affairs (MNRE-DWA), National Meteorological Services (NMS), Komati Basin Water Authority (KOBWA), Swaziland Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE), Swaziland Environment Authority (SEA), National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), and Beneficiary Communities*).

6. EVALUTION, CRITERIA AND RATING

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports including the Annual Project Reports/Project Information Reports (APR/PIR), project budget revisions, mid-term review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in TOR Annex B of this Terms of Reference. 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 D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA & EA Execution	Rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation– Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution – Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance		Financial resources	

Effectiveness		Socio-political	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

7. PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

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. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) 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 terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (Type/Source)	UNDP Own financing (US\$)		Government (US\$)		Partner Agency (US\$)		Total (US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans								
*In-kind support								
*Other								
Totals								

8. MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

9. IMPACT

The evaluators 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 ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

10. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

11. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Swaziland*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

12. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	10 th May 2016
Evaluation Mission	7 days	15-22 May 2016 (inclusive of travel)
Draft Evaluation Report	13 day	10 th June 2016

Final Report	8 days	30 th July 2016
---------------------	--------	----------------------------

13. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO (cc to UNDP RTA and PMU)
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO and UNDP RTA
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, CO, PMU, GEF OFP and other stakeholders
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	Sent to CO (cc to RTA and PSC members) for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*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. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

14. TEAM COMPOSITION

Two consultants with the following qualifications shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to the planned schedule. The international consultant who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience will be designated as the team leader and will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review and submitting the final report. The International Consultant has the overall responsibility for completing the desk review prior to the country mission to Swaziland and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP Swaziland and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional backup and conduct local consultation meetings with stakeholders. The National Consultant recruitment process will be conducted separately by UNDP Country Office. The collection of documents is to be done by National Consultant prior to commencing the work.

Qualifications of Team Leader (International consultant)

- International consultant with at least an advanced academic degree or the equivalent and professional background in fields related to climate change adaptation, Integrated Water Resources Management, and Environment or Engineering.
- A minimum of 10 years' experience.
- Proven experience and appreciation on the policy mainstreaming work and related policy processes.
- Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferable those involving UNDP-GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors.
- Excellent communication skills (writing and reading) with good command in English.
- Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions and recommendations.
- Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams and deliver quality reports within the given time.
- Familiarity with the challenges of developing countries.
- Experience in African countries, especially in SADC region, is considered as advantageous.

Qualifications of National consultant

- At post-degree qualification and professional background in fields related to climate change adaptation and Integrated Water Resources management.
- With a minimum of 10 years working experience in the relevant field, with emphasis on policy work,
- Understanding of climate change (adaptation) and IWRM in the Swaziland context
- Good understanding of national development policies and strategies as well as institutional set-up in Swaziland
- Demonstrate skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring and evaluation process.
- Proficient in writing and communicating in both English and SiSwati.
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and teamwork.

15. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG [‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations’](#).

16. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following the submission and approval of the Inception Report
40%	Following the submission and approval of the 1 ST draft evaluation report
50%	Following the submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

17. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>.) by 6th March 2016). A team or individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. and P11 in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total estimated cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal

- (i) Cover letter and Professional Resume CV and P11;
- (ii) Technical Proposal, including the proposed evaluation methodology and work plan (1 page max.);
- (iii) Financial Proposal, including proposed fee for maximum 30 working days and all other travel related costs.
- (iv) Sample of executive summary of a terminal evaluation or any type of evaluation report led by the applicant.

Terms of reference approved by:

Kabiru Nasidi
Deputy Resident Representative (UNDP)

TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: CPAP (2011-2015) Outcome 3:

National institutions have the capacity and provide guidance on the utilization of natural resources in a sustainable and equitable manner.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

Enhanced national capacity to put in place environmentally friendly and sustainable development.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4.

Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme:

CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability; CCA-2: Increasing Adaptive Capacity; and CCA-3: Adaptation Technology Transfer¹.

Applicable SCCF Expected Outcomes:

Outcomes 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.1.

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicators 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.3.1, and 3.1.1.

Project Objective: Promote the implementation of national and trans-boundary integrated water resource management that is sustainable and equitable given expected climate change.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1: Institutional capacity for climate change adaptation strengthened through the integration of climate change risks	1.1: Key scientific knowledge gaps on climate change impacts within the water sector defined, targeted research to fill knowledge gaps carried out, climate change response options identified, and main findings and strategic	1.1 Information in Swaziland on climate change risks and possible impacts is scarce, particularly regarding flood vulnerability, groundwater potential and crop	1.1: Key scientific knowledge gaps on climate change impacts within the water sector defined, targeted research to fill knowledge gaps carried out, climate change response options identified, and main findings and strategic recommendations disseminated to at least twenty (20) relevant organisations across sectors (incl. KOBWA, MNRE, MoA, MoEPD, MoF, MoH, MoPSI,	1.1.1 Flood vulnerability assessment report 1.1.2 Report on assessment of groundwater potential and optimising groundwater use in	Risk: Difficulty in accessing existing baseline data from government departments

into national water resources management policies and the establishment of inter-sectoral-coordination mechanisms based on inclusive and informed national dialogue	recommendations disseminated to at least twenty (20) relevant organisations across sectors (incl. KOBWA, MNRE, MoA, MoEPD, MoF, MoH, MoPSI, MTEA, NCCC, NDMA, NMS, NWA, RBAs, SEA, SWADE, SZWP, TPTC)	diversification options	MTEA, NCCC, NDMA, NMS, NWA, RBAs, SEA, SWADE, SZWP, TPTC)	the IWRM framework 1.1.3 National feasibility map for alternative water supply options, e.g. rainwater harvesting, sand dam construction 1.1.4 Assessment report of crop diversification potential	
	1.2: A set of tailor-made climate change response measures related to national (and trans-boundary) water management identified and integrated into at least three (3) national level policies related to water resources management (e.g. NWP, IWRMP, draft National Climate Change Policy) through a series of national policy dialogue workshops (incl. with	1.2 Key national policies do not, or not adequately, consider climate change	1.2: A set of tailor-made climate change response measures related to national (and trans-boundary) water management identified and integrated into at least three (3) national level policies related to water resources management (e.g. NWP, IWRMP, draft National Climate Change Policy) through a series of national policy dialogue workshops (incl. with organisations listed under Output 1.1 and using strategic recommendations from that output)	1.2.1 Revised/ updated policy documents with specific sections on climate change adaptation 1.2.2 Policy dialogue workshop reports & attendance lists	Assumption: Government remains committed to incorporating climate change adaptation into its policy documents as a matter of priority Risk: Policy adoption process gets obstructed by external (political) factors

	organisations listed under Output 1.1 and using strategic recommendations from that output)				
	<p>1.3: Institutional needs for inter-sectoral cooperation identified (through national dialogue - Output 1.2), appropriate national inter-sectoral coordination mechanism clearly defined, establishment/ strengthening of national coordination mechanism supported and capacity of key staff/ stakeholders strengthened through at least three (3) targeted training courses on inter-sectoral coordination</p>	<p>1.3 Inter-sectoral coordination needs and mechanisms not clearly defined, National Climate Change Committee not gazetted and with limited competencies</p>	<p>1.3: Institutional needs for inter-sectoral cooperation identified (through national dialogue - Output 1.2), appropriate national inter-sectoral coordination mechanism clearly defined, establishment/ strengthening of national coordination mechanism supported and capacity of key staff/ stakeholders strengthened through at least three (3) targeted training courses on inter-sectoral coordination</p>	<p>1.3.1 Policy dialogue workshop reports & attendance lists</p> <p>1.3.2 Institutional needs assessment report with recommendations for institutional strengthening</p> <p>1.3.3 Government Gazette with formal establishment of inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms; minutes of committee meetings</p> <p>1.3.4 Training course reports, attendance lists and</p>	<p>Risk: Lack of government commitment to formalised inter-sectoral coordination mechanism</p> <p>Divergent sector stakeholder interests undermine effective inter-sectoral coordination</p>

				completed evaluation forms	
Outcome 2: Climate change risk management measures integrated into national water and agricultural programmes and implemented in pilot projects to promote adaptation on the ground	2.1: Guidelines for mainstreaming climate change risks into key national policies (NWP, IWRMP, NCCP) developed, toolkits on practical application of climate change response measures (identified through Output 1.2) developed and at least five (5) targeted training courses on toolkit application delivered	2.1 Key national policies do not, or not adequately, consider climate change and inadequate knowledge on practical implementation of climate change response measures	2.1: Guidelines for mainstreaming climate change risks into key national policies (NWP, IWRMP, NCCP) developed, toolkits on practical application of climate change response measures (identified through Output 1.2) developed and at least five (5) targeted training courses on toolkit application delivered	2.1.1 Guideline and toolkit documents 2.1.2 Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms	Risk: (Some) relevant stakeholders do not view climate change as a priority issue
	2.2: Programme/ project specific climate change risks and tailor-made response measures identified and integrated into at least three (3) major management/ investment plans implemented in Swaziland (incl. KDDP, LUSIP and CDPs developed under the GEF SLM programme	2.2 Climate change risks and possible response measures at present not considered in national management/ investment plans	2.2: Programme/ project specific climate change risks and tailor-made response measures identified and integrated into at least three (3) major management/ investment plans implemented in Swaziland (incl. KDDP, LUSIP and CDPs developed under the GEF SLM programme implemented by SWADE)	2.2.1 Programme specific climate change risk assessment/ response options reports 2.2.2 Revised management/ investment plans	Risk: (Some) relevant stakeholders do not view climate change as a priority issue

	implemented by SWADE)				
	2.3: Capacity of key stakeholders and water resources management and/or agricultural development practitioners to integrate climate change risks into their activities strengthened by incorporating the climate risks/responses measures (identified under Output 2.2) into the ongoing training courses offered as part of ongoing national programmes (e.g. KDDP, LUSIP).	2.3 Knowledge and awareness of climate change risks is very low and climate change risk is not adequately considered in ongoing implementation of ongoing activities	2.3: i) Climate change adaptation modules developed for train-the-trainers courses based on risks/responses identified under Output 2.2 to raise trainers awareness and capacity on CCA; ii) at least two forthcoming training courses are strengthened through the inclusion of CCA modules in the training materials, and iii) strengthened training courses offered to build awareness and capacity of practitioners	2.3.1 Climate change adaptation modules for ToT courses 2.3.2 Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms	Assumption: Relevant stakeholders are willing to participate in training Risk:(Some) relevant stakeholders do not view climate change as a priority issue
	2.4: Community based climate resilience projects implemented in pilot sites, including the installation of rainwater harvesting systems in at least four (4) identified communities/ areas and rainwater infiltration improvement schemes (incl. reforestation) in at	2.4 Climate change risk awareness and adaptation capacity at community level is very low	2.4: Rainwater harvesting systems installed and rainwater infiltration measures (reforestation etc.) applied at the following four sites: i. Komati River Basin at pilot schools enrolled in the KOBWA programme ii. Mkhiweni Inkhudla in the Umbeluzi River Basin at pilot schools/clinics/Tinkhundla's/NCPs; iii. Kashewula community in the Umbeluzi River Basin at pilot schools/clinics/Tinkhundla's/NCPs;	2.4 Site visits to pilot sites in Komati Basin, Mkhiweni, KaShewula and Ngwavuma	Assumption: Selected communities are committed to participating in the pilot projects as declared during the PPG field visits Risk: Competing activities for land use could cause disagreement in

	least four (4) communities/areas		iv. Ngwavuma River Basin in the Maputo Basin at pilot schools/clinics/Tinkhundla's/NCPs.		relation to implementation of adaptation measures; project installation (rainwater harvesting tanks, planted trees etc.) affected by vandalism, theft
Outcome 3: Negotiations on trans-boundary water management for the Incomati, Maputo and Umbeluzi river basins informed by climate change risk analysis.	3.1: Climate change impacts on trans-boundary water resource management (TWRM) and negotiation options assessed, tailor-made (short-, mid- and long-term) TWRM strategy paper for Swaziland developed through consultations with key stakeholders (as integral part of national policy dialogue - Output 1.2) and position paper for Swaziland TWRM negotiation team(s) jointly developed (with negotiators)	3.1 Present water agreements (on Incomati, Maputo) do not adequately address climate change and adaptation	3.1: Climate change impacts on trans-boundary water resource management (TWRM) and negotiation options assessed, tailor-made (short-, mid- and long-term) TWRM strategy paper for Swaziland developed through consultations with key stakeholders (as integral part of national policy dialogue - Output 1.2) and position paper for Swaziland TWRM negotiation team(s) jointly developed (with negotiators)	3.1.1 TWRM strategy for Swaziland with explicit consideration of climate change risks/ impacts 3.1.2 Negotiation position paper for Swaziland	Assumption: Other riparian countries accept consideration of climate change risks/impacts as negotiation subject (it has been identified as priority at Tripartite (TPTC) level
	3.2: Targeted information briefs on projected climate change impacts on	3.2 Stakeholder knowledge and awareness on climate change	3.2: Targeted information briefs on projected climate change impacts on TWRM developed and disseminated to senior decision-makers in at least twenty	3.2 Information briefs	Risk: (Some) relevant stakeholders do not view climate

	TWRM developed and disseminated to senior decision-makers in at least twenty (20) relevant organisations, including key water user groups	impacts on TWRM is very limited	(20) relevant organisations, including key water user groups		change as a priority issue
--	---	---------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------

TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
- Project Document (Pro-Doc)
- Quarterly and Annual Progress reports
- Annual Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR)
- Mid-Term Review Report with the Management Response
- All technical reports produced by the project
- All sites handover reports
- Project Impact Review Report
- Quarterly and Annual financial reports
- Annual plans and budgets
- Audit Reports
- Field Monitoring Reports
- Established MOU/A
- UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011-2015
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2011-2015
- GEF Focal Area Strategic Objectives

TOR ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A set of evaluation questions must be fully reviewed and amended by the consultant in the context of this TE and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

Evaluation Criteria	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impacts: Are there indicators that the project has contributed to. Or enabled progress towards, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

TOR ANNEX D: RATINGS

Ratings Scales		
Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution 6: Highly satisfactory (HS): No shortcomings 5: Highly satisfactory (HS): Minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1: Highly unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	Sustainability Ratings 4: Likely(L) negligible risks to sustainability 3: Moderately Likely (ML): Moderate risks 2: Moderately Unlikely: Significant Risks 1: Unlikely: Severe risks	Relevance ratings 2: Relevant (R) 1: Not Relevant (NR)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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:

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: _____

TOR ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE

The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- 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)

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)

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/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 (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)

- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- 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
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- *Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail*

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ANNEX H: AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

The following is a template for the evaluator(s) to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP PIMS #)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

