# Sustainable Development and Integrated Water Management

**Annual Project Evaluation Terms of Reference**
**UNDP Country Office and Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture**
**Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**
**April 2019**

## 1. Background and context

With a rapidly growing population of presently close to 32 million, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia faces a number of challenges including growing urbanization and environmental change. While urbanization poses great pressure on regional water and sewage infrastructure and bears pollution risks, environmental challenges include depletion of aquifers and increasing torrential flood risks. Earning relatively high annual revenues from natural resources, Saudi Arabia has invested heavily in development and upgrading infrastructure during the past few decades, including in water and sewage infrastructure, road networks, housing, hospitals, and schools.

Due to Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture's (MEWA) recent initiatives, efficient water use and governance in the municipal and irrigation subsector, reuse of wastewater and exploitation of shallow aquifers caused significant reduction of groundwater abstractions.

Nevertheless, a set of bolstering measures towards sustainable water supply even in stress and emergency situations and minimizing the climatically induced environmental risks needs to be formulated. These actions or interventions simultaneously should target the supply side; curtail water demands in various productive sectors; and mitigate the environmental risks.

However, to make a transition from the current patterns of water administration to sound water management mode, *two prerequisites are required*. First, there is strong need to strengthen the technical and organizational capacities of the MEWA to deal with the triple challenge of water exploitation and distribution (operational side), research for additional resources and cutting-edge technologies to satisfy the increasing demand (research side), and rigid control and administration of all water-related aspects (control side). Second, a sound information base covering data on groundwater availability, quality, withdrawal, and usage is about to be put in place.

The transformation of this information into an all-encompassing water resources management requires sustained long-term efforts, especially since the MEWA has limited capacity and experience in this field. It needs to go a long way in terms of development and strengthening its technical capacities in order to be able to meet its mandates.

To this effect MEWA partnered with UNDP Country Office to address challenges being faced in capacity development and strengthening institutional role of the Ministry. The project has been designed to initiate a systematic process of capacity development to help in sustainable development of water resources and management of water-related affairs in the Kingdom to ensure permanent and sufficient supply.

Annual evaluations are set within this project document to ensure targets are met and course of action corrected when needed during the lifetime of the project. This 2019 annual evaluation, the first since the start of the project, is meant to gauge the progress of all outcomes, in terms of delivery and also in how far the indicators are being met and to recommend the changes needed.

This intervention requires working with all heads of departments involved with the various outcomes as well as all consultants on the project and other relevant project and ministry staff.

The evaluation will take place in Riyadh, within the offices of MEWA but may require meetings with various national stakeholders .

Basic Project information can also be included in table format as follows:

| PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION | | |
|---|---|---|
| Project/outcome title | Sustainable Development and Integrated Water Management | |
| Atlas ID | SAU10/107888 | |
| Corporate outcome and output | National Capacities Developed for Better Management of Non-oil Natural Resources | |
| Country | Saudi Arabia | |
| Region | RBAS | |
| Date project document signed | 20/02/2018 | |
| Project dates | Start | Planned end |
| | 01/03/2018 | 28/02/2022 |
| Project budget | $24,859,429 | |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation | | |
| Funding source | Government Cost-Sharing | |
| Implementing party[1] | Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture | |

## 2.  Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

This first evaluation is being conducted at the end of the first year of the lifecycle of this project to ensure outputs are well planned and will achieve intended targets within the timeframe intended. The evaluation will also advise on future direction of the project. The project management will, accordingly, take into consideration the findings to change the course of the project, if needed, in terms of revising outputs, changing timeframes, altering human resources and/or budgeting.

Scope and objectives of the evaluation:

- This evaluation will cover all outcomes of the project documents.  It will delve into the details of the achievements this far attained, how these feed into the final target (or fail to do so) and how best to change the course, if need be, to produce the results required.  An impact assessment of the work done thus far is needed to justify continuing some or all components

of the project as they stand or changing the design of one or more components for better results.

- Some concerns regarding delays in the delivery of one or more components of the project have arisen and a strong concern with regard to budgeting is being discussed
- Coordination amongst all project components has also been a matter of concern
- This evaluation will cover all activities held during the first year of the project and highlight issues and recommendations in all aspects (technical, financial, management, structural and operational), including the effective use f of resources and delivery outputs in the signed project document and workplan
- The evaluation will suggest way forward for better planning to achieve the intended results

Issues relate directly to the questions the evaluation must answer so that users will have the information they need for pending decisions or action. An issue may concern the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness or sustainability of the intervention. The direct and indirect impacts are to be highlighted. In addition, UNDP evaluations must address how the intervention sought to strengthen the application of the rights-based approach and mainstream gender in development efforts**.**

### 3.  Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Questions should be grouped according to the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used).

The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions and these dimensions need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (see page 77, table 10 of Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations).

**Project evaluation questions**

**Relevance:**

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities (VISION 2030 and NTP 2020), the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from the previous project considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

**Effectiveness**

- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved? (Please list concrete impact)

- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**Efficiency**

- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability**

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?

- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

**Evaluation cross-cutting issues questions**

**Human rights**

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

**Gender equality**

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

### 4. Methodology

Methodological approaches:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders
  - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** when relevant or meetings not possible
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.

o   Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

## 5.   Evaluation products (deliverables)

- **Evaluation inception report (10 pages max).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the evaluation, UNDP expects a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).**[2] The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within two weeks of receiving draft, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group** (if requested in the TOR).
- **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.
- **One-page evaluation summary to be presented to HE the Minister.** The one pager is to highlight key achievements of the project and their impact.

## 6.   Evaluation team composition and required competencies

- **Required qualifications:** PHD degree in relevant discipline, minimum 10 years' experience in evaluations, preferable in the field of Water Resources Management, knowledge of Saudi, region or similar context, a plus.
- **Technical competencies:** Evaluation skills and experience, technical knowledge.
- **Language skills required:** Fluent English, knowledge of Arabic considered an asset

The applicant evaluator should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation

## 7.   Evaluation ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.[3]

---

[2] A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.
[3] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at
http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## 8.  Implementation arrangements

The evaluator will meet with UNDP as well as the National Project Coordinator.  She/he will work directly with the CTA and Project manager and meet with all project personnel as deemed necessary as well as stakeholders.

Reporting will be done via the M&E Focal point at UNDP

The evaluator is independent and will not be dictated recommendations by any party

## 9.  Time frame for the evaluation process (over a period of two months)

- Desk review and Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report: five working days (within two weeks from signature of contract)
- Briefings of evaluator: 1 working day (first day on location)
- In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires): 10 working days (within six week of contract signing)
- Presentation of preliminary findings: 1 working day (day 12)
- Preparing the draft report: home based, maximum two weeks after mission on location has ended
- Stakeholders' review of the draft report (for quality assurance): within two weeks of receiving report
- Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report: three days after receiving comments

In addition, the evaluator may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination. Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables will be included in the annexes of the TORs

## working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation

| ACTIVITY | ESTIMATED # OF DAYS | DATE OF COMPLETION | PLACE | RESPONSIBLE PARTY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Phase One: Desk review and inception report** | | | | |
| Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed) | - | At the time of contract signing | remote | Evaluation manager and commissioner |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team | - | Within 2 days of contract signing | Via email | Evaluation manager |
| Desk review and Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report | 5 days | Within two weeks of contract signing | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Comments and approval of inception report | - | Within one week of submission of the inception report | UNDP | Evaluation manager |
| Briefing meeting with UNDP and partners | 1 day | First day on the job | UNDP/MEWA | UNDP/MEWA |
| **Phase Two: Data-collection mission** | | | | |
| Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups | 10 days | Within six weeks of contract signing | In country | UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities etc. |
| Debriefing to UNDP, MEWA and key stakeholders | 1 day | End of mission (day 12) | In country | Evaluation team |
| **Phase Three: Evaluation report writing** | | | | |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages) | 5 days | Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Draft report submission | - | | | Evaluator |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report | - | Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report | UNDP | UNDP/MEWA |
| Debriefing with UNDP | 1 day | Within one week of receipt of comments | Remotely UNDP | UNDP, MEWA and evaluator |
| Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office | 3 days | Within one week of final debriefing | Home- based | Evaluation team |
| Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes) | - | Within one week of final debriefing | Home- based | Evaluation team |
| **Estimated total days for the evaluation** | **26** | | | |

## 10. TOR annexes

Annexes can be used to provide additional detail about evaluation background and requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators. Some examples include:

- **Intervention results framework and theory of change.** Provides more detailed information on the intervention being evaluated.
- **Key stakeholders and partners.** A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, together with an indication of their affiliation and relevance for the evaluation and their contact information. This annex can also suggest sites to be visited.
- **Documents to be consulted.** A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
  - Vision 2030
  - National Transformation Plan
  - Project Document and Budget Revisions
  - Partnership arrangements (e.g., agreements of cooperation with Governments or partners).
  - Minutes of all meetings
  - National Water Strategy

- **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

**Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix**

| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub questions | Data sources | Data-collection methods/tools | Indicators/ success standard | Methods for data analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- **Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables.** Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluators present the detailed schedule.
- **Required format for the evaluation report.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the quality criteria for evaluation reports (see annex 7).
- **Code of conduct.** UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.