

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Project Final Evaluation
Transboundary wastewater pollution control project #102692

1. Background and context

The wastewater sector in Palestine has been marginalized and its infrastructure is weak and insufficient to cover the required needs. In many areas, the collected wastewater from the urban communities is discharged, raw or partially treated, into different natural streams and wadis and crosses the borders to Israel causing pollution of natural resources, including ground water. This often results in tensions and conflict with the Israelis. Israel deducts the cost of treatment from the Palestinian taxpayers without any reference to quantities or specific locations and without verification from the Palestinian side. Only, in September 2019, Palestinian Water Authority (PWA) received monthly figures of the deduction that covers two years. The figures are not clear or linked to identified equations. The project aims to strengthen the wastewater infrastructure in critical locations and support PWA in improving its transboundary wastewater management. The Transboundary wastewater pollution control project contributes to the Palestine Programmatic Framework 2018-2021 (CPD) Outcome 4 - Leaving no one behind: Social Development and Protection and specifically Output 4.3: "Support and build the capacity of PWA, Ministry of Local Government, and related municipalities in wastewater and solid waste management (i.e. wastewater tariff, cost recovery, promote community participation, and raise awareness) and Improve access to wastewater and solid waste services including collection, treatment and reuse/recycling". It also contributes to the UNDAF 2018-2022 Outcome 3.3: "Palestine's infrastructure, and natural and cultural resources are more sustainably used and managed" and Outcome 4.1: "More Palestinians, especially the most vulnerable, benefit from safe, inclusive, equitable and quality services".

Building on the recommendation of the feasibility study that was conducted by UNDP and financed by the Netherlands in 2014, and the recommendations of the master plan prepared by PWA, UNDP aims to address and enhance transboundary wastewater management through the implementation of the preproject subjected to evaluation. The project targeted 6 communities in Baqa Al-Sharqieh, Zeita and Nazlat municipalities. Before the project implementation, the targeted communities (Baqa Al-Sharqia, Nazlat Issa, An-Nazla Al-Sharqia, An-Nazla Alwesta, An-Nazla AL-Gharibia and Zeita) were using cesspits and dumping wastewater into Wadi Abu Nar and the surrounding areas, posing significant public health risks and a threat to the shared water aquifer. Moreover, mismanagement of wastewater in these communities was causing transboundary pollution and generated conflict and tensions between Palestinians and Israelis. Therefore, the need to establish a comprehensive wastewater management system was identified in order to safeguard the environment, prevent pollution and manage conflict.

The project responded to the UNDAF outcome 3.4 Palestine infrastructure, and natural and cultural resources are more sustainably used and managed. The objective of the project is to enhance transboundary wastewater management and control pollution through the achievement of the following outputs:

- 1) Residents of Baqa Alsharqia, Zeita and the four Nazlat communities have increased access to wastewater services
- 2) Capacities of Baqa and Nazlat Municipalities to operate and maintain wastewater collection system are improved
- 3) Community awareness and commitments are raised
- 4) Capacity of PWA to measure and manage transboundary wastewater in different locations in the West Bank is enhanced

The project was identified based on the feasibility study that was conducted by UNDP and financed by the Netherlands in 2014. The project activities included: 1) Installation of flowmeters in up to five transboundary wastewater streams, 2) Construction of wastewater networks to connect the five unserved communities in the project area, namely, the remaining of Baqa Al-Sharqia, Nazlat Issa, An-Nazla Al-Sharqia, An-Nazla Alwesta, An-Nazla, Al-Gharibia which serve around 14,500 of the population, 3) enhancing the capacities of the targeted municipalities to ensure the sustainability of the provided wastewater services, and finalizing the transboundary wastewater specific agreements.

More detailed background and context are available in the project document that will be made available. As of the end of February, the project activities are 90% completed.

Basic Project information

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Transboundary wastewater pollution control in Baqa As-Sharqia, Zeita and Nazlat	
Atlas ID	Pal10-102692	
Corporate outcome and output	Enhanced transboundary wastewater management in Wadi Abu Nar	
Country	Palestine	
Region	Arab Region	
Date project document signed	14 March 2018	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	1 March 2018	30 April 2020
Project budget	USD 6,708,488	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	USD 6,708,488	
Funding source	Netherlands	
Implementing party¹	UNDP/PAPP	

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the performance of the project and to measure to what extent the objective/outputs/activities have been achieved against the results and resources framework and identifying factors that have hindered or facilitated the success of the project. It aims at critically reviewing the stages of the project and its products through employing a participatory approach. Focus as much as possible on the strategic political aspects of the programme, the sustainability of the results generated and commitments for the future with respect to transboundary wastewater management and money deducted by Israel to cover the cost of the treatment. The transboundary aspect of the project should be given extra attention in the evaluation, considering the sensitivity of the work on areas bordering Israel. The findings and

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

recommendation of the evaluation will be used as a good reference for UNDP in designing any future initiatives in transboundary wastewater management. The evaluation must also address how the project sought to strengthen the application of rights-based approach and mainstream gender.

The evaluation should focus on the following:

A) Project objective/outputs

- i. *Objective, Output, Activities*
 - *Effectiveness and efficiency of project activities*
 - *Progress in the achievement of outcomes/outputs, measured against the baselines and indicators set at the outset of the project.*

B) Processes

- i. *Institutional arrangement*
 - *Formulation and implementation stages.*
 - *Consultative processes.*
 - *Assumptions and risks.*
 - *Sustainability of results.*
- ii. *Partnerships*
 - *Assessment of level of involvement and perception of partners.*
 - *Assessment of collaboration level among relevant stakeholders.*
- iii. *Processes and Administration*
 - *Project administration procedures*
 - *Milestones*
 - *Key decision and outputs.*
 - *Project oversight and active engagement by UNDP and the project steering committee.*
 - *Coordination between UNDP and partners.*
- iv. *Disbursements*
 - *Overview of actual spending against budget expectations.*
 - *Analyze disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.*
- v. *Budget procedures*
 - *Effectiveness of project document to provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget.*
 - *Audits and any issues raised in audit and subsequent adjustments to accommodate review recommendations.*
 - *Review budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevancy of such revisions.*
- vi. *Coordination mechanisms*
 - *Appropriateness and efficiency of coordination mechanisms and approaches.*
 - *Propose improved coordination mechanisms and approaches.*

C) Sustainability of Results

- *Identify evidence showing that the results/lessons of project could be replicated to other areas*
- *Analyze risk to ensuring sustainability of the project outcomes and results (i.e country ownership, financial, institutional capacity).*

D) Monitoring and Evaluation

- *Identify problems/constraints, which impacted the successful delivery of the project identified at the project design stage.*
- *Identify threats/risks to project success that emerged during implementation and strategies implemented to overcome these threats/risks.*

E) Conclusion, lessons learned

- *Assess substantive reports (e.g. risk assessment, progress reports, lessons learned documents)*
- *Identify key lessons emerging.*
- *Identify element hindering or promoting success.*

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Evaluation questions should be grouped according to the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: (a) relevance; (b) effectiveness; (c) efficiency; and (d) sustainability

The following table includes some suggested questions:

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects 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?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme 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 project's 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 possible questions

Human rights

- To what extent have disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the project?

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

The consultant shall undertake the evaluation through the following main steps:

- 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.
 - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor representative, representatives of targeted communities and end users
- **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
- **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.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
 - 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)

The consultant shall deliver the following:

1. **Inception plan and report:** The plan should outline the overall strategies, actions and timeline of the evaluation. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix, which specifies both principal and specific evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, review and analysis methods. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

2. **Evaluation debriefing:** Following the desk review, data collection and field visits, the evaluator should provide UNDP with preliminary debriefing and findings.
3. **Draft evaluation report (40-60 pages including the executive summary):** the draft evaluation report should include an executive summary of not more than 3 pages describing key findings and recommendations. The programme team and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The evaluator will ensure that the report, to the extent possible, complies with the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports².
4. **Final evaluation report:** as mentioned earlier, the report should be between 40-60 pages in English. It should include detailed lessons learnt and the list of all people interviewed. The evaluator should keep an evaluation report audit trail of how comments have been addressed in response to the draft report
5. **Presentation of findings:** a presentation should be scheduled to inform UNDP and the stakeholders about the evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations.

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The consultancy firm should have proven experience in implementing at least 3 similar assignments during the last 3 years and should be able to deploy specialized experts for carrying out this assignment. The evaluation team should provide their own computer and communications equipment. Interested consultant should formulate an evaluation team with following minimum requirements:

Team leader: an expert with a postgraduate degree in environment, natural resources management, or related fields and with the following 10 years working experience. The team leader should demonstrate the following:

- Proven strong knowledge of results-based management, monitoring and evaluation methods for development projects
- Good knowledge of procedures governing the implementation and management of internationally funded projects and programme;
- Broad knowledge of water and wastewater in Palestine combined with good awareness of political implications.
- Demonstrated experience with implementation and/or evaluation of projects with partners who have different interests or projects with political components.

Wastewater expert:

- Have at least Master's degree or equivalent in environment and natural resources management environmental economics or natural sciences with experience in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation coupled with the vast knowledge and experience in regional projects.
- A minimum of eight years of post- graduate professional experience in environment or sustainable resources management.
- Demonstrated expertise and knowledge of wastewater collection and treatment

Both the experts should ideally have the following competencies and attribute:

1. Demonstrable analytical skills.
2. Some prior knowledge of transboundary water and wastewater in Palestine.
3. Good knowledge of the UNDP Guidelines and Procedures will be considered an asset.

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607>

Competency in the following is required:

1. Excellent English language writing and communication skills knowledge.
2. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.

7. Evaluation ethics

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 consultants will start the evaluation process with an inception meeting with UNDP representatives. The consultants should submit an inception plan based on the meeting within 2 weeks of the issuance of contract. S/he will then undertake the review of documentation, interviews with key stakeholders -field visits, preparation of an evaluation report including lessons learned and recommendations. S/he will submit the draft product to UNDP for comments and finalize the product within 2 weeks after receiving the feedback. In consultation with the Evaluation Team Leader and as requested, the programme manager will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. She will also assist in organizing any briefing and de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders input in the evaluation draft report. UNDP will facilitate the evaluation process and assist in connecting the evaluator with the senior management, and key stakeholders. UNDP will also assist in organizing the site visits and meetings and help identify key partners for interviews by the evaluation team.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted in 25 working days over a period of two months. The detailed final evaluation methodology will be agreed as part of the consultation inception process by way of virtual communication with relevant UNDP representatives.

UNDP will provide formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables, if relevant, once the consultant signs the contract.

Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome 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	UNDP	Evaluation Manager
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the time of contract signing	Via email	Evaluation Manager
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within one week of contract signing	Home-based	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within one week of contract signing		Evaluation Team
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	10 days	Within two weeks of approval of the inception report	In country With field visits	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day		UNDP	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages)	5 days	Within one week of the completion of the field mission	Home-based	Evaluation team
Draft report submission	-			Evaluation team
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within one week of submission of the draft evaluation report	UNDP	Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments	UNDP	UNDP, evaluation reference group, stakeholder and evaluation team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP	2 days	Within one week of final debriefing	Home-based	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP	-	Within one week of final debriefing	Home-based	Evaluation team
Estimated total days for the evaluation	25			

10. Application submission process and criteria for selection

Interested consultancy firms are required to submit a proposal and relevant Curriculum Vitae of proposed key staff that demonstrates the qualification, skills, experience and track record to deliver the services required and that reflects and understanding of key issues relating to the scope of work. Please also provide three contactable references.

The preferred service provider will be selected based on the experience and qualifications expressed in the offer and joint technical and financial proposal submitted.

TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

The technical proposal shall describe the approach and methodology that will be applied by the consulting firm to meet the objectives and scope of the assignment and shall include the following:

- a) The methodology
- b) The suggested work plan
- c) Description of tools that will be used and provided
- d) Company Profile including description of company facilities and resources
- e) List of relevant projects undertaken within the last two years
- f) Contact information for two previous clients for reference purposes to whom similar services has been provided and completed
- g) Profile of experts included in the plan. A matrix should be provided to show which expert will work on what activities and for what duration
- h) CVs of the experts who will participate in conducting the assignment

The proposal shall be valid for a minimum of 90 days from the date of bid closing and shall be duly signed by the official representation of the consulting firm and stamped

FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

The offeror is asked to prepare the Price Schedule in **US Dollars** to be provided in a separate envelope from the rest of the RFP. The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount all-inclusive for the provision of the requirement.

The lump sum amount shall be broken down to show the following level of detail:

- Daily rates of staff
- Administrative costs
- Overhead and profit
- Man rate per hour
- Cost of workshops, if needed
- Any other applicable costs

EVALUATION

A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with evaluation of the technical proposals prior to any price proposal being opened and compared. The price proposal will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score (70%) in the evaluation of the technical proposals. The technical proposals are evaluated on the basis of their responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR).

Technical Proposal Evaluation		Points obtainable
1	Expertise of Firm /Organization	20
2	CVs of the experts	40
3	Evaluation Plan including key milestones	20

4	Methodology	30
	Total	100

The evaluation form for the technical proposals follows. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance of weight of the item in the overall evaluation process.

Technical Evaluation Criteria			Weight	Points
FORM 1	Expertise of Firm /Organization		20	
	a	Does the Company Profile reflect the requirements of the TOR?		5
	b	Do projects undertaken within the last 2 years relate to the TOR? (Minimum 2 years' experience in provision of similar services to TOR)		5
	c	Quality of References provided by 2 previous clients		5
	d	Quality of examples of Evaluation methods		5
FORM 2	Staffing Plan		40	
	a	Is overall staffing plan sufficient to undertake TOR?		10
	b	Are profiles of each staff adequate to undertake TOR?		10
	c	Team Leader (minimum post-graduate degree & 10 years relevant experience)		7
	d	Evaluators previous experience and level of education (minimum post-graduate degree & 8 years relevant experience)		13
FORM 3	Evaluation Plan including key milestones		20	
	a	Evaluation plan clearly demonstrates what will be undertaken at each phase		10
	b	Project will be completed within the time specified in the TOR?		10
FORM 4	Methodology		20	
	a	Clearly illustrates how the evaluation will be conducted to cover all required elements		5
	b	Clearly illustrates how data will be collected		5
	c	Clearly illustrates how each activity will be evaluated to ensure that the overall evaluation covers all project components		5
	d	Clearly illustrates how the final report will be developed and finalized.		5
	TOTAL		100	

In the Second Stage, the price proposal of all Offerors, who have attained the minimum 70% score in the technical evaluation will be opened and evaluated.

AWARD OF CONTRACT

The procuring UNDP entity reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, and to annul the solicitation process and reject all Proposals at any time prior to award of contract, without incurring any liability to the affected applicant or any obligation to inform the affected applicant or applicants of the ground for the UNDP's action.

The UNDP procuring entity will award the Contract to one offeror, who obtains the highest Total Combined Score on his/her Proposal (based on combined scoring method)

The formula for the rating of the Proposals will be as follows:

Rating the Technical Proposal (TP):

TP Rating = (Total Score Obtained by the Offer / Max. Obtainable Score for TP) x 100

Rating the Financial Proposal (FP):

FP Rating = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100

Total Combined Score:

(TP Rating) x (Weight of TP, 70%)
+ (FP Rating) x (Weight of FP, 30%)

Total Combined and Final Rating of the Proposal

11. TOR annexes

- **Intervention results framework.** Provides more detailed information on the intervention being evaluated.
- **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.
- **Code of conduct:** 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system'