

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project No.: 00091894

Project Title: “Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins.”

Functional Title: Consultant for Independent Terminal Evaluation

Contract Type: Individual Consultant

Location: Quito - Ecuador

Duration: 45 days over a time period 90 days

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support 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 “*Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins.*” (PIMS #4402)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary		
GEF Project ID:	83398		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	UNDP Ecuador: 91894 UNDP Perú: 92113	GEF financing:	3,960,000	
Country:	Ecuador - Perú	IA/EA own:	BIN / EC 2'625.000 PERÚ 1'335.000	2'073,939,90 916.599,03
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	Bin / EC 10'000.000 Perú: 10'000.000	5.000.000 5.000.000
Focal Area:	Energy and Environment Management for Sustainable Development	Other:	ECUADOR 104.100 track y ART 132.500 capnet PERÚ 114.500 132.500 capnet	48.022,92 0,00 0,00 0,00

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP5	Total co-financing:	20'483.600	10,048.022,92
Executing Agency:	Secretariat of Environmental Policy, Climate Change and Sustainable Development (SPACCyDS, for its Spanish acronym), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS) National Authority of Water (ANA in Peru)	Total Project Cost:	24'443.600	13'038.561,85
Other Partners involved:	National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA); Government of the provinces of Chaco, Formosa, Entre Ríos and Misiones Ministry of Environment (MINAM)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		24/08/2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31/08/2019	Actual: 30/06/2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *strengthen the institutional, policy, legal and scientific-technical capacities to implement Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo- Chira and Zarumilla River Basins and Aquifers, integrating climate variability concerns. The project aims to enhance binational efforts of Peru and Ecuador for Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management (ITWRM) in the three main aquifers and basins shared by the two countries in the Pacific Ocean drainage basin – Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla. It will give special attention to integrating groundwater concerns and opportunities and extreme manifestations of climate variability and change in the area. The aquifers and linked river basins “Zarumilla”, “Puyango-Tumbes” and “Catamayo-Chira” contain an important, but often highly variable, water supply that is essential to the region’s socio-economic development and to the integrity of its ecosystems. These resources are threatened by overexploitation, pollution and inefficient management, as well as by climate variability and change.*

The project follows a three-pronged approach consisting of improving the common understanding of these shared water resources and their environmental and socioeconomic status; strengthening institutional capacities and cooperation mechanisms between the two countries sharing these aquifers and basins; and applying and disseminating IWRM demonstrations in targeted site interventions. The project has a strong emphasis on capacity development and, through the TDA/SAP process, will support countries in the identification of the required legal, policy and institutional reforms that can deliver global, regional and national environmental benefits. The project will apply the most recently validated GEF International Waters Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Programme (SAP) methodology to achieve project objectives and outcomes.

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 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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ 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 ([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 ([Quito – Ecuador, Loja - Ecuador, Machala – Ecuador, Calvas – Ecuador, Celica - Ecuador, Lima – Perú, Tumbes – Perú, Piura - Perú](#)), including the following project sites ([list](#)). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

City*	Site / distance from the project office / means of mobilization	Interviews will be held with the following stakeholders at a minimum
Quito	Av. Toledo N22-286 y calle Lérica (SENAGUA) Centro Corporativo EkoPark, Torre 4, piso 2 / Vía Nayón s/n y Av. Simón Bolívar (UNDP)	Deputy Secretary of Social Affairs at National Water Authority (SENAGUA – Ecuador) Project team / Binational Coordination unit UNDP Steering Committee members Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project
Loja	Quito – Loja: 689 Km / 1h10m by plane Loja – Guineo Chico (Celica): 220 Km / 2h30 by car Project’s car and driver will be provided Quito – Loja: 689 Km / 1h10m by plane Loja – Limones (Zapotillo): 258 Km / 4h by car	Hydrographic Administrative Units of Puyango Catamayo (Loja) Subnational governments involved in the project (Celica, Calvas and Zapotillo Ecuador) Project team / National Coordination Unit Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

City*	Site / distance from the project office / means of mobilization	Interviews will be held with the following stakeholders at a minimum
	Loja – Atillo (Calvas):90 km / 2:30 by car Project's car and driver will be provided	
El Oro	Quito – Santa Rosa: 565 Km / 1h15 by plane Santa Rosa – Las Lajas: 55 km / 40m by car Santa Rosa – Arenillas: 20 km / 20 m by car Project's car and driver will be provided	Hydrographic Administrative Units of Jubones (Machala) Subnational governments involved in the project (Las Lajas, Arenillas) Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project
Lima	Calle Diecisiete N° 355, Urb El Palomar, San Isidro (ANA) Jorge Chávez 275, Miraflores 15074, Perú (UNDP)	National Water Authority (Head of Water Resources Planning) UNDP Steering Committee members Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project
Piura	Lima – Piura: 993 Km / 1h45m by plane Panamericana Norte Km. 3.5, Carretera Piura – Sullana (AAA Piura) Piura – Paimas: 150 Km / 2h00m by car Project's car and driver will be provided	Local Water Authority Administrative authority of the Water Jequetepeque - Zarumilla Subnational governments involved in the project (Piura) Project team / National Coordination Unit Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project
Tumbes	Lima – Tumbes: 1271 Km / 1h50m by plane Calle Francisco Navarrete N° 111- Tumbes (ALA Tumbes) Tumbes – Pampas de Hospital: 20 Km / 30m by car. Project's car and driver will be provided	Local Water Authority Tumbes Subnational governments involved in the project (Tumbes) Project team / National Coordination Unit Individual consultants or enterprises that provide consulting services to the project

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools,

project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. 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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. 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 (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

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.

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, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *(Ecuador)*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. Please note, that all travel and related expenses to field visits need to be included in the financial proposal. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TR will be approximately 45 days over a time period of 90 days and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date*
Contract signing		January 2, 2020
Preparation	05 business days	January 9, 2020
Evaluation Mission	15 business days	January 30, 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	15 business days	February 20, 2020
Final Report	10 business days	March 13, 2020

*These are tentative dates. SENAGUA and UNDP will send comments on deliverables within 8 business days after their reception.

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO 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.

CONSULTANT PROFILE

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- University degree in environmental sciences, water management, civil or agricultural engineering or other related fields.
- Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience evaluating or managing development and/or environmental or water projects.
- Experience in evaluation of at least three (3) water or environmental projects.
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Principles and Projects.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system and GEF projects will be considered an asset.
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish will be necessary.
- Excellent English and Spanish communication skills.
- Knowledge in the basic computer programs, such as Microsoft Office.

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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upon approval of Inception Report as an advance to cover costs of travel.

30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Technical proposals (CV and technical offer) will weight a maximum of 70% and only the consultants that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
CV	Knowledge:		30%
	University degree in environmental sciences, water management or other related fields.	10	
	Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Principles and Projects	5	
	Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish will be necessary. Excellent English and Spanish communication skills	10	
	General experience:		
	Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience evaluating or managing development and/or environmental or water projects.	15	
	Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	10	
	Specific experience:		
	Experience in evaluation of at least three (3) water or environmental projects.	40	
	Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system and GEF projects will be considered an asset.	10	
	TOTAL:	100	
Technical Proposal	Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:		40%
	How much the offeror understands the nature of the work and conforms to the Terms of Reference?	25	
	Does the offeror's portfolio demonstrate experience in the development and elaboration of products similar to those described in the ToRs?	25	
	Is the methodology, established to achieve the products defined for the consultancy, described in depth?	20	
	Is the methodology adequate to achieve the products defined for the consultancy?	15	
	Has a clear presentation been made? Is the sequence of activities and their planning logical and realistic? Does it lead to an efficient implementation of the consulting objective?	15	

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
	TOTAL:	100	

Economic proposal	Score	Percentage
<p>The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.</p> <p>Only the technical proposal that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.</p>	100	30%

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
Objective: Strengthening institutional, policy, legal and scientific-technical capacities to implement Integrated Transboundary Water Resources Management in Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo- Chira and Zarumilla River Basins and Aquifers, integrating climate variability concerns	Level of knowledge of SENAGUA, ANA, Water Resources Basin Councils (Peru), Irrigation Boards and Potable Water Boards (Ecuador) on IWRM and management of transboundary basins	Baseline institutional capacity will be measured using institutional capacity survey within 3 months of project start-up	80% of stakeholders who have received training indicate application of IWRM by end of project	Implementation study carried out at the end of the project to measure the level of knowledge of stakeholders and the application of this knowledge on IWRM	There is a sustained commitment by the Governments of Ecuador and Peru to strengthen the policy framework and governance in sectors related to IWRM in watersheds and transboundary watersheds
	Area (ha) which IWRM practices are being implemented in Catamayo-Chira, Puyango Tumbes and Zarumilla River Basins in Ecuador and Peru	0 ha. There are only specific actions of efficient water or water quality management, without an integrated management of water resources	10,300 ha of project influence benefit from IWRM actions in the watersheds of interest.	Project GIS Project reports	There is effective communication between public entities
	Number of beneficiaries from implementation of IWRM in pilot projects	0 beneficiaries, because the pilot projects have not been established (base line to be defined)	234,549 local inhabitants (125,335 men and 109,214 women)	Reports on the implementation of pilot projects Baseline report and report at the end of the project	Rotation of personnel does not undermine the capacity development of actors
	Institutional framework for binational dialogue and cooperation on IWRM	Only a Binational Commission for Zarumilla has been formally established and there is no Strategic Action Program (SAP) developed or approved.	Proposal for statute and regulations for the operation of the binational commission for the integrated management of water resources of the transboundary hydrographic basins between the Republic of Ecuador and the Republic of Peru	Final document with proposal for statute and framework of action of the single binational commission.	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	# of Local Drinking Water Boards / Local Governments that meet national minimum standards of drinking water quality and provide at least 3 hours of water per day to users at the pilot sites	It is estimated that less than 50% of Drinking Water Boards / local governments meet standards.	4 improvement plans / improved management models under the IWRM approach in the areas of pilot projects	Self-evaluation reports at the end of the project, according to ARCA Resolution 003)	
Outcome 1: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis developed for the Integrated management of Transboundary Water Resources Management (ITWRM) in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla binational aquifers and basins.	Indicator 1: Hydrogeological studies in important aquifers of the basins	The availability of hydrogeological information is greatest for the Zarumilla basin, while the information for the other basins of Catamayo-Chira and Puyango-Tumbes is scattered (primarily data on water quality information, volume of flow that is exploited, groundwater levels), with a medium to low level of hydrogeological information and lack of integration and interpretation of this information.	Basic hydrogeological studies in: a) Alto Piura; b) Catamayo-Loja; and c) Zarumilla aquifers, including monitoring, inventory of wells, identification of hydrogeological units, definition of recharge areas, hydrodynamics, hydrochemistry and water quality, estimation of reserve amounts, among others.	Hydro-geological studies completed	Key reference information is collected in a timely manner to avoid delays in the preparation of both ADT and subsequent PAEs The main actors are convened by SENAGUA and ANA and come together to validate and agree on the information
	Indicator 2: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA): Agreement on transboundary priorities and immediate root causes in binational watersheds and the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla binational aquifers and basins.	The cross-border priority themes have been identified and agreed, but this was done on the basis of limited information on effects; and an inadequate root cause analysis (score 2 in the IW Program Tracking Tool)	Establishment / strengthening of a GIS database for basins and aquifers (with public access) Agreement on cross-border priorities between Ecuador and Peru derived from reliable baseline data and immediate causes and root causes properly identified (score 4 on the AI Program monitoring tool)	GIS database ADT completed	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
Outcome 2: Strategic planning and capacity building to strengthen governance of transboundary water resources in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira & Zarumilla watersheds and aquifers	Indicator 3: Strategic Action Plan for the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla basins respectively	Neither Ecuador nor Peru have developed a SAP for any of the three basins. In Peru, there are water resource basin management plans for the Tumbes and Chira-Piura basins, which present agreed-upon solutions for the national-level management of the basins. In Ecuador there are general guidelines and a management plan for the Catamayo- Chira basin	One (01) SAP developed related to cross-border issues complemented by the National Strategic Action Plans (score of 4 in IW Program Tracking tool). These are programs focused on water resources that will solve problems common to both countries, and will be based on the information gathered in the TDA under Outcome 1.	A complete SAP document	There is a sustained commitment by the governments of Ecuador and Peru to strengthen the policy framework and governance in sectors related to IWRM in transboundary watersheds There is effective communication between public entities Interested parties in Ecuador and Peru agree on the structure and operating mechanism of the
	Indicator 4: National Inter-ministerial Committees	Neither Ecuador nor Peru have established National Interministerial Committees to address IWRM issues	National Interministerial Committees established and functioning in both Ecuador and Peru (score of 3 on IW tracking tool)	Minutes of the meetings of the National Interministerial Committees	Binational Commissions for Puyango-Tumbes and Catamayo-Chira Rotation of personnel does not affect the capacity
	Indicator 5: Proposed regulations to strengthen the Binational Commissions	There are no general operating rules or procedures to guide the establishment and operation of Binational Commissions. For the Zarumilla Binational Commission there are statutes, internal regulations and a draft operational regulation for the Zarumilla aquifer. There are some instruments but the concerted institutionality has not been developed.	Proposed operational procedures / regulations developed to guide the establishment of Binational Commissions and to strengthen the current Zarumilla Binational Commission	Draft of Standard / Operational Procedures Document with proposed new / updated IWRM standard (s) and management of transboundary watersheds (e.g. Standard on Binational Commissions and / or on water protection zones)	development of the main actors

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	Indicator 6: M&E indicators to measure environmental and socioeconomic status of basins and aquifers and to monitor implementation of SAPs and NSAPs	Such indicators have not been agreed upon.	Agreement on indicators to measure river basin and aquifer processes, stress reduction and environmental and socioeconomic status and level of implementation of SAPs/NSAPs. Binational work plan agreed upon for joint monitoring in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla basins	Minutes of the meetings of the National Interministerial Committees confirming agreement on the indicators Agreement between SENAGUA and ANA on parameters Monitoring reports	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	<p>Indicator 7: % of officials from ANA, SENAGUA, water user boards, water resource basin councils and local governments trained on IWRM (specific topics of training described in description of Output 2.4)</p>	<p>0 % have been trained on these issues. Isolated training has been provided on various topics (such as 'water culture').</p>	<p>In Ecuador: - At least 60% of members of water user boards trained in each pilot area. - At least 60% of SENAGUA officials in the Puyango Catamayo Demarcation trained - At least 60% of SENAGUA officials in the Jubones Demarcation trained -At least two (2) parish-level Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GADs) in each pilot area involved in training activities - At least one (1) canton-level GADs involved in each pilot area in education and training activities. - At least one (1) provincial-level GAD involved in education and training activities In Peru: - At least 60% of officials of the Local Water Authorities (ALAs) trained in each pilot area - At least one (1) basin council involved in training activities in each pilot area. - At least one (1) regional government involved in training activities in each pilot area.</p>	<p>Project reports</p>	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
Outcome 3: Pre-SAP demonstrations in IWRM implemented and investment needs in Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla aquifers and watersheds identified	Indicator 8: Pilot 1 (Ecuador) Number of protection zones in mini watersheds for the catchment of water for human consumption.	Although there are areas dedicated to the conservation of forests and paramos, there are no water protection zones within the canton, nor is there a technical-administrative mechanism for the declaration of water conservation zones in the country. Possible areas must have an action plan.	2 zones declared as water protection zones in the canton, according to the legal framework applicable in Ecuador, in the project's intervention cantons.	Official declaration of water protection zones endorsed by SENAGUA and issued by the municipalities. Elaboration of decrees to support the official declaration Plans of action of the zones of water protection Ordinances for the declaration of water protection zones Technical and administrative mechanism for the declaration of water protection zones	Pilot projects are initiated in a timely manner to achieve the environmental and socio-economic goals
	Indicator 9: Pilot 1 (Ecuador) 1 pilot experience of reduction of pollution by domestic sewage in surface water, in cantón Loja	There are some WW decontamination facilities in the canton, but they are not widely extended. The municipality of Loja has plans to install WWTP in rural areas.	1 WWTP installed and operated in the rural area of the canton that complies with design parameters of sanitary civil works and meets the national standard on decontamination of waste water	Reports of the Unit responsible for Drinking Water and Sanitation of the Municipality of Loja. Certified Laboratory Analysis Reports	The cost of construction of the plant is adjusted to the budget of the project. UMAPAL has a management model that allows the operation and maintenance of the WWTP.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	Indicator 10: Pilot 1 (Ecuador) A project of Integral Management of Water Resources that considers Drinkable Water, Sanitation and interception of polluting effluents.	<p>The sector does not have drinkable water and the discharge of domestic wastewater goes directly to receiving bodies (gorges and other water bodies), especially in rural areas.</p> <p>The water quality status at the waste water discharge points will be determined at the start of the project.</p>	1 drinking water system and 40 basic sanitation units installed and operating in Guineo Chico sector in the Sabanilla parish, which intercepts coliforms, fats and oils and prevents their discharge into the environment.	<p>Delivery report.</p> <p>As-built plans of the work.</p> <p>Inspection reports</p>	Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively. Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively
	Indicator 11 Measures for agricultural pollution mitigation in water bodies.	There are local initiatives to reduce agricultural pollution, but they are dispersed and require social participation	Municipality and water boards involved have instruments and agreements to mitigate the water pollution produced by agricultural activities.	Training plans and social mechanisms defined for the mitigation of pollution considered in management models.	There are no major new sources of pollution in the area of pilot projects that may undermine the achievement of environmental and socio-economic goals Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively
	Indicator 12: Pilot 3 (Ecuador) Number of protection zones in mini watersheds for the catchment of water for human consumption.	<p>Although there are areas dedicated to the conservation of forests and paramos, there are no water protection zones within the canton, nor is there a technical-administrative mechanism for the declaration of water conservation zones in the country.</p> <p>Possible areas must have an action plan.</p>	2 zones declared as water protection zones in the canton, according to the legal framework applicable in Ecuador	<p>Official declaration of water protection zones endorsed by SENAGUA and issued by the municipalities.</p> <p>Elaboration of decrees to support the official declaration</p> <p>Plans of action of the zones of water protection</p> <p>Ordinances for the declaration of water protection zones</p> <p>Technical and administrative mechanism for the declaration of water protection zones</p>	Pilot projects are initiated in a timely manner to achieve the environmental and socio-economic goals

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	Indicator 13: Pilot 4 (Ecuador) Reduction of water pollution by discharges of domestic wastewater	There is a waste water treatment plan (WWTP) whose operation is not optimal	3 rehabilitated WWTPs that comply with the national regulations applicable to effluent discharges to freshwater bodies. The rehabilitation contemplates the protection of the WWTP in La Victoria by building a wall of breakwaters and the functional evaluation of all plants)	Delivery report. As-built plans of the work. Inspection reports	Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively. Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively
	Indicator 14: Pilot 4 (Ecuador) Measures for the mitigation of the agricultural pollution to the bodies of water.	There are local initiatives to reduce agricultural pollution, but they are dispersed and require participation and social control	Municipality and water boards involved have instruments and agreements to mitigate the water pollution produced by agricultural activities.	Training plans and social mechanisms defined for the mitigation of pollution considered in management models.	There are no major new sources of pollution in the area of pilot projects that may undermine the achievement of environmental and socio-economic goals Key stakeholders for the implementation of pilot projects can work together effectively
	Indicator 15: Pilot Chira River (Peru) Wastewater treated in WWTP complies with current MPL in: thermotolerant coliforms (NMP / 100ml), BOD (mg / l) and total suspended solids (ml / l).	Level of thermotolerant wastewater coliforms, BOD and total solids, exceeds MPL (DS No. 003-2010-MINAM)	Waste water treated in WWTP complies with MPL (thermotolerant coliforms 10000 NMP / 100ml, BOD 100 mg / l and Total solids in suspension 150 ml / l).	Results of measurement of effluent parameters of the WWTP (final discharge of WWTP), based on the manual of procedures of the competent authority	Technical-economic proposal is viable for its implementation by the project.
	Indicator 16: Management model of WWTP and reuse of wastewater implemented allows good and correct operation and maintenance of the plant.	There is no appropriate management model for WWTP and wastewater reuse.	WWTP and wastewater reuse, managed locally, presents adequate operating and maintenance conditions.	Creation of WWTP / reuse management unit, operations manual and operation and maintenance records	Institutions assume commitments for the implementation and management of the WWTP.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	Indicator 17: Number of cross-border basin institutions and organizations involved in the implementation of pilot projects.	There are no project pilots	At least 20 cross-border watershed institutions and organizations participate and support the implementation of pilot projects.	Reports of Workshops and minutes of meetings with commitments assumed in Pilot Projects	There are involved in Pilot Projects at least: 02 ALAs, 01 AAA JZV, 02 CRHC, 01, EPS, 04 Local governments, 02 Regional Housing Directorate, 02 Regional Governments, 04 JASS, 02 User Boards.
	Indicator 18: Population that accesses campaigns, through communication media, in IWRM and water culture.	None at the start of project	30% of the population of priority districts (30% of 49,706)	Monitoring of communication campaigns.	Media and a strategy are available
	Indicator 19: Number of agricultural and population water users participating in training events in efficient use and water conservation.	None at the start of project	At least 100 leaders of agrarian and population water user organizations have received trainings in efficient use and conservation of water	Reports of training workshops, attendance lists, briefing notes.	Budget and training plan aligned with ANA strategies are available
	Indicator 20: Pilot Tumbes River (Peru) Wastewater treated in WWTP complies with current MPL in: thermotolerant coliforms (NMP / 100ml), BOD (mg / l) and total suspended solids (ml / l).	Level of thermotolerant wastewater coliforms, BOD and total solids, exceeds MPL (DS No. 003-2010-MINAM)	Waste water treated in WWTP complies with MPL (thermotolerant coliforms 10000 NMP / 100ml, BOD 100 mg / l and Total solids in suspension 150 ml / l).	Results of measurement of effluent parameters of the WWTP (final discharge of WWTP), based on the manual of procedures of the competent authority	Technical-economic proposal is viable for its implementation by the project.
	Indicator 21: Management model of WWTP and reuse of wastewater implemented allows good and correct operation and maintenance of the plant.	There is no appropriate management model for WWTP and wastewater reuse.	WWTP and wastewater reuse, managed locally, presents adequate operating and maintenance conditions.	Creation of WWTP / reuse management unit, operations manual and operation and maintenance records	Institutions assume commitments for the implementation and management of the WWTP.
	Indicator 22: Population that accesses campaigns, through communication media, in IWRM and water culture.	None at the start of project	30% of the population of priority districts (30% of 49,706)	Monitoring of communication campaigns.	Media and a strategy are available

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	End-of-project Target	Verification sources	Assumptions / Risks
	Indicator 23: Number of agricultural and population water users participating in training events in efficient use and water conservation.	None at the start of project	At least 100 leaders of agrarian and population water user organizations have received trainings in efficient use and conservation of water	Reports of training workshops, attendance lists, briefing notes.	Budget and training plan aligned with ANA strategies are available
	Indicator 24: Information (documents / products) of the project, good practices and systematized experiences, shared through website	Since the project has not yet been launched, there has been no exchange of project documents / products or dissemination of project best practices. Lessons learned from the Zarumilla Binational Commission's work have been identified.	Project website running according to IW: Learn guidelines, updated regularly, and information shared through participation in the International Water Conferences 8 (in 2015)	Project website with all key project documents	
	Indicator 25: Investment needed for IWRM in the three identified basins and aquifers.	At present, a comprehensive financial analysis of the investment needs in IWRM has not been carried out for the three watersheds.	Prefeasibility studies of the investments required for IWRM in the three shared watersheds and aquifers completed	Consultancy report completed, with prefeasibility study	

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries program document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Final project product reports

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the 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 norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- 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 consultant
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
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 rated⁶)
- 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- 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

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: _____