**Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**For the Terminal Evaluation Consultant**

*(International Recruitment, IC Contract)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location:** | Home-based with no travel envisioned |
| **Application Deadline:** |  |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Contract |
| **Assignment Type** | International Consultant |
| **Languages Required:** | English required; |
| **Starting Date:** (date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | 1st April 2021 |
| **Duration of the Assignment:** | Estimated 1st April – 21st May 2021  (Approximately 30 working days) |

**BACKGROUND**

##### **Introduction**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled Kura II: Advancing IWRM across the Kura river basin through implementation of the transboundary agreed actions and national plans (PIMS # 5325) implemented through the United Nation Development Program, Istanbul Regional Hub (UNDP-IRH). The project started on the 23rd August 2016 and is in its last year of implementation.

The Terminal Evaluation process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)

##### **Project Description**

UNDP GEF Kura Project “Advancing Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) across the Kura river basin through implementation of the transboundary agreed actions and national plans” is implementing the Strategic Action Program (SAP) for the Kura River Basin in partnership with the Governments of Georgia and Azerbaijan. The project is funded by The Global Environment Facility (GEF) (www.thegef.org)

The SAP is framed around four agreed Ecosystem Quality Objectives (EQO) which are:

* To achieve sustainable utilization of water resources to ensure access to water and preserve ecosystem services;
* To achieve water quality such that it would ensure access to clean water for present and future generations and sustain ecosystem functions in the Kura river basin;
* To achieve and maintain ecosystem status whereby they provide essential environmental and socio-economic services in a sustainable manner in the Kura River Basin; and,
* To achieve mitigation of adverse impacts of flooding and climate change on infrastructures, riparian ecosystems and communities.

The GEF will support priority activities towards these objectives. The GEF funded SAP implementation Project has the objective “to integrate water resources management in the Kura river basin to address water-energy-food-ecosystem security nexus through the implementation of agreed actions in the SAP”.

There are five project components to support the countries to achieve this objective. These are:

* Project Component 1: Establishment of effective cross sectoral IWRM governance protocols at the local, national and transboundary levels in the Kura Basin;
* Project Component 2: Strengthening national capacities to implement multi-sectoral IWRM in the Kura basin;
* Project Component 3: Stress reduction in critical areas and pre-feasibility studies to identify investment opportunities for improving river system health;
* Project Component 4: Targeted education and involvement projects to empower stakeholders in implementing local / national / regional actions in support of SAP implementation;
* Project Component 5: Enhancing science for governance by strengthening monitoring, information management and data analysis systems for IWRM.

##### **TE Purpose**

The **purpose** of the TE is to provide an impartial evaluation of the project in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management and achievements.

The Terminal Evaluation consultant will develop a technical report on the assessment of the achievement of the UNDP-GEF Kura II project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from the project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The Terminal Evaluation report should promote accountability and transparency, and assess the extent of project accomplishments.

The Terminal Evaluations for GEF-financed projects have the following complementary purposes:

* To promote accountability and transparency;
* To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-supported GEF-financed initiatives; and to improve the sustainability of benefits and aid in overall enhancement of UNDP programming;
* To assess and document project results, and the contribution of these results towards achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits;
* To gauge the extent of project convergence with other priorities within the UNDP country programme, including poverty alleviation; strengthening resilience to the impacts of climate change, reducing disaster risk and vulnerability, as well as cross-cutting issues such gender equality, and empowering women.

The Project Team, GEF RTA, and the two GEF NFPs, and other key stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on the draft report and, if needed, provide additional information relevant to the TE team’s assessment of results. The main output results of the terminal evaluation process will be presented in the UNDP-GEF Kura II final Steering Committee meeting in Middle April 2021.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **TE Approach & Methodology**

The TE must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments. The TE methodology should include:

* Document review of all relevant documentation including the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project Steering committee meetings minutes, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE Consultant will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins
* Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
* Organize series of interviews with key relevant stakeholders who have project responsibilities and beneficiaries, this list includes:
  + The UNDP-IRH management
  + The GEF Regional Technical Advisor
  + The two project’s National Focal points (the Azerbaijani NFP and the Georgian NFP)
  + The UNDP Country Office in Azerbaijan and in Georgia
  + The UNDP-GEF Project CTA/RC and the project team
  + The members of the project National Advisory Groups
  + key experts and consultants contributing in the project implementation
  + Representatives of relevant NGOs involved in the project implementation
* All interviews should be conducted online due to Covid-19 restrictions. All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
* Validation of key tangible outputs and interventions through analysis of the available documents and report produced for these outputs. These documents should include technical reports, brochures, and pictures or videos that were taken by the project team from the field sites during the different phases of implementation.
* 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, online group discussions, etc.
* Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
* Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the TE process should ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final TE report should describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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 rating scales are provided in the TOR Annex F). The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

**Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |
|  |  |

The Evaluation will also 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 will receive assistance from the PCU to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table (example template is in the TOR Annex F), which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

1. **Detailed Scope of the TE**

Consultant will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Steering Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. Then they will participate in an TE inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the TE, producing the TE inception report thereafter. The TE Consultant will then organize a series of interviews with relevant stakeholders.

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess the project results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects *(*[*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf*](about:blank)*).*

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in TOR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country driven
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

1. Project Implementation

* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP-IRH) (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

1. Project Results

* Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
* Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*) , socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE Consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex F.

1. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE Consultant shall prepare and submit:

1. TE Inception Report: TE Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *1 week* after signing the contract. TE Consultant submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *7st April 2021*
2. Presentation: TE Consultant presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE interviews. Approximate due date: *20th April 2021*
3. Draft TE Report: TE Consultant submits full draft report with annexes *within 2 weeks* of the end of the TE interview. Approximate due date: *5th May 2021*
4. Final TE Report and Audit Trail: TE Consultant submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within one week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *15th May 2021*. The final TE report must be in English.

The final TE report will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.

1. **TE Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits if any.

1. **Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *30 working days* over a time period of *9 weeks*  starting *1st March 2021*. The approximate TE timeframe is as follows:

* *15 Feb. 2021:* Application closes
* *31 May 2021:* Selection of TE Consultant
* *1 April 2021:* Prep the TE Consultant (handover of project documents)
* *7th April 2021: 5* days: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
* *10th March 2021: 2* days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE interviews
* *20th March 2021: 10* days : TE Disk review: stakeholder meetings, and interviews
* *21st April 2021:* Presentation of initial findings
* *30th April 2021: 10* days: Preparation of draft TE report
* *1st of May 2021:* Circulation of draft TE report for comments
* *10th May 2021: 3* days: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
* *15h May 2021:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
* *21st May 2021:* Concluding Project SC meeting to present the TE findings
* *21st May 2021:* Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is *1st May 2021.*

1. **Required skills and experience**

**Competencies:**

**Corporate competencies:**

* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism;
* Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**Functional competencies:**

* Excellent communication skills
* Demonstrable analytical skills

**Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Education:

* A Master’s degree in water resources management, applied water resources evaluation or other closely related field.

Experience:

* Recent experience (within 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies required
* At least 3 years’ experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios required
* At least 3 years’ experience in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters transboundary freshwater systems required
* At least 5 years’ experience working with the GEF evaluations required
* Work experience in transboundary fresh ater management for at least 5 years required

Language skills:

* English is the working language of the UNDP-GEF Kura II Project and it is required

Assets:

* Experience working in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Caucasus in fresh water management is an asset, in evaluation of project implementation preferred
* Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis and demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *GEF International Waters* is an asset
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
* The ability to communicate in Russian is an asset.

1. **Evaluator Ethics**

The TE Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. 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.

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

1. **Payment Schedule**

* 20% payment on 10th of April 2021: upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
* 20% payment on 21st of April 2021: upon presenting the initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE interviews.
* 30% payment on 1st of May 2021: upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
* 30% payment on 15th of May 2021: upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

1. **Application Process**

**Financial Proposal:**

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees and any other expenses that may be required to finalize the TE process);

**Procedure for applying for this consultancy**

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](about:blank) provided by UNDP;
2. **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](about:blank));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](about:blank). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted online.

**Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the Technical Proposal includes educational background, experience on similar assignments and other ToR requirements will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 35 points:

* Criteria A: Master’s degree in water resources management, applied water resources evaluation or other closely related field, Max Points: 5,
* Criteria B: Recent experience (within 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies required, Max Points: 5,
* Criteria C: At least 3 years’ Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios required, Max Points: 5,
* Criteria D: At least 3 years’ experience in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters transboundary freshwater systems required, Max Points: 5,
* Criteria E: At least 5 years’ experience working with the GEF evaluations required, Max Points: 10,
* Criteria F: At least 5 years work experience in transboundary freshwater management required, Max Points 5.

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max 15 Point

1. **Annexes to the TE ToR**

* **ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**
* **ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**
* **ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**
* **ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**
* **ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**
* **ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table**
* **ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**
* **ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template**

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

| **Outcomes & Outputs and Indicators[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline** | **Milestone and Project Targets** | **Source of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1: Establishment of effective cross sectoral IWRM governance protocols at the local, national and transboundary levels in the Kura Basin**  **Outcome 1: Regional, national and local legal, policy and regulations harmonized within the Kura basin for strengthened IWRM implementation, including harmonized intersectoral coordination with environment, agriculture, energy, municipal water and industrial sectors** | | | | | |
| **1.1 Updated regulations for environmental flow calculation methodology**  Indicators:  P.I. 1.1 Calculation methodology for E Flows updated based on available information measured by percent change of standard deviation of flow from historical norm of natural flow from previous approach  SRI.1.1 Percent change in monthly flow impacts from previous to updated calculation methodology  Pre-ESI 1.1 Agreed status criteria including E Flows across the basin in line with EU WFD by month 42 of project | There is bi-lateral interest in updating environmental flow approaches, including those explored in the Foundational Phase. Sufficient information still is needed updated regulations for enforcement mechanisms for a staged approach. The previous Kura Aras Project emphasized need to update environmental flow calculation from the 10% average annual flow used in the Soviet era to more closely approximate seasonal flows using updated staged statistical and ecosystem based approaches. In AZ National Science Foundation is supporting early work in Ganga Chay Basin. | 1.1.1 Plan for increased monitoring and enforcement of environmental flows regulations by month 12 in selected sub-basin based on existing information  1.1.2 Plan for updated environmental flow methodology, including monitoring approach and evaluation criteria accepted by appropriate ministries for trial in sub basin by month 12 based on existing information  1.1.3 Proposed updated methodology adopted in at least 1 sub basin in each country for at least 1 full year started by month 18 to test updated approach  1.1.4 trial methodology in sub basin to conclude by month 36 for review (Linked to Output 3.3)  1.1.5 Ministries will accept the proposed methodology for environmental flow calculations within 4 years, process started by end of project | Report on the support plan (incl. description of the current baseline, with available information)  Draft methodology of calculation of environmental flow  Summary report/indicators on achieved progress  Lessons learned reports from sub-basin trials  Updated methodology for application in practice  National reports on introduction of environmental flows into water management legislation or strategy  Report on environmental status criteria to include E Flows across the basin. | Assumption: Trialing of updated flows calculations in sub basin can be transferred (Link to Output 3.3)  Assumption: sufficient historical data is available for selected sub basins (Link to Output 5.1)  Assumption: There is strong political will at the national level to support the timely development and adoption of updated regulations and plans (Link to Output 1.5)  Risk: potential conflicts between sectors over the use and management of resources across seasons (Link to Output 1.5)  Risk: Very lengthy processes associated with the development and adoption of national legislation and plans |
| **Output 1.2 Improved protocols water flow management regulatory strategies**  P.I 1.2.1 Water efficiency included in national and sectoral plans by number of additional references to water efficiency and demand management in laws, regulations and sectoral plans  SRI. 1.2.1 Verifiable estimates of water saved from application of regulations on water efficiency  P.I. 1.2.2 Percent of basin covered by flood hazard & risk maps  Pre-ESI. 1.2 Agreed river system status criteria includes integrated flow management | Current water management policies do not sufficiently support coordinated rational water use. In Georgia new Water Law is anticipated to be delivered to Parliament, with sub-laws including tariffs in line with the EU Association Agreement.  To apply the water nexus for **integrated flow management** there is a need to account for climate change impacts. This will improve regional water-energy-food-environmental security, and requires protocols to support flow management coordination.  Harmonization of flood risk management with European practice is one of the priority areas for the region for effective management of flood risks resulting in reduction of casualties. | 1.2.1 Develop plans to address gaps in regulatory protocols to encourage efficient water use based on assessments in 5.1, 5.2 and update review of laws, regulations and enforcement mechanisms  1.2.2 Within 12 months national level reports developed on waste water reuse regulation and potential  1.2.3 National level recommendations on updated protocols presented within 42 months of project start up based on output 5.1 and recommendations based on lessons learned  1.2.4 Preparation of flood hazards and risks maps of the Kura Basin by using existing information | National level proposal for legislation amendments for efficient water use, including baselines, to minimize losses, support sustainable groundwater use, and promote safe wastewater reuse  Sectoral guidelines for improved water use efficiency to support sustainable surface and groundwater use, and promote safe wastewater reuse  Integrated flow management/ Water nexus informational materials and applications for decision makers, RBMO/local authorities  National level recommendations based on outcome of 5.1 and lessons learned  Support for preparedness and response on floods in the Kura Basin | Assumption: Updated laws will be accepted by parliament and may be effectively enforced.  Risk: local SH/WUA rejection of reuse approach  Risk: Intersectoral disagreements on water use efficiency  Assumption: Sufficient information regarding withdrawals of water available (linked to Output 2.1, 2.4, 4.1, 5.1) |
| **1.3 Institutional support for River Basin Management Organization and local authorities**  PI 1.3.1 Percent change in number of recommendations implemented resulting from approach with RBMO  PI 1.3.2  Number of interventions funded by competent authorities and under implementation from RBMPs and Program of Measures | The countries are rapidly moving towards approximating EU water management approaches. This requires appropriate authority is assured to RBMOs and institutions to inform decision making regarding water use by local and national authorities. Both RBMO and local basin authorities will need institutional mandates to functioneffectively.  Previous projects have developed RBMPs but bodied do not have authority to implement or supervise these.  Appropriate institutional structures are needed to support RBMO and local authorities in order to ensure sustainability. | 1.3.1 Based on appropriate international best practices, provide methodology of implementing EUWFD at national levels with institutional support to RBMOs  1.3.2 Based on appropriate international best practices review and recommend improvements to institutions to support RBMO/local authorities and intersectoral exchange/ coordination within 18 months  1.3.3 Develop EU WFD implementation guidance materials including information exchange mechanisms as per Output 5.4 within 36 months  1.3.4 Within 42 months strengthen functional and technical capacity of current RBMO at least 2 sub practical recommendations | Institutional review reports for RBMO/local authorities and inter-sectoral coordination  Recommendations for improved institutional support to RBMOs  Guidance materials for RBMOs and supervising institutions | Assumption: suitable sub basin RBMO/local authorities for trialing of EUWFD approach (linked to outputs 2.2 and output 4.2)  Risk: climate change impacts could vary water availability during trial period |
| **1.4 Pollution abatement plans developed with key stakeholders.**  PI 1.4.1 Constructed PAP/CAPs with abatement and compliance indicators detailed in text  P1 1.4.2 Number of sites eligible for PAP/CAP within water quality surveillance monitoring network  PI 1.4.3 Number of potential viable financing mechanisms for PAP implementation | Current pollution abatement plans are nascent for water pollution, and are based on permitting that requires more robust enforcement. Previous projects have focused on water quality monitoring but not on actual abatement and compliance measures.  In Azerbaijan regulations will be updated before 2016. In Georgia new legal mechanisms are under development in line with the EU Association Agreement. | 1.4.1 Within 9 months all of point sources identified and included in the cadaster with pollution map for point sources  1.4.2 Conduct pollution source assessment, and determine causes and based on this develop water quality surveillance strategy and provide technical assistance on how to make Environmental Compliance Action Plan monitoring network in the Kura River (identification of sampling points) within 18 months  1.4.3 Within 30 months of completion of cadasters for water quality, develop country specific plans for pollution abatement based on BAT and BEP for priority areas  1.4.4 National reports identifying the costs of water quality degradation to national GDP by 24 months and promote financial mechanisms  1.4.5 By 38 months a common report on pollution abatement financing mechanisms for large scale interventions | Cadaster of pollutants  Report on types of pollution and surveillance monitoring network design map  Draft pollution abatement and compliance action plans working with key enforcement and polluters  Reports on green alternatives for pollution abatement  Reports and location of financing mechanisms promotion workshop  Report to be submitted to ministries on pollution abatement strategies and environmental compliance action plans | Assumption: Link with pollution abatement activities in Output 2.1 to develop strategic abatement approaches, and Output 2.3 to build enforcement capacity, and Output 3.2 to showcase effective approaches  Assumption: willingness of polluting sector/industry to participate in abatement plan development (link to output 1.6)  Assumption: Sufficient national capacity to enforce pollution abatement plans (linked to Output 2.3) |
| **1.5 Support to intersectoral water policy coordination and harmonization at the national and transboundary levels**  PI 1.5.1 Number of sectors represented at national and regional meetings (PI)  PI 1.5.2 Pre-and post-workshop and study tour perceptions surveys for participants | Movement toward harmonization of water management approaches, including harmonization of water quality standards needs further support. The EUWI supported National Water Policy Dialogue (NWPD) Committees are moving forward in Georgia with support to sub laws for water. In Azerbaijan, additional support will be needed, in line with multi-sectoral water use. | 1.5.1 Meetings and workshops for intersectoral water team/NWPD members and associates to highlight what each sector is doing, provide trainings/workshops on specific approaches towards harmonization of approaches to water management held 2 times per year in each country and 2 regional meetings per year  1.5.2 Study tours at local, national and regional levels, with 1 tour per year per country  1.5.3 International study tour to observe intersectoral projects within 24 months | Meeting minutes, including agenda and lists of participants  Documented training materials available on line in local languages  Training documentation  Participation of members at neighboring countries NWPD Meetings and trainings | Assumption: continuation of the EU Water Initiative National Water Policy Dialog Meetings and or similar coordination  Assumption: willingness of parties to share information and experiences (links with output 2.4 and output 5.4) |
| **1.6 Public Private Partnership to foster sustainable national and regional integrated water resources management through use of green technologies**  PI 1.6.1 Number of private sector organizations involved in the PPP  PI 1.6.2 Amount of economic benefit possible for use of green technology for water use in the short medium and long-term  SRI 1.6.1 Number of businesses applying green technologies for improved water management  PI 1.6.2 Number of agreed metrics for green businesses for improvements in water management (Pre ESI) | Green technology is not yet well known in Georgia and Azerbaijan, though there is an initiative within Ministry of Economic Development within the Department of Sustainable Development that will increase this. Within Azerbaijan organizations such as State agency for renewable energy agency and Joint Stock Companies (JSC) such as AzEnergy, as well as AzerSu and Azerbaijan Amelioration JSC are moving towards conservation of resources. Additionally agricultural firms are working in this direction, though not through project initiatives | 1.6.1 Based on recommendations of PSC and NWPD recruit core members of the PPP to receive priority support towards green business development within 6 months of project start up, and meetings held 2 times per year with the National Water Policy Dialog/Interministerial committee meetings  1.6.2 Within 12 months complete Report on Economic benefits of green technology for water use in national languages  1.6.3 Within 12 months develop metrics for green-businesses to determine baseline and improvements for improved water management  1.6.4 Within 18 months develop Sector specific catalog of green technologies for sustainable water use and income generation, with source database on line updated bi-monthly  1.6.5 Working with PPP develop “Green Business Award Program” to be awarded annually starting in year 2, based on sectors and improvements | Reports on Economic benefits of green technology for water use in national languages.  Sector specific catalog of green technologies for sustainable water use and income generation, with source database on line and local trainings.  Featured case studies in country to showcase benefits, and positive externalities  Metrics developed for green-businesses to determine baseline and improvements for improved water management.  Green business awards program initiated. | Assumption: Willingness of companies/firms and JSC to participate in PPP (links with output 3.1 and output 4.3)  Assumption: Expansion of efforts are transferable and green technologies can be adopted by participating organizations (links with output 3.1)  Risk: Sustainability of initiative after project completion |
| **Component 2: Strengthening national capacities to implement multi-sectoral IWRM in the Kura basin**  **OUTCOME 2: Enhanced capacity for sectoral ministries and agencies to successfully harmonize and implement national IWRM Plans** | | | | | |
| **2.1 Capacity building training programs for IWRM professionals for different target groups**  Indicators:  PI 2.1.1 Number of identified gaps in capacity filled by trainings across sectors  PI 2.1.2 Pre- and post-training aggregated test scores  PI 2.1.3 Number of training components applied professionally by the water managers at end of project | The Ministry of Environment Protection in Georgia has initiated a Center for Environmental Information and Education with facilities under development – providing training on a wide range of environmental issues. The Ministry of Agriculture has also initiated a Scientific Research Center. In Azerbaijan UNESCO IHP has linked with Baku State University, for some hydrological trainings. Additionally, AzerSu, the Azerbaijan Amelioration JSC, and Ministry of Emergency Situations have conducted trainings for staff. Inter-sectoral trainings will strengthen approaches, facilitate data exchanges, and improve integrated planning and use of water resources for sustainable | 2.1.1 Gap analysis of sectoral capacity needs for water managers within 9 months of start-up  2.1.2 Establish interministerial water training center within 9 months  2.1.3 Development of interlinked on-the-job trainings for IWRM Professionals within 12 months of project start-up  2.1.4 Conduct at least 6 topic specific on-the-job training curriculum for 24 months, from months 12-36, with quarterly face to face meetings and updates  2.1.5 Develop online trainings based on curriculum of developed trainings. Database created in first 6 months of trainings and updated quarterly  2.1.6 Document trainings and training materials available on line for certification of subsequent generations of water managers beginning after 30 month | Sectoral capacity needs reports for each country  Training center logs, equipment uses, media reports on uses.  Trainings materials, with baseline, midpoint and final assessment of impacts  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion reports on impacts of training on organization  Database accessible on line  All training materials available in national languages and online training courses on webpage, with secure certifications for successful completion | Assumption: Topics will include environmental economics, river basin ecology, cross sector integrated flow management with environmental flows stakeholder and gender mainstreaming, pollution abatement strategies with compliance action plans, and climate change and adaptation for professional water managers  Assumption: Trainings will be transferable across sectors and scheduling can conform to work schedules of participants  Risk: Uneven capacity between sectors and departments  Risk: There may be a strong need to train additional staff from ministries if existing staff is not sufficient or available. In this case, young professionals and graduate students may be trained by the project |
| **2.2 Enhanced capacity for institutions to implement river basin management plans**  PI 2.2.1 Number of competent authorities and interested parties represented in RBMOs training  PI 2.2.2 Percent of basin covered at baseline and at project completion by RBMOs/RBMPs  PI 2.2.3 Number of implementable measures linked to SAP with in the POMs for RBMPs | In Georgia the EU Association Agreement has been signed and the draft roadmap for implementation draft highlights the need to build capacity of national and local stakeholders to meet the requirements.  In Azerbaijan, there is an awareness that to improve sustainable water management in line with the EU WFD and there is a high need to build capacity in line with international best practices, including among local authorities | 2.2.1 Needs assessment for selected localized river management organizations within 9 months  2.2.2 Capacity building plans for trial in targeted areas based on best practices initiated within 12 months, with updates every 4 months, to include identification on reference conditions and biomonitoring in line with the EU WFD  2.2.3 Application of trial capacity building for targeted area based with regular trainings on site 3 times per year with RBMP/POMs  2.2.4 Strategy for expansion of capacity building efforts to additional targeted areas by 24 months  2.2.5 All training materials on line with trainings initiated by in final year  2.2.4 Draft and share lessons learned reports in final year | Needs assessment report  Capacity building plans and regular reports of all trainings conducted  Capacity building impact reports, and materials for training in national languages  Lesson learned reports, strategy reports, on line access reports, subsequent training report formats delivered from first sets of trainings | Assumption: This will be supported by improved governance for stress reduction in critical areas in Component 3, output 3.2  Assumption: this will be linked with Output 4.1 Training of Trainers for Interested Parties in RBMOs, with Documentation of approach used adapted for other stakeholders  Assumption: continuity of trainings following project completion |
| **2.3 Strengthen capacity for enforcement of water resources laws and regulations**  PI 2.3.1 Number of laws and regulations not incompliance at baseline compared to numbers of laws and regulations brought into compliance at end of project  SRI 2.3.1 Percent change in water quality compliance by parameter  PI 2.3.2 Number of incentives developed for improved compliance  ESI 2.3.2 Based on output 5.3, notable empirical changes in ecosystems status during extended trainings period | In both Georgia and Azerbaijan environmental monitoring and enforcement will require strengthening as both countries come more into line with international best practices. The monitoring and enforcement bodies currently need updated capacity and strengthened coordination to ensure improved conditions | 2.3.1 Assessment of needs and gaps in enforcement capacity, including roles for water pollution and water allocation, laws and equipment, for existing and anticipated regulations. Identify enforcement priorities within 9 months  2.3.2 Develop capacity building strategy working with enforcement bodies, to address enforcement priorities by 12 months  2.3.3 Develop budget for enforcement needs and staged budget allocation strategy with enforcement responsibilities matrix within 18 months  2.3.4 Conduct targeted 24 month trainings for prioritized enforcement areas with on-the-job trainings  2.3.5 Develop report with recommendations for sustaining effective enforcement mechanisms | Needs assessments  Capacity building strategy with priority enforcement  Responsibilities matrix for enforcement, and enforcement capacity budget allocated  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion reports on impacts of training on organization  Final report for sustainable enforcement | Assumption: Monitoring and enforcement bodies are able to share information openly with each other (Linked with Outputs 1.5, 2.4, 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4)  Assumption: Enforcement agencies are suitably staffed to fulfill missions (Linked to Output 5.2)  Risk: relationship between monitoring and enforcement are clearly articulated in organizational mission  Risk: Insufficient political will or institutional capacity for effective enforcement |
| **2.4 Strengthened capacity information management, data analysis for enhanced IWRM decision-making support**  PI 2.4.1 Number of gaps at baseline assessment and filled at end of project  PI 2.4.2 Percent change increase in digitized data and accessibility for use by decision-makers  PI 2.4.3 Number of intersectoral information exchange linkages formalized at national and transboundary levels at baseline and end of project | In Georgia the Ministry of Environmental Protection Center for Environmental Information and Education is establishing a data management and unified database and linked with NEA and will need support for populating and analysis, as well as decision support. In Azerbaijan, the IWRM Plan developed under the previous GEF project highlighted the need to construct and maintain a harmonized database for integrated intersectoral water management | 2.4.1 Assessment of needs and gaps in information management, data analysis for IWRM and identify decision support priorities within 9 months  2.4.2 Develop capacity building strategy working with information producing and management bodies, including indicators development, modeling, intersectoral GIS use, and analysis to address priorities by 12 months  2.4.3 Develop staged budget allocation strategy for information data management needs and equipment with agreed intersectoral responsibilities matrix within 18 months, including quality control for data, and models applications  2.4.4 Conduct targeted 24 month trainings for prioritized information management and decision support areas with on-the-job trainings | Needs assessments  Capacity building strategy with priority information needs, modeling approaches  Responsibilities matrix for information data management needs and equipment and budget allocated  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organization | Assumption: Successful operation of systems developed in component 5  Assumption: Willingness of sectors to share data across platform and to contribute to national water resources data base (Linked to Output 1.5, and 5.1)  Assumption: Data available and reliable through QA/QC measures (Linked to Output 2.1, and Component 5)  Risk: Gaps and errors in historic data may provide partial or faulty analysis parameters |
| **Component 3: Stress reduction in critical areas and pre-feasibility studies to identify investment opportunities for improving river system health**  **OUTCOME 3: Stress reduction in critical areas, and pre-feasibility studies in support of investment opportunities to improve river system health** | | | | | |
| **3.1 Showcase technologies to reduce factual water losses in different sectors**  SRI 3.1. Amounts of water and amount of money saved by application of green technologies at the local and national levels compared to costs and 5, 10 and 20 years spans. | Currently there are not specific programs in place for water conservation in Georgia using green technologies. Irrigation approaches currently used will benefit from improved efficiency.  In Azerbaijan some farmers are using newer technologies such as drip irrigation, but to date there are not programs specifically targeting this approach with clear focus on use reductions | 3.1 1 National assessment reports of physical water supply system for agricultural and municipal sectors with prioritized recommendations within 12 months  3.1.2 Preparation of plans for enhanced efficiency for agricultural and municipal consumption within 18 months  3.1.3 Apply 4 sector-specific water use efficiency interventions and lessons learned for up scaling from each country within 39 months, | National assessment report of physical water supply systems for each sector  Preparation plans with baseline measures, budget, evaluation criteria scaling, replication strategy, and clear stress reduction indicators  Report with empirical measures of stress reduction impacts, evaluation criteria assessment and up-scaling, replication strategy | Assumption: Data available on water use to successfully gauge factual water losses (linked to Output 1.2, 2.1, 2.4 and 5.1)  Assumption: Effectiveness of efforts to successfully change water use patterns and improve efficiency (linked to Output 4.1, and 4.4)  Assumption: Willingness of sectors to participate at local levels and sufficient incentives for cooperation (linked to Output 1.6)  Risk: damage to or loss of equipment for improved water efficiency, including from severe weather event |
| **3.2 Conduct pre-feasibility studies for select projects identified in pollution abatement plans.**  SRI 3.2.1 Improvement expected from implementation of pollution abatement.  PI 3.2.1 Baseline indicators and metrics developed to determine scale and scope of improvements  PI 3.2.2 Amount of support and interest measured by pre-commitments from donors and other sources | International and bilateral initiatives in the water sector have focused primarily on water quality monitoring and support to updated legal measures. Both countries are ready to move forward towards application of technologies that will improve conditions. Application of internationally accepted environmentally beneficial and low cost approaches to priority water quality improvement for priority areas. | 3.2.1 Identify 2 top priority water quality hotspots Working with NWP, PPP, an key stakeholders from Component 1, within 12 months  3.2.2 Identify pollution abatement projects to maximize impacts for stress reduction in line with the pollution abatement plan development in Component 1, and in collaboration with capacity building efforts in Component 2, within 15 months  3.2.3 Conduct study tour for key stakeholders to learn about technologies and approaches used in similar cases in 24 months  3.2.4 Conduct costed and detailed prefeasibility studies with detailed evaluation criteria, stakeholder analysis, expected benefits, and alternate approaches with final recommendations for presentation to governmental and private sector at the 36 months of project with international and national experts | Prioritized list of hotspots for pollution abatement pre-feasibility study  Selection criteria for pollution abatement projects and selection report  Study tour participants list, itinerary, report, and impact assessment from participants  Detailed Pre-feasibility plan for presentation to government and private sector | Assumption: The focus will be on projects with highest transboundary water quality improvement impacts, linked to Output 1.3, 2.1 and 2.3  Assumption: Availability of cost effective options for pollution abatement linked to output 1.6, and output 2.1  Assumption: sufficient data available for monitoring impacts of project implementation within prefeasibility study (linked to output 5.1)  Assumption: availability of appropriate incentives for private sector to adopt pollution abatement (linked to Output 1.6 and 5.2)  Risk: shift in political will or lack of financial support for project once prefeasibility study is completed |
| **3.3 River restoration projects for improved ecosystem health using integrated flow management**  ESSI 3.3.1 Change in baseline to completion assessment of river ecosystem status  SRI 3.3.1 Kilometers of river impacted by river restoration activities  PI 3.3 Number of stakeholders involved in river restoration activities, including diverse city of stakeholder groups represented | Both Georgia and Azerbaijan have expressed a strong interest in application of river restoration approaches for selected areas with critical needs and impacts linked to integrated flow management approached | 3.3.1 Identify prioritized sites suitable for river restoration projects to maximize impacts for stress reduction In collaboration with capacity building efforts in Component 2, within 12 months  3.3.2 Develop detailed river restoration plans for specific sites within 18 months, and collect baseline data and anticipated social, economic and environmental benefits in line with Components 4 and 5  3.3.3 Initiate river restoration activities with integrated flow management documenting progress and key lessons learned with close monitoring of costs and impacts. Within 24 months of project start up  3.3.4 Conclude initial river restoration project at least 6 months prior to project completion with detailed replication strategy and lessons learned | Site selection report and scoping study  Detailed plan with baseline information  River restoration activities monitoring reports  Project report, impact assessment, and replication strategy | Assumption: Available sites for river restoration, with strong local stakeholder support (Linked to Outputs 1.1, 1,2, 1.5, and 4.1)  Assumption: sufficient baseline data available for impact assessment (Linked to Outputs 1.1, 2.4, and 5.1)  Assumption: scale of restoration sufficient to impact ecosystem based data, and up-scaling of efforts (Linked to output 1.2 and 5.3)  Risk: severe weather events (flooding/drought) may impact project timing and completion |
| **Component 4: Targeted education and involvement projects to empower stakeholders in implementing local / national / regional actions in support of SAP implementation**  **OUTCOME 4: Stakeholder Education with academic, civil society, private sector, and local communities to gain experiences to increase their involvement in national and regional IWRM applications and innovations.** | | | | | |
| **4.1 A team of diverse professional IWRM trainers to work with stakeholders**  PI 4.1.1 Number of stakeholder groups trained  PI 4.1.2 Number of stakeholders reached through additional training activities  PI 4.1.3 Number of training modules developed  PI 4.1.4 Number of IWRM Trainer certificates (in person and online) awarded by end of project | In Georgia the Ministry of Environmental Protection Center for Environmental Information and Education is being established and will focus on a wide range of environmental issues including stakeholder engagement in line with the EU Directives. Both Azerbaijan and Georgia have Aarhus Centers for public information. Many previous projects have done training for stakeholders, though the long term impacts are not evaluated. To date there is not an established team of IWRM Trainers who draw from local and national bodies to support stakeholders for improved water management in the face of climate change | 4.1.1 Conduct stakeholder analysis survey to determine training needs, willingness to participate, and incentives to change water use behaviors by stakeholder groups within 9 months of project start up  4.1.2 Establish a targeted recruitment of IWRM trainers for stakeholders to draw from academic institutions, NGOs, WUAs, RBMO/local authorities, journalism/media, women’s organizations, youth organizations and others, within 9 months of project start for internship program  4.1.3 Establish training curriculum, specific to stakeholder types, for training of trainers, and recruit national and international experts to provide trainings within 12 months of project start-up  WUA, Women’s Groups, Journalists, RBMO, Youth  4.1.4 Conduct at least 6 topic specific training curriculums for trainers, and support training outreach programs, with quarterly face to face meetings and updates  4.1.5 Development of online trainings based on curriculum of developed trainings. Database created in first 12 months and updated quarterly  4.1.6 Training materials on line for certification of subsequent generations beginning by 24 months with evaluation of impacts | Stakeholder analysis survey results and assessment with recommendations for curriculum development  Roster of stakeholder trainers, and internship program selection criteria for rotating interns throughout project implementation  Trainings materials, with baseline, midpoint and final assessment of impacts  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organization  Database accessible on line  All training materials available in national languages and online training courses on webpage, with secure certifications for successful completion | Assumption: Strong stakeholder desire for additional water conservation, climate change adaptation information (linked to Outputs 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 4.4)  Assumption: Sufficient number of stakeholders interested and available in becoming trainers (Linked to Output 4.2)  Assumptions: materials developed for training relevant to stakeholder groups and transferability of stakeholder involvement approaches (Linked to Output 5.2)  Assumption: Available number of interns interested in working as Trainers, and supporting the development of the ToT approach (Linked to Outcome 4.2)  Assumption: Sufficient project staff time allotted to supervise interns (Linked to Outcome 4.2) |
| **4.2 Annual academic IWRM conferences**  PI 4.2.1 Number of academic articles presented at conference  PI 4.2.2 Number of academic articles published in peer-reviewed journals after presentation conferences  PI 4.2.3 Number of recommendations developed as a result academic inputs adopted at local and national levels.  PI 4.2.4 Number of masters students training topic specific activities approaches to water resource management from key universities | Following the efforts to support the design of linked regional IWRM graduate programs under the previous UNDP-GEF Kura Aras Project, both Baku State University and Tbilisi State University have now developed a linked IWRM MSc Curriculum that are currently undergoing approval processes. In order to further facilitate coordination between programs, and contribute to harmonization of approaches to water management the linkages and experience sharing should be maintained. | 4.2.1 Determine themed annual academic conferences to be held each year working with national universities, and other water management organizations  4.2.2 Sponsor academic IWRM conference including lecturers and IWRM MSc and other graduate students from national and regional institutions to present research related to improving water management in the Kura Basin in 2 day regional academic conference  4.2.3 Sponsor joint IWRM MSC trainings for 1 week annually on selected topics in line with themed topics to be presented at annual academic conference to be presented by regional and international academic experts  4.2.4 Training materials available on line for certification of subsequent generations beginning in 24 months | Themed annual conference plans for 3 conferences, with dates, locations, and number of participants  Annual conference proceedings, including all materials presented to be published as academic conference report online, in national languages and English for distribution to international organizations and academic resource centers.  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organization  All training materials available in national languages and online training courses on webpage, with secure certifications for successful completion | Assumption: Strong interest in academic conference and agreement on priority themes (Linked to outputs 1.3, 2.1 2.2 and others)  Assumption: Scheduling of conferences with academic schedule allows for sufficient preparation time for logistics |
| **4.3 Empowering social marketing campaigns to improve impacted stakeholders understanding of their role in water management**  PI 4.3.1 Number of stakeholders targeted to number stakeholders reached  PI 4.3.2 Number of webpage hits and social media statistics  PI 4.3.3 Impacts based on stakeholder analysis, and outreach activities  PI 4.3.4 Percent change in perceptions from baseline Survey in 5.2 to end of project survey | Many stakeholders outside of water management are not aware of their potential to positively impact water resource use and availability. Social marketing campaigns help raise awareness and induce small behavioral changes that can have cumulative impacts. To date, a substantial social marketing campaign for improved water management in the face of climate change has not yet been conducted in either Azerbaijan or Georgia | 4.3.1 Develop strategy for staged targeted social marketing campaigns for stakeholders to include use of social media, public information materials, and metrics to gauge impacts within 15 months Based on Stakeholder Analysis survey in 4.3  4.3.2 Design at least 4 social marketing campaigns to be implementing in at least 3 stages for gender mainstreaming, farmers and water user association members, RBMO/local authorities, and municipal water users within 18 months  working with international, regional and national experts and interns,  4.3.3 Conduct mid-term review of impacts to determine effectiveness of campaigns and adjust accordingly, within 30 months  4.3.4 Conduct social media educational and outreach activities to increase exposure of efforts within 30 months  4.3.5 Conduct end stage stakeholder analysis to gauge impacts and draft report on replication, and recommended next steps at least 4 months prior to project completion | Strategy report and baseline metrics  Social marketing campaign plans for targeted groups  Social marketing materials and distribution logs  Mid-term review assessment with recommendations  Educational and outreach activity logs and materials online as appropriate  End stage stakeholder analysis report and final report | Assumption: Representativeness of stakeholder analysis survey  Assumption: Suitability of social marketing materials and approaches  Assumption: ability to successfully reach targeted audience  Assumption: ability of social marketing campaign to influence stakeholder behaviors  (All assumptions linked to Outputs 4.1 and 5.2) |
| 4.4. **Local competitions and regional showcasing of local stakeholder innovations for climate change adaptation related to water**  PI 4.4.1 Number of innovation submitted  PI 4.4.2 Number of categories for awards  PI 4.4.3 Number of awards given  PI 4.4.4 Number of social media hits for innovations  PI 4.4.5 Number of stakeholder innovations shared at regional and international forums | Currently most stakeholders are adapting to climate change independently, without a venue to showcase adaptation innovations. Many turn to national and international governments to address challenges of adaptation without realizing they can be empowered to address matters themselves. Local efforts and innovations should be recognized and where possible replicated in order to improve climate change adaptation and to empower all stakeholders. | 4.4.1 identify and nominate select stakeholder innovations for first year awards for innovations working with NWPD members, IWRM Trainers, Interns and PPP  4.4.2 Conduct local and national competitions to encourage innovations from stakeholders on adaptation measures related to water management, to be held annually, as part of social marketing and public outreach campaign  4.4.3 Promote replication of innovative adaptation measures at national and regional technology conferences, through social media, and through international forums, within 18 months and updated quarterly | Innovations catalog and panel decisions  Awarded prizes for innovations  Promotional materials for innovations and regional conference awards | Assumption: Sufficient stakeholder interest in climate change adaptation (Linked to Output 5.2)  Assumption: this will be linked to social marketing campaign and PPP green business awards (Linked to Outputs 1.6, 4.3 and 4.5)  Risk: innovations may not be original design |
| **4.5 Project information and experiences shared** through IW:LEARN activities supported  PI 4.5 Number of experiences formally shared with other projects | As per all GEF International Waters Projects, experience sharing through the IW:LEARN Project will enable the Project team and key stakeholders to contribute to and learn from shared experiences globally | 4.5.1 Contribution of at least 6 Experience Notes to IW:LEARN covering project activities and lessons learned with at least 2 drafted by year 2 of project  4.5.2 Participation in regional and international IW:LEARN conferences and trainings, pending availability  4.5.3 Project Key Stakeholders Participate in GEF International Waters Conference(s) during project implementation | Experience Notes  Participation reports  GEF IWC Conference Reports and Participation Report | Assumption: Transferability of experiences to other GEF IW Projects, and beyond (Cross-cutting)  Assumption: regional and international conference topics relevant to Project implementation (Cross-cutting) |
| **Component 5: Enhancing science for governance by strengthening monitoring, information management and data analysis systems for IWRM**  **OUTCOME: Azerbaijan and Georgia using integrated monitoring, and information management systems for sustainable IWRM at national and transboundary levels** | | | | | |
| **5.1 Improved assessment of geographic distribution of ground and surface water availability and seasonal fluctuations**  PI 5.1.1 Number of sectors using hydrological modeling software and GIS with remote-sensing at beginning midpoint and end of project  PI 5.1.2 Percent of basin covered in Azerbaijan and Georgia by digital data suitable for effective modeling | Within the IWRM Plans drafted during the prior GEF Kura Aras Project, both countries stressed the need to improve data assessment and modeling of water resources. To date, this need still exists and is key to overall IWRM, RBMO and improved water resources management for conjunctive use | 5.1.1 Assessment of available ground and surface water availability in river basin within 12 months  5.1.2 Analyze the historical hydromet station data along the river basin to estimate the seasonal variability along the river within 18 months  5.1.3 Conduct intersectoral trainings on hydrogeological modeling software and use of GIS and remote sensing techniques for delineation of ground water aquifer within 24 months  5.1.4 Apply the hydrogeological modeling in one sub basin for each  country within 36 months, to include water qualitywaste water discharges from point source pollution based on available information  5.1.5 Develop the final report on the basis of the historical materials and the results obtained by means of detailed hydro-geological observation works and hydro-monitoring studies regarding the respective sections on the territories of each country within 42 months. | Baseline assessment report  on available data  Report on surface and ground water distribution and temporal availability  Analysis of historical flow trends  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organizations  Model outcomes, scenarios and recommendations report | Assumption: Information to gauge flow rate impacts on water quality and ecosystem health (linked to Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.3, 5.2, and 5.4)  Assumption: Sufficient data for modeling purposes (Linked to Outputs 1.2, 2.1 and 2.4)  Assumption: data quality sufficient for accurate modeling and assessment (Linked to Outputs 1.2, 2.1 and 2.4)  Assumption: access to all relevant data, including groundwater and hydromet historical data (Linked to Outputs 1.5, 2.4 and 4.4) |
| **5.2 An assessment of the economic and social benefits per unit of water used in different sectors**  PI 5.2.1 Level of baseline economic, social and hydrological information available compared to end of project  PI 5.2.2 Stakeholder survey results on perceptions of water users on water quality, water use and unanticipated water needs across sectors with compared to 2005 survey and end of project abbreviated study  PI 5.2.3 Application of market transaction prices and deductive methodology models in the decision support systems y sector | Within the IWRM Plans drafted during the prior GEF Kura Aras Project, both countries stressed the need to for conducting an economic assessment, including social benefits of water use across sectors. While initial efforts have been made in this direction, larger scale assessments in line with the EU WFD approaches and water nexus are needed here. | 5.2.1 Conduct a baseline assessment of available data sources based on all key sectors within 12 months  5.2.2 Conduct stakeholder surveys on water use, water quality and anticipated water needs across sector based users  Within 15 months  5.2.3 Train sector representatives on integrated nexus approaches for: Water pricing, cost recovery, and pollute pays principals starting within 24 months  5.2.4 Develop O&M costs for water sector management including environmental, agriculture, municipal water and hydropower sectors to deliver to Ministries within 24 months  5.2.5 Determine market transaction prices, using inductive methods with econometric estimation of production and cost functions for agriculture and energy, and municipal water demand functions within 36 months  5.2.6 Construct models for deductive methodologies for mathematical programming, value-added and alternative costs modeling within 36 months | Baseline assessment report  Stakeholder analysis survey results for economic and social assessment baseline for future studies  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organizations  Report and presentations for decision makers  Reports based on sector of the estimated costs and benefit for each sector per unit of water, based on available information and qualified assumptions as necessary, including economic analysis report  Mathematical modeling to be applied to econometric water management approaches to support informed decision making | Assumption: Availability of relevant information from all sectors (Linked to Output 1.5)  Assumption: Pricing rates are accurate (Linked to Output 1.5)  Assumption: Data from 5.1 is sufficient to support economic analysis and modeling data  Assumption: sufficient staff for trainings (Linked to output 2.1)  Assumption: Accountability of data and econometric data fluctuations (Linked to Output 5.1) |
| **5.3 Staged river system ecological assessment**  PI/Pre ESI 5.3.1 Number of indicator species identified for river system health  PI/Pre ESI 5.3.2 Number of endemic species identified and cataloged  PI/Pre ESI 5.3.3 Number of reference conditions criteria identified  PI 5.3.1 Number of categories for classification of river ecosystems  PI 5.3.2 Percent increase in database completion for ecosystem status | Only project based ecological assessments related to EIAs etc. There is a planned Permit database as part of the Center Information & Education in Georgia. This will include a data base for all environmental information planned with staged access.  In Azerbaijan there is not yet an established governmental program to conduct river ecosystem assessments | 5.3.1 Assessment of available data, and report on information gaps and needs within 12 months  5.3.2 Develop 2 year plan for assessment to be extended at the national level following the project within 18 months working with national and international universities  5.3.3 Create database for ecological assessment to include macro-invertebrates within 18 months  5.3.4 Create ecosystem classification structure within 18 months  5.3.5 Begin to fill data base to include species counts and seasonal flow variation within 21 months working with local authorities, universities and ministries (contracted firm)  5.3.6 Develop final report on Kura River Ecosystem with recommendations for sustainable research to support continued data collection by 42 months | Assessment reports  Plans for assessments with indicators for measurement criteria  Database online for public use of regional data  Classification structure and methodology  Populated database for regional use as needed  Final report | Assumption: Availability of expertise nationally, regionally and internationally (Linked to Output 2.1)  Assumption: selected monitoring sites are representative of river system ecology (Linked to output 3.3)  Assumption: classification and database population are accurate (Linked to Outputs 2.1 and 2.4)  Assumption: consistency of sampling approaches and methodologies (Linked to Output 2.1 and 2.4)  Risk: lack of long term support for sustainability |
| **5.4 Protocols in place to support data and information exchange, for sound IWRM decision-making at national and transboundary levels.**  PI/Pre ESI 5.4.1 Number of commonly agreed indicators and parameters  PI/Pre ESI 5.4.2 Number of standard operating procedures harmonize between laboratories  PI/Pre ESI 5.4.3 Percent of database categories for common indicators actively used and agreed by end of project | GE NEA increased number of monitoring/sampling points and measurement parameters and biomonitoring (limited) done regularly up to 116 sampling points for chemical  In Azerbaijan parameters are expected to be updated by early 2016  Parameters must be harmonized in line with international best practices, and both countries are willing to move in this direction. | 5.4.1 Develop sets of agreed indicators for information exchange for water quantity, quality and all project outputs to be shared in an annual “State of the Kura River” Report  5.4.2 Review and update current regulations on water quality in line with EU/WFD within 12 months  5.4.3 Harmonize the laboratory analysis methodologies and standard operating procedures for sampling and analysis of water quality including quality control and quality assurance within 36 months  5.4.4 Develop a harmonized regional database from an agreed set of indicators to show status of water quality status in TB status within 36 months  5.4.5 Outline steps for ISO 17025 accreditation for both national laboratories within 24 months  5.4.6 Train staff on use of harmonization measurements and indicators within 36 months  5.4.7 Detailed final report on harmonization with assessment of work to date and recommendations for next steps by 42 months | Set of agreed indicators, baselines and annually updated for “State of the Kura River Report”  Update report  Report on strategy to harmonize methodologies and SOPs with QC/QA guidelines  Database with mechanism for entry by approved authorities  ISO 17025 Recommendations reports for laboratories  Training logs, curriculum materials, student reports, certificates of successful completion, reports on impacts of training on organizations  Final Report | Assumption: Compatibility of water quality data (Linked to output 2.4)  Assumption: willingness of sectors to share data (Linked to Output 1.5)  Risk: Do sufficient equipment, staffing, and consumables for laboratory assessments  Risk: insufficient political will to support data exchange and harmonization |

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 11 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 12 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 13 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 14 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 15 | Audit reports if available |
| 16 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 17 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 18 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 19 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 20 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$10,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 21 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 22 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 23 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) ([https://digitallibrary.un.org/?ln=en](about:blank)) |
| 24 | List/map of demonstration projects’ sites |
| 25 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 26 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. *Opening page:*

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

1. *Executive Summary*

* *Project Summary Table*
* *Project Description (brief)*
* *Evaluation Rating Table*
* *Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons*

1. *Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[3]](#footnote-3))*
2. *Introduction*

* *Purpose of the evaluation*
* *Scope & Methodology*
* *Structure of the evaluation report*

1. *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*

1. *Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[4]](#footnote-4))*
   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*
  1. *Project Implementation*
* *Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)*
* *Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)*
* *Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management*
* *Project Finance:*
* *Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)*
* *UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues*
  1. *Project Results*
* *Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)*
* *Relevance(\*)*
* *Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)*
* *Country ownership*
* *Mainstreaming*
* *Sustainability (\*)*
* *Impact*

1. *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*

1. *Annexes*

* *ToR*
* *Itinerary (if applicable)*
* *List of persons interviewed*
* *Summary of interviews*
* *List of documents reviewed*
* *Evaluation Question Matrix*
* *Questionnaire used and summary of results*

1. *Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form*

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* | | | |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project’s Mid-Term Review.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Monitoring & Evaluation Ratings Scale** | |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS) | There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S) | There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design / implementation met expectations |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design /implementation was somewhat lower than expected |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U) | There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale** | |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS) | There were no shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution exceeded expectations |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S) | There were no or minor shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution met expectations. |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | There were some shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations. |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | There were significant shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was somewhat lower than expected |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U) | There were major shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was substantially lower than expected |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/execution |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation and execution |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency** | |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S) | Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings. |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U) | Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings. |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainability Ratings Scale** | |
| Ratings | Description |
| 4 = Likely (L) | There are little or no risks to sustainability |
| 3 = Moderately Likely (ML) | There are moderate risks to sustainability |
| 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU) | There are significant risks to sustainability |
| 1 = Unlikely (U) | There are severe risks to sustainability |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** | |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

**Co-financing table\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* format of the table to be adjusted according to the needs and method of the data collection

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:**  **Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

*The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

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

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/**  **Organization** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Indicators: PI = Process Indicator, SRI = Stress Reduction Indicator, ESI = Environmental Status Indicator, Pre ESI = Prerequisite for Environmental Status Indicator, in line with GEF requirements. All indicators assume baseline measures are established within the initial phase of the project implementation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)