

https://jobs-admin.undp.org/cj_job_screening_rights.cfm?job_id=98371

Job ID/Title :98371 - International Terminal Evaluation Consultant

Scope of advertisement: Globally advertised (Including jobs.undp.org)

Category (eligible applicants): External

External defines as applicants external to UNDP and to the UN Common system, including UNDP non-staff.

Brand: UNDP

Practice Area: Climate & Disaster Resilience

Application Deadline:23-Apr-21

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Type and Level: International Consultant

Current status: **Approved** by jayati.das on 16-Apr-21 @ 04:38:PM

Approved by jayati.das on 16-Apr-21 @ 04:38:PM

Submitted for Approval by eros.hoxhallari on 16-Apr-21 @ 04:01:AM

Edited by eros.hoxhallari on 14-Apr-21 @ 07:20:AM

Edited by eros.hoxhallari on 14-Apr-21 @ 07:18:AM

Saved as Draft by eros.hoxhallari on 14-Apr-21 @ 06:32:AM

Duty Station :Home based

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)

Duration of Initial Contract:

Expected Duration of Assignment: Estimated 1 May – 1 July 2021 (Approximately 30 working days)

Background:

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 entitled “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the extended Drin River Basin” (PIMS 4482; \$ 4M; Albania, North Macedonia and Montenegro are the Project beneficiaries) and the associated medium-sized project entitled “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the White Drin and the extended Drin Basin” (PIMS 5510; \$ 1N; Kosovo is the beneficiary country) implemented through the United Nation Development Program and executed by the Global Water Partnership (GWP) Organization through Global Water Partnership Mediterranean. The two projects are operationally linked and are executed as one. The projects started on late 2015 and is in its final 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).

1. Project Description

The Drin Basin is located in the southeastern part of the Balkan Peninsula. It comprises the transboundary sub-basins of the Drin and Buna/Bojana Rivers and of the Prespa, Ohrid and Skadar/Shkoder Lakes. The Drin River is the “connecting body” of the “extended” Drin Basin, linking the lakes, wetlands, rivers and other aquatic habitats into a single, yet complex, ecosystem of major importance. The water bodies and their watersheds are spread in a geographical area that includes Albania, Greece, North Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo[1].

The complex nature of the Drin Basin -where lakes, rivers and underground flows interact in ways hard to unravel compounded by the many and often conflicting uses of water resources and by the transboundary conditions that prevail throughout the basin- determines the high fragility of the basin ecosystems and poses serious challenges to the overall sustainability of the water resources of the basin.

The main transboundary problems in the Drin Basin[2] are:

- deterioration of water quality
- natural and regulated variability of the hydrological regime
- biodiversity degradation
- variability of the sediment transport regime.

Climate variability and change has also been recognized as a significant regional (and global) problem that influences the four priority transboundary problems.

Overall, prior to the interventions supported through the two projects, there was an absence of an overarching basin-wide policy formulation and decision-making framework grounded on scientific data and knowledge. This hindered the design of coherent strategies, legislation and regulations, and prevented the identification of investments which are aligned with the sustainable utilization of the Basin’s water resources and their integrated management.

The two Projects aim to *promote joint management of the shared water resources of the transboundary Drin River Basin, including coordination mechanisms among the various sub-basin joint commissions and committees.*

Each of the Projects is articulated into five -identical in content- components; they are designed to achieve the goal mentioned above, through: (i) building consensus among countries on key transboundary concerns and drivers of change, including climate variability and change, reached

through joint fact finding; (ii) facilitating the agreement on a shared vision and on a program of priority actions deemed necessary to achieve the vision; (iii) strengthening technical and institutional capacities.

The Projects are aligned in content, aims and objectives with the Drin Coordinated Action, that is the framework set by the Drin riparian countries for the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Management of the Extended Transboundary Drin Basin (Drin MoU; signed by the Ministers responsible for the management of water resources and/or environment, and high-level representatives of the Riparians[3], in Tirana, on 25 November 2011).

The Projects assist in the operationalization of the institutional structure of the Drin Coordinated Action, rendering it capable of undertaking its coordinative and executive role.

This includes:

- The **Meeting of the Parties**
- The **Drin Core Group (DCG)**. This body is given the mandate to coordinate actions for the implementation of the MoU. The DCG Secretariat provides technical and administrative support to the DCG.
- Four **Expert Working Groups (EWG)**: (i) Water Framework Directive implementation EWG (ii) Monitoring and Information exchange EWG (iii) Biodiversity and Ecosystem EWG (iv) Floods EWG.

The DCG has undertaken the role of the Steering Committee of the Projects.

The Projects are executed by GWP-Med with the involvement of UNECE. The budget is \$4,5 for the full-size project and \$1 M for the medium-sized project.

The Projects have been instrumental in enhancing cooperation among the Drin Riparians. In addition to the Strategic Action Programme that was endorsed by Ministers and high-level representatives in April 2021, there have been catalytic outcomes as a result of the project contributing to the enhancement of the political process under the Drin MoU:

- The DCG requested to initiate actions for the establishment of a Drin Joint Commission through the signing of an International Agreement. A draft international agreement text to be negotiated is being prepared.
- The DCG is becoming the reference point for a range of management actions supported by various donors and initiatives. Apart from the GEF Drin project, it is the SC of the:
 1. Part of the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) supported Project “Promoting the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in Southeastern Europe, through the use of the Nexus approach” focusing on Drin.
 2. Adaptation Fund supported and UNDP implemented “Integrated climate-resilient transboundary flood risk management in the Drin River basin in the Western Balkans”.
- The Lake Ohrid Management Plan was adopted by both Albania and North Macedonia.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent mitigation measures taken by the beneficiary Riparians (lockdowns, curfews etc.), have adversely affected the execution of meetings, studies for which input by the representatives of institutions is necessary (e.g. provision of information and data; input for the development of studies; approval of studies; etc.) and field activities (demonstration activities, study visits, awareness activities etc.). As a response, the PCU has used internet-based means to conclude the execution of the project activities. The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in delays in the project execution but has had a small effect in its results.

2. 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 project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses 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.

The main output results of the terminal evaluation process will be presented in a Steering Committee meeting that will be organized in May or June 2021.

[1] All references to Kosovo on this website are made in the context of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999)

[2] As these were identified through the Drin Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis

[3] Albania, North Macedonia, Greece, Kosovo and Montenegro.

Description of Responsibilities:

1. TE Approach & Methodology

The TE must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The 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 PIF, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP, Project Document, project reports and annual PIRs, project Steering Committee meetings reports, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the TE consultant considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation.
- Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
- The TE is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the Project Team, executing partner, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser, UNDP Country Office(s)/evaluation managers, and direct beneficiaries.
- Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:
 - The UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor
 - The UNDP Country Offices in Albania and in Kosovo
 - The GWP-Med being the executing agency
 - The Project Manager
 - Steering Committee members
 - Beneficiaries and stakeholders[1]
- Interviews to 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 available documents and reports produced for these outputs. These documents should include technical reports, brochures, and possibly pictures or videos that were taken by the project team from the field sites during the different phases of implementation.
- Other methods such as outcome mapping, online group discussions, etc.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
- Assurance of maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the TE process should ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE Consultant and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP Country offices in Albania and Kosovo and GWP-Med, regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time

and data. The TE Consultant must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule; data to be used in the evaluation etc. should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP Country offices in Albania and Kosovo, GWP-Med and the TE Consultant.

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.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. A set of mitigation measures including lockdowns, curfews, travel bans etc., were applied and some continue to be in place. Most of the consultations and trainings are being conducted through online platforms. The TE Consultant should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conduct the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

1. Detailed Scope of the TE

The TE Consultant will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, project reports and annual PIRs, project Steering committee meetings reports, project budget revisions, etc.) provided by the Project Team and UNDP. Then she/he will participate in an TE inception workshop to clarify her/his 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 (as per revisions by the Steering Committee; see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf) .

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 drivenness
- 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) (*) and Executing Agency (*), 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 (improved governance, climate change, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management)
- 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 and worst 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 Consultant 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.

1. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE Consultant shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *2 weeks* before the TE mission/interviews. TE Consultant submits the Inception

Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *15 May 2021*

- Presentation: TE Consultant presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *25 May 2021*
- Draft TE Report: TE Consultant submits full draft report with annexes *within 2 weeks* of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *8 June 2021*
- Final TE Report*: TE Consultant submits revised report, detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within 1 week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *1 July 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.[\[2\]](#)

1. TE Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Country Office in Albania in coordination with UNDP Country Office in Kosovo and UNDP IRH.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant . The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE Consultant to provide all relevant documents and set up stakeholder interviews.

1. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *30 working days* over during May-July 2021

- *23 April 2021*: Application closes
- *15 May 2021*:: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE interviews
- *21 May 2021*:: TE stakeholder meetings, and interviews
- *25 May 2021*: Presentation of initial findings
- *8 June 2021*:: Preparation of draft TE report
- *9 June 2021*: Circulation of draft TE report for comments

- *11 June 2021*: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *25 June 2021*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *1 July 2021*: Concluding Project SC meeting to present the TE findings
- *1 July 2021*: Expected date of full TE completion

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

[1] including but not limited to the Water Agency, Albania; Ministry of Environment, Albania; Ministry of Environment & Physical Planning, North Macedonia; Ministry of Environment & Energy, Greece; Kosovo* Environmental Protection Agency, Ministry of Environment & Spatial Planning, Kosovo*; Ministry of Environment & Spatial Planning Ministry of Sustainable; Development & Tourism, Montenegro Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Montenegro, Municipality of Shkodra, Municipality of Ohrid, Municipality of Rahovec; project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

[2] Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

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 :

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.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Education

- At least Master's degree in water resources management, applied water resources evaluation, environmental science or management, or other closely related field;

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to International Waters transboundary fresh water systems;
- Experience working with the project evaluations;
- Experience working in South East Europe;
- Work experience in resources management and international waters for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated experience with International Waters projects;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and International Waters is an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

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 evaluator 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 evaluator 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **Payment Schedule**

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- 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).

Application Procedure

Interested applicants are advised to carefully study all sections of this ToRs and ensure that they meet the general requirements as well as specific qualifications described. Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

The application should contain:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application.
- **Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability**-please fill in the attached form. [Download Here](#) (*kindly use FireFox Browser*)
- **Filled P11 form** including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees, please upload the P11 instead of your CV. [Download Here](#) (*kindly use FireFox Browser*)
- **Financial Proposal in USD***- Specifying a **Total Lump Sum in USD** for the tasks specified in this announcement. Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant during the contract period (e.g. fee and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services).

***Kindly note that Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal are two separate documents and should be both part of your application.**

How to Submit the Application:

To submit your application online, please follow the steps below:

- Download and complete the UN Personal History Form (P11) for Service Contracts (SCs) and Individual Contracts (ICs);
- Merge your UN Personal History Form (P11) for Service Contracts (SCs) and Individual Contracts (ICs), Financial Proposal Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability and cover letter into a single file. The system does not allow for more than one attachment to be uploaded;
- Click on the Job Title (job vacancy announcement);
- Click “Apply Now” button, fill in necessary information on the first page, and then click “Submit Application;”
- Upload your application/single file as indicated above with the merged documents (underlined above);
- You will receive an automatic response to your email confirming receipt of your application by the system.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials

*Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services). Travel costs to and from duty station must be included in the financial proposal.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>.

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Annexes to the TE ToR

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE Consultant
- 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

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK				
Objective	To foster the joint management of the shared water resources of the extended transboundary Drin River Basin through the establishment of joint management mechanisms among the various sub-basin commissions and committees (Lakes Prespa, Ohrid and Skadar)			
Objectively Verifiable Indicators				
Outcomes	Indicator (Process)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification
<p>Outcome 1.</p> <p>Consensus among countries on key trans boundary concerns and drivers of change, including climate change and variability, reached through joint fact finding</p>	<p>1. The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis of the Extended Drin River Basin, consistent with the projects in accordance with the WFD in sub-basins, and identifying main issues of transboundary concern and drivers of change, is completed and approved by countries.</p>	<p>Project countries have pursued the management of the shared water resources of the Drin River Basin, both surface and groundwater, predominantly from a national perspective. Countries are at different levels with regard to the EU accession, and implementation of the WFD including the preparation of RBM plans; when RBM plans are being prepared, this is not done in coordination with neighbouring countries. Bilateral and multi-lateral agreements concerning lake sub-basins are in place (Ohrid, Prespa, Skadar), but coordination, recognition of transboundary issues at Drin</p>	<p>Approval of TDA by the Drin Core Group.</p>	<p>Final TDA document.</p> <p>Reports of analyses undertaken as part of the TDA.</p> <p>Meeting minutes and records of approval by Drin Core Group.</p> <p>PIRs, midterm and final evaluations.</p>

	<p>2. Information management system containing data gathered through the TDA is established.</p>	<p>basin level and overall IWRM approach are lacking.</p> <p>Information and data related to the management of Drin Basin are dispersed among countries and institutions.</p>	<p>Establishment of an Information Management System (IMS) that will enable the DCG, and country users to collect, store, and share data and information in a consistent way.</p>	<p>Information available on official websites at UNDP project website, and national government websites.</p> <p>Information Management System (IMS)</p>
<p>Outcome 2. Visioning process opens the way for systematic cooperation in the management of the transboundary Drin River Basin</p>	<p>1. The Shared Vision contained in the 2011 Drin MoU is confirmed to be consistent with the findings of the TDA</p>	<p>Countries adopting fragmented approach to water resources utilization and environmental protection with little consideration of transboundary implications and freshwater ecosystems sustainability.</p> <p>A Shared Vision for the management of the Drin Basin has been developed through a multi-stakeholders process and adopted by the Drin Riparians as part of the Drin MoU.</p> <p>Lack of an overarching basin-wide science based framework for the implementation of the medium and long term priority actions in view of</p>	<p>Expert opinion that the Shared Vision is consistent with the findings of the TDA.</p>	<p>Meeting minutes and report of approval by Drin Coordination Group.</p>

	<p>2. A Strategic Action Programme (SAP with a 5 year time horizon) consistent with the 2011 Drin Shared Vision MoU and based on TDA findings, is approved by the DCG. It should address main issues of transboundary concern and contain concrete actions at the national and regional levels, as well as environmental quality objectives (horizon of 20 years), relevant indicators, and strategic development lines and priorities.</p>	<p>achieving the overall aims and objectives of the Drin MoU, and of the updated Vision hinders the formulation of coherent policies, legislative reforms and identification of investments targeted to the sustainable utilization of the Basin's water resources and dependent ecosystems, and their integrated management.</p>	<p>SAP formulated and endorsed by the Drin Core Group and adopted by the Meeting of the Parties to the Drin MoU (Ministerial Meeting – see Outcome 4.3).</p>	<p>Strategic Action Program document endorsed by DCG.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.</p> <p>Countries and donors commit to sustain joint cooperation mechanisms and to undertake priority reforms and investments</p>	<p>1. Partnership Conference, aimed at raising awareness and interest of the international community and ODA providers on sustaining countries commitment to SAP implementation.</p>	<p>Donor interest in the region, technical assistance and investments do not respond to a strategic vision to address transboundary issues in the Drin Basin and sub-basins in an integrated manner.</p>	<p>Partnership Conference held.</p>	<p>Partnership Declaration issued at the end of the Conference</p>
<p>Outcome 4. The operationalization and strengthening of the institutional and legal frameworks for transboundary cooperation will facilitate balancing of water uses and sustaining environmental quality throughout the extended Drin Basin</p>	<p>1. The three Drin Core Group (DCG) Expert Working Groups (EWG) become fully operational making it possible for the DCG to assume the full range of responsibilities stemming from the Drin MoU and act as a Joint Commission.</p> <p>2. Inter-ministerial committees are formed and/or there is multi-sectoral input and</p>	<p>The institutional structure for the implementation of the Drin MoU comprise of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of the Parties (MOP; Parties are represented by Ministers). The MOP takes place on an annual basis. • Drin Core Group, established as a result of the Drin Dialogue Project (UNDP/UNECE/GWP-Med). Its success has fostered the formulation and 	<p>The DCG Expert Working Groups become operational in assisting the DCG to assume the full range of responsibilities stemming from the Drin MoU.</p> <p>The Inter-Ministerial Committees are</p>	<p>TORs are developed for EWGs, meetings of the EWGs are held, and reports include recommendations for the DCG to implement the project and the Drin MoU Work Plans for each EWG are prepared and approved by DCG.</p> <p>Inter-ministerial bodies formed and/or there is multi-sectoral in put an</p>

	<p>discussions at the national level with regard to SAP development and responding to guidance from the DCG.</p> <p>3. A Strategic Action Program (SAP with horizon 5 years) is adopted by the countries.</p> <p>4. DCG members, DCG working group members, water and land managers, policy makers and other practitioners are trained in surface/groundwater management, IWRM, implementation of international policy instruments (WFD, UNECE Water Convention), and other relevant disciplines and technologies.</p>	<p>approval of the present project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Expert Working Groups (1. Implementation of Water Framework Directive; 2. Monitoring and Information Exchange; 3. Biodiversity and Ecosystems). The EWGs have been established but are not yet operational hence can't provide the necessary assistance to the DCG for the latter to assume the full range of responsibilities stemming from the Drin MoU. <p>Lack of an overarching basin-wide science based framework for the implementation of the medium and long term priority actions in view of achieving the overall aims and objectives of the Drin MoU, and of the updated Vision hinders the formulation of coherent policies, legislative reforms and identification of investments targeted to the sustainable utilization of the Basin's water resources and dependent ecosystems, and their integrated management.</p>	<p>established and/or functional inter-sectoral dialogue at the national level is conducted.</p> <p>SAP adopted by the Meeting of the Parties to the Drin MoU (Ministerial Meeting).</p> <p>Full and successful participation of all DCG members and expert groups, and of qualified representatives of land-water managers and practitioners in training activities.</p>	<p>discussions at the national level with regard to SAP development and responding to guidance from the DCG.</p> <p>Strategic Action Program document agreed upon all project countries at ministerial level.</p> <p>Records of completed training programs and list of attendees.</p>
<p>Outcome 5. Benefits demonstrated on the ground by environmentally sound approaches</p>	<p>1. Program of Pilot Demonstrations, responding to the Drin MoU approved by countries during inception period is</p>	<p><i>Regional experience so far does not include testing of IWRM in a large basin, coping measures for climate variability and change,</i></p>	<p>Program fully implemented by the end of the project.</p>	<p>Final reports of all pilot demonstrations.</p>

<p>and technologies new to the region</p>	<p>implemented resulting in:</p> <p>- Management Plan for Ohrid Lake is prepared;</p> <p>- Integrated modelling tool is developed assisting in appropriate quality for treated effluents and appropriate wastewater management solution for Shkodra city in Albania to be determined.</p> <p>- Facility, equipment and scheme for production of fuel-briquettes from Skadar Lake macrophytes biomass are tested as means for the reduction</p>	<p><i>nutrient management, amongst others.</i></p> <p><i>A Basin Management Plan is not in place in Lake Ohrid; the preparation, in accordance to the WFD, of a basin management plan for a shared water body is not tested in the Drin Basin.</i></p> <p><i>Shkodra city is a pollution hotspot affecting areas of paramount ecological importance.</i></p> <p><i>Nutrients enter the Shkoder/Skadar lake through its tributary, Moraca. De-forestation takes places in the Montenegrin part and collected wood is used for heating purposes.</i></p>	<p><i>The Ohrid Basin Management Plan is prepared and the WFD approach for the preparation of a management plan in a Drin's transboundary sub-basin is tested.</i></p> <p><i>Scientific sound solutions to address unsustainable wastewater management are identified; the tool used in this regard can be used in other ecologically sensitive areas facing similar pollution issues.</i></p> <p><i>A solution for the removal of nutrients loads from the lake and the reduction of pressure on forests is tested.</i></p>	<p>PIRs, Mid-term and Final Evaluations.</p> <p>Project Website.</p> <p>Ohrid Basin Management Plan.</p> <p>Report describing methodology and outcome of modelling tool.</p> <p>Facility, equipment and scheme for production of fuel-briquettes from Skadar Lake macrophytes.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

	<p><i>of nutrient load in Shkoder/Skadar lake.</i></p> <p><i>- Ad hoc Flood Expert Working Group is established and feasibility for flood insurance is tested in priority areas</i></p> <p><i>A joint monitoring network in Skadar/Shkoder and Buna/Bojana sub-basins in Albania and Montenegro is developed and tested.</i></p>	<p><i>Floods have been having detrimental effects across the Drin Basin. The issue can't be dealt with effectively with unilateral action. Related instruments/approaches and cooperation among Drin Riparians is necessary but absent.</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring systems in Drin Riparians are not harmonized undermining cooperation for the management of the transboundary Drin's sub-basins.</i></p>	<p><i>[Facilitate cooperation among Drin Riparians for the management of flood risk implementing approaches new to the area.]</i></p> <p><i>A transboundary monitoring network is tested, capacitating Drin Riparians to replicate this in the rest of the Drin's sub-basins.</i></p>	<p><i>Reports of meetings of Expert Working Group; Assessment report regarding feasibility for insurance</i></p> <p><i>Transboundary monitoring network and results of testing report including related maps.</i></p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Outcome 6. Public support and participation to IWRM and joint multi-country management enhanced through stakeholder involvement and gender mainstreaming</p>	<p>1. Stakeholder Involvement and Gender Mainstreaming Strategy is defined and adopted by Drin Core Group.</p>	<p>Level of public participation in decision-making is unclear in all countries, with efforts being made to introduce/implement legislation leading to increased stakeholder involvement and public participation. Gender issues not yet considered.</p>	<p>Drin Core Group approval of Stakeholder Involvement and Gender Mainstreaming Strategies.</p>	<p>Two Documents contain the Strategies and evidence of adoption by DCG.</p> <p>Reports reflecting participatory approach and gender equity in project events and processes.</p>
<p>Outcome 7. Political awareness at all levels and private sector participation strengthened through higher visibility of the project's developments and targeted outreach initiatives</p>	<p>1. Information, Communication and Outreach Strategy is prepared and implemented.</p>	<p>Public awareness of natural resource sustainability issues and of water governance and management is generally scarce.</p>	<p>Communication activities support the preparation and adoption of the TDA and the SAP.</p> <p>All the project's main events, findings and achievements recorded and disseminated through media events and ICT.</p> <p>Project's active participation to IW LEARN activities and events using at least 1% of GEF grant.</p>	<p>Website documents outreach activities.</p> <p>Communication activities (tailored made communication to target stakeholders including emails, publications etc)</p> <p>Project results and achievements presented at major international fora (WWF, IWC, WWW, etc) project website established in accordance to IWLEARN standards, experience reports produced, participation of project representatives at IW biannual conference</p>

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

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1.	Project Identification Form (PIF)
1.	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
1.	CEO Endorsement Request
1.	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
1.	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
1.	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
1.	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
1.	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
1.	GEF Tracking Tools
1.	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
1.	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
1.	Audit reports if available
1.	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
1.	Sample of project communications materials
1.	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
1.	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)
1.	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
1.	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
1.	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) (https://digitallibrary.un.org/?ln=en)

1.	List/map of demonstration projects' sites
1.	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
1.	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[1])*

1. *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[2])*
 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 at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

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).

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&
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were minor shortcomings; quality of
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were moderate shortcomings; quality
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of

1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in M&E des
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an

Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale	
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no shortcomings; quality of imp
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor shortcomings; qual
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some shortcomings; quality of i
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of i
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in quality o
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an

Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency	
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds
5 = Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expecte
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat low
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lo
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Only a negligible level of outcomes achiev
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an

Sustainability Ratings Scale	
Ratings	Description
4 = Likely (L)	There are little or no risks to sustainab
3 = Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainab
2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainab
1 = Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainab
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected inci

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

Co-financing table*

Co-financing	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)	Government

(type/source)			(mill. US\$)
	Planned	Actual	Planned
Grants			
Loans/Concessions			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-kind support 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[2] 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.

[3] 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)

