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**ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**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 upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management/Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration project for Sub-Saharan Africa* (PIMS 3362)Project.

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

**Project Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:**  |  |
| **GEF Project ID:** | **PIMS 3362** |  | ***at endorsement (Million US$)*** | ***at completion (Million US$)*** |
| **UNDP Project ID:** | **00045537** | **GEF financing:**  | **0.975** | **0.975** |
| **Country:** | **Botswana** | **IA/EA own:** |  |  |
| **Region:** | **Southern Africa** | **Government:** | **10.6** |  |
| **Focal Area:** | **International Waters** | **Other:** | **UNDP 0.920****GWPSA 0.3** |  |
| **FA Objectives, (OP/SP):** |  | **Total co-financing:** | **11.82** |  |
| **Executing Agency:** | **Department of Water Affairs (Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources)** | **Total Project Cost:** | **12.795** |  |
| **Other Partners involved:** | **Kalahari Conservation Society, Global Water Partnership Southern Africa** | **ProDoc Signature (date project began):**  | **19 December 2008** |
| **(Operational) Closing Date:** | **Proposed:****19 December 2011** | **Actual:****30 April 2013** |

**Objective and Scope**

The project was designed to facilitate the development of national processes, procedures, methods and options for efficient and equitable Integrated Water Resources Planning (IWRM). The development and implementation of a dynamic IWRM/Water Efficiency Plan for Botswana will address both national and trans-boundary water management priorities and will be supported by and contribute to regional knowledge management processes, directly contributing to increasing awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders to engage in the IWRM process. To this effect, the project was also to implement a pilot project for water conservation through conjunctive use of grey-water and rainwater harvesting in selected schools of Botswana with the aim of demonstrating tangible impacts on the ground and further documenting and disseminating lessons learnt across the Southern African region.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Goal:** | **IWRM is operationalized across southern Africa, and contributes to environmentally, economically and socially sustainable development.** |
| **Project Objective** | **To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and contributing to regional knowledge management processes, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning** |
| **Outcome 1** | **A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrates global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources** |
| **1.1 An assessment of issues and the status of water resources management (Situation Analysis Report produced)** |
| **1.2 Water resources management issues and actions identified, prioritized and strategized (IWRM Action Plan produced)** |
| **1.3 Cross-sectoral institutional coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms for integrated water resources planning and management developed and established (Institutional audit and stakeholder participation framework developed)** |
| **1.4 A dynamic IWRM Plan prepared** |
| **Outcome 2** | **Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives** |
| **2.1 Consistent and practical guidance for IWRM developed and made available (IWRM Guidelines)** |
| **2.2 Institutional changes to facilitate stakeholder participation implemented (Creation of Institutions recommended in the Water Sector Review)** |
| **2.3 Knowledge management products produced, knowledge and awareness about IWRM created, and information disseminated, at local, national and regional levels (Publications/Publicity documents, workshops, conferences held)** |
| **2.4 Bi-directional mechanisms to incorporate national and trans-boundary concerns, agreements and processes into respective water resources planning and management arrangements established (Platform for exchanges for information includes, among others, regional conferences organized and/or hosted by SADC related to the revised shared water protocol, etc.)** |
| **Outcome 3** | **Demonstration Project: Water conservation through conjunctive use of Grey-water Re-use and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Pilot Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation**  |
| **3.1 Water conservation measures implemented and demonstrated at selected schools as part of IWRM and WE Plan in Botswana and lessons documented and disseminated across the region.** |
| **3.2 Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (Government, private sector and members of the public) to roll out water conservation and management programmes and actions at public/priate institutions throughout Botswana and beyond** |

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

**Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Gaborone*,* Botswana, including the following project sites;

* Shoshong, Shoshong Senior Secondary School
* Mahalapye, Madiba Senior Secondary School
* Francistown, Our Lady of the Desert Primary School
* Letlhakane, Motsumi Junior Secondary School
* Seronga, Mbiroba Camp

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Department of Water Affairs
* Water Utilities Corporation
* Botswana Water Partnership
* Department of Waste Management and Pollution Control
* Department of Environmental Affairs
* Ministry of Agriculture
* University of Botswana

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

**Evaluation Criteria & Ratings**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| **M&E design at entry** |  | **Quality of UNDP Implementation** |  |
| **M&E Plan Implementation** |  | **Quality of Execution - Executing Agency**  |  |
| **Overall quality of M&E** |  | **Overall quality of Implementation / Execution** |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| **Relevance**  |  | **Financial resources:** |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  | **Socio-political:** |  |
| **Efficiency**  |  | **Institutional framework and governance:** |  |
| **Overall Project Outcome Rating** |  | **Environmental :** |  |
|  |  | **Overall likelihood of sustainability:** |  |

**Project finance / cofinance**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co-financing****(type/source)** | **UNDP own financing (mill. US$)** | **Government****(mill. US$)** | **Partner Agency****(mill. US$)** | **Total****(mill. US$)** |
| **Planned** | **Actual**  | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** |
| **Grants**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Loans/Concessions**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * **In-kind support**
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * **Other**
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Totals** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Mainstreaming**

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Botswana. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

**Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Preparation** | ***3* days**  | ***11/09/13*** |
| **Evaluation Mission** | ***10* days**  | ***27/09/13*** |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | ***10* days**  | ***12/10/13*** |
| **Final Report** | ***2* days**  | ***15/10/13*** |

**Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**Team Composition**

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 Evaluator.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
* Have knowledge and experience in Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) initiatives
* Be well informed about the national, regional and global ‘water’ issues
* Be familiar with multi-stakeholder approaches and the facilitation of change processes
* Exhibit multi-disciplinary skills relating to ‘sustainable development’ especially from a Natural Resources Management and development perspective

**Evaluator Ethics**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

**Payment modalities and specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| ***10%*** | **On contract signing** |
| ***10%*** | **On approval of the Inception Report** |
| ***30%*** | **Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report** |
| ***50%*** | **Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report**  |

**Application process**

Applicants are requested to apply by (4 September 2013). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**Annex a: project logical framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Title:****Accruing Multiple global benefits through Integrated Water Resource Management/Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration project for sub-Saharan Africa** |
| ***Goal******IWRM is operationalized across Southern Africa, and contributes to environmentally, economically and socially sustainable development*** |
| ***Objective*****To facilitate national processes and development of institutional mechanisms, supported by and informing a regional knowledge management process, for efficient and equitable IWRM planning**  |
| **Outcomes**1. **A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrate global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources**
2. **Increased awareness and capacity of stakeholders (government, private sector and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives**
3. **Pilot Project: Water conservation through conjunctive Use of Grey-water Re-use and Harvested Rainwater in schools in Botswana**
 |
| Outcome 1: A dynamic IWRM Plan adopted and implemented for Botswana, which addresses national and trans-boundary water management priorities, integrate global environmental management objectives, and balances multiple uses of water resources |
| Outputs | Inputs and Actors | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| For Outcome 1: Plan formally adopted by GoBPlan effectively implemented through institutional mechanisms createdTrans-boundary priorities addressedGlobal environmental objectives integrated and pursuedMultiple uses of water balanced | Assessment reportsIWRM planTrans-boundary management strategy and programme documents Documentation of cross-sectoral, participatory consultation and coordination processesRecords and outputs of inter-ministerial coordination mechanismPlanning documents and monitoring reports | Recommendations of NWMP Review are implemented |
| 1.1 An assessment of issues and the status of water resources management | * PMU
* Financial and human resource inputs from GoB, UNDP-GEF and CWP
* Stakeholders at all levels, including water users and civil society
* Consultants
 | Workshops performedAssessment report(s) published | Workshop proceedingsAssessment report(s) | Current GoB focus on IWRM is maintained |
| 1.2 Water resources management issues and actions identified, prioritized and strategized |  Workshops performed Appropriate reports published that specifies agreed actions, priorities and strategies | Workshop proceedingsReports | Multiple stakeholder participation in workshops maintained |
| 1.3 National level institutions for IWRM established and cross-sectoral institutional coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms for integrated water resources planning and transboundary water resources management developed and established | National institutions for IWRM established and coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms in place  | DWA Progress ReportsMonitoring reports | Water Resources Council established to coordinate IWRM Planning |
| 1.4 A dynamic IWRM Plan prepared | IWRM plan published and processes for its up-dating in place | Plan documentDWA Progress Reports | GoB capacity enhanced to facilitate plan formulation  |
| Outcome 2: Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (government, private sector and members of the public) to engage in the IWRM (planning and implementation) process through regional knowledge management initiatives |
| Outputs | Inputs and Actors | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| For Outcome 2:Knowledge management platforms in place and informing national and regional IWRM planning processesGuidance material accessed by IWRM practitioners | Proceedings of dialogue and networking eventsRequests for informationProject monitoring reportsGWP/CWP progress reports and documentation. Documentation from regional networks and Cap-NetIWRM planning guidance materialDocumentation of planning processesPublic outreach and participation plans | Effective linkages between national and regional knowledge management networks created and functional |
| 2.1 Consistent and practical guidance for IWRM developed and made available | * PMU
* Financial and human resource inputs from GoB, UNDP-GEF and CWP
* Institutional and human resource inputs from regional institutions such as GWP-SA, IWSD, WaterNet and SAWINET
* Consultants

  | Guidelines and information material for IWRM published | Review of guidelines and information material Progress and monitoring reports | PMU established and working with GoB |
| 2.2 Institutional changes to facilitate stakeholder participation implemented | Extent and importance of institutional changes made | Progress and monitoring reports | WRC established and functional |
| 2.3 Knowledge and awareness about IWRM created, and information disseminated, at national and regional level | Number of training events and persons trainedNumber and quality of awareness and information programmes and materials produced | Course reportsMaterials reviewProgress and monitoring reports | IWRM Information networks fully functional at national and regional levels |
| 2.4 Bi-directional mechanisms to incorporate national and trans-boundary concerns, agreements and processes into respective water resources planning and management arrangements established  | Mechanisms visible in national and trans-boundary plans and arrangements | Progress and monitoring reportsNational and trans-boundary plan documents and agreements | National water resources planning processes recognize the need to incorporate regional concerns. |
| Outcome 3: Pilot Project: Water conservation through conjunctive Use of Greywater Re-use and Harvested Rainwater in schools in Botswana |
| Outputs | Inputs and Actors | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| Please refer to the detailed Logframe for this Demonstration project below |

**Pilot Projects Framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **Pilot Project Title****Water conservation through conjunctive Use of Grey-water Re-use and harvested rainwater in schools within Botswana: A Case for IWRM and WE Plan Implementation**  |
| ***Goal******IWRM and WE Plan is made operational in Botswana and contributes to environmentally, economically and socially sustainable development*** |
| ***Objective*****To facilitate the development of national processes and institutional mechanisms for IWRM and Water Efficiency planning that will inform and support a regional knowledge management process,**  |
| **Outcomes**1. **Water conservation measures implemented and demonstrated at selected schools as part of the IWRM and WE Plan in Botswana and lessons documented and disseminated across the region.**
2. **Increased awareness and capacity of stakeholders (government, private sector and members of the public) to roll out water conservation and management programmes and actions at public/private institutions throughout Botswana and beyond.**
 |
| Outcome 1: Water conservation measures implemented and demonstrated at selected schools as part of the IWRM and WE Plan in Botswana and lessons documented and disseminated across the region. |
| Outputs | Inputs and Actors | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| Pilot project adopted as a national initiative.Project institutionalized and used as basis for setting water allocation and pricing processes. | Progress reports.Documentation of cross-sectoral, participatory consultation and coordination processesRecords and outputs of inter-ministerial coordination meetings.National planning documents and monitoring reports | Recommendations of NWMP Review are implemented |
| 1.1 Schools participating in the pilot identified through stakeholder consultation | * PIU
* Financial and human resource inputs from schools and other institutions in Botswana
* GWP/CWP
* Stakeholders at all levels, including water users and civil society
* Consultants
 | Number of schools participating in the pilot water conservation project  | Inception Report | Current GoB focus on IWRM is maintainedCommitment and interests from schools in the water conservation practices |
| 1.2 An assessment of capacities of schools for water resources conservation and management conducted, including the identification of 1) technical capacity needs, 2) infrastructure needs and 3) m3/month that can be potentially saved through water conservation measures at each participating school. | Assessment report(s) published that specifies the capacity and infrastructure needs as well as the amount of water that could be potentially saved through various water conservation measures at each participating school. | Assessment report(s) |
| 1.3 Water resources conservation and management programmes and actions identified, costed, prioritized and strategized at each school and the corresponding M&E framework developed. | Technical Reports summarizing the agreed water resource conservation and management programmes and actions with priorities published.A concrete action plan with financial information and timeline for each participating school.M&E framework with indicators that will measure actual on the ground changes through the pilot project (e.g., # of participating schools, # of participating students, amount of water saved per school, per capita, etc.) | Technical ReportsAn action plan for each participating schoolM&E framework | Multiple stakeholder participation in workshops maintainedReasonably costed, readily implementable water conservation measures available. Indicators that can be monitored with non-significant additional financial and human resource inputs available. (e.g., water consumption at school measured periodically.) |
| 1.4 Water conservation and management programmes and actions implemented at each school to realize # m3/month saving of water by the end of year 3. (The appropriate quantitative conservation target for each school will be determined through 3.1.2 and 3.1.3.) | Prioritized water conservation measures (e.g., water conservation and rain harvesting system) designed, adopted and put into practice.Number of sites where the WE measures have been installed | Field visits |
| 1.5 Cross-sectoral coordination (e.g. between DWA and schools) and stakeholder participation mechanisms established to monitor and evaluate the pilot project implementation at schools | Appropriate coordination committees established and functional  | CWP and DWA Progress ReportsMonitoring reportsCommittee meeting minutes | National level IWRM institutions established  |
| Outcome 2: Increased awareness and capacity of national and regional stakeholders (Government ministries of Local Government, Education, private sector and members of the public) to roll out water conservation and management programmes and actions at public/private institutions throughout Botswana and beyond |
| Outputs | Inputs and Actors | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| IWRM implementation guidelines and material accessed by IWRM practitioners | Project implementation reports by the various institutionsProject monitoring reportsGWP/CWP progress reports and documentation.  | National institutions collaborate in implementation of IWRM and water efficiency programme |
| 2.1 Practical (step-by-step) guidelines for formulation and implementation of the water conservation programme and actions at a school/institution institution developed and made available to wider national audience | * PIU
* Financial and human resource inputs from various GoB institutions, and the CWP
* Consultants

  | Guidelines and information material published | PublicationsProgress and monitoring reports | Water conservation programme and actions successfully formulated at selected schools  |
| 2.2 Institutional capacities for adoption of IWRM enhanced. | Training programme developed | Training ProgrammeProgress and monitoring reports | Effective conservation measures identified at selected schools |
| 2.3 Lessons learned on the cross-sectoral coordination and stakeholder participation for the effective M&E for water conservation and management programme and actions extracted and disseminated widely throughout Botswana and beyond. | Lessons learned producedLessons learned disseminated using at least 3 national/regional fora  | Lessons learned publicationProgress and monitoring reports | The cross-sectoral coordination committee established and functional. |

**Annex b: list of documents to ne reviewed by the evaluators**

**A. PROJECT DOCUMENTS & REPORTS**

1. PROJECT DOCUMENT- OCTOBER 2008
2. INCEPTION REPORT- JUNE 2009
3. NATIONAL SCOPING STUDY FOR THE IWRM PROJECT- MAY 2010
4. PROCEEDINGS FOR THE NATIONAL SCOPING STUDY-MAY 2010
5. PROCEEDINGS FOR SENSITIZATION WORKSHOP-AUGUST 2010
6. PROCEEDINGS ON PSC RETREAT- OCTOBER 2010
7. TRIP REPORT TO BIOKAVANGO PROJECT -DECEMBER 2010
8. OPERATIONS MANUAL FOR THE MADIBA RE-USE PROJECT- DECEMBER 2010
9. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (KCS & DWA)-DECEMBER 2010
10. INVENTORY OF WETLAND SYSTEMS IN BOTSWANA-FEBRUARY 2011
11. GUIDELINES FOR LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT –SEPTEMBER 2011
12. DRAFT IWRM PLAN-JULY 2012
13. DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT REPORT-AUGUST 2012

**B. MINUTES OF PROJECT MEETINGS**

1. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 PSC MEETINGS
2. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 TAG MEETINGS
3. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 PCG MEETINGS

**C. QUARTELY REPORTS**

1. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 QUARTELY REPORTS

**D. CONSULTANCY AGREEMENTS**

1. KCS & D.R MAGOLE-(FACILITATION OF PSC RETREAT IN MAUN) OCTOBER 2010
2. KCS& AURECON BOTSWANA-(IWRM INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)- JUNE 2012
3. KCS & CAR-(DEVELOPMENT OF THE IWRM PLAN)-AUGUST 2011
4. KCS& INTERGRATED MEDIA-(PRODUCTION OF IWRM DOCUMENTARY) APRIL 2011
5. KCS& ECOSURV-(DEVELOPMENT OF LIQUIDWASTE GUIDELINES)-MARCH 2011
6. KCS & OLIVER CHAPEYAMA-(FACILITATE SENSITIZATION WORKSHOP-AUGUST 2010
7. KCS & AQUALOGIC-(REVIEW OF THE LIQUIDWASTE GUIDELINES)-JULY 2012
8. KCS & BRIAN JONES-(COMMUNICATION MARKETING SERVICES)-SEPTEMBER 2012

**Annex C: Evaluation Questions**

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex D: Rating Scales**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | *Impact Ratings:*3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| ***Additional ratings where relevant:***Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

**Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

Evaluators:

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**Name of Consultant: \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

**Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i. | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| ii. | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| iii. | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| 1. | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| 2. | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| 3. | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6))  |
| 3.1 | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| 3.2 | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| 3.3 | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| 4.  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| 5.  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

**Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

***(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)***

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**ANNEX 2 CREDENTIALS OF THE EVALUATOR**

**Dr Philip Tortell** (PhD Marine Ecology, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand; BSc Hons Zoology, Victoria University of Wellington; B.Sc. (Special) University of London, U.K.; Dip Ph. Ed. Otago University, New Zealand; Dip Teaching, Malta Colleges of Education) has been working in various aspects of environmental administration, marine/coastal resources management, and biodiversity conservation since the mid-1970s. He had 13 years experience with the New Zealand Government as Investigating Scientist in the Commission for the Environment and as Director of Protected Ecosystems and Species in the Department of Conservation. Since 1989 he has been working as an international environmental consultant in conceptual planning, design, resource mobilization, implementation and particularly evaluation, of environmental programmes and projects. His work has been usually as Team Leader, mainly for UNDP/GEF, and has covered national environmental programme planning, environmental administration reform, integrated coastal zone planning, biodiversity conservation, solid waste management, and the rehabilitation of degraded land (desertification).

Dr Tortell is fully conversant with the GEF process and its project planning and evaluation requirements and has drafted proposals under the biodiversity, international waters and land degradation thematic areas. He is also very familiar with the UNDP system and its country programme cycle from inception to terminal evaluations.

From his initial professional training as a teacher and his teaching experience at all levels from primary to adult education, Dr Tortell is a capable teacher/trainer on various aspects of environmental management and has organized and delivered many workshops and similar events. He is also particularly successful in the dissemination of public information in written and oral delivery. He has advocated for and led community groups in reaching consensus on environmental issues and has provided opportunities for meaningful public participation in the management of natural resources.

Dr Tortell has worked in 61 countries with particular experience of Central Asia, the Caspian region, the Pacific, Southern Africa and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). He has also worked in countries considered more difficult and post conflict such as in the newly independent republics soon after the breakup of the Soviet Union, Kosovo, North Korea, Burundi and DR Congo.

Dr Tortell is on the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of experts convened by UNEP for the GEF, and is a past member of the UN Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Protection (GESAMP). He has also served on the advisory group for NZAID for its Pacific Initiative for the Environment. On the home front, he is a long-standing and current member of the Royal Society of New Zealand and the NZ Association for Impact Assessment, and past member of the NZ Marine Sciences Society and the NZ Limnological Society.

He has dual nationality (Maltese and New Zealand) and is fluent in Maltese, English and Italian with basic knowledge of Russian and Arabic.

Dr Tortell has carried out a number of Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations for GEF projects primarily in the International Waters and Biodiversity thematic areas. His evaluation experience is utilized by the UNDP Evaluation Office for whom he carries out Quality Assessments of evaluations.

**ANNEX 3 SCHEDULE AND ASSIGNMENT TIMELINE**

|  |
| --- |
| **BOTSWANA IWRM TE – MISSION SCHEDULE AND ASSIGNMENT TIMELINE** |
| Tue 17 | 0700 | Depart Wellington, transit Auckland, transit Singapore |
| Wed 18 | 06100900110018101910 | Arrive JohannesburgMeet Mike Ramaano, past PMMeet Akiko Yamamoto, UNDP/GEF RTADepart JohannesburgArrive Gaborone |
| Thu 19 | 0830093011301430 | Meet at UNDP, Dr Phemo KgomotsoMeet at KCS, Felix Monggae Meet at Dept Water Affairs, Botsalo ThamukuMeet at University, Chairperson Botswana Water Partnership, Dr Piet Kenabatho |
| Fri 20 | 0900100011301400 | Meet at Centre for Applied Research - Dr Jaap Arntzen and Tshepo SetlhogileMeet at Debswana, - Mike BrookMeet at Dept Environmental Affairs - Ingrid OtukileMeet at Ministry of Agriculture - William Kapele |
| Sat 21 |  | Information consolidation; preparation of Preliminary Findings ppt |
| Sun 22 |  |
| Mon 23 | 0800 | Depart GaboroneMeet at Shoshong Senior Secondary School - Hendrick Rantlaleng, School Head, Bremer Mapii DeputyMeet at Motsumi Junior Secondary School, Letlhkane – Meshack Sechele, School HeadOvernight in Francistown |
| Tue 24 | 08301530 | Meet at Our Lady of the Desert primary School – Margaret Hunyepa, School Head and teachersDrive to GaboroneMeet at DWA - Tracy Molefi, Deputy Director - International Waters Office |
| Wed 25 | 110012001500 | Meet at DWA – Bogadi Matangwani – Deputy DirectorMeet at DWA – Abraham Sebeso, Ministry of EducationMeet at UNDP – Dr Phemo Kgomotso |
| Thu 26 | 100013452000 | Meet at SADC – Phera RamoeliMeet at DWA – Dr Obolokile Obakeng, DirectorMeet at hotel – Leonard Dikobe |
| Fri 27 | 11001200 | Meet at UNDP – Lare Sisay, Deputy Resident RepresentativePresentation of Preliminary Findings |
| Sat 28 | 0925 | Depart Gaborone, transit Johannesburg |
| Sun 29 | 2325 | Transit SingaporeArrive Auckland |
| Mon 30 | 0935 | Depart AucklandArrive Wellington |
|  |  |  |
| Oct 18 |  | Draft Report out for comments |
| 19 Oct - 04 Nov |  | Period for comments on the draft |
| 15 Nov |  | Delivery of Final TE Report |

**ANNEX 4 EVALUATION MATRIX**

| **Criteria/****Sub-criteria** | **Main Questions to be Addressed by the EVALUATION** | **What to Look For** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** |
| **1 Project design as a tool to address identified threats and barriers**  | * Does the project reflect the needs of Botswana and Sub-Saharan Africa?
 | * Project design in response to identified threats and barriers
 | * Relevant documents.
* Project Document and related documentation
 | * Documents review
 |
| **2 Alignment of project with GEF global priorities** | * Is the project in line with the relevant GEF Operational Programme and strategic priorities?
 | * Match or mis-match between project products and the GEF relevant strategic objectives
 | * Relevant documentation
* UNDP/GEF RTA
 | * Documents review
* Consultations with RTA and others
 |
| **EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT** |
| **1 Progress toward achievement of the Objective and Outcomes** | * Did the project implementation across all its activities contribute to progress toward the stated outcomes and objective?
 | * Achievement of, or progress towards objective and outcomes with reference to indicators
 | * PIRs
* MTE and Management Responses
* Local communities/beneficiaries
* PMUs self-assessment
 | * Documents review
* Consultations in the field
* Consultations with Stakeholders
 |
| **EFFICIENCY** |
| **1 Managerial efficiency (execution efficiency)** | * Has the project been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates?
* Have UNDP and other partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
* Did the project implementation place an undue burden on some partners?
* Have the Risks been avoided or mitigated?
 | * Project extensions, cost over-runs
* Delivery rate
* Risk management strategy
 | * Relevant documents especially PSC Minutes, PIRs, Annual Reports, etc
* PMU self-assessment
 | * Documents review
* Consultations with PMU and UNDP CO staff
 |
| **2 Programmatic efficiency (implementation efficiency)** | * Were the project resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?
 | * Focus of project activities; project design
* Involvement, ownership
* Partner satisfaction or disappointment with arrangements
 | * ProDoc
* Annual Work Plans
* PIRs
* UNDP COs
* RTA
* Donor reports
 | * Documents review
* Consultations with PMU and UNDP CO
* Consultations with donor partners and implementation partners
 |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** |
| **1 Design for Sustainability** | * Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?
 | * Sustainability Plan/Exit Strategy
 | * ProDoc and project design
* PIRs
 | * Review of relevant documentation
 |
| **2 Issues at implementation and corrective measures** | * What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?
* What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
 | * Reviews of LogFrame
* Examples of adaptive management
 | * Various project documentation
* Project Manager
 | * Documents review
* Regional Project Coordinator, Project Managers at country level
 |
| **3 Up-scaling of pilot initiatives** | * If there was testing of pilot initiatives, was a plan for up-scaling of such initiatives, if successful, prepared?
 | * Examples of up-scaling and replication planning
 | * Various project documentation
* Project Manager
 | * Documents review
* Consultations with PMU, UNDP CO and Government
 |
| **4 Sustainability strategy** | * Have the heirs to the project been identified and prepared?
 | * Arrangements in place for the transition
 | * PMU and PIRs
* Prospective heirs
 | * Consultations with PMU, UNDP and various parties
 |

**ANNEX 5 DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND CONSULTED**

The standard basic project documentation was reviewed which, in the case of this project, was voluminous, in spite of the fact that the project had closed five months before the Terminal Evaluation. This included the Project Document, the Inception Report and Report on the Launch and Inception Workshop, various monitoring reports (AWPs, QPRs, etc), Minutes of various meetings of the Project Steering Committee, the Project Coordination Committee and the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), four Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), as well as various comments made by the project on other related initiatives. Following are key documents referred to in the text and/or otherwise consulted.

DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund (2002) *Country Programme Outlines for Botswana (2003 - 2007).* Annual session 2002, Geneva, Item 13 of the provisional agenda Country cooperation frameworks and related matters

GEF Evaluation Office (2009) *Annual Performance Report 2008*. GEF Council Paper GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 5, May 28, 2009

Global Environment Facility (2006) *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*

Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office (2008) *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*. Evaluation Document No.3

Global Environment Facility (2012) *Policy on Public Involvement in GEF Projects*. GEF/PL/SD/01. Date 08/13/2012

Government of Botswana and United Nations (2013) *Programme Operational Plan 2012-2014*. UNDAF Action Plan 2013-2014. Gaborone.

Government of Botswana and UN System in Botswana (2009) *United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2012-2016, Botswana*. March 2009

Hillson, David (2009) *Managing Risk in Projects*. Gower Publications.

Kalahari Conservation Society (2012) IWRM Water News and IWRM Model Project – Rainwater Harvesting and Recycling. Two articles in *Kalahari*, the Newsletter of the Kalahari Conservation Society, December 2012, Issue no. 96. Gaborone

Southern African Development Community (SADC) *Regional Strategic Action Plan on Integrated Water Resources Development and Management (2011-20150), RSAP III*. Gaborone.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2012-2016. March 2009

UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group (2005) *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (2007) *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators*

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/gef/node/2024>

<http://www.cso.gov.bw/index.php?option=com_content1&parent_id=370&id=372&nid=370>

<http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

<http://www.iwrmbotswana.com/>

**ANNEX 6 PERSONS MET AND CONSULTED**

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Lare Sisay, Deputy Resident Representative

Akiko Yamamoto, Regional Technical Advisor - Water/Strategy & Adaptation, UNDP-GEF

Phemo K Kgomotso, Programme Analyst Energy & Environment, Botswana Country Office

Leonard Dikobe, past Programme Analyst Energy & Environment, Botswana Country Office

**IWRM Project**

Michael Ramaano, past Project Manager

**Department of Water Affairs**

Obolokile Thothi Obakeng, Director

Tracy Molefi, Deputy Director, International Waters

Bogadi Matangwane, Deputy Director

Botsalo Thamuku, Water Engineer, Water Conservation Division, seconded to project

**Kalahari Conservation Society**

Felix Monggae, Chief Executive Officer, PSC Member,

**University of Botswana**

Piet Kenabatho, Chair of Botswana Water Partnership, PSC Member

**Centre for Applied Research**

Jaap W Arntzen, Managing Director, National Consultant to the project

Tshepo Setlhogile, National Consultant to the project

**Debswana**

Mike Brook, Group Manager Hydrogeology, PSC Member

**Department of Environmental Affairs**

Ingrid Mpundu Otukile, Chief Natural Resources Officer, past GEF OFP, PSC Member

**Ministry of Agriculture**

William Kapele, Principal Agricultural Engineer, PSC Member

**Shoshong Senior Secondary School**

Hendrick Rantlaleng, School Head

Bremer Mapii, Deputy School Head

**Motsumi Junior Secondary School, Letlhakane**

Meshack Sechele, School Head

**Our Lady of the Desert Primary School, Francistown**

Margaret Hunyepa, School Head

Mrs Siwela, teacher

Mrs Magwabi, teacher

Mrs Seimpato, teacher

**Aurecon Botswana (Pty) Ltd**

Samantha Braid, International Consultant to the project

**Ministry of Education**

Abraham Sebeso, past Principal Education Officer, Dept Secondary Educ, TAG Member

**Southern African Development Community (SADC)**

Phera Ramoeli, Senior Program Officer – Water

**ANNEX 7 CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM**

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

**Name of Consultant: \_\_Philip Tortell\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

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

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

Signed at *Wellington on 14 September 2013*

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)