

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for independent **Terminal Evaluation** of the GEF/UNDP MSP project
 “Protection and Sustainable Use of the Dinaric Karst Transboundary Aquifer System”

Type of Contract: Individual Contract (Consultant)
Languages Required: English
Duration: estimated April 2015 – May 2015 (estimated 28 working days)
Location: Home based (14 days) + 14 days on mission to: Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro.
Deadline for submission: 31 March 2015, by 17.00 hours (CET)
Applications are to be submitted to the following addresses:
m.nikolic@unesco.org with cc to s.sesum@unesco.org and l.bialy@unesco.org or
 by post at the address UNESCO, Zmaja od Bosne BB, UN House , 71.000 Sarajevo

1. INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Protection and Sustainable Use of the Dinaric Karst Transboundary Aquifer System” (PIMS #4056, Atlas # 59453).

The Project Document was signed by the Ministry of the Environment Forestry and Water Administration of Albania, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministry of Regional Development, Forestry and Water management of Croatia and Ministry for Spatial Planning and the Environment of Montenegro May 2010 and it will end on 31 May 2015.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project title:	Protection and Sustainable Use of the Dinaric Karst Transboundary Aquifer System			
GEF Project ID:	4056		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00059453/0074336	GEF financing:	2.16	
UNESCO Project ID:	INT 007 2696			
Country:	Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro	IA/EA own:	0	0
Region:	SEE	Government:	1.9	
Focal Area:	International Waters	Other:	1.503	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	3.403.570	
Executing Agency:	UNESCO	Total Project Cost:	5.563.570	
Other Partners involved:	IGRAC International Groundwater Resource Assessment Centre	Pro Doc Signature (date project began):		May 2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 June 2014	Actual: 31 May 2015

This Terminal Evaluation (TE) is initiated by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub as the GEF Implementation Agency and UNESCO as the Executing Agency responsible for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Ministries of the project countries, UNDP/GEF and project levels, and the GEF Secretariat) with assessment of the extent to which the project has met its overall objectives and outcomes and to help provide lessons learned for future similar projects.

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

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

Project description

The DIKTAS project (Protection and Sustainable Use of the Dinaric Karst Transboundary Aquifer System), is the first ever attempted globally to introduce sustainable integrated management principles in a transboundary karst freshwater aquifer of the magnitude of the Dinaric Karst System. At the global level the project aims at focusing the attention of the international community on the huge but vulnerable water resources contained in karst aquifers (carbonatic rock formations), which are widespread globally, but poorly understood. The Dinaric Karst Aquifer System, shared by several countries and one of the world's largest, has been identified as an ideal opportunity for applying new and integrated management approaches to these unique freshwater resources and ecosystems.

At the regional level the project's objectives are to:

1. Facilitate the equitable and sustainable utilization and management of the transboundary water resources of the Dinaric Karst Aquifer System, and
2. Protect from natural and man-made hazards, including climate change, the unique groundwater dependent ecosystems that characterize the Dinaric Karst region of the Balkan Peninsula.

These objectives, which aim to contribute to sustainable development of the region, are achieved through a concerted multi-country effort involving improvement in scientific understanding, the building of political consensus around key reforms and new policies, the enhanced coordination among countries, donors, projects and agencies, and the consolidation of national and international support.

Project Outcomes/outputs

The Project produces a better knowledge of the groundwater source and on the causes of its degradation. As one of the outcome a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) were prepared and published. A TDA is an assessment and prioritization of Transboundary water related issues of concern. It uses the best available verified scientific and technical information to examine the state of the environment and the root causes for its degradation. The analysis is carried out in a cross sectorial manner, focusing on Transboundary problems without ignoring national concerns and priorities.

Second outcome of the project: Strategic Action Plan (SAP), and a consultation mechanism (NIC and CIE) among the countries sharing the aquifer, formal agreement on corrective actions including policy, legal and institutional reforms, and investments, to be taken jointly and improved awareness and sustained international support.

Results are measured in terms of the achievement of key benchmarks (establishment of national inter-ministry committees, approval of TDA, endorsement of SAP, establishment of a joint permanent consultation mechanism).

2. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the terminal evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report written in English that should follow requirements as indicated in [Annex F](#).

The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

Special attention shall be paid to the Lessons Learned section. The Terminal Evaluation Report will include a separate chapter on Lessons Learned, providing recommendations for replication and transfer of the experience related mainly to:

- post-project sustainability of the efforts both in terms of governance and in terms of environmental benefits;
- capacity building;
- successes and challenges.

The report together with its annexes shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word and pdf format.

The review will take place in consultant's home office with four missions to Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro. The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and all key stakeholders. The consultant should request all meetings during the missions at least 3 working days prior to undertaking the missions.

The consultant is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners, facilitated by participating implementing agencies.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method² 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 in [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 Ministry of the Environment Forestry and Water Administration of Albania, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministry of Regional Development, Forestry and Water management of Croatia and Ministry for Spatial Planning and the Environment of Montenegro. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro, which are also the project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, Ministry of the Environment Forestry and Water Administration of Albania, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministry of Regional Development, Forestry and Water management of Croatia and Ministry for Spatial Planning and the Environment of Montenegro; Steering Committee members; Project Team, key stakeholders.

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	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 / co-finance

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 will receive assistance from the 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\$)		Other (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	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/vulnerable groups.

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.³

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 UNESCO. The UNESCO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

³ 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](#)

Although the evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNESCO, UNDP or GEF or the project management.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be up to 28 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	recommended: 3-4 days	20.04.2015
4 Evaluation Missions	recommended: 14 days	18.05.2015
Draft Evaluation Report	recommended: 5-8 days	23.05.2015
Final Report	recommended: 1-2 days	28.05.2015

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

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

*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.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNESCO regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Mr Sinisa SESUM (head UNESCO antenna office in Sarajevo of UNESCO Venice Office) copy
Ms Alice Aureli
Chief Groundwater Systems and Settlements Section
UNESCO - Division of Water Sciences
International Hydrological Programme (IHP)
Coordinator Transboundary Aquifers Management Programme -ISARM
1, rue Miollis - 75732 Paris Cedex 15, France

Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- **First payment:** 10% of the total contract upon submission of the first field visit workplan, depending on the date of the evaluation missions and its acceptance by UNESCO approving officer Mr Sinisa SESUM;
- **Second payment:** 40% of the total contract upon submission of the draft Evaluation Report and its acceptance by UNESCO project manager;
- **Third/Final payment:** 50% of the total contract upon submission of the final Evaluation Report and its acceptance by UNESCO project manager.

3. COMPETENCIES

Required competencies:

- Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
- Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
- Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities

4. QUALIFICATIONS

The Evaluator **must be independent** from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of activities in question, i.e. he/she must not have participated in the preparation and/or implementation of the assessed project and must not be in a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

Academic Qualifications/Education:

- Master degree in economics, engineering, environmental science, groundwater management or equivalent experience.

Experience:

- At least 7 years of professional experience in the field of sustainable freshwater management;
- Familiarity with water management policies in SEE;
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
- Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects;
- Knowledge of MS Word, Excel and email communication software;

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills

5. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

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).

UNESCO 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.

- **Financial Proposal** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, travel – international and local, per diems and any other possible costs), using the following template.

	Nr. of units*	Units	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office**				
	14	man/days		0
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
Work on mission**				
	14	man/days		0
		man/days		0
		man/days		0
Sub-total fee				0
Travel costs				
International travel to and from country/ies	4	mission		0
DSA		overnights		0
Local travel		destination		0
Sub-total travel costs				0
TOTAL				0

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

** Add rows as needed

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'](#)

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...). All envisaged **travel costs** must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel.*

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNESCO 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>

ANNEXES:

- A: Project Logical Framework
- B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator
- C: Evaluation Questions
- D: Rating scales
- E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
- F: Evaluation Report Outline
- G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

