



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: [11 February 2013]

Country: BOTSWANA

Description of the assignment: TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project name: *Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management/Water Use Efficiency Planning: A demonstration project for Sub-Saharan Africa (PIMS 3362)*

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 25 DAYS

Proposal should be submitted at the following address:

United Nations Development Programme
United Nations Building, Cnr Khama Crescent and President's Drive, Government Enclave
P O Box 54, Gaborone, Botswana

Or by email to procurement.bw@undp.org no later than March 11, 2013; 1600pm (Botswana time)

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. *The Procurement Unit* will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. BACKGROUND

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.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with the full TOR (see [Annex 1](#)). 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

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

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.

For detailed information, please refer to Annex 1

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

I. Academic Qualifications:

- PhD in Water Resources Management, Environmental Management, Development Studies, Social Policy Analysis, or related, preferably a combination of academic and technical experience in both social and economic fields. A master's degree and at least 5 years of experience would also be acceptable

II. Years of experience:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF work would be an added
- Demonstrable previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
- Previous experience in designing and leading terminal evaluations
- Knowledge and experience in Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) initiatives
- Be well informed on global water debates

III. Competencies:

- Demonstrated analytical communication and report writing skills;
- Excellent public speaking and presentation skills
- Capacity to work with target groups (community and high-level policy fora)

4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:

- (i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work
- (ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work

2. Financial proposal

3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

- **Lump sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel:

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

6. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

** Technical Criteria weight; [70%]*

** Financial Criteria weight; [30%]*

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>		
Criteria A: Qualifications (academic & technical, minimum Masters)	YES/NO	-
Criteria B: Adequate work and/or professional experience	YES/NO	-
Criteria C: Complete Consultancy package submitted (Technical and Financial Proposal)	YES/NO	-
Criteria D: Context – knowledge of Botswana &/or Southern	10/100	10

Africa regional water issues		
Criteria E: Technical Competence – appropriate technical and academic qualification (30)	30/100	30
Criteria F: Relevant Professional/Work Experience – IWRM, M&E, Policy Analysis (30)	30/100	30
Criteria G: Methodology/ Approach – clear understanding of methodologies (research methodology, sampling techniques and data collection), and qualitative analytical skills	20/100	20
Criteria H: Presentation & Packaging – good writing, interpretation and communication skills.	10	10
<u>Financial</u>		

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

ANNEX 2- INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

TERMINAL EVALUATION 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:	Accruing Multiple Global Benefits through Integrated Water Resources Management/Water Efficiency Planning:			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3362		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
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	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		19 December 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 19 December 2011	Actual: 30 April 2013

	Africa			
--	--------	--	--	--

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	<p>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</p> <p>1.1 An assessment of issues and the status of water resources management (Situation Analysis Report produced)</p> <p>1.2 Water resources management issues and actions identified, prioritized and strategized (IWRM Action Plan produced)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>1.4 A dynamic IWRM Plan prepared</p>
Outcome 2	<p>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</p> <p>2.1 Consistent and practical guidance for IWRM developed and made available (IWRM Guidelines)</p> <p>2.2 Institutional changes to facilitate stakeholder participation implemented (Creation of Institutions recommended in the Water Sector Review)</p>

	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/private 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 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 ([see 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,

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

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	
--	--	---------------------------------------	--

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.³

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

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](#)

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	20/03/13
Evaluation Mission	10 days	03/04/13
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	13/04/13
Final Report	2 days	15/04/13

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'](#)

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 (28 February 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

		<p><u>For Outcome 1:</u></p> <p>Plan formally adopted by GoB</p> <p>Plan effectively implemented through institutional mechanisms created</p> <p>Trans-boundary priorities addressed</p> <p>Global environmental objectives integrated and pursued</p> <p>Multiple uses of water balanced</p>	<p>Assessment reports</p> <p>IWRM plan</p> <p>Trans-boundary management strategy and programme documents</p> <p>Documentation of cross-sectoral, participatory consultation and coordination processes</p> <p>Records and outputs of inter-ministerial coordination mechanism</p> <p>Planning documents and monitoring reports</p>	<p>Recommendations of NWMP Review are implemented</p>
1.1 An assessment of issues and the status of water resources management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU • Financial and human resource inputs from GoB, UNDP-GEF and CWP 	<p>Workshops performed</p> <p>Assessment report(s) published</p>	<p>Workshop proceedings</p> <p>Assessment report(s)</p>	Current GoB focus on IWRM is maintained
1.2 Water resources management issues and actions identified, prioritized and strategized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders at all levels, including water users and civil society • Consultants 	<p>Workshops performed</p> <p>Appropriate reports published that specifies agreed actions, priorities and strategies</p>	<p>Workshop proceedings</p> <p>Reports</p>	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 Reports Monitoring 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 document DWA 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

		<p><u>For Outcome 2:</u></p> <p>Knowledge management platforms in place and informing national and regional IWRM planning processes</p> <p>Guidance material accessed by IWRM practitioners</p>	<p>Proceedings of dialogue and networking events</p> <p>Requests for information</p> <p>Project monitoring reports</p> <p>GWP/CWP progress reports and documentation. Documentation from regional networks and Cap-Net</p> <p>IWRM planning guidance material</p> <p>Documentation of planning processes</p> <p>Public outreach and participation plans</p>	<p>Effective linkages between national and regional knowledge management networks created and functional</p>
2.1 Consistent and practical guidance for IWRM developed and made available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU • Financial and human resource inputs from GoB, UNDP-GEF and CWP 	Guidelines and information material for IWRM published	<p>Review of guidelines and information material</p> <p>Progress and monitoring reports</p>	PMU established and working with GoB
2.2 Institutional changes to facilitate stakeholder participation implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional and human resource inputs from regional institutions such as GWP-SA, IWSD, 	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	WaterNet and SAWINET • Consultants	Number of training events and persons trained Number and quality of awareness and information programmes and materials produced	Course reports Materials review Progress 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 reports National 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

		<p>Pilot project adopted as a national initiative.</p> <p>Project institutionalized and used as basis for setting water allocation and pricing processes.</p>	<p>Progress reports.</p> <p>Documentation of cross-sectoral, participatory consultation and coordination processes</p>	Recommendations of NWMP Review are implemented
1.1 Schools participating in the pilot identified through stakeholder consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 maintained
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)	Commitment and interests from schools in the water conservation practices
1.3 Water resources conservation and management programmes and actions identified, costed, prioritized and strategized at each school and the corresponding M&E framework		Technical Reports summarizing the agreed water resource conservation and management programmes and actions with priorities published.	Technical Reports	Multiple stakeholder participation in workshops maintained

developed.		<p>A concrete action plan with financial information and timeline for each participating school.</p> <p>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.)</p>	<p>An action plan for each participating school</p> <p>M&E framework</p>	<p>Reasonably costed, readily implementable water conservation measures available.</p> <p>Indicators that can be monitored with non-significant additional financial and human resource inputs available. (e.g., water consumption at school measured periodically.)</p>
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.)		<p>Prioritized water conservation measures (e.g., water conservation and rain harvesting system) designed, adopted and put into practice.</p> <p>Number of sites where the WE measures have been installed</p>	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 Reports Monitoring reports Committee 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 institutions Project monitoring reports GWP/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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PIU Financial and human resource inputs from various GoB institutions, and 	Guidelines and information material published	Publications Progress and monitoring reports	Water conservation programme and actions successfully formulated at selected schools

available to wider national audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the CWP Consultants 			
2.2 Institutional capacities for adoption of IWRM enhanced.		Training programme developed	Training Programme Progress 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 produced Lessons learned disseminated using at least 3 national/regional fora	Lessons learned publication Progress and monitoring reports	The cross-sectoral coordination committee established and functional.

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE 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 BOKAVANGO 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

14. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 PSC MEETINGS
15. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 TAG MEETINGS
16. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 PCG MEETINGS

C. QUARTELY REPORTS

17. 2009,2010,2011 & 2012 QUARTELY REPORTS

D. CONSULTANCY AGREEMENTS

18. KCS & D.R MAGOLE-(FACILITATION OF PSC RETREAT IN
MAUN) OCTOBER 2010
19. KCS& AURECON BOTSWANA-(IWRM INTERNATIONAL
CONSULTANT)- JUNE 2012
20. KCS & CAR-(DEVELOPMENT OF THE IWRM PLAN)-AUGUST
2011

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 21. | KCS& INTERGRATED MEDIA-(PRODUCTION OF IWRM |
| DOCUMENTARY) APRIL 2011 | |
| 22. | KCS& ECOSURV-(DEVELOPMENT OF LIQUIDWASTE |
| GUIDELINES)-MARCH 2011 | |
| 23. | KCS & OLIVER CHAPEYAMA-(FACILITATE SENSITIZATION |
| WORKSHOP-AUGUST 2010 | |
| 24. | KCS & AQUALOGIC-(REVIEW OF THE LIQUIDWASTE |
| GUIDELINES)-JULY 2012 | |
| 25. | 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

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form⁴

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.

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷ 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.

- 3.2** 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 report)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____