



REPUBLIC
OF
KENYA



Poverty Reduction Through Sustainable NRM



Investing in rural people

**MINISTRY OF WATER, SANITATION AND IRRIGATION
UPPER TANA CATCHMENT NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
(UTaNRMP)**

**REOI -
Individual Consultants**

FOR

PROJECT COMPLETION REVIEW-

WATER EXPERT

1st Edition

December 2020



Foreword

This REOI is based on the 1st edition of the IFAD-issued standard procurement document for REOI advertisement – individual consultants to be used in projects financed by IFAD, available at www.ifad.org/project-procurement.

IFAD does not guarantee the completeness, accuracy or translation, if applicable, or any other aspect in connection with the content of this document.

REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

(Individual Consultants)

Country: KENYA

Project: UPPER TANA CATCHMENT NATURAL RESOURCES
MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Assignment title: PROJECT COMPLETION REVIEW (PCR) – WATER EXPERT

Reference no. UTaNRMP/PCR/003/2022-23

The Government of Kenya has received financial assistance from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) towards financing the Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project, and intends to apply part of the proceeds for the recruitment of consulting services provided by individual consultants as part of a team to undertake Project Completion Review.

The use of any IFAD financing shall be subject to IFAD's approval, pursuant to the terms and conditions of the financing agreement, as well as IFAD's rules, policies and procedures. IFAD and its officials, agents and employees shall be held harmless from and against all suits, proceedings, claims, demands, losses and liability of any kind or nature brought by any party in connection with Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project.

The overall objective of the Project Completion Review is to assess and document overall Project implementation performance and the results achieved. This process calls for an informed reflection on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Project interventions and as elaborated in the detailed terms of reference attached to this document.

The attention of interested consultants is drawn to IFAD's Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism Policy¹ and the Revised IFAD Policy on Preventing Fraud and Corruption its Activities and Operations². The latter sets forth IFAD's provisions on prohibited practices. IFAD further strives to ensure a safe working environment free of harassment, including sexual harassment, and free of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) in its activities and operations as detailed in its IFAD Policy to Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.³

Interested consultants shall not have any actual, potential or reasonably perceived conflict of interest. Consultants with an actual, potential or reasonably perceived conflict of interest shall be disqualified unless otherwise explicitly approved by the Fund. Consultants are

¹ The policy is accessible at <https://www.ifad.org/en/document-detail/asset/41942012>.

² The policy is accessible at www.ifad.org/anticorruption_policy.

³ The policy is accessible at <https://www.ifad.org/en/document-detail/asset/40738506>.

considered to have a conflict of interest if they a) have a relationship that provides them with undue or undisclosed information about or influence over the selection process and the execution of the contract, or b) have a business or family relationship with a member of the client's board of directors or its personnel, the Fund or its personnel, or any other individual that was, has been or might reasonably be directly or indirectly involved in any part of (i) the preparation of the REOI, (ii) the selection process for this procurement, or (iii) execution of the contract. Consultants have an ongoing obligation to disclose any situation of actual, potential or reasonably perceived conflict of interest during preparation of the EOI, the selection process or the contract execution. Failure to properly disclose any of said situations may lead to appropriate actions, including the disqualification of the consultant, the termination of the contract and any other as appropriate under the IFAD Policy on Preventing Fraud and Corruption in its Projects and Operations.

The Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project (UTaNRMP) now invites eligible Individual consultants ("consultants") – **Water Expert** to indicate their interest in providing the services.

Interested consultants should provide information demonstrating that they have the required qualifications and relevant experience to perform the services in the form of a curriculum vitae (CV). A consultant will be selected in accordance with the individual consultant selection (ICS) method set out in IFAD' Project Procurement Handbook that can be accessed via the IFAD website at www.ifad.org/project-procurement. Interviews will be conducted be conducted as part of the selection process.

The shortlisting criteria shall include:

- REOI filled and signed appropriately, copy of valid tax compliance certificate, (mandatory) before proceeding to the next level
- Bachelor's degree in civil engineering, water engineering or Agricultural engineering,
- Masters in Water Resources Management or above (PhD)
- Relevant experience in the last ten (10) years in the area of planning, supervision, implementation and monitoring of community water resources management related interventions,
- Undertaken one (1) assignment on Project Completion Review Reports for Government/donor supported Projects with a focus on water resources management,
- Undertaken three (3) assignments on Water Resources Management for community development projects in midterm reviews, baseline surveys, Impact Assessment Studies or any other related assignments in the last 8 years.

- Documentary evidence in form of commendations/recommendations on experience in related assignments in the last 8 years in community development Projects.

Only the highest ranked individual consultant will be invited to submit a combined technical and financial offer, which is then negotiated with the client. However, if negotiations with the individual fail, the PE may invite the second ranked individual for negotiations.

Any request for clarification on this REOI should be sent via e-mail to the address below utarnmp@gmail.com no later than 27th January 2023 at 11:00AM EAT. The client will provide responses to all clarification requests by 31st January 2023.

Expressions of interest in the form of curriculum vitae (CV) must be delivered in a written form to the address below in person, or by postal mail by 7th February 2023 at 11:00AM

Completed Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) documents in a plain sealed envelope and clearly marked with “**Water Expert**” should be addressed and sent to:

The Project Coordinator,
Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project,
P.O BOX 996-60100
Tel: 254-68-2231376/2231517
EMBU

or dropped in the Tender Box situated at the **main entrance to the EMBU West Water offices located** on Embu-Meru Road **opposite Kangaru DEB Primary School** or posted so as to reach the above address on or before **11:00 AM on 7th February 2023**

Opening will be on **7th February 2023 at 11:00 a.m.** in the presence of bidders or their representatives who choose to attend in the **MKEPP Documentation Centre. Electronic bids and late submissions will not be accepted regardless of the circumstances.**

Late tenders will not be accepted regardless of the circumstances.

PROJECT COORDINATOR

For: Principal Secretary, Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST SUBMISSION FORMS

EOI Submission Form

Individual Consultants

A. Project Data

Project Name	
Assignment	

B. Consultant Data

* Name	
* Country of Nationality	
* Address of consultant	
* E-mail of consultant	

C. Assignment Specific Qualifications and Experience

* Assignment Specific Experience (Provide information demonstrating your ability, skills and experience to undertake advertised assignment and deliver inputs/ outputs required under the TOR)
* Please provide summary of your qualifications and attach your Curriculum Vitae (CV) in the format indicated below

D. Eligibility Declaration

I, the undersigned, certify to the best of my knowledge and belief

- The CV I attached correctly describes my qualifications and my experience

- I am not part of the team who wrote the terms of reference for this consulting services assignment.
- I am not sanctioned (not eligible for engagement) by GoK and IFAD or another development partner.
- I have not been convicted of an offense or crime related to theft, corruption or fraud.
- I understand that it is my obligation to notify GoK and IFAD should I become ineligible to work with GoK and IFAD or another development partner, or should I be convicted of an offense related to theft, corruption or fraud.
- I understand that any misrepresentations that knowingly or recklessly mislead, or attempt to mislead may lead to the automatic rejection of the proposal or cancellation of the contract, if awarded, and may result in further remedial action, in accordance with GoK and IFAD's Anticorruption and Anti money laundering Policies.

* Completed by (Name/Position)	
Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	

Attachment: Curriculum Vitae in the format indicated below

CURRICULUM VITAE (CV)

1. **Name of Expert** [*Insert full name*]: _____

2. **Current Residential Address:** _____
Telephone No.: _____
Fax No.: _____
E-Mail Address: _____

3. **Date of Birth:** _____ **Citizenship:** _____

4. **Education** [*Indicate college/university and other specialized education of expert, giving names of institutions, degrees obtained, and dates of obtainment*]: _____

5. **Membership in Professional Associations:** _____

6. **Other Trainings** [*Indicate significant training since degrees under 5 - Education were obtained*]: _____

7. **Countries of Work Experience:** [*List countries where expert has worked in the last ten years*]: _____

8. **Languages** [*For each language indicate proficiency: good, fair, or poor in speaking, reading, and writing*]: _____

9. **Employment Record** [*Starting with present position, list in reverse order every employment held by expert since graduation, giving for each employment (see format here below): dates of employment, name of employing organization, positions held.*]:

From [Year]: _____ To [Year]: _____

Employer: _____

Positions held: _____

Name, postal address, email and telephone number of contact person: _____

10. Detailed Tasks Assigned

[*List all tasks to be performed under this assignment*]

11. Work Undertaken that Best Illustrates Capability to Handle the Tasks Assigned

[*Among the assignments in which the expert has been involved, indicate the following information for those assignments that best illustrate the expert's capability to handle the tasks listed in line 10.*]

Name of assignment or project: _____

Year: _____

Location: _____

Client: _____

Main project features: _____

Positions held: _____

Activities performed: _____

12. Certification:

I, the undersigned, certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this CV correctly describes my qualifications and my experience.

I also understand that any willful misstatement described herein may lead to my disqualification or dismissal, if engaged.

Signature of expert

Date: _____
(Day/Month/Year)

(Provide proof academic certificates, professional certificates, current membership of professional bodies, and employment history)

TERMS OF REFERENCE-PROJECT COMPLETION REVIEW

1.0 INTRODUCTION

UTaNRMP has been implemented since May 2012 and is due to undertake Project Completion Review in line with the Financing Agreement between IFAD and the Government of Kenya. The proposed Project completion review for the Upper Tana Natural Resources Project will be undertaken by the Lead Agency Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation on behalf of the Borrower in close coordination with IFAD. Its main purpose is to report on the results achieved through Project interventions for accountability and learning purposes. The process will facilitate reflection on performance, elicit lessons learned and define an appropriate post-Project strategy. The Project Completion Review process will be guided by the methodological framework set out in IFAD Project Completion Review Guidelines.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project (UTaNRMP) is an eight years project whose initial completion and closure date was 31st December 2020 and 30th June 2021 respectively. Following the request by Government of Kenya (GoK), IFAD approved additional financing and extension of 30 months w.e.f 1st July 2020. With the additional financing and extension, the new completion and closure dates are 31st December 2022 and 30th June 2023 respectively. The Project is funded by Government of Kenya, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Spanish Trust Fund and the Beneficiaries. The initial 8 year loan agreement was signed on 23rd May 2012 and came into force same day of signing while Amendment to the Financing Agreement on the Additional Financing was signed on 29th June and 13th July 2020 by Government of Kenya and IFAD respectively. The Project is multi-sectoral and the Project Lead Agency (PLA) is the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation.

The **goal** of the Project is to “*contribute to reduction of rural poverty in the Upper Tana river catchment*”. This goal is pursued via two **Project development objectives (PDOs)** which reflect the poverty-environment nexus:

- a) Increased sustainable food production and incomes for poor rural households in the Project area;
and
- b) Sustainable management of natural resources for provision of environmental services.

The Project outcomes are:

- i) Rural communities empowered for sustainable management of natural resources;
- ii) Natural resource-based rural livelihoods sustainably improved
- iii) Land, water and forest resources sustainably managed for the benefit of local people and the wider community
- iv) Project effectively and efficiently managed

The Project is implemented through four (4) components namely:

- i) **Community Empowerment component**

The outcome of the component is: Rural communities empowered for sustainable management of natural resources;

Outputs of the component are: a) Communities with increased awareness of sustainable NRM; b) Key community organizations with increased capacity to manage natural resources sustainably; c) Community action plans for livelihood improvement and sustainable NRM

ii) Sustainable Rural Livelihoods component

The outcome of the component is: Natural resource-based rural livelihoods sustainably improved while outputs are: a) Agricultural packages adapted to agro-ecological and socio-economic contexts; b) CIGs successfully adopt or improve farm and/or non-farm IGAs.

iii) Sustainable Water and Natural Resources Management component

The outcome under the component is: Land, water and forest resources sustainably managed for the benefit of local people and the wider community.

Outputs for the component are: a) Sustainably managed water resources; b) Sustainably managed forest and agricultural ecosystems.

iv) Project Management and Coordination component

The component's outcome is: Project effectively and efficiently managed while outputs are: a) Fully functional governance, management, monitoring and reporting systems; b) Knowledge about NRM effectively managed and disseminated to stakeholders.

UTaNRMP's implementation has been based on clear approaches, strategies and methodologies namely: The Ecosystem approach implemented through the River Basin Catchment and forest management blocks; Participatory Forest Management (PFM) approach; Sub-Catchment Management (SCM) approach; Inclusive Gender equality and mainstreaming approach mainly through Gender Action Learning System (GALS) methodology; Participatory Rural Appraisal methodology; Support to livelihoods strategy.

2.1 Project coverage

The Project is being implemented in six (6) counties of Embu, Tharaka Nithi, Meru, Nyeri, Murang'a and Kirinyaga, the associated hotspots (hilltops, wet lands, and degraded areas) and protected areas (Forest reserves and national parks). The activities are being implemented in the following river basins:

(i) Tributaries of the four (4) MKEPP-NRM River Basins:

Ena (Itimbogo, Thura, Rwanjoga, Riachina, Gangara, Kiambere)

Kapingazi/Rupingazi (Kiye, Thambana, Nyanjara, Itabua, Kathita)

Kathita (Ngaciuma, Kinyaritha, Kuuru, Riiji)

Kithinu/Mutonga (Naka, Nithi, Maara South, Maara North, Thuci)

(ii) Initial 12 high Priority River Basins for UTaNRMP:

Maragua, Murubara, Nairobi, Ragati, Rujiweru, Rupingazi, Saba Saba, Thangatha, Thanantu, Thiba, Thika/Sasumua, Thingithu.

(iii) Other 12 River Basins:

Amboni/ Muringato, Iraru, Kayahwe, Lower Chania, Mara, Mariara, Mathioya, Nyamindi, Ruguti, Rwamuthambi, Sagana, Ura

The Project goal is to contribute to poverty reduction targeting about 300,000 households (1,500,000 people) whose livelihoods revolve around the use of the natural resources of Upper Tana catchment. These include smallholder crop and livestock farmers and community groups involved in Natural Resources Management (NRM) and income generating activities. Special focus is on women and youth as well as other vulnerable groups within the above categories. The Project also provides indirect benefits to the non-target groups in the Upper Tana catchment through services and enterprises linked with the Project activities, as well as to populations outside the catchment who rely on water and hydro-electricity from the river system.

2.2 Project’s Management Institutions

The key institutional structures that ensure smooth implementation of the Project starting at the policy level up to the implementation level are: Project Steering Committee (PSC); Project Coordinating Team (PCT); County Project Coordinating Committees (CPCCs) and County Project Facilitating Teams (CPFTs). At the sub-county level, the Project has established Sub-County Implementing Teams (SCITs) responsible for overseeing the day to day Project implementation and supporting community based institutions such as Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs), Community Forest Associations (CFAs), Focal Development Area Committees (FDACs), Civil works groups and Common Interest Groups (CIGs).

Implementation of the Project interventions has been technically supported by the National and County Governments’ staff through relevant departments. Technical departments include: Agriculture, Livestock, Social development, Kenya Forest Service, Water, Irrigation, Kenya Wildlife Services and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). Treasury, Procurement, Internal Audit staff has been facilitative in procurement, financial management processes.

2.3 Project funding

The total Project cost is **US\$ 87.749 million**. The donor funding is a loan to the National Government on a highly concessional terms with a service charge of 0.75% per annum with a maturity period of 40 years including a grace period of 10 years starting from the date of approval of the loan.

Funding by source is as summarized in table 1 below.

Table 1: Funds allocation by component in USD (Million-Est)

No.	Component	PDR Allocation	Additional funding	Revised allocation with additional financing	% Allocation
1.	Community Empowerment	4.14	0.853	4.993	6
2.	Sustainable Rural Livelihood	22.27	5.51	27.78	32

No.	Component	PDR Allocation	Additional funding	Revised allocation with additional financing	% Allocation
3.	Sustainable Water and NRM	31.98	9.148	41.128	47
4.	Project Management & Coordination	10.45	3.3	13.65	16
	Total	68.84	18.811	87.479	100

Source: Project Design Report (February 2012) and amended Financing Agreement July 2020

2.4 Key Project dates and milestones

Project Concept Paper	October 2010
Operations Strategic Committee (OSC)	March 2011
Project Initial Design	March 2011
Project Detailed Design	August-October 2011
Signing of Financing Agreement	23 rd May 2012
Loan effectiveness date	23 rd May 2012
Initial Project completion Date	30 th June 2020
Extended Project completion date	31 st December 2022
Initial Loan Closing Date	31 st December 2020
Extended Loan closing date	30 th June 2023
Mid-term Review	June 2017
Final Impact Assessment Survey	May 2020

3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT COMPLETION REVIEW

The overall objective of the completion review is to assess and document overall Project implementation performance and the results achieved, both for accountability and learning purposes. This process requires an informed reflection on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Project interventions. More precisely, the detailed objectives of the completion process include the following:

- a) To assess the relevance of Project interventions at the time of Project design and at present;
- b) To assess the effectiveness of Project implementation, or the extent to which Project objectives were met, and to document the immediate results and impacts of Project interventions (Project impact relates to the “positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended). Impact domains include: Household incomes and assets; Food security; Human and social capital; Agricultural productivity; Institutions and policies; Gender equality and women’s empowerment.
- c) To review the Project costs, benefits and the efficiency of the overall Project implementation process, including IFAD’s and partners’ performance;
- d) To assess the prospects of sustainability of Project benefits beyond Project completion;
- e) To generate and document useful lessons from implementation that will help improve IFAD’s or Borrower’s future programming and designs.
- f) To identify any potential for the replication or up-scaling of best Project practices;
- g) To document innovations which the Project interventions have introduced and tested;

3.1 Performance assessment questions

The Project Completion Review will seek to answer each the following detailed questions categorized according to the evaluation criteria for the overall assessment:

3.1.1. Project Relevance

Assess the extent to which the Project objectives were consistent with the priorities of the rural poor in the Upper Tana catchment and their perception of their needs; with the priorities and poverty alleviation policies and strategies of the country; and with IFAD’s mandate and policies. More precisely, answer each of the following detailed questions:

- Did the Project design focus on, and were its objectives consistent with, the needs and priorities of the rural poor? Was the design process participatory and did it take into account the needs, potential, livelihoods, asset bases and development opportunities of the rural poor at the time of Project design? Are these characteristics, constraints and opportunities still the same today?
- Were the approaches promoted consistent vis-à-vis the socio-politico-economic conditions at the time of Project design and vis-à-vis prevailing environmental and climate conditions? Were Project objectives, approaches and activities consistent with IFAD’s objectives of increasing the assets and incomes of poor rural households, Improving their food security among others?
- Were the Project objectives realistic and consistent with the national development blue prints and policies on poverty reduction strategies, agriculture and rural development strategies and other sectoral priorities? In particular, was the Project design aligned with key national policies? Are these policy documents still relevant today or were there significant changes in the policy context?

- Were the Project objectives consistent with IFAD’s mandate, its *Strategic Framework* and with IFAD’s country strategy as reflected in the COSOP (2013-2018 & 2020-2025)? Were IFAD policy concerns (existing at the time of Project’s design or developed later during implementation, reflected in the policies and strategies on targeting, social inclusion, innovation etc.) adequately incorporated into the Project design?
- Did the Project Design Documents include a well-defined, clearly articulated Logframe or Results’ Framework? Were all identified activities and outputs consistent and commensurate for the attainment of proposed goal and objectives? Were external risks (or assumptions) clearly identified? Were the proposed indicators relevant and adequate to monitor Project implementation and results?
- Were the initial implementation arrangements well defined and adequate to ensure a smooth, cost-efficient Project implementation? Were there any major changes in these arrangements, and if so, were these changes appropriate and timely?
- Were there major changes in the external Project environment (e.g. policies, socio-economic conditions, political changes, crisis, etc.) since the design and Project life? Were Project objectives adjusted to reflect changing circumstances during the implementation? Are the initial (or revised) Project objectives still valid?
- What were the main factors that contributed to a positive, or less positive Project relevance?

3.1.2 Project effectiveness

The team will assess the extent to which the Project’s specific objectives were achieved in both quantitative and qualitative terms. This will involve the careful description of the main activities undertaken by the Project since inception as well as a thorough analysis of the results achieved at the output, outcome and impact levels. Variations between initial and actual targets will be highlighted and the external factors that had a bearing on the level of Project effectiveness will be explained. More precisely, the team will answer the following questions:

- Were all activities implemented as planned? If not, what were the reasons? Were all expected outputs achieved in quantitative and qualitative terms? Did they lead to the intended outcomes and were those outputs and outcomes properly measured and documented? Are there significant discrepancies between original targets and actual achievements, and if so, what are the reasons?
- Did the Project achieve its objectives?
- Was the Project implementation well monitored? Are all results at all levels properly measured, quantified and documented? Is this information reliable?
- Did all results meet the set quality standards? If not, what were the problems?
- Were all results achieved within the original timeframe and budget?
- Did the Project provide all expected benefits to all intended targeted groups? Do results and achievements adequately fulfil the needs of these intended targeted groups?
- What are the external factors that facilitated, or constrained, output delivery and the achievement of Project objectives?

- What factors in Project design and implementation accounted the most for the estimated results in terms of effectiveness?

3.1.3 Project efficiency

The team will assess the economic efficiency of the conversion process of the Project inputs and resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) into results. This analysis will involve a review of the following aspects:

3.1.3.1 Resources use

- What were the main expenditure patterns? Were financial and budgetary resources spent as initially anticipated? Were there deviations from original cost estimates and, if so, what were the reasons? Was the budget significantly amended during the implementation phase?
- Were there timely and adequate financing contributions from all Project financiers, including in-kind contributions from beneficiaries and any additional resources leveraged by the Project?
- For the resources spent, was the number (and quality) of outputs optimal? Could the Project have produced more with the same resources, or the same results with less money? Could other approaches have produced results more efficiently in terms of costs, time and resources?
- Was the Project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness?
- Did the Project build on earlier initiatives?
- Wherever possible, the evaluation should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the Project with that of other similar Projects.

3.1.3.2 Quality of Project management

- How well did the Project Coordinating Team (PCT) coordinate and manage Project activities? Were implementation schedules adequately met? Was the Project management responsive to changes in the environment or to the recommendations made during the various supervision teams of the Project Steering Committee? Was the PCT adequately staffed with motivated staff members? How useful were the various Project management tools (AWPB, Procurement Plan, M&E Plan) developed during implementation? Were these tools properly used by the Project management?
- Were there appropriate arrangements in place for sound financial management, flow of funds, financial record keeping and the timely preparation of financial reports? Were there any issues?
- How efficient was the Project M&E or MIS systems in providing reliable, timely information on output delivery, outcomes and impact? Was M&E information adequately analyzed and used by Project management for planning and decision-making purposes?
- Was the Project Steering Committee useful and proactive to help resolve problems and guide Project implementation?

3.1.3.3 Quality of IFAD supervision and implementation support

- To what extent did the services and support provided by IFAD ensure a sound Project design and an efficient Project implementation? Did IFAD mobilize the adequate technical expertise and resources in Project design and implementation?
- Did IFAD provide adequate support through direct supervision and/or country presence? Were supervision teams useful and timely? Did IFAD ensure pro-active problem identification, follow-up and resolution?
- How efficient was IFAD in handling loan administration, procurement reviews and AWPB reviews? Were there any delays in funds' transfers?
- Was IFAD proactively engaged in policy dialogue activities at different levels in order to ensure the replication and scaling-up of pro-poor innovations? Was IFAD active in creating effective partnerships?

3.1.3.4 Cost-benefits analysis

- For each of the main Project investments, what were: (a) the actual costs and value of inputs mobilized (*including capital costs, operation and maintenance costs, labor costs, taxes*); (b) the estimated economic benefits (*including revenues from sales, incomes, value of self-consumed production*); and (c) the estimated social benefits?
- What is the cost ratio of inputs to outputs and is it comparable to local, national or regional benchmarks? What are the loan costs per beneficiary? What are the team's conclusions with regard to this costs-benefits analysis? What are the main internal or external factors that may have had a negative or positive impact on costs or benefits?
- If applicable, how does the actual Project internal rate of return (IRR) compare with the estimated IRR calculated during Project design?

3.1.4 Sustainability

The team will assess the likelihood that the benefits from Project intervention will continue after Project completion. It will also assess the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks, including climate-related risks, beyond Project life. The adequacy of the post-Project strategy, as designed and/or implemented, will also be examined. More precisely, the mission will examine the following questions:

- Was an appropriate post-Project strategy developed and implemented since Project start-up?
- **Social sustainability (Empowerment):** Do Project beneficiaries have the necessary capacities and skills, individually or collectively to continue the approaches or manage the investments promoted by the Project? Are these socially acceptable? Is there sufficient local ownership for these approaches or investments? Was there adequate beneficiary participation during Project implementation? Is there interest and willingness, among concerned communities, to continue with promoted approaches or investments after Project completion?
- **Economic and financial sustainability:** Do Project investments where applicable generate sufficient cash flow and income to offset future investment and O&M costs? Are Project investments economically and financially viable? If not, what are the constraints?

- **Technical sustainability:** Are the approaches promoted by the Project viable from a technical point of view? Are spare parts for acquired or promoted systems and equipment locally available? Do beneficiaries have the necessary technical capacities to operate and maintain the investments promoted by the Project? Do they have access to adequate funds for operation and maintenance?
- **Institutional sustainability:** Are the institutions supported by the Project self-sufficient and viable? Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners? Are the new approaches or practices promoted by the Project mainstreamed within normal government operations? Is there a clear indication of government commitment after the loan closing date in terms of follow-up actions, provision of O&M funds, etc.?
- **Environmental sustainability:** Are the approaches and investments promoted by the Project environmental-friendly? Are they helping reduce the pressure on the natural resource base? Are they having any negative impact on the environment or the natural resource base? Did promoted techniques and approaches take into account climate change issues? Are they promoting adaptations to climate change? Can recurrent natural hazards endanger prospects of sustainability?
- **Climate change:** Are the agricultural and NRM approaches promoted by the Project suitable in a context of a rapidly changing climate? How may changes in climatic conditions affect the sustainability of interventions in the long run? Which precursors are critical to achieve long-term impact?

3.1.5 Project Impacts

The impact of Project interventions should be presented in quantitative and qualitative terms, using the standard IFAD's impact domain classification. The mission will examine in particular the following questions:

Households' incomes and assets: Did the Project contribute to positive changes in households' assets? Did the composition of incomes change or was there a diversification in means of livelihood? Did the Project improve ownership, or security of access to land, water or productive resources? Were there positive changes in households' assets, and if so, what were the main changes? Was there an increase in households' financial assets?

Human and social capital and empowerment: Did the Project influence the knowledge and skills of the rural poor? Did the rural communities gain access to safe water sources and other social facilities? Did the Project enhance social capital and cohesion in the communities? Did rural people's organizations and grassroots institutions change? Did the Project affect the capacity of the rural poor to influence decision making and access to institutions (social services, local development actors, national authorities) either on an individual or collective basis? Did the Project affect social capital, social cohesion and the self-help capacity of rural communities?

Food security: Did the Project improve food availability, whether self-produced or purchased, to ensure a minimum necessary intake for all household members? Do Project beneficiaries have

an improved and more regular access to enough or more nutritious food? Is there a reduction in the occurrence, or duration, of lean periods? Did children's nutritional status change (stunting, wasting and underweight status)? To what extent did the rural poor improve their access to input and output markets that could help them enhance their productivity and access to food? To what extent were the rural poor able to overcome market volatility or climate changes to ensure year-round food security?

Agricultural productivity: Did the Project contribute to increase agricultural and livestock productivity as measured in terms of cropping intensity, yields and land productivity? Are there changes in the levels of local production and crop diversification? Are farmers applying improved or more sustainable farming practices? Did the Project ensure that smallholders benefited from increased agricultural production and were enabled to manage market fluctuations and changes in climatic or natural resources conditions?

Institutions and policies: Are there changes in the capacities of the various grassroots organizations supported during Project implementation (such as Rural Producers' Groups, Interest Groups or Users' Associations)? Are there changes in the institutional capacities of the main institutions involved in Project implementation? Are there changes in the quality or range of services delivered for the rural poor? Are there changes in local governance or in the behaviors of local institutions? Are there changes in the policy or institutional framework as a result of Project-led policy dialogue activities (e.g. changes in the laws, statutes, rules, regulations, procedures, national quality standards or norms)?

Gender equity and women empowerment: Did the Project generate changes in gender roles or gender relations? Are there changes in women status at the community level (participation in local elections or decision-making processes, representation in rural producers' groups), at the household level (workload, nutrition status, women influence on decision-making) or the community level)? What is the impact of capacity-building activities on individual women or on Women Groups? Are there changes in the institutional or legal framework that were made in favour of women as a result of Project policy dialogue activities?

Innovation: The team will assess the extent to which Project interventions have introduced and tested innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction. These are any processes, tools or practices that add value or solve a problem in new ways. More precisely, the following questions will be answered:

- Was the Project designed specifically to test or lead to innovation, for example by piloting new concepts or technologies? Did the Project test and introduce innovative ideas in the Project target area? What are the characteristics of these innovations? Are these consistent with the IFAD definition of the concept? How did the innovation originate and was it adapted in any particular way during Project design? Are these approaches truly innovative with regard to the local or national contexts?

- Were these innovative approaches carefully monitored and documented? Were these innovations discussed with the Government or other actors? Were these innovative approaches successful? Did these innovations address relevant needs of the rural poor and are these viable?
- Were these innovations adopted by the rural poor, local implementation partners, government entities or any other actors?

Scaling up: The team will assess the extent to which some approaches, technologies or innovative features pilot-tested or successfully implemented by the Project are likely to be up-scaled. It will also assess the likelihood that some Project approaches may be replicated in other geographical areas. More precisely, the team will examine the following aspects:

- How likely is it that the Project - or some of its activities, approaches or innovative technologies - may be replicated in other localities or at the national level by the Government or other donors? Has any component or activity of the Project already been replicated beyond the target area or target group?
- How proactive was Project management, or other stakeholders, in discussing future up-scaling with the Government or other development partners? What are the prospects or obstacles?

Environment and natural resource management: Were the approaches to environment preservation and natural resources management appropriate to local circumstances and were they effective in addressing local problems? Are there positive or negative changes in the natural resources base (forests, water resources) that may be attributable to Project interventions? Did the Project have positive or negative changes – intended or unintended - on the environment? Did it contribute to the protection or rehabilitation of natural and common property resources (land, water and forests)? Has the degree of environmental vulnerability changed?

Adaptation to climate change: Were the approaches for climate change adaptation promoted by the Project appropriate to local circumstances and were they effective? Did the Project manage to empower rural communities to cope with, mitigate or prevent the effects of climate change and natural disasters? Are farming communities more resilient to such disasters and are farming practices better adapted to climate change? Were the coping capacities of vulnerable natural systems restored?

Targeting and outreach: The team will assess the extent to which Project interventions have reached the intended target groups, that is the specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit specific interventions were initially designed and implemented. The team will also assess the effectiveness of the Project targeting strategy. More precisely, the team will examine the following aspects:

- Did the Project reach out to the expected number of beneficiaries in the manner intended? Did the Project provide all anticipated benefits to the specific socio-economic groups identified in the Project Design Document? Were there deviations from initial outreach targets and if so, what were the reasons?
- Was outreach properly monitored in both quantitative (e.g. number of direct and indirect beneficiaries) and qualitative terms (e.g. beneficiaries' socio-economic profile)?
- Did the Project implement a sound targeting strategy? Did the Project regularly analyze the needs, potentials and priorities of intended target groups and the poverty dynamics in the Project target area and developed specific outreach strategies accordingly?
- Were there measures taken to ensure that the poor and vulnerable groups would not be excluded from Project implementation and would benefit from it; and that the non-poor would not capture Project benefits?
- Did the Project implement gender-sensitive implementation approaches? Did the Project ensure equal participation of men and women in implementation? Were there specific measures undertaken in order to promote women participation in Project activities? Did the Project's M&E system track gender-disaggregated data?

3.1.7 Knowledge generation and sharing

The team will assess the quality of the Project knowledge management system established in the course of Project implementation for the generation and sharing of knowledge that could be useful to others. Such knowledge may concern the results of Project innovations or any implementation approaches that were successful – or unsuccessful - in addressing rural poverty issues. More precisely, the team will answer the following questions:

- Did the Project design include an appropriate knowledge management strategy? Was it duly implemented? Did the Project produce any knowledge products? Did it organize knowledge-sharing events and activities? If so, what were the quality, usefulness and outcomes of such events?
- Did the Project implementation process generate any new and relevant knowledge regarding the implementation of pro-poor approaches or rural development issues? Can this knowledge be applied in other contexts?

3.1.8 Performance of implementation partners

The team will assess the performance of each of the various partners involved in Project implementation (*other than IFAD*). These are the organizations or entities directly responsible for Project implementation, for providing strategic guidance and oversight or for the provision of essential services. More precisely, and in addition to determining if all implementation partners have adequately fulfilled their respective roles and responsibilities, the team will examine the following:

- **Service providers:** What was the performance of the main service providers (*such as NGOs, training institutes, business development service providers, participating financing institutions private contractors or contracted government agencies*) involved in service delivery? Were

services delivered in a timely manner? Did service providers adhere to agreed schedules and contracts?

- **Grass-roots institutions:** What was the performance of the grass-roots institutions (CBOs, CIGs, FDACs, CFAs, WRUAs, etc.) involved in daily Project activities, their capacities, motivations, strengths and weaknesses? Were they actively participating in Project implementation? What was the performance of the local-level or decentralised government agencies involved in Project implementation?
- **Central Government agencies:** Did the Executing Agency and Implementing Agency comply with the covenants of the loan agreement and the provisions of the Project Design Document? Were they proactive in supporting Project implementation and identifying solutions to problems? Was the Project Steering Committee fulfilling its role adequately?
- **Co-financiers:** *What was the performance of external Project co-financiers? Was there a timely provision of funds in the level expected? Did co-financing partners adequately support Project implementation, supervision or oversight? Were all co-financiers' procedures (for example for financial reporting, the preparation of progress reports, etc.) harmonized among themselves and with Government's procedures?*

3.1.9 Lessons learned

The team will present the main lessons learned from Project implementation, based on the analysis of what learning from experience may be applicable to a more generic situation. In so doing, the team will refrain from exposing platitudes, keeping in mind the following definition of a lesson learned: “*knowledge or understandings gained by experience which may be positive, as in a successful experiment, or negative, as in a mishap or failure*”. All lessons learnt presented should be significant in that they have a real or assumed impact on operations; valid in that they are factually and technically correct; and applicable in that they identify a specific design, process, or decision that reduces or eliminates the potential for failures and mishaps, or reinforces a positive result. In order to identify these lessons learned, the team may examine the following questions:

- What specific knowledge or lessons can we derive from Project implementation that may be used in the future in similar, or different, contexts?
- What were the Project strengths and its main weaknesses? What were the main opportunities, or threats, in the environment that have facilitated, or constrained, Project implementation?
- With the benefits of hindsight, what are the things that should have been done differently? What are the specific dimensions of the Project design that one should never repeat again in similar contexts or circumstances?

What are the specific aspects of Project implementation that will be worthwhile replicating in future interventions in the country, or elsewhere, because they were particularly interesting or successful?

In the external context, what will be the important conditions required for similar interventions to lead to similar results elsewhere or in the future?

4.0 METHODOLOGY

The PCR team will use a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools in order to make an informed assessment on overall project performance and results. For transparency and accuracy purposes, it is important that the consultation with project stakeholders should be as large and inclusive as possible.

- i) Primary sources of information will include project reports and documents (supervision reports, MTR report, progress reports, AWPB, etc.), M&E data (including logframe data), any surveys or specific studies undertaken by the project, PCT and service providers' records and the records of the groups supported by the project. These sources will be used extensively in order to generate quantitative information on project results or estimate project efficiency.
- ii) In addition to primary sources of information, the team will collect relevant data from secondary sources, such as national and local statistics, other donors' statistics, the civil society, private sector entities (trade associations, universities, etc.). These will be used mainly to breach information gaps on certain issues or to cross-examine the data generated from other sources.
- iii) In case sufficient or reliable impact data is not available, the team should undertake a mini-survey while in the field in order to collect basic information from a small sample of respondents (to be selected using the most appropriate sampling method). To this end, a questionnaire should be developed before the field work starts.
- iv) In addition and in order to gather an in-depth understanding on certain issues, collect stakeholders' feedback and generate important insights, the team will use a variety of qualitative tools, such as key informants' interviews, focus group discussions and rapid case studies. Before starting the field work, it is important that the team dedicates sufficient time to prepare the necessary interview guides.
- v) The method of direct observation will also be used by the team. A large sample of project sites, or locations where project activities took place, will thus be visited in order to collect impressions and feelings, verify that reported interventions took place, confirm that they met expected quality standards and beneficiaries' needs, or to take note of the external context of project intervention. Selection of project sites will require careful consideration in order to avoid biases.
- vi) If found useful, the organization of a stakeholders' workshop either before the beginning of the field work or towards the end of the mission, can be envisaged in order to collect initial feedback on project performance or to share the mission's preliminary findings.

vii) In order to strengthen the analysis and overcome the weaknesses, intrinsic biases and the problems that may be associated with a single method, the team will “triangulate” all findings, combining methods and data sources in order to cross-examine initial findings.

5.0 TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The total duration of the assignment will be up to 30 days from the date of contract signing. Towards the end of the field work, the team will present for discussion its initial findings and conclusions in an Aide-Mémoire, during a wrap-up meeting to be hosted by the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation.

The team will prepare a Project Completion Review report following the outline presented in IFAD’s Project Completion Review Guidelines. The draft PCR report will be circulated among main stakeholders for review and consolidated, and this will be supplemented with PCR validation workshop. The team will revise the draft PCR report based on feedback from this workshop. The final PCR report will be finalized and submitted electronically by the end of the 30 days contract period.

6.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE AND TEAM COMPOSITION

The IFAD Hub Director and the Principal Secretary –Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation, will lead the entire process of the PCR. The logistical organization of the team will be jointly made by IFAD’s Country Project Officer (CPO) and Project Coordinator.

The PCR team will comprise.

1. Task Team Leader (TTL) and Evaluation Specialist - to be contracted by IFAD
2. Agriculture and livestock production expert-To be contracted by Government
3. Targeting, Gender and Youth expert-To be contracted by Government
4. Natural Resources Management/Environment expert-To be contracted by Government
5. Water expert/Engineer-To be contracted by Government
6. Fiduciary Expert-To be contracted by Government
7. Economic and Financial Analysis (EFA) Expert-To be contracted by Government

7.0 SPECIFIC TASKS AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE WATER EXPERTS/ENGINEER

These TORs should be read alongside with the PCR General TORs in section 3.0, which are an integral part of the tasks by individual experts.

- i. Assess the extent to which the outputs under Component 3 (sub-component 1): Sustainable Management of Water Resources have resulted into outcomes and impacts,
- ii. Review the quality of reports on outreach, delivery approaches and impact at beneficiary level and catchment at large,

- iii. Assess the performance and adequacy of staff responsible for the sub-component at design and any changes during implementation,
- iv. Assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the sub-component design/structure, methodology and results for future project implementation/design,
- v. Analyse and document sub-component related impact domains as specified in section 3.0,
- vi. Analyse and document the main lessons learnt relating to the sub-component,
- vii. Assess the sub-component related innovations, potential for scaling up and replication,
- viii. Review the effectiveness of Sub-component’s approaches to environment conservation in addressing the upper Tana catchment environment issues,
- ix. Assess the effectiveness of approaches for climate change adaptation promoted by the Project,
- x. Assess the performance and adequacy of sub-component related Institutions,
- xi. Identify practical approaches required to address the water resources management challenges,
- xii. Provide written inputs for the relevant sections of the Aide Memoire and the PCR.
- xiii. Perform any other task as requested by the TTL.

Expected Outputs

- Contribute to the draft Aide-mémoire that will be finalized by the team leader.
- Contribute to the draft Project Completion Review Report adhering to IFAD’s *Project Completion Review Guidelines* and Format.

Qualifications and Experience:

- Masters in Water Resources Management or above (PhD)
- Bachelors degree in civil engineering, water engineering or Agricultural engineering,
- Relevant experience in the last ten (10) years in the area of planning, supervision, implementation and monitoring of community water resources management related interventions,
- Undertaken three (3) assignments on Water Resources Management for community development projects in midterm reviews, baseline surveys, Impact Assessment Studies or any other related assignments in the last 8 years.
- Undertaken one (1) assignment on Project Completion Review Reports for Government/donor supported Projects with a focus on water resources management,
- Proof/evidence in form of commendations/recommendations on experience in related assignments in the last 8 years in community development Projects.

Evaluation Criteria and Score.

i. Preliminary –

This will be a pass/fail criteria and candidates must pass all to proceed to the technical evaluation

#	Criteria	Yes/No
---	----------	--------

1	All filled and signed appropriately	
2	Copy of valid tax compliance certificate	

ii. Technical Score: -

The contract will be awarded to the highest-ranked technical proposal within the available budgetary limit. Only the highest ranked individual consultant will be invited to submit a combined technical and financial offer, which is then negotiated with the client. However, if negotiations with the individual fail, the Procurement Entity may invite the second ranked individual for negotiations.

WATER EXPERT/ENGINEER		
	CRITERIA	SCORE
1	Masters in Water Resources Management or above (PhD) (0 mark for lack of degree & 15 marks for the degree)	15
2	Bachelors degree in civil engineering, water engineering or Agricultural engineering (0 mark for lack of degree & 10 marks for the degree)	10
3	Relevant experience in the last ten (10) years in the area of planning, supervision, implementation and monitoring of community water resources management related interventions i) Zero (0) mark for lack of specified experience in the last 10 years ii) 5 marks for experience of 1-2 years within the last 10 years iii) 10 marks for experience of 3-5 years within the last 10 years iv) 15 marks for experience of over 5 years within the last 10 years	15
4	Undertaken three (3) assignments on Water Resources Management for community development Projects in midterm reviews, baseline surveys, Impact Assessment Studies or any other related assignments in the last 8 years (6.67 marks for each assignment)	20
5	Undertaken one (1) assignment on Project Completion Review Reports for Government/donor supported Projects with a focus on water resources management 30 marks for one (1) PCR and zero for lack of the same	30
6	Documentary evidence in form of commendations/recommendations on experience in related 3 assignments in the last 8 years in community development Projects 3.33 marks for each evidence	10