

Pangani River Basin Management Project

Terms of Reference for Project Internal Review

1. Background

The World Conservation Union (IUCN) implements a programme of conservation and natural resource management in Eastern Africa. The programme has a focus on freshwater ecosystems and their management and Pangani River Basin in Tanzania is one area of such focus. With financial support from Water and Nature Initiative (WANI), European Commission (EC) and United Nations Development Programme/Global Environmental Facility (UNDP/GEF), Pangani Basin Water Office (PBWO) in partnership with IUCN, has since 2002 been implementing the Pangani River Basin Management Project (PRBMP). Project activities are expected to continue into 2010. Project partners would like to take the opportunity now to formally review the project so as to guide future implementation.

An overview of Project finance, from 2002 is summarised in the table below:

Source	Duration	Funding	Funding US\$
WWC to WANI: Dialogues Pilot Project	2003 - 2004	US\$ 69,875	US\$ 69,875
DfID to WANI: Environmental Flows Pilot Project	2003 - 2005	US\$ 70,000	US\$ 70,000
DfID to WANI: Environmental Economics Pilot Project	2003 - 2005	US\$ 125,000	US\$ 125,000
WANI Pangani Demonstration Site: Development	2002 - 2004	US\$ 70,000	US \$70,000
WANI Pangani Demonstration Site: Implementation	2004 - 2007	US\$ 1,000,000	US\$ 930,000
Government of Tanzania	2004 - 2006	US\$300,000	US \$300,000
EU Water Facility	2006 - 2009	EUR 1,707,822	US\$ 2,218,461
UNDP/GEF Climate Change	2007 - 2010	US\$1,000,000	US\$ 1,000,000
Total:	2002 - 2010		US\$ 4,783,336

Each co-finance had/has a separate Project document starting and ending at different periods. The logframes under the different project components address the same goal and have now been harmonised and combined.

The project goal is to: *strengthen integrated water resources management in the Pangani Basin, including mainstreaming climate change, to support the equitable provision and wise governance of freshwater for livelihoods and environment for current and future generations.*

The project objective is to: *empower water users and managers in Pangani Basin to manage and allocate water resources with consideration for climate change, the environment and other technical information, through consultative processes and the sound framework of an IWRM plan.*

The project has five results it aims to achieve:-

- i) Increased understanding of environmental, economic and social implications of different river flow scenarios under expected climatic conditions and increased capacity to collect and analyze such flow assessment information
- ii) Water Users strengthened and empowered to participate in IWRM and Climate Change adaptation processes through dialogue and decentralized water governance

- iii) Coordination between water and climate change sectors strengthened and lessons learned from project activities scaled up to inform other communities, basins and countries
- iv) Basin Water Office coordinates other sectors and stakeholders in the development of an IWRM Plan
- v) Project implemented effectively & efficiently to the satisfaction of all stakeholders

1.1 Project Implementation Modalities

The project is implemented by Pangani Basin Water Office and IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme. The project office is hosted by PBWO and has two staff, a Project Coordinator and a Project Manager. Close partnership for implementation has also been established with PAMOJA, a national NGO that promotes joint action, with offices in Moshi, and SNV Netherlands Development Organization with branch offices in Arusha. IUCN provides technical advice, management and donor liaison support.

2. Aim and Objectives of the Mid-term Review

This mid-term review is requested by PBWO and IUCN to assess the progress and performance of the Pangani River Basin Management Project. The aim of the review of the Project is to assess project achievements, impacts, and lessons learned. The review has been commissioned at a time when new funding from EU and UNDP GEF has been mobilized in to scale up the work started through the WANI funding. The EU funding aims to support integrated water resource management while the UNDP GEF funds contribute to strengthening capacity of the Basin in adaptation for climate change.

The overall purpose of this review is twofold:

I. Learning and Improvement: It is intended that the outcomes of this mid-term review will provide useful and relevant information to the ongoing scope of work of the partner institutions; explore why the interventions implemented by the project succeeded or not; and provide guidance for implementation mechanisms of subsequent PRBMP interventions to be carried out in the Basin in the next three years.

II. Accountability: The mid-term review is also an instrument for the overall accountability system of the project. Consequently, the review will assess whether or not the project plans were fulfilled and resources were used in a responsible way.

The mid-term review aims at assisting partners to assess sustainability of activities, approaches, and structures initiated or supported by the project, and provide recommendations for the future. Specific objectives of the review will be as follows:

- i. Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation, including assessing the institutional arrangement, partnerships, risk management, M&E and project implementation
- ii. Determining the relevance of the project in relation to the existing needs of the stakeholders and environment,
- iii. Evaluating the impacts of the project and the contribution of the outputs to the overall Purpose,

- iv. Providing guidance on establishment of critical benchmark baselines for impacts assessment
- v. Assessing the long term sustainability of project interventions,
- vi. Identifying lessons learned on the strategic approach (strategic processes and mechanisms chosen to achieve the project objectives),

3. Scope of the mid-term review

Within this framework, specific issues and questions to be addressed will include, but not be limited to, the following:

Effectiveness

- i. Are the activities implemented in accordance with the project plans? If not, why?
- ii. What outputs have been achieved? To what extent do they contribute to the objectives?
- iii. How effective are the approaches and structures in delivering the desired outputs? How can they be improved?
- iv. Do the partner organizations work together effectively? Is the partnership structure effective in achieving the desired outputs?

Efficiency

- i. Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- ii. Are the funds being spent in accordance with project plans and using the right procedures?
- iii. Have there been any unforeseen problems? How well were they dealt with?
- iv. Are the capacities of the partners adequate?
- v. What have been the roles of the partners and staff and are they appropriate?
- vi. Is there an effective process, built into the management structure for self-monitoring and assessment, reporting and reflection?

Relevance

- i. Establish whether or not the design and approach are relevant in addressing the identified needs, issues and challenges
- ii. To what extent is the project contributing to the strategic policies and programmes of IUCN and that of the partners?

Sustainability

- i. Is the approach used likely to ensure a continued benefit after the end of the project?
- ii. Are all key stakeholders sufficiently and effectively involved? Are their expectations met and are they satisfied with their level of participation?
- iii. Are alternative or additional measures needed and, if so, what is required to ensure continued sustainability and positive impact?

Impact

- i. Is the project bringing about desired changes in the behaviour of people and institutions?
- ii. Have there been any unintended positive or negative impacts arising from particular outcomes?

- iii. What could have been the likely situation (of the environment and its management) without the project?

4. Methodology

The methodology for the mid-term review is to be developed through consultation with project partners taking into account the budget and the ToRs. The methodology adopted should update the preliminary issues and questions outlined within the ToRs, specifying the specific review issues, questions, methods of data collection and analysis that will be undertaken. It should encompass a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. It should also allow for wide consultation with all interested partners and stakeholders and should include:

- a) A desktop review of all relevant documentation, including (but not limited to):
 - i. The project document, contracts and related agreements
 - ii. Annual workplans and budgets
 - iii. Progress Reports
 - iv. Technical reports
- b) Face to face interviews and discussions with all key stakeholders involved in the project to ensure that the review is carried out in a participatory manner. A list of key partners and stakeholders would be identified at an early stage (see tentative list - item no. 8 below) and a consultation process developed. All stakeholders consulted should be in a position to present their views in confidence to the team and to identify issues, opportunities, constraints and options for the future
- c) Electronic interviews through teleconference or written comments – e.g. email; where partners cannot be reached for face to face interviews

Pangani Basin Water Office and IUCN will assist with the organisation of meetings and discussions, and inform the relevant stakeholders of the review process and their role in it, well in advance.

5. Review Team Composition

The team will consist of two people, an international evaluation expert with water resources management background, and a national evaluation expert, preferably from the Ministry of Water in Tanzania. The two experts will have complementary skills covering programme design and implementation, programme review, natural resources management especially community participation, policy and institutional processes more so in water resources management. The international expert will be the team leader, with considerable prior experience in evaluation methodologies and principles. The team leader will have the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the evaluation, writing of the report, and timely submission of the draft and final version. Detailed responsibilities of each team member should be determined at the beginning of the mission and outlined in the methodology.

6. Reporting/Feedback

The review team shall be responsible for the following reports, which are to be submitted to PBWO and IUCN:

- i. A report outlining the proposed methodology and detailed responsibilities of each team member to be submitted prior to the onset of the assessment process.
- ii. A findings report, which should include the following:
 - a) An assessment of the performance of the project, based on the project document, contracts and agreements
 - b) Identification of the main lessons learned

7. Timing & Schedule

The mid-term review is scheduled to take place in the month of January-February 2008 (see the detailed itinerary for the field trip below), for a total of 17 working days broken down as follows:

- i. Review of background documentation and preparation of methodology – 2 days
- ii. Discussion and agreement on proposed methodology with project partners – 1 day
- iii. Assessment of project progress and performance – including field visits and interviews with project partners and key stakeholders – 6 days
- iv. Analysis of findings and production of draft report – 5 days
- v. Debriefing - presentation and discussion of findings to project partners - 1 day
- vi. Finalization/revisions of the report and submission – 2 day

8. Project partners and key stakeholders – tentative list.

- i. Pangani Basin Water Office
- ii. Pangani River Basin Management Project Office (hosted by PBWO)
- iii. The Core team members (a sample representation)
- iv. Ministry of Water, Tanzania
- v. SNV the Netherlands Development Organization
- vi. PAMOJA
- vii. IUCN EARO/TCO
- viii. Southern Waters
- ix. IUCN Headquarters
- x. European Commission
- xi. UNDP/GEF: i) UNDP Tanzania Country Office, ii) UNDP/GEF Eastern/Southern Africa (Akiko Hamamoto; Alan Rodgers)

9. Itinerary for the Mid-term Review Team

Day	Time	Activity
1 (Sun)	5.00 P.M	Travel to Moshi, Tanzania by air
2 (Mon)	8.00 – 1.00 P.M	Briefing and presentation of revised review methodology at Pangani Basin Water Office
	2.00 - 5.00P.M	Revision of methodology and preparation for field/partner visits (spend night in Moshi)
3 (Tue)	8.30 – 12.30 pm	Interview with Project Staff
	2.00 – 5.00 pm	Interview with PBW Officer and PBWO staff
		Interview with Core team members based at PBWO (spend night in Moshi)
4 (Wed)	9.000 – 11.00 am	Interview with PAMOJA
	11.00 am	Travel to Arusha
	2.00 – 4.00 pm	Interview with SNV (spend night in Arusha)
5 (Thu)	8.30 am(whole day)	Travel to field sites and hold interviews with Water User Association members (accompanied by the Project staff for introduction and guidance) (spend night in Moshi)
6 (Fri)	8.30 am(whole day)	Travel to field sites and hold interviews with Water User Association members (accompanied by the Project staff for introduction and guidance) (spend night in Moshi)
7 & 8 (Sat – Sun)	7.30 am	Travel to Dar es Salaam
		Information synthesis and analysis (spend night in Dar es Salaam)
9 – 10 (Mon-Tue)	9.00 am at TCO	Telephone Interview i) Southern Waters ii) SNV Dar es Salaam iii) IUCN HQ – Head of Water Programme iv) UNDP GEF (South Africa – Akiko; Nairobi – Alan Rodgers) Interviews with UNDP Dar es Salaam; EC (Petra), Ministry of Water staff and Core team members based in Dar es Salaam Zero draft report writing (spend night in Dar es Salaam)
11 (Wed)	8.30 am	Zero draft report writing
	3.00pm	Travel back to Moshi (spend night in Moshi)
12 (Thur)	10.00am	Debriefing - presentation and discussion of findings to PBWO (spend night in Moshi/Travel back home)

Annex 1. Mid-term Review Report: Suggested Outline

Title page

- Name of project being reviewed
- Name of the organization to which the report is submitted
- Names and affiliations of the reviewers
- Date

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

- Identify those who contributed to the review

List of acronyms

Executive summary

- A self-contained paper of 1-2 pages
- Summarize essential information on the subject being reviewed, the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, methods applied and major limitations, the most important findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order

Introduction

- Describe the project being reviewed. This includes the problems that the interventions are addressing; the aims, strategies, scope and cost of the intervention; its key stakeholders and their roles in implementing the intervention
- Summarize the review purpose, objectives, and key questions. Explain the rationale for selection/non selection of review criteria
- Describe the methodology employed to conduct the review and its limitations if any
- Detail who was involved in conducting the review and what were their roles
- Describe the structure of the review report

Findings and conclusions

- State findings based on the evidence derived from the information collected. Assess the degree to which the intervention design is applying results based management principles. In providing a critical assessment of performance, analyse the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and if possible impact. To the extent possible measure achievement of results in quantitative and qualitative terms. Analyse factors that affected performance as well as unintended effects, both positive and negative. Discuss the relative contributions of stakeholders to achievement of results
- Conclusions should be substantiated by the findings and be consistent with the data collected
- They must relate to the review objectives and provide answers to the evaluation questions
- They should also include a discussion of the reasons for successes and failures, especially the constraints and enabling factors

Lessons learned

- Based on the evaluation findings and drawing from the evaluator(s)' overall experience in other contexts if possible provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well
- Include both positive and negative lessons

Recommendations

- Formulate relevant, specific and realistic recommendations that are based on the evidence gathered, the local context, conclusions made and lessons learned. Discuss their anticipated implications. Consult key stakeholders when developing the recommendations
- List proposals for action to be taken (short and long-term) by the person(s), unit or organization responsible for follow-up in priority order.
- Provide suggested time lines and cost estimates (where relevant) for implementation.

Annexes

- Attach ToR (for the mid-term review)
- List persons interviewed, sites visited.
- List documents reviewed (reports, publications).
- Data collection instruments (e.g., copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.).

Annex 2: Glossary of terminologies

Effectiveness

The extent to which the intervention objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Effectiveness is also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention/project has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact.

Efficiency

A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

Relevance

The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies. Relevance also attempts to explore whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.

Sustainability

The continuation of benefits from an intervention after financial assistance has ended. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Impact

The changes in the environment (Biophysical), and/or lives of people as perceived by them and their partners at the time of evaluation, plus sustainability-enhancing change in their environment to which the project has contributed. Changes can be positive or negative, intended or unintended. In the logframe terminology these "perceived changes" may correspond either to the purpose level or to the goal level of a project intervention.