



Consultancy Ref No: 59/WRAP/NORTH /23-24

RFP FOR CONSULTANCY SERVICES WWF-PAKISTAN

SUBJECT:

**External Midterm Evaluation of “Water Resource
Accountability in Pakistan (WRAP)”**

TERM OF REFERENCE

1: Background of the Project

The Nature Based Solutions (NbS) project, under FCDO's Water Resource Accountability in Pakistan (WRAP) programme aims to protect the integrity and health of natural ecosystems by developing institutional capacities for better management of resources and engaging local stakeholders for building their climate resilience and by mainstreaming Nature-based Solutions (NbS) in northern Pakistan's water management for improved water resources management and livelihood improvement. The project leads to a) improved resilience of vulnerable communities to climate induced disasters; b) increased capacity of water-stressed communities to efficiently manage and conserve water; c) enhanced recharge of groundwater; d) improved biodiversity, habitat conservation, and other ecosystem services e.g. carbon sequestration; e) climate-adapted alternative livelihoods for local communities; f) and set a new benchmark for integrated flood risk management that combines scalable green and grey infrastructure approaches in Pakistan. To drive a paradigm shift towards mainstreaming NbS into provincial adaptation plans across Government entities, a multidisciplinary, and a well-coordinated approach will be ensured through continued capacity enhancement of government leadership. An integrated water resource and river basin management approach will help with rehabilitation of springs and water channels, flash flood mitigation and diversion, and regulate water availability in the target sites. The project will explore a range of approaches and technologies (interventions) that will draw on local and international good practices to improve water quality and access.

Component 1 of the project deals with Ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction, integrated water resource management and water governance to improve communities' resilience to climate change impacts. This entails working in collaboration with relevant government departments for aligning NbS interventions with the district and sub-national adaptation plans, resilience building of communities through NbS interventions, facilitating trainings and setting up of demonstration models for communities to enhance capacity for flood and other climate induced risk reduction, preparedness and response among key stakeholders. In order to ensure that the NbS interventions are sustained and continue to function effectively, the project ensures that climate-adapted, community-based natural resource management is implemented locally to contribute towards improving ecosystem restoration, water and food security, and climate-adapted livelihoods, thus increasing the resilience of ecosystem and vulnerable communities.

Component 2 focuses on building a case for inclusion of NbS in policy and planning by documenting case studies and impacts from Component 1. These case studies and key learnings will be disseminated among key stakeholders for integration across government plans and policies, and replication of NbS in other districts of the country. The project will strengthen institutional capacity for employing NbS, in collaboration with partners and other stakeholders across government departments and communities for improved water governance and integrated water resource management. The project will facilitate

coordination for integration of NbS within government planning documents and efforts will be made for effective water governance and improved integrated water resource management. A multi-stakeholder platform for NbS for IWRM and Water Governance will be established for coordination within and across provinces and sectors.

2: Outcomes and Outputs of the Project

Outcome 1.1: Nature-based Solutions (NbS) introduced for integrated water resource management, river basin management, and watershed management protection

- 1.1.1 Site specific Nature-based Solutions (NbS) finalized
- 1.1.2 Ecosystem restoration in selected sites (and associated watershed) through engineering and bio-engineering solutions
- 1.1.3 Development and Implementation of site-specific NbS implementation framework, social and environmental management plans.

Outcome 1.2: Adaptive capacity of communities vulnerable to climate change induced risks is strengthened

- 1.2.1 Increased water security for enhancing communities' resilience towards climate induced risks
- 1.2.2 Strengthened local social institutions to promote climate smart best water management practices
- 1.2.3 Improved socio-economic resilience among target communities through livelihoods enhancement

Outcome 1.3: Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) approach mainstreamed to implement and maintain NbS

- 1.3.1 Develop community-based natural resource management (NRM) plans for improving the health and integrity of ecosystems and supporting sustainable livelihoods
- 1.3.2 Implementing NRM plans to demonstrate and maintain NbS interventions for providing sustained economic benefits to the communities while ensuring resilient ecosystems
- 1.3.3 Educating and sensitizing communities, students, tourists, and others stakeholder on sustainable water management practices

Outcome 2.1: Building the Case for Policy Integration and Scaling-up of NbS for Improved Water Governance and Integrated Water Resource Management

- 2.1.1 Developing an evidence-based case for NbS integration in provincial and federal policies and plans to ensure its maintenance and sustainability

2.1.2 Strengthening institutional capacity for scaling up NbS approaches at national and sub-national level

Outcome 2.2: National enabling environment for improved water resource management

2.2.1 Facilitating inter-departmental coordination for integrating NbS framework in the development of local and sub-national adaptation plans

2.2.2 Leveraging partnerships and complementarities for improved water governance and IWRM

3: Objectives of Midterm Evaluation

The objective of this external midterm evaluation is to systematically and objectively assess the design, implementation and outcomes of the WRAP project, with particular emphasis on relevance, timeliness, efficiency, effectiveness, adaptive management, impact and sustainability overall ensuring a responsible exit for both WWF and FCDO. The evaluation is also aimed to assess qualitatively as well as quantitatively, the project achievements against targets and milestones, on cost benefits analysis or value for money analysis, and where appropriate, can estimate the overall impacts. The evaluation also aims to specifically and independently assess the achievements of the project against the milestones of log frame and targets of work plan.

4: Principles of Evaluation

The evaluation should strive to comply with the principles outlined below

Useful	Provides clear opportunities to influence change, and findings are timed to inform internal or external decision making Asks useful, well-defined questions that are feasible to answer Considers use of evaluation findings throughout design, implementation and beyond finalization of the evaluation, including recommendations which are actionable and have practical implications for adaptations. Engages internal and external stakeholders, provides opportunities for mutual learning, representation of different groups and recognition of context, and to inform decision making for other stakeholders Works with evaluation respondents, ensuring participation in processes as appropriate and strong mechanisms for feedback
Credible	Includes appropriate level of objectivity, through commissioning independent evaluators, and/or through involving independent figures in steering and peer reviewing both the design and outputs of the evaluation. Seeks to represent the diversity of people that FCDO's work is designed to benefit and involve them in evaluation work where feasible.

	<p>Ensures processes and products are transparent to the extent possible, and teams are accountable for the findings and related follow-up actions.</p> <p>Aligns with partnership principles as relevant, for example commitments in the Paris Declaration, Accra and Busan Agreements and Sustainable Development Goals aim to strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.</p>
Robust	<p>Applies approach and methodology that are feasible and appropriate, reliable and replicable, and stand up to independent scrutiny from design stage.</p> <p>Engages right expertise in design, implementation, analysis and quality assurance.</p> <p>Aligns with best practice in evaluation quality standards, such as the Magenta book and relevant DAC criteria, quality standards and principles.</p> <p>Ensures design and implementation take into account contextual factors, including conflict and Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) dynamics.</p> <p>Has suitable management and governance structures in place</p>
Proportionate	<p>Aligns level of investment in evaluation to level of scrutiny required, type of learning needed and availability of resources</p> <p>Applies approaches that meet the learning need, in terms of scope, budget, timeline, participation, context and questions to be answered</p> <p>Uses experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations only where it is feasible to apply this type of method, on a high priority intervention or topic, and where there is a clear evidence gap and need for new rigorous studies.</p> <p>Demonstrates value for money</p>
Safe and Ethical	<p>Considers balance of benefits and risks and takes action to mitigate risk</p> <p>Aligns to FCDO safeguarding rules and Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework of WWF Network.</p> <p>Contributes to strengthening availability of disaggregated data and evidence,</p> <p>Ensures respect and dignity of people affected by the subject of the evaluation, their equitable participation in the evaluation and the dissemination of findings to them; follows best practice in ethical research, as outlined in FCDO Ethical Research, Evaluation and Monitoring guidance.</p> <p>Adheres to GDPR rules or equivalent in data management practices</p>

5: Minimum Standards of Compliance for Evaluation

The following minimum standards of compliance for evaluation are in place to help achieve the principles outlined in section 5 above, upholding a high quality in evaluations and maximizing learning in FCDO funded projects. The standards are focused around (1)

publication and (2) independent quality assurance. At a minimum, and recognizing the cases for application and exceptions outlined in the table, the standards must be adhered to when commissioning an external evaluation or providing funds towards a partner-managed and commissioned external evaluation. However, all FCDO evaluations (including internal) should aim to uphold these standards, in a proportionate and feasible manner, and should justify where they have not been applied. For further details on minimum standards follow the link; [FCDO evaluation policy - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/evaluation-policies).

6: Criteria of Evaluation

The Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), will be followed to conduct the midterm evaluation of the WRAP Project which will specifically focus on the below standards.

Relevance

- How well the project was designed in terms of its relevance towards achieving the set objectives and to what extent the proposed interventions were relevant to community needs?
- Consider in light of the actual progress made whether the theory of change continues to provide a sound basis for programme interventions and if any changes are required.
- How did the project respond to the priority needs of target communities, including how these needs were identified and addressed?
- Has the ESSF enabled due adherence to WWF's social policies on human rights and gender
- Does the project/programme make a clearly aligned and meaningful contribution to Global Practice Outcomes of WWF Network, SDGs and national priorities?

Coherence

- Does this project have internal coherence, such that the project interventions create synergies and interlinkages with other interventions in country/landscape?
- Do the project interventions provide an added value and complement/coordinate with other donors and sector' interventions in the same context/landscape including FCDO and WWF own projects?

Effectiveness

- To what extent are the results that are reported a fair and accurate record of achievement?
- Review the quality of data underpinning programme monitoring and decision making.
- To what extent the project achieved its midterm objectives?
- To what extent has the project delivered results against set milestones and targets of the work plan?

- What were the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?
- To what extents the project's partnerships were effective for the execution of the project?
- How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?

Efficiency

- To what extent did WWF-Pakistan deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?
- To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?
- To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
- Was the process of achieving results efficient OR could a different approach have produced better results?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the project implementation process?

Impact

- Assess social, economic, environmental and policy level impacts of the project at all appropriate scales—local, landscape, national, regional, and present evidence
- What are the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended?
- How confident can we be that that WWF activities contributed to the perceived change? What is the likelihood that these changes would have occurred in the absence of the project/programme?

Adaptive Management

- Did the team examine good practice lessons from other conservation/development experiences and consider these experiences in the project/programme design? How well was the complaints mechanism followed – and the concerns of local people addressed?
- Did the project/programme establish a baseline status of conservation targets and key milestones? Is there ongoing systematic monitoring of these targets and milestones?
- Review the risks and assumptions in the NbS proposal and logframe, including fiduciary risk, how these are monitored and the adequacy of risk mitigation measures in place
- How learnings are integrated into future plans and implementation approaches?

Sustainability

- To what extent has the project engaged relevant stakeholders and communities in the implementation of the project?
- Was any mechanism developed and implemented by the project which ensures that the benefits delivered by the project are sustained after project completion?

What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?

- How effective is the proposed exit strategies, and approaches?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?

7: Evaluation Summary Table

The Evaluators will assign the project a score assessing the extent to which the project embodies the description of strong performance as described below:

5 - Excellent, 4 - Good, 3 - Sufficient, 2 - Low, 1 - None at all N/A – Not Applicable D/I – The criterion was considered, but data were insufficient to assign a rating or score.

Evaluators are also supposed to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report.

Criteria	Description of Performance	Evaluator Score	Evaluator brief Justification
Relevance and Quality of Design	1. The project addresses the necessary factors in the local context to bring about positive changes in conservation elements, biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services) and human wellbeing		
	2. The project has rigorously applied key design tools including involvement of partners and community members, as appropriate, in the design		
	3. The project has identified the right opportunities or strategies to respond to key threats		
Coherence	The project interventions are synergistic with and provide value to other interventions by the same actor in-country. They also are harmonized and consistent with other actors' interventions in the same context		
Efficiency	1. Most/all project activities have been delivered with efficient use of human &		

	financial resources and with strong value for money.		
	2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently		
Effectiveness	1. Most/all intended outcomes for mid period were attained.		
	2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed to this project		
Impact	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, ecological processes, human wellbeing were realised.		
	2. WWF actions have contributed to the perceived changes		
Sustainability	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.		
	2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed - as relevant		
Adaptive Management	1. Project results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.		
	2. The project team, involving key stakeholders, uses these findings, as well as those from related projects/ efforts, to strengthen its work and performance		
	3. Learning is documented and shared for project/programme and wider learning		

8: Evaluation report structure

To support more systematic recording of evaluation findings to advance WWF's broader organisational learning, all evaluators should follow, to the extent possible, the evaluation report structure below. These provide standardised frameworks for summarising evaluation findings and support sharing results internally and externally.

Title Page

Report title, project or programme title, and contract number (if appropriate), Date of report, authors and their affiliation, locator map (if appropriate)

Executive Summary (between 2 to 4 pages)

Principal findings and recommendations, organised by the core evaluation criteria from the TOR.

Table of Contents**List of Acronyms and Abbreviations*****Body of the report (perhaps no more than 25 pages)*****A. Introduction (max 3 pages)**

- Concise presentation of the project/programme characteristics
- Purpose, objectives, and intended use of the evaluation (reference and attach the ToR as an annex)
- Evaluation methodology and rationale for approach (reference and attach as annexes the mission itinerary; names of key informants; a list of consulted documents; and any synthesis tables containing project/programme information used in the exercise; limitations of the methodology/evaluation.)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

B. Project/Programme Overview (max 5 pages)

- Concise summary of the project or programme's history, evolution, purpose, objectives, and strategies to achieve conservation goals (attach theory of change including conceptual model, results chain or logical framework and project monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Summarise WWF's main interest in this project or programme

C. Evaluation Findings (4-6 pages)

- Findings and lessons learned organised by each of the selected core evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale.
- Tables, graphics, and other figures to help convey key findings

D. Recommendations for this project (3-5pages)

- Recommendation organised each of the core evaluation criteria and the findings, including sufficient but concise rationale – recommendations should be specific, actionable and numbered.
- Suggestions for any modifications to the project theory of change.
- Project/programme performance rating tables to provide a quick summary of performance and to facilitate comparison with other projects/programmes (see the Summary Table Part B, below).

Annexes

- Terms of Reference

- Evaluation methodology detail
- Itinerary with key informants
- Documents consulted
- Project/programme theory of change/ logical framework/ conceptual model/ list of primary goals and objectives
- Specific project/programme and monitoring data, as appropriate
- Summary tables of progress towards outputs, objectives, and goals
- Maps
- Recommendations summary table

9: Eligibility Criteria for Consultants

- An evaluation specialist with more than ten years of experience in programme/project evaluation in an international development context.
- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation and strong data analysis skills.
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches including quantitative and qualitative research methods.
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience of water governance, integrated water resource management, local livelihoods, environment and conservation
- Consideration of the extent to which the evaluator or evaluation team has appropriate knowledge/experience of working in Pakistan. This includes language proficiency to conduct the evaluation required or that resources be made available (e.g. translator etc) to enable the evaluation to proceed smoothly.
- Knowledge of Value for Money analysis OR cost benefit analysis of projects
- Experience of working with FCDO funded projects will be an advantage
- Familiarity with the standards of FCDO and WWF-Pakistan

10: How to Apply

Only electronic applications will be accepted. Please send your proposals along with required documents to the following

[To: Faiza khan \(fkhan@wwf.org.pk\)](mailto:fkhan@wwf.org.pk)

[Cc: Muzzammil Ahmed \(mahmed@wwf.org.pk\)](mailto:mahmed@wwf.org.pk)

Proposals submitted after deadline will not be considered. The deadline for submission of proposals is **30th November 2023**. The assignment is expected to be started in **first week of January 2024** and will complete by **mid-March 2024**.

The requirements for proposal submission contain

- I. Curriculum Vitae (CV) of consultant and co consultants (if any) showcasing relevant experience and how they would apply it to this work?
- II. Organization profile (in case of a firm)

- III. Technical proposal (proposed tools, sampling criteria, detailed methodology for Evaluation, timeline, work plan, professional bio data of consultant, etc.)
- IV. Detailed financial proposal
- V. Find prescribed application format at [Consultancy Assignments \(www.wwf.org.pk\)](http://www.wwf.org.pk)

12: Duration of Assignment

The timeline for the execution of this assignment is **75** days; starting from **1st January 2024** and will be ending by **March 15, 2023**. A minimum **10% penalty** will be imposed in case of not meeting the deadline/requirements.

13: Budget

Total Budget for this consultancy is **PKR 3 Million** Inclusive of all taxes and out of pocket expenses