

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final evaluation of

Improved Drinking Water Supply for Kiritimati Island - Contribution agreement FED/2013/328-527

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1 – Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Resilience

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi - CRIS reference number 2018/401033/1

Contracting Authority: the European Union Delegation to the Pacific

1 BACKGROUND2

1.1 RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND2

1.2 THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED.....3

1.3 STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION4

1.4 OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION.....4

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT4

2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION5

2.2 REQUESTED SERVICES6

2.3 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS9

2.4 SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER).....12

2.5 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION13

2.6 LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT.....13

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED.....13

3.1 NUMBER OF EXPERTS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY13

3.2 EXPERTISE REQUIRED.....14

3.3 PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING14

4 LOCATION AND DURATION14

4.1 STARTING PERIOD14

4.2 FORESEEN DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT IN CALENDAR DAYS14

4.3 PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF15

4.4 LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT.....15

5 REPORTING.....15

5.1 CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION15

5.2 USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS16

5.3 COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS.....16

5.4 ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY16

5.5 LANGUAGE.....16

5.6 NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES16

5.7 FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....16

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA17

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM18

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY19

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE21

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....22

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)26

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

The Republic of Kiribati is scattered over 33 islands across 5 million sq km of the Pacific, however its land area is only 811 sq km, of which 40% is on the island of Kiritimati (also known as “Christmas Island”), the world’s largest coral atoll, located in the eastern Line & Phoenix Islands. The capital, Tarawa, is in the western Gilbert Islands. Kiribati has few natural resources (copra, phosphate, fish), and its soil is infertile (low water holding capacity and low nutrient and organic content), so it is unsuitable for agriculture. The country depends on foreign aid (all major donors are represented there), fishing licences, tourism and remittances.

Kiritimati is administered by the **Ministry of Line and Phoenix Islands Development (MLPID)** and is a low lying coral atoll with an area of approximately 640km comprising lagoons and land area rising to about 4 meters above sea level. A population of approximately 6356 people live in the main villages of Poland, Banana, Main Camp, Tabwakea, Tennessee and London with 73 per cent residing at Tabwakea, Tennessee and London. Kiritimati is located in an equatorial dry zone (8 months or more per year without rain) with limited groundwater resources that do not replenish quickly. Even when it rains, there is only very little surface run-off to collect, because the soil on the atoll is porous. Drinking water supplies are also under pressure because Kiritimati has been witnessing population growth through immigration from the Gilbert Islands since the 1950s-60s.

In the later decades of the 20th century, as the Gilbert Islands were getting more crowded, the higher land-to-population ratio on Kiritimati also promised better living conditions, generating population growth rates of up to 8% (2005) although they have abated since 2% in 2015). The population now stands at 6,500 people or 1,016 households. The Government of Kiribati has been promoting migration to Kiritimati by designating it as a “national growth centre” since 2004 and the **Kiribati Development Strategy 2016-2019 (KDP)** and the recently approved **Kiribati Vision for the next 20 years (KV20)**, hoping to alleviate overcrowding in the Gilberts and to stimulate economic growth through a housing and infrastructure construction boom on the island. There is a good potential for fisheries (construction of a transshipment hub), development of eco-tourism and sport fishing. To materialise its ambition, in 2017 the Government of Kiribati opened up 2,370 new land leases in Kiritimati. Of those, almost 600 land leases have already been awarded and 534 families are expected to settle in Kiritimati in the coming months. More than 30% of applications received so far are from applicants living on Tarawa. According to recent MLPID figures, around 1,836 new leases are planned to be awarded by mid-2019, which would correspond to around 10,000 additional residents. The government resettlement plan is not progressing in parallel with adequate investments in basic services (mainly WASH) and there is an urgent need to meet the growing population's basic expectations. This situation requires actions at both infrastructure and institutional/governance level to ensure long-term sustainability of existing and new investments in the water sector.

There are four major groundwater lenses on Kiritimati Island with the Decca and Four Wells water lenses supplying the main population residing at Tabwakea and London that can support a population of around 6,000 people. The groundwater lens at Banana can support a population of 7,000 people and the ground water lens at New Zealand Airfield located at Poland is able to support a maximum population of approximately 9,800 people.

Although there is, hydrologically speaking, enough drinking water on the island as a whole to support even up to 21,700 inhabitants (ADB, 2007), the current settlement pattern is concentrated on the north-western tip of the island where in the 1950s-60s, the UK and US military units were housed. But that is not where most of the groundwater is located, which is in lenses to the further south, in environmentally protected areas which are not considered attractive for inhabitation. The lenses supporting the north-western parts were not managed effectively for decades, generating low available quantities. Supply was unreliable, with

up to 50% of water lost in defective pipes and 1-2 hours of tap water supply per day per household. Local Government and community participation in water management was dormant and no-one knew how much water was left in the lenses, esp. the two (Decca and Four Wells) near the priority areas of London and Tennessee (population 1,953 or 360 households) where Government, businesses, schools and the hospital are located.

The Action **Improved Drinking Water Supply for Kiritimati Island** seeks to address these problems by working with communities and the Ministry of Line and Phoenix Island Development ("MLPD") through the Water and Sanitation Division ("WSD") to improve the supply and management of drinking water and the understanding of the sustainability of potable groundwater resources. The direct beneficiaries are the Tennessee and London villages and local Government. The wider target group is the entire population of the island (through the water awareness activities, and in as much as they use the hospital located in London).

1.2 The Action to be evaluated¹

Title of the Action to be evaluated	Improved Drinking Water Supply for Kiritimati Island
Budget of the Action to be evaluated	EUR 4,726,136
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated	FED/2013/328-527
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start: 12/12/2013 • End: 11/12/2018

The **overall objective** is to improve living conditions (including health services), reduce poverty and further economic development on Kiritimati.

The **project purpose** is to improve the capacity of Government to secure a safe and sustainable drinking water supply on Kiritimati island communities, including increased access in the priority areas of Tennessee and London.

Three main results are envisaged:

- Result 1 – “Improved Government and community participation in the management of Kiritimati’s drinking water supplies, including the management of drinking water safety and water use efficiency”;
- Result 2 - “Improved understanding of the condition and sustainability of Kiritimati's island potable groundwater resources”;
- Result 3 - “Improved quality, quantity and reliability of potable water supplied to the priority areas of London and Tennessee”.

The **Action is implemented** by the Pacific Community through its Geoscience, Maritime and Energy Division. The Pacific Community is an international development organisation owned and governed by its 26 countries and territory members. SPC is headquartered in New Caledonia (with a sub-office in Fiji) and a team on the ground in Kiritimati

The **Action is jointly financed** with the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade that in 2017 top-up the EU funding with additional 135,384 EUR to purchase 6 solar pumps and complement ongoing EU-funded works.

¹ The term ‘Action’ is used throughout the report as a synonym of ‘project and programme’.

The **Action is jointly managed** with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MFED) and the MLPID under the Financing Agreement (Decision) between the EU and the Republic of Kiribati.

The **Action is implemented** through the Water and Sanitation Division, Disaster and Community Resilience Programme of the Pacific Community (SPC).

A **Project Management Unit (PMU)** is permanently based in Kiritimati Island, with an office within MLPID as the lead national implementing agency. The project works closely with the WSD/MLPID, in implementing project activities. Other key implementing partners are the Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE) and the Kiritimati island Council that are represented on the Project Steering Committee. The SPC Water and Sanitation Division also provides technical support to the project.

The project was designed to help the Government of Kiribati to reach Goal 6 of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (“Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all”) and the water component of the “Human Right to Water and Sanitation”. The project also supports the goals of the **National Water Resources Policy and Implementation Plan (2009)** which provides a framework for coordinated action in the provision of water services, as well as the **London and Phoenix Islands Integrated Development Strategy (LPIDS, 2016-2036)**, where “Food and Water Security” is explicitly mentioned as one of eight priorities supply; the need to understand the current condition and maximum sustainable yields of the groundwater resources on the island; and the need to physically rehabilitate/extend the dilapidated reticulated drinking water supply system which existed in the settlements of London and Tennessee (built in 2000 through the Australian (DFAT) funded “Kiritimati Water and Sanitation Project”, KWASP).

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

The **main stakeholders** are: the EU Delegation to the Pacific, MLPID, the Kiritimati Island Council, the UNIMANE (traditional group of elders), Women's' groups, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE), MFAT, the Public Utilities Body (PUB).

The **target groups** of the project are 220 households in the settlements of London and Tennessee, two schools (although the project has worked with all schools on the island), the only hospital, and MLPD/WSD. The **final beneficiaries** are the wider population of the island in as much as they use the hospital, schools or work in the project area. The project responds to the need for more and better Government and community participation in the management of its drinking water.

1.4 Other available information

The project has been monitored in 2016 and 2017: 2 ROM reports are available. Annual and quarterly activity reports are also available together with the Steering committee's reports. These documents will be shared with the contractor after the signature of the contract.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final
Coverage	The Action in its entirety
Geographic scope	Kiritimati Island, Republic of Kiribati
Period to be evaluated	The entire period of the Action: from 12/12/2013 to date

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority² of the European Commission³. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**⁴ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.⁵

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:

- An overall assessment of the WASH policy assuming the absorption capacity of the new immigrants from outer islands;
- An overall assessment of the institutional capacity to guarantee investment sustainability and ensure population could enjoy its right to free water in the long term (maintenance, metering, revenue collection...);
- An overall assessment of the past performance of the **Improved Drinking Water Supply for Kiritimati Island**, paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve future Actions;

In particular, this evaluation will serve to understand the performance of the Action, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results as to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Actions in the same sector.

The main users of this evaluation will be will be the National Authorising Officer, the MFED, MLPID, MISE, the PUB, SPC, EU Delegation, New Zealand MFAT and other development partners involved in these sectors.

² COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

³ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁴ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁵ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in the Pacific and in the Republic of Kiribati, with other EU policies and Member State Actions and other donors mainly New Zealand, Australia, World Bank, Asian Development Bank and Japan.

And in addition:

- *The matching of the needs of national and local partners;*
- *The materialisation of the expected results (or perhaps only some of them) and their facilitating and contrasting factors;*
- *The performance of the management and its capacity to adapt to changing conditions.*
- *The governing mechanisms of the Action;*
- *The involvement and appropriation of the line Ministries (MLPID, MISE, MFED);*
- *The contribution to SDGs (5, 6, 11, 13,)*
- *The sustainability of the Action and – more generally - of the sustainability of any action in the WASH sector - with particular attention to institutional arrangements, asset management, budget allocation, technical capacities.*

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

The evaluation will also pay particular attention to the next steps, future actions as the EU and Kiribati has confirmed their partnership in the WASH sector for the next cycle of cooperation. Lessons learnt and main recommendations to guide formulation are of key importance.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁶ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

⁶ *The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.*

Relevance – (Problems and needs)

The consultants will, amongst others, assess the following:

The relevance of national and local priorities, strategies, methodologies, activities and overall approach to achieve the main objective "improve living conditions (including health services), reduce poverty and further economic development on Kiritimati".

More specifically, the evaluators should make an assessment of the contribution of the action to:

- Improving Government skills and increase community participation in the management of Kiritimati's drinking water supplies;
- Improving Government skills in performing routine monitoring of water lenses;
- Improving water supply system for better access to clean water;
- Improving communities understanding of their role to ensure water lenses' sustainability and of the importance of clean water for their health.

Efficiency (Sound management and value for money)

Evaluate the efficiency with which the activities of the project have been undertaken in order to yield project results. The following aspects should be considered:

- To what extent was the programme run/delivered in an efficient way?
- To what extent were implementation arrangements adequate in terms of management, coordination and human resources? What type of administrative, financial or managerial challenges did the programme face and to what extent has it affected planning and delivery?
- To what extent were the resources made available sufficient for the planned interventions for the programme?

Effectiveness (Achievement of purpose):

The evaluation will analyse the relationship between the purpose of the project and results achieved. The following questions should assist with the assessment of the effectiveness of the project:

- To what extent are the activities and outputs consistent with the objectives of the project and do the activities meet the objectives and results set out in the project (as outlined in the logical framework)?
- What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from products and services delivered?
- To what extent have the identification, design and implementation processes, including outreach involved communities, local and national stakeholders as appropriate?
- To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted on the effectiveness of work and projects implemented?
- To what extent did the project succeed in integrating a gender₁ perspective?
- How were other cross-cutting issues such as youth, climate change and human rights considered in the design and implementation of activities?

Impact (Achievements of wider effects)

The evaluators will analyse to the extent possible the foreseen and unforeseen action impacts, whether they be positive or negative. Consultant will, if possible, compare the scenario immediately prior to the implementation of the project with the achievements at end of the project.

Based on the results of the projects to date, the evaluator will assess the impact of the actions in the following areas:

- Impact on the capacity of the Government – mainly the line Ministries - and the local communities to ensure sustainable management of the water resources.
- Coherence between the action and other activities conducted by other donors in the Countries and in Kiritimati.

Sustainability (Likely continuation of achieved results)

The evaluator will assess the potential for the overall sustainability of the action beyond project life-time. The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes/proposed outcomes of the actions and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends or non-funding support interventions (such as: policy dialogue, coordination). The following questions should assist with the assessment of the effectiveness of each project:

- To what extent are the outputs delivered and results achieved so far sustainable?
- To what extent has the training and awareness raising activities at the institutional and community levels resulted in the acceptance by beneficiaries of the water project deliverables?
- What are the key factors for sustainability and broad-based ownership of the water project deliverables, and for mainstreaming these into national and local policies and activities?
- What are the opportunities for up-scaling and replication of the programme approach and components?
- Which unmet needs would be relevant to consider for delivering future sustainable water and WASH solutions in Kiritimati and Line Island group?

In addition, particular emphasis should be given to:

Community Acceptance and Ownership

- This important component of sustainability needs to be assessed in all relevant target groups. Did the target groups feel the outputs of the project were relevant to their needs?

Appropriate Technology - equipment

- Is the technology / equipment offered adequate to the capacity and needs of the target groups?
- Is the capacity building offered adequate to the capacity and needs of the target groups?

Institutional and Management Capacity

- Assess the commitment of all parties involved, such as communities, governments, (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) to use the strengthened capacity in contributing towards sustainability of their climate change action.
- Is the institutional framework in place adequate to ensure sustainable management of water resources (in term of budget allocation, internal organisation, division of labours amongst line ministries, number and quality of the staff)

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

- Inception
- Desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The Dissemination phase will be undertaken by the EU Delegation that will share the results with partners, the Country and regional organisations. The expert recruited under the assignment will include in the draft and final report good quality pictures to accompany his/her analysis with images. This will facilitate an easier understanding for all users.

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Inception interviews Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (of the Intervention Logic (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home based review • Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority – EU Delegation - and the Implementing partner in Suva, Fiji Islands. • Inception Note • Meeting with Reference Group
<u>Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase • Methodological design of the Field Phase 	
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial meetings at country level with stakeholders, targeted beneficiaries • Gathering of primary evidence with the most appropriate techniques • Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intermediary Field Note • Slide Presentation • Debriefing with the line Ministries and implementing partners in Kiritimati • Debriefing with the EUD and the implementing partners possibly in conference call

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and <i>meetings</i>
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations • Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Report • Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module • Final Report

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in Suva, FIJI, between the EUD, the Reference Group and the evaluators. Half-day presence of evaluators is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to Kiribati in the water sector, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix⁷, which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

⁷ The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Note**; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action especially any evaluations and research studies carried out by civil society, Government, other donors (especially EU Member States) and/or the private sector. This is to ensure a more robust approach to identifying information gaps and to ensure complementarity with evaluations that have already been done.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected phone and face-to-face] interviews with the project management, the relevant EU services in Suva and key partners in Suva and Kiritimati island may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

A presentation by the evaluation team to the Reference Group, if needed, will take place in Suva. One day presence of evaluator is required (excluding travel time).

2.3.4 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of Inception Note by the Evaluation Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the project management, and other relevant stakeholders: Ministry of Line and Phoenix Island Development, Island Council, faith organisations, local grass-root associations.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies – Ministry of health, Ministry of Environment and Land. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the project management, the EU Delegation, the Reference Group.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5

2.3.5 *Synthesis Phase*

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in by in person or by videoconference/teleconference the **Draft Final Report** to the EUD and Reference Group (implementing partner) to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence of the evaluator is required

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.4 **Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)**

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Delegation, National Authorizing Officer and line Ministries (MLPID, MISE, PUB) of the beneficiary Country.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Cat II	1	30	20

The expert (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Cat II expert, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than **30 working days, out of which 20 in the field.**

3.2 Expertise required

Master's Degree in **natural resource management or similar relevant fields**; or Bachelor's degree in natural resource management or similar relevant fields with at least 6 years relevant work experience

Proved expertise in programme management; monitoring and evaluation experience building on the results-based management approach.

The consultant should have:

- Ability to present credible findings derived from evidence and putting conclusions and recommendations supported by the findings;
- Specific knowledge and understanding of the organizational and institutional context of urban basic services/ WASH;
- Specialized knowledge of projects or programmes in the field of urban basic services, water, sanitation, hygiene and community engagement;

Anthropological background in island communities of Micronesia is desirable.

Minimum requirements for the Cat. II expert:

- 6 years of experience in evaluation;
- 6 years of experience in evaluating WASH, environmental/climate change projects;
- Demonstrable understanding of the following areas of climate change, adaptation, WASH, environment
- Familiarity with approaches to development in small communities in Pacific remote area is desirable.

Language skills of the team:

- English: expert shall possess a C2 level expertise;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at

<https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is mid-November 2018.

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: **90 calendar days.**

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions and distribution of outputs.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff⁸

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Note). The ‘Indicative dates’ are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as ‘0’).

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Fiji and Republic of Kiribati, Kiritimati Island and tentatively South-Tarawa (to be confirmed during the Inception phase).

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Report Note	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods ○ Consultation strategy ○ Field visit approach • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan 	End of Inception Phase
Intermediary Report	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities conducted during the field phase • Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted • Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field ones) 	End of the Field Phase
Draft Final Report	20 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase

⁸ As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	20 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 2 paper copies and in electronic version (USB) at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services n. 2018/401033/1

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1 – Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Resilience

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price⁹.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	40
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	20
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	60
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

⁹ For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper for the Republic of Kiribati and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action
- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module - two distinct documents: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

“This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission”.

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (optional)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

Please remember that the following table **is not to be filled by you** but rather by the framework contractors as an integral part of their offer.



This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹⁰		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹⁰ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources



- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

5. Usefulness of recommendations

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:



- Lessons are identified
- When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments
Final comments on the overall quality of the report	
Overall score	

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

Project Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions & Risks
Objective Improved living conditions (including health services), reduced poverty and increased economic development on Kiritimati Island.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30% of population on Kiritimati Island will have access to safe drinking water by 2017. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic and poverty indicators. MDG indicators & targets. Project reports. 	<p>There is Government ownership for active involvement from relevant Government departments in implementing the project.</p>
Purpose Improved capacity of Government to secure a safe and sustainable drinking water supply on Kiritimati Island communities, including increased access in the priority areas of Tennessee and London.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75% of households (220 households in London & Tennessee) with access to safe drinking water by 2017. 100% of schools and hospital at London and Tennessee with access to safe drinking water by 2017 (2 schools and London Hospital). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports. ROM reports. Audit reports. MLPID briefs and reports. 	<p>Water is categorized as an important priority for Government with adequate resources provided by Government to support MLPID implement key functions.</p> <p>Appropriate materials and skilled personnel available locally to support implementation.</p> <p>Capacity within MLPID capable of operating and maintaining the newly installed water supply system.</p> <p>Excellent coordination between the project and key stakeholders and MLPID to ensure smooth implementation of project.</p> <p>The impact of climate change and sanitation issues does not compromise sustainability of the groundwater lens.</p> <p>Communities and households willing to participate and engage in implementing their</p>

Project Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions & Risks
			responsibilities to maintain an efficient water supply system.
Expected Results 1. Government and community participation in the management of Kiritimati Island drinking water supplies, including the management of drinking water safety and water use efficiency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government initiatives established to improve management of water supplies. Community/school and other groups established in target areas to promote good water management practices. Water and Sanitation Division actively working to implement water use efficiency plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government policy documents. Project reports. Sustainable Water Management Plan for Kiritimati Island. 	Government proactive to implementing Sustainable Water Management Plan and water efficiency/management activities
2. Improved understanding of the condition and sustainability of Kiritimati Island's potable groundwater resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly monitoring of all boreholes at Decca and Four Wells water lenses undertaken. Daily monitoring of flow rates from all pumps at Decca and Four Wells. Establish maximum sustainable extraction rates for Decca and Four Wells water pumps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring data collected from borehole and all wells at Decca and Four Wells. Data collected of Automatic Weather Station at Decca. Project reports. 	Water and Sanitation Division routinely collecting data and ensure pumping rates are within sustainable extraction rate.
3. Improved quality, quantity and reliability of potable water supplied to the priority areas of London and Tennessee.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitation of the existing water supply infrastructure to ensure all existing pumps at Decca and Four Wells are operational. Infrastructural upgrade to the Decca Water Lens with construction of new galleries with more and a new pipeline to improve supply of water to households in London and Tennessee, including hospital. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering Plans and design documents. Tender documents. Project Reports. As constructed drawings. Work Completion Certificates. 	Companies responsive to international tendering process to upgrade works on Christmas Island. Ability to secure parts and fittings of existing infrastructure from international suppliers.

Project Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions & Risks
Result 1 1.1 PMU established and Project Steering Committee (PSC) operational. 1.2 Design & implement a training plan for safe and efficient operation, maintenance & management of water supply system to benefit MLPID staff and communities. 1.3 MLPID including London-Tennessee community assisted to develop a Sustainable Water Management Plan for the Decca to London/Tennessee water supply system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PMU established within MLPID within first 6 months of implementation with appropriate staff. PSC established and operation within first 12 months of implementation. Training Plan for Water and Sanitation Division (WSD) developed and implemented by 2016. Targeted communities and stakeholders involved in implementing training and managing household water supply connections. Develop and implement a Sustainable Water Management Plan for MLPID by 2016. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Inception Report. Project Quarterly Report Recruitment Reports. Minutes of PSC meetings. MLPID Reports. Training Plan Report. Sustainable Water Management Plan. 	
Result 2 2.1 Install/rehabilitate and operate monitoring boreholes for the Decca and Four Wells groundwater lenses. 2.2 Sustainable yield and optimal extraction rate determined for the Decca and Four Wells groundwater lenses. 2.3 Prepare and submit an Environment Impact Assessment report (EIA) to the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture for the proposed construction work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitate 15 existing boreholes at Decca and Four Wells by 2015. Drill and install 12 new monitoring boreholes at Decca and Four Wells by 2015 at locations for new galleries. Collect salinity readings from all boreholes quarterly and analyse data. Develop EIA report by 2015 and submit to MELAD for approval of construction work license. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Reports. Consultant's Reports. EIA Report Flow meter readings MELAD civil works license. 	Leakage is controlled at around 20%. Sufficient project resources available to cover major construction upgrade proposed for improved supply to Tennessee/London.
Result 3 3.1 Undertake improvement works to the existing water supply system. - rehabilitate galleries, pipes & pumps. - install water meters at households & repair leakages. - replacement of solar chlorination unit - implement appropriate awareness activities. 3.2 Develop, implement and monitor a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install four new solar pumps by 2016. Replace windmill blades and install new pumps at all 8 wind pumps by 2016. Install 19 flow meters at all pumps by 2016 at Decca and Four Wells. Install two bulk meters at Decca and Four Wells by 2017. Install 2 new solar chlorination units at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Reports. Engineering Reports Concept & Architectural Plans. Tender documents. Consultant's Reports. Recruitment and workshop reports. Infrastructure assets. 	

Project Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions & Risks
trial hybrid solar/wind groundwater extraction and transfer system and monitor performance. 3.3 Undertake detail design work of the proposed water supply upgrade works taking into account forecast water demands. 3.4 Construct three new groundwater abstraction galleries at the Decca water lens 3.5 Construct the new pipeline connecting the Decca galleries to service Tennessee and London including associated pipework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decca and Four Wells by 2017. Install one Automatic Weather Station at Decca by 2016 and collect data. Monitor trial hybrid solar/wind pumping system over 6 months. Recruit Awareness Officer and implement awareness programmes at schools and communities. Develop architectural/engineering plans for the Decca/Four Wells water supply system by 2016. Construction of the new galleries and associated piping network to be completed by 2017. 		