

Terms of Reference (ToR) for Mid-term Evaluation of IWMP Projects sanctioned during 2009 & 2010)

1. Background

Currently watershed development programme is being considered as the corner stone of larger overall rural development in the country. The programmes has gained greater importance and today is one of the flagship programme of DoLR, under MoRD. With the initiation of IWMP in 2009, the programme has shifted to a holistic approach covering all sectors in a given environment of watershed with sub-watershed as a unit of intervention. With this, different types of projects ceased to function and all watershed programmes are brought under one umbrella with a focused approach. Hence it may not be out of context to demarcate the watershed approach/programme as pre -2009 (i.e. pre IWMP) & post 2009 (after IWMP).

The first batch of IWMP was initiated during 2009 and it has completed almost four years in its actual implementation. The project was designed for a 5 to 7 years duration and it is at its mid-point period of implementation. Hence the mid-term evaluation of these IWMP Projects initiated during 2009 & 2010 is proposed to be carried-out the purpose is to get a feed-back on the initial impacts of the programme and the bottlenecks faced if any in the process of its implementations. This mid-term evaluation would enable a pathway analysis at the mid-course providing for improvement in the next course.

The IWMP as envisaged bestows utmost importance on concurrent Monitoring & Evaluation of the projects. The stress is on for a timely result based monitoring system which is used as a tool for project management. The system is to enable a corrective mechanism, in real-time. The M&E system on the whole is designed as a learning mechanism with corrective options both at the project & policy level. The proposed mid-term evaluation is a part of this overall strategy.

2. Objectives

The objective of proposed mid-term evaluation are as follows.

- i) To assess the Sensitization & Awareness activities carried out by type and the level of impact.
- ii) To assess the Entry Point Activities (E.P.A) implemented & its impacts under the project.
- iii) To assess the status of institutional arrangements made and their adequacy for project implementation.
- iv) To assess the Training & Capacity Building activities at all level by type, status and observed initial impacts.
- v) Assessment of Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) - process followed in the preparation of and the quality.
- vi) Assess the administrative machinery system and its adequacy at SLNA & District & PIA Levels, to implement the project as per the Common Guidelines.
- vii) To assess M&E System under the Project- Particularly the Status & functioning of third Party Monitoring agencies.
- viii) To assess the convergence and linkages developed, its impacts & Limitations
- ix) To assess the **Income Generating Activities** (IGAs) initiated under the project- The status, process, types, linkages & handholding arrangements.
- x) Assess the level of involvement of the community in the project planning, implementation & monitoring.
- xi) To assess the Level of Involvement of Women & the Vulnerable in the project, Women involvement, inclusion of SCs, STs, Marginal farmers & Landless households.
- xii) To assess the extent of project implementation at the Field level– Sectoral progress, status and the initial impacts on – natural resources, land-use, land-cover, bio-mass, groundwater & surface water level, agriculture & allied activities, cropping-area production & productivity, cropping diversity, & intensity, shift to horticulture or other commercial crops and change in livestock sector.
- xiii) The fund flow status, financial progress and impediments if any.

3. Methodology :

(a) Sample size & area coverage :

- i. Impact study desired by the Department of Land Resources Ministry of Rural Development will be confined to the IWMP projects implemented under the support of the DoLR funds.
- ii. The study will cover watersheds in all the 29 states and 20 % of the watersheds will be selected in proportion to those sanctioned between 2009 & 2010.
- iii. State wise sampling will be in proportion to the number of projects sanctioned under IWMP.
- iv. The study will cover 20% of households from the sample villages.
- v. No less than 90 households will be covered from each of sub-watersheds/micro watersheds for statistical analysis purposes.
- vi. From each sub-watershed/micro three villages representing ridge, Middle and Valley portion will be selected for household surveys. From each village at least 30 households would be covered.
- vii. In addition to the above about 50% of household to be considered from outside the watersheds area, with similar topography & socio-economic features. This would facilitate a comparative analysis of with & without project scenario (i.e. 45 households from untreated similar area).

(b) The analytical framework:

The study would follow the following analytical frame work:-

- i) Natural Resources Analysis: – Covering Land use, Land cover, Bio-mass, Hydrological & Soil profiles- to a limited extend of level of implementation.
- ii) Agriculture sector analysis: - Area Production & productivity analysis, analysis of allied sector like live stocks, horticulture etc.
- iii) Economic Analysis-Including Cost Benefit Ratio Analysis and Internal Rate of Return (IRR) Analysis. (Covering Income, Employment, Debt & Migration Analysis).
- iv) Institutional Analysis – Community Based Organizations (CBOs) & Project Implementation Agencies (PIAs), Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), Community at Large, other stakeholder if any.

- v) Systemic & Financial flow Analysis: – Administrative arrangement system analysis of fund flow analysis.
- vi) Community Involvement analysis: – How far the project is community driven than merely community centered.
- vii) Gender sensitivity and equity analysis: - i.e. Women Involvement in Planning and Implementation of the project & Distribution of investment returns by class, caste & gender.
- viii) Over all Analysis- A conclusive overall impact analysis of all the above sectors. Interlinking the Watershed Community & Natural Environment.

Ideally the analysis to be carried out in comparison with related baseline values (i.e. before the project status) collected during the initiation of project. In case of non-availability of such data, the analysis should be made in comparison with related normal values of the region. However in case of natural resource analysis i.e. for Land use, Land cover and Bio-mass changes use of Remote Sensing Technology would be adopted for a pre & post project situational analysis. The analysis of natural resources, agricultural & allied sectors, and economic analysis should include both before and after and with & without, comparative analysis.

(c) Chapter Scheme of Contents:-

The final report should contain the following:-

- i) Executive summary
- ii) Introduction, detailing the background of scheme & methodology of study, sample size & analytical frame work.
- iii) Status of Progress of Project
- iv) Expire by Build, sanitization and awareness levels at Watershed level, status of Agriculture and Allied Sectors.
- v) Status of Institutional Systems
- vi) Impact on the Society especially with Gender & Equity Analysis.
- vii) Over-all Impact- A summary of analysis.
- viii) Best practices, limitations if any & lessons learnt with suggestions for future alternative policy linkages.

4. Qualifications for empanelment of Evaluating Agency:-

The requisite qualifications for empanelment of the Evaluating Agencies as circulated by this Department to SLNAs (in addition to the provisions in ToR) would be as under:-

- a. The names of leading and reputed organizations (including NGOs) with required infrastructure, expertise and experience should only be included.
- b. Project implementing Agencies (PIA) should not be empaneled for the State in which it is working as PIA.
- c. As per the common guidelines, the panel is to include only institutions and agencies- not individuals.
- d. The individual evaluators or officials deputed by the enlisted organizations/NGOs, should have academic qualification of graduation in any of the discipline namely agriculture, soil sciences, forestry, rural development and related areas or have undergone specialized training in any these discipline and have worked for a minimum period of ten years in related disciplines in any Organization of repute or under the Central/State/Government in the concerned Departments.

5. Institutional Arrangements for the study:-

The agency to be deployed for the purpose would take a premier lead role in coordinating the task at the National Level. The agency also would be responsible for the preparation of consolidated report at the over-all national level. The responsibility of coordinating the state level reports would also be with this agency. The agency would in turn sub-contract separate institutes/agencies for carrying out the studies & preparation of report at the state level, as per the need and operational requirement. The lead agency at the national level would be of reputed credentials with established infrastructure facilities to facilitate supervise and coordinate the work.

A) National Agency (NA):-

The Lead National Agency will anchor the study. DoLR will be coordinating the study along with this agency. The role of National Agency would be:

- (a) Organizing National Workshop for;

- I) Evolving a standard format for reporting and identify key indicator for comprehensive study of Mid-term evaluation
 - II) Developing the financial norms for the study.
 - III) Planning for overall evaluation strategy.
- (b) Scrutiny and consolidation of study findings and suggestions of policy implication.
 - (c) Coordinating and supervising the state-wise comprehensive studies.
 - (d) Organize National sharing workshop (Sharing of lesson and draw up strategies for better result).
 - (e) Bring out the consolidated report.

B) Collaborating Institutions:-

For the collaborating institutional arrangement, preference will be given to Govt. institutions having requisite experience in the field to be selected as collaborating institutions. In the absence of the same, leading academic/research institutions and Non-Government Institution of repute and experience also can be considered. These organizations will perform the following tasks:

- (a) Assist National Agency in Carrying out the mid-term evaluation of watershed projects as per the design, indicators, tools and instruments developed by National Agency. State Level Agency would carry out field survey and prepare a comprehensive study report based on the common minimum framework developed by National Agency.
- (b) Organize workshop to share the findings of the study and incorporate the feedback.
- (c) Collection and documentation of best practices.
- (d) Any other work assigned by National Agency related to the study.

6. Deliverables

- (a) Inception report
- (b) State-wise status report on mid-term evaluation of watershed projects.
- (c) National Level consolidated comprehensive study report on watershed project and mid-term performance

7. Time Duration of the Project

The project to be completed within 9 months from the date of initiation/contract.

8. The coverage of the study:

(a) The study covers projects sanctioned during the period 2009- 2010. The breakup of projects sanctioned and completed are as follows.

Name of the Scheme	No. of Projects Sanctioned	No. of Projects Completed	Amount Spent
IWMP 2009	1324	--	501.48 cr.
IWMP 2010	1865	--	1496.83 cr.

9. BUDGET

A detailed budget would be prepared by the Lead National Agency, including the following items:-

A. For Lead Agency

Sl. No.	Item of Expenditure	Amount (Rs)
1.	(a) Human Resource / Manpower (b) Travel	
	Sub Total	
2.	Organizing Workshop	
3.	Communication	

4.	Institutional Charges (if any)	
5.	Misc. Expenditure (not above 5% of total)	
6.	Tax (as applicable)	
	Total (A)	

B. Detailed Cost Estimation of per Watershed (for collaborating agencies):-

Sl. No.	Item of Expenditure	Amount (Rs)
1.	(a) Human Resource/ Manpower (b) Travel cost	
	Sub Total	
2	Organizing Workshop (lump sum)	
3.	Communication	
4.	Report preparation	
5.	Institutional Charges (if any)	
6.	Misc. Expenditure	
7.	Tax (as applicable)	
	Total (B)	
	Grand Total of Table (A + B)	

10. An indicative list of processes to be considered for mid-term assessment/evaluation is annexed

(Annexure-1). Detailed Indicators & Sub-indicators for assessing their status and impact are to be developed, by the lead agency in a workshop. These will be incorporated in to a questionnaire schedule which be used for data collection at various level.

Parameters for Mid-Term Evaluation of Integrated Watershed Management Programme

Activities/Process to be evaluated

1. Entry point Activities.
2. Sensitization & Awareness Activities.
3. Grass-root Level institutional Development (Community Based Organization formation/Functioning).
4. Capacity Building (at all levels)
5. Preparation of (DPR) Detail Project Report
6. Annual Action plan
7. NGO- placement & functioning
8. Placement & functioning of M & E agencies i.e. (third party monitoring).
9. Baseline/ Benchmark- status
10. Information, Education & Communication system – if any
11. Physical & Financial target & Achievement
12. State Level Nodal Agency / Watershed Committee cum Data Cell/ (DWPO) / Watershed Development Team / Project Implementation Agency -> Organizational structure – status & functioning
13. Adoption of Remote Sensing(RS)/ Geographic Information Systems (GIS) & Management Information System (MIS) under the project
14. Work Implementation: Target Vs Achievement – Sector-wise, Quantity & Quality of Works, Initial Impacts observed.