## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Okavango SAP Implementation Project**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Implementation* (PIMS# 4755) implemented through the *Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)*, which is to be undertaken in *2020*. The project started on the *1st February 2018* and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* ([*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\_Midterm%20Review%20\_EN\_2014.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Cubango-Okavango River Basin remains one of the least human impacted river basins on the African continent. It is situated in remote areas far from the basin countries' capital cities and main centers of economic activities. The basin supports predominantly rural communities, whose livelihoods are dependent on natural resources, subsistence rain-fed agriculture and flood-recession agriculture. As a result, the people of the basin are in general poorer, less healthy, and less well educated than national averages in their respective countries, underscoring the need for economic development in the basin. At the same time, in its present near-pristine status, the river provides significant ecosystem benefits and will continue to do so if managed appropriately. However, pressures are now building to develop the basin's resources to increase incomes and alleviate poverty in the basin population.

In response to this, UNDP with finance from GEF supported the three countries (Angola, Botswana and Namibia) that share the resources of the Cubango-Okavango River basin to conduct the joint assessment of the basin, including the future water resources development analysis, which led to the production of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis; then supported them to agree on a set of transboundary priorities for the sustainable development and management of the basin. After some negotiations, the set of transboundary priorities were approved by the Cabinet in each country, and jointly endorsed by the Ministers by all three countries as the Strategic Action Programme.

The project was designed to support the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Cubango-Okavango River Basin (CORB). The objective of the project is to strengthen the joint management and cooperative decision making capacity of the Cubango-Okavango River basin states on the optimal utilization of natural resources in the basin, with the aim to support the socio-economic development of the basin communities while sustaining the health of the basin ecosystems. The project has three components. Component 1: Basin Development Management Framework strengthening. Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development Demonstration Projects. Component 3: Integrated Water Resource Management.

*Project Objective:* strengthening the joint management and cooperative decision-making capacity of the CORB states on the optimal utilization of natural resources in the basin, aiming to support the socio-economic development of the basin communities while sustaining the health of the basin ecosystems.

*Expected Outcomes:*

*Outcome 1:* A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space.

*Outcome 2:* Strengthened management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates.

*Outcome 3:* Environmentally sound socioeconomic development demonstrated in the basin to allow the basin population to improve their socioeconomic status with minimum adverse impacts to and enhanced protection of the basin ecosystem.

*Outcome 4:* The basin’s states capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) principles enhanced, supporting the Basin Development Management Framework (BDMF).

The project duration is 4.5 years from November 2017 to July 2022 with a total budget is 6.1 million USD and planned co-financing of 336 million USD from the member states contributions, international cooperating partners and private sector.

**Brief overview of the institutional structure of the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)**

The UNDP-GEF support to the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) implementation project is coordinated by OKACOM Secretariat through the Project Management Unit (PMU). Since the project is supporting implementation of the SAP, all OKACOM relevant structures, briefly presented below, have a role on the implementation of the project in line with their respective mandates.

**The Ministers’ Forum**

Established in July 2015, 20+ years after the 1994 OKACOM Agreement, the Ministers’ Forum consists of OKACOM sector ministers. It was established in order for the Parties to (i) enhance and deepen cooperation among the OKACOM Member States, and (ii) ensure the effective implementation of the OKACOM mandate as envisioned by the 1994 OKACOM Agreement as well as the approved Strategic Action Programme (SAP). The body functions entails: (a) approval of policy and political issues, (b) guidance to OKACOM on institutional matters, (c) endorsing, signing and ratifying agreements and other legal instruments, and (d) resolve matters that would have been escalated to the Forum by the Council of Commissioners.

**The Council of Commissioners**

The Council of Commissioners (CoC) is the principal organ responsible for defining and guiding policy and for the general supervision of the activities of OKACOM. It serves as the technical advisor to the parties on matters relating to the development and utilisation and conservation of the transboundary water resources of common interest within the Cubango-Okavango River Basin, and perform other functions pertaining to the utilisation and development of water resources as the Parties may agree to assign to the commission. These includes but not limited to; establishing permanent or temporary subsidiary committees according to the nature and specificity of the matter; approve the governance procedures regulating the operational procedures of all permanent or temporary subsidiary OKACOM organs; approve the work plans, budgets and reports for OKACOM. The CoC consist of three (3) Permanent Members from each Member state.

**The Okavango Basin Steering Committee**

The Okavango Basin Steering Committee (OBSC) was established in accordance with terms contained under Articles 12 and 13 of the OKACOM Agreement. It is the think-tank of the Commission which provides independent, objective, strategic and technical advice on OKACOM policies, operational strategies, and programmes through the use of appropriate data and information, action research, lessons learnt, best available scientific knowledge on matters relating to the development, utilisation and conservation of the transboundary water resources of common interest within the Okavango River Basin. The OBSC consists of total of nine (9) members, comprising of three (3) members from each Member State. The OBSC meets twice a year but can have extraordinary meetings as may be needed.

**Technical Committees**

As provided for in Art 4(2) of the OKACOM Agreement for establishment of further permanent or temporary committees five specific technical committees have been established to contribute to the implementation of the CORB Strategic Action Programme through provision of technical guidance on adaptive basin level management of water resources. The Technical Committees are sub-committees of the OBSC providing technical backstopping on specific issues. The members are nominated by the OBSC and each country has three members per committee.

OKACOM technical Committees are as follows:

*1. Institutional and Policy Development Technical Committee (IPDTC)* - the main function of the IPDTC is to contribute to the implementation of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme through provision of technical support in strengthening institutional and operational capacity of OKACOM.

*2. Socio Economic Technical Committee (SETC)* - the main function of the Socio-Economic Technical Committee is to contribute to the implementation of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme by providing advice, support and guidance to OKACOM and its partners on socio-economic issues that arise from the Cubango-Okavango River Basin water resources management and socio-economic development.

*3. Water Resources Technical Committee (WRTC)* - the main function of the Water Resources Technical Committee (WRTC) is to contribute to the implementation of the Cubango-Okavango Strategic Action Programme through provision of technical guidance on adaptive basin level management of water resources.

*4. Land Management Technical Committee (LMTC)* - the main function of the Land Management Technical Committee (LMTC) is to provide technical advice to OKACOM on sustainable land use, management of human settlements, infrastructure development, conservation of natural resources and basin wide tourism development.

*5. Biodiversity and Environment Technical Committee (BETC)* - the main function of the Biodiversity and Environment Technical Committee (BETC) is to advise OKACOM and its partners on technical matters relating to the identification, conservation and recovery of species at risk, and environmental management planning within the Basin.

A number of international cooperating partners (ICPs) are also supporting OKACOM implementing its Strategic Action Programme. These includes the European Union, USAID Resilient Waters Program, The Nature Conservancy, The Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility (CRIDF), among others. Under the project socio-economic and livelihoods component, local NGOs (*Associação de Conservação do Ambiente e Desenvolvimento Integrado Rural* - ACADIR in Angola, the Namibia Nature Foundation - NNF in Namibia and the Ngamiland Council of Non-Governmental Organizations - NCONGO in Botswana) were contracted to support in delivering the identified key demonstration projects in the three riparian states. Relevant key stakeholders for the project in addition to the above indicated includes riparian communities, artisanal and subsistence fishermen, academia, school children and the youth, farmers, community-based tourism operators, and specialized national governments institutions particularly at local level.

**OKACOM Secretariat**

The OKACOM Secretariat (OKASEC) is an organ of OKACOM, with the legal capacity and mandate to assist OKACOM in implementing its decisions. It also provides administrative, financial and general secretarial services support and assumes an instrumental role in information sharing and communication. The Secretariat is responsible for the day to day operations of OKACOM and is based in Gaborone, Botswana. OKASEC core staff includes the Executive Secretary (ES), who heads the Secretariat, Programme Coordinator (PC), Finance and Administrative Manager (FAM), the Communication and Outreach Manager, the Decision Support System Specialist, the Policy Analyst and the Record and Office Assistant and Project based staff.

**Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners and stakeholders**

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by OKACOM, an Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) established by the three countries, on behalf of the three participating countries.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is hosted in the OKACOM Secretariat. The PMU is comprised of a Project Manager, Project Administrative and Finance Officer, Coordinator for the Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Demonstration Projects. The project provides financial support for two OKACOM’s posts as approved in its organizational structure expected to be absorbed under the Commission regular resources; these posts consist of a Senior Scientific Officer and a Communication and Outreach Manager, who contribute to the project implementation as part of their duties.

For the project implementation to follow as closely as possible to the OKACOM’s institutional structure presented above, and avoid the creation of project-specific implementation structures, the following project governance structure has been established:

*The Project Steering Committee (PSC)* has three roles: (i) the Executive (OKACOM), who is the primary custodians of the project, representing the project ownership to chair the group; (ii) the Senior Supplier (UNDP, including UNDP-GEF), representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project; and (iii) the Beneficiary (s), representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project, to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. The PSC’s act as the highest decision-making body for the project, to review the project progress, approve budgets and financial reports, and review and approve outputs as requested, to provide strategic guidance and policy directions to project implementation and to ensure the relevance of the project by making sure that the project is well aligned to national policies and priorities of the countries and the basin it supports.

The PSC decisions are made in accordance with standards that ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In addition, the PSC plays a critical role in UNDP commissioned project evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Project reviews by this group are made at designated decision points during the running of the project, or as necessary when raised by the Project Manager or a member of PSC. This group is consulted by the Project Manager for decisions when the Project Manager's tolerances (normally in terms of time and budget) have been exceeded. It is composed by (i) UNDP Resident Representative (Supplier), (ii) UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (Supplier), (iii) OKACOM (Executive), represented by the Head of Delegation to the Commission-Angola, the Head of Delegation to the Commission-Botswana, the Head of Delegation to the Commission-Namibia and the Executive Secretary; and (iv) Beneficiaries representatives (the role assumed by the Heads of the Delegations to the Commission and/or appointed separately by the above members as appropriate).

*The Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG)* assures the PSC that the project is being implemented effectively, ensures the quality of technical outputs from the project, and assists in the implementation of national and regional activities. It supports the OKACOM Secretariat to coordinate the UNDP-GEF project with other OKACOM initiatives supported by other partners and/or carried out by the countries or OKACOM themselves to ensure the effective delivery of the OKACOM Programme and the CORB SAP Implementation. The RTAG composition comprises: (i) OKACOM, represented by the Okavango Basin Steering Committee (OBSC), (ii) OKACOM Secretariat, and (iii) UNDP. However, the RTAG may include various stakeholders and partners, such as representatives from other International Cooperating Partners, Civil Society Organizations active in the basin, private sectors, and/or government representatives from Regional and Local Councils in the basin, as appropriate. Project Manager can make a proposal to the core member of RTAG for the inclusion of those additional members prior to each RTAG meeting.

*The Technical Working Groups (TWGs)* with the aim to provide sound scientific and technical advice to project implementation processes, in conjunction with the OKACOM Technical Committees as alluded above under OKACOM institutional structure in support to the OBSC. The roles and responsibilities of the TWGs includes: (i) ensuring the technical quality of the final project deliverables through the review of ToRs and project deliverables at the draft stage, as requested by the Project Manager and/or RTWG, (ii) critically examine submitted consultancy and research work to ensure product quality, and (iii) serve as a source of objective technical advice to all those involved at the policy, planning, management and implementation levels. The TWGs are accountable to the RTAG and accessible to the PMU (entrusted to contribute in their respective areas of expertise).

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *OKACOM relevant structures (Secretariat, Commissioners or Okavango Basin Steering Committee - OBSC co-chairs, relevant technical committees), relevant International Cooperating Partners (European Union funded project, USAID Resilient Waters Program, The Nature Conservancy, Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility – CRIDF, among others), and local communities / beneficiaries of the demonstration projects*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to *Angola, Botswana and Namibia,* including the following project sites *Calai and Menongue in Angola, Maun and Shakawe (in Botswana), Rundu and Khaudum National Park in Namibia.*

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Achievement Rating[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ log-frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *35 days* over a time period of *16 of weeks* starting *11 May 2020* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *27 April 2020* | Application closes (through existing roster) |
| *04 May 2020* | Select MTR Team |
| *11 May 2020* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *The week of 18 – 22 May 2020 (3 days)* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *The week of 25 – 29 May 2020 (3 days)* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report - latest start of MTR mission |
| *08 June – 03 July 2020 (20 days)* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *The week of 29 June - 03 July 2020 (exact date to be confirmed) (1 day)* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission (this includes presentation of preliminary findings to the Project Steering Committee during OKACOM Week) |
| *The week of 13 – 17 July 2020 (4 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *27 and 28 July 2020 (2 days)* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report. |
| *05 and 06 August 2020 (2 days)* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *14 August 2020* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: April 13, 2020 | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: May 29, 2020 | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the MTR mission: June 12, 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: June 26, 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is *UNDP Botswana Country Office (CO).*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants (support from UNDP Angola CO will be provided for the recruitment of a National Consultant from Angola to support in Angolan part of the basin) and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the Cubango-Okavango River Basin riparian states for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert from Angola. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the areas indicated below, for the International Consultant (Team Leader) the qualification, experience, and technical expertise and competencies of the applicants will be evaluated using the criteria indicated below; thus, it is important that the relevant expertise and experience are highlighted in the applications. The overall assessment rating is out of 100.

**Education (20):**

* Minimum a master’s degree in natural resources management, water resources management, natural sciences, environmental management, environment, development studies, or other closely related field; (20 points)

**Professional Experiences (70):**

* Previous work experience in trans-boundary water management, integrated water management, biodiversity and ecosystems, hydrology or related fields for at least 10 years; (10 points)
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 points)
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to international waters; (10 points)
* Experience in evaluation of UNDP-GEF funded projects (MSP and/or FSP); (15 points)
* Experience working in SADC region, exposure into the basin riparian states is an added value; (5 points)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and international waters/transboundary water management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10 points)
* Demonstrated experience in the (re-)construction of Theory of Change; (5 points)
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5 points)

**Language (10):**

* Excellent English communication and report writing skills and knowledge of Portuguese is desirable. (10 points)

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[10]](#footnote-10) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[11]](#footnote-11));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address The Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme P.O. Box 54 Gaborone, Botswana in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for the *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation* project Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: OR by email to [procurement.bw@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bw@undp.org) This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by **12 noon Botswana time (GMT+2) by the 20th March 2020.**Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

**ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*GEF International Waters Tracking Tool*)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the *Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation* project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[12]](#footnote-12)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*GEF International Waters Tracking Tool)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy:** To what extent is the project strategy **relevant** to the participating country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?Is the project responsive to the regional and global development agenda (e.g. Africa Agenda 2063 and SDGs? | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results:**  To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:**  i. To what extent has the project efficiently used its resources (human, technical and financial to achieve its planned results since implementation started.  ii. Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far i.e. has the project recognized and effectively responded to urgent and emerging priorities which were not originally in the project document?  iii. To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability:**  i. To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental **risks** to sustaining long-term project results?  **ii.** How strong and sustainable are systems put in place through national systems to continue delivering quality services to the target groups or beneficiaries. | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Cross cutting issues:**  **i. Human Rights:** To what extent have the poor, people with disabilities, women and other marginalized groups benefitted from implementation of the project  **ii. Gender Equality:** To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions? To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?  **iii. Capacity Building:** Did the programme adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency. Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the programme utilized by the country? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Partnerships:**  i. To what extent has the project been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors including bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society organizations, academia and the private sector to leverage results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge Management:**  i. To what extent has the project compiled, documented and disseminated key actions, lessons and findings to its key stakeholders? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[13]](#footnote-13)**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)