Baastel
30 Years Promoting Sustainable Development

SUPPORT TO THE CUBANGO-OKAVANGO RIVER BASIN STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) IMPLEMENTATION (PIMS# 4755)

Mid-Term Review

Evaluation Report - FINAL

Prepared by

Olivier Beucher

Prepared For

OKACOM Secretariat

UNDP

30 January 2021

LE GROUPE CONSEIL BAASTEL

Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée

Boulevard Adolphe Max 55, Brussels, Belgium

92, rue Montcalm, Gatineau QC, Canada

P: +32 (0)2 893 0032

E: olvier.beucher@baastel.com

W: www.baastel.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

APRs	Two Annual reports
BDMF	Basin Development and Management Framework
CIS	Communication and Information Strategy
CO	Country Office
COC	Council of Commissioners
CORB	Cubango-Okavango River Basin
CRIDF	Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DfID	UK Department for international development
DSS	Decision Support System
FA	Field Assistant
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IC	International Consultant
ICPs	International Cooperating Partners
IFA	Integrated Flows Assessment
IMS	Information Management System
IPDTC	Institutional Policy Development Technical Committee (OKACOM)
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Namibia)
MSIOA	Multi-Sectors Investment Opportunities Analysis
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAPs	Nation Action Plans
NCONGO	Ngamiland Council of Non-Governmental Organisation
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
OBSC	Okavango Basin Steering Committee
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OKACOM	Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission
OKASEC	OKACOM Secretariat
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PIF	Project Information Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PM	Project manager
PMC	Project Management Costs
PMU	Project Management Unit

PSC	Project Steering Committee
RBM	Results-Based Management
RF	Results Framework
RR	UNDP Resident Representative
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
RTAG	Regional Technical Advisory Group
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
Sida	Swedish international Development Agency
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
ToRs	Terms of Reference
T-PES	Transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
WRTC	Water Resources Technical Committee (OKACOM)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The essentials of the project reviewed are as follows:

Table ES1. Project information table

Project Title	Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	4755	PIF Approval Date :	September 12, 2013
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	5526	CEO Endorsement Date	7 March 2017
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00090284	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	1 February 2018
Country(ies):	Angola, Botswana and Namibia	Date project manager hired:	
Region:	Southern Africa	Inception Workshop date	N/A
Focal Area:	International Waters	Midterm Review completion date:	30 January 2021
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	IW-1 IW-3	Planned planed closing date:	June 2021
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF TF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	30th April 2022
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	UNDP		
Other execution partners:	The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM)		
Project Financing	at CEO endorsement (US$)	at Midterm Review (US$)*	
[1] GEF financing:	$6,100,000	$2,798,815	
[2] UNDP contribution	$620,000	$60,000	
[3] Government:	$293,376,355	$2,134,596	
[4] Other partners:	$42,641,678	$15,469,878	
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	$336,638,033	$18,654,474	
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	$342,738,032	21,453,289	

* as per information collected during MTR exercise

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Cubango-Okavango River Basin remains one of the least human impacted river basins on the African continent. The basin supports predominantly rural communities, whose livelihoods are dependent on natural resources, subsistence rain-fed agriculture and flood-recession agriculture. In this context, pressure on natural resources are increasing, requiring a joint response by the three countries though integrated river-basin management.

A joint assessment of the basin was conducted in 2009 (*Cubango-Okavango River Basin Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis - TDA)* under the banner of the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM). On this basis, a *Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Sustainable Development and Management of the Cubango-Okavango Basin* was produced and endorsed by the three countries in 2011. The SAP is a basin-wide policy framework document for the Cubango-Okavango river system basin that lays down the principles for the development of the basin and improvements of the livelihoods of its people through the cooperative management of the basin and its shared natural resources. The overarching objective of the SAP is to promote and strengthen the integrated, sustainable management, use and development of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin (CORB) at national and transboundary levels according to internationally recognised best practices in order to protect biodiversity, improve the livelihoods of basin communities, and the development of basin states.[1]

This UNDP/GEF Project Support to the Cubano-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation was designed to support the implementation of the SAP. Started in February 2018 for a duration of 4.5 years and implemented through OKACOM, the project objective 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*. To achieve this objective, the project encompasses three components and four outcomes to be achieved, as presented in Table 1:

Table ES2. Project components and outcomes

Components	Outcomes
Component 1: Construction of Basin Development and Management framework	Outcome 1: A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space Outcome 2: Strengthened management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates
Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development - Demonstration Projects	Outcome 3: Environmentally sound socioeconomic development piloted 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
Component 3: Integrated Water Resources Management	Outcome 4 : The basin's states capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) principles enhanced, supporting

[1] The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission. 2011. *Strategic action programme (SAP) for the sustainable development and management of the Cubango-Okavango basin*. Maun, Botswana: OKACOM, 2011

OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR AND APPROACH

This Mid-term Review (MTR) exercise aims to (i) Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document; (ii) 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 intended results; and (iii) Review the project strategy and its risks to sustainability.

This MTR was implemented following a structured process that integrates data collection and data analysis, in order to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of results of the ongoing project, proposing recommendations for the remainder of the implementation. The review was conducted considering Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria and following ToRs and the *Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects*.

Main limitations stand in the need to adapt to COVID19 travel restrictions. As a result, the consultant had to rely exclusively on phone/Skype interviews and virtual field visits.

FINDINGS

Project strategy

The project is strongly embedded within the regional strategy defined in the SAP and is also relevant to national contexts and priorities. The MTR also confirms that the problems addressed by the project in demonstration sites are directly relevant to local contexts.

The selected strategy (the 3 components of the project) and the choice of OKACOM as implementing partner were relevant and effective choices to achieve intended results.

The project conceptualization and design process (including inception) were overall good and participatory. The inception phase was however too long and suffered from staff turnover, which generated important delays in implementation.

The specific role of women and how gender aspects will be dealt with during project implementation are little considered in the project design documents. This is an important weakness of the design phase, which would have gained from a real gender analysis being conducted.

Project's objectives and outcomes are clear, but there is a lack of clarity and coherence with outputs, and then activities and indicators. The Results Framework (RF), as established in the Prodoc, is not respecting basic Results-Based Management (RBM) standards and therefore appears as unclear and not practical, which also impact targets and timeframes, and further reporting on results.

Progress towards results

Project implementation is overall satisfactory and on track to achieving most of the expected results by the end of the project, provided that a no-cost extension be allocated, in consideration of the time lost at project start and due to the COVID19 pandemic.

Outcome 1 (A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space) indicators are all on target to be achieved, and more or less on track with mid-term targets. Good progress has in particular been achieved regarding OKACOM governance documents and institutional structure and in strengthening the technical capacity of the OKACOM for joint management and cooperative decision making. A significant achievement for the region is also the establishment of the CORB Fund, which now enables the project to initiate discussions on the approach and processes to define the CORB Transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services that will be used as alternative funding stream to the CORB Fund. Rated *Satisfactory.*

Outcome 2 (Strengthened Management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates) indicators are together rated as *Satisfactory*, two of them being rated as *Highly Satisfactory*: the project has achieved very good progress in strengthening technical capability to manage and operated the Decision Support System (DSS) and Information Management System (IMS); and communication and information show very good achievements. With project support, OKACOM and its secretariat are strengthened into a reliable and well-functioning structure able to successfully drive and manage multi-country projects.

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) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Despite efforts from the project team and its implementing partners to move things forward in the selected demonstration sites, results achieved to date are variable between demos, due to various challenges duly identified (drought, remote access to communities, delays). All demos are however on a fairly good trend to deliver substantial, communicable and replicable results by project end.

Outcome 4 (Basin's capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on the IWRM principles enhanced, supporting the Basin development and Management Framework) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Targets on common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies are not reached. But besides that, significant progress is noted in terms of joint monitoring of resources at the basin level, as well as in assessing resources. Using project resources to upgrade equipment and capacities to comparable levels in the 3 countries, and thus enabling consistency in the data collected, is a strong achievement of the project, reinforcing the joint management potential of the basin, but also standardising methodologies and tools, establishing joint working habits and opening data sharing between countries. Important delays occurred in the launch of various studies (SEA, ground a water assessment, sedimentation study), but at mid-term, conditions seem to be now on track for the development of an IWRM plan for the basin, which will constitute a major result of the project.

Trust between the three countries, strong working relationships and a common understanding and responsibility over CORB resources are key assets to overcome barriers and challenges met by the project.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management arrangements are effective and the established roles and responsibilities a clear and transparent. There is room for improvement however in the management by delivery partners of the activities conducted in the field; close monitoring and support by the PMU are therefore important to ensure delivery of the demonstration projects.

Work planning processes suffer from a poorly designed results framework, and as a result are not truly results-based. To compensate this, activities in annual workplans were redesigned to reflect reality and achieve outputs and outcomes in the most efficient way possible.

With nearly 50% of budget disbursed at project mid-term, project financial delivery is on track and closely monitored by UNDP Botswana CO through established procedures.

The project is not leveraging its planned cofinancing, mostly because initial plans were unrealistic. Strong effort was put in developing partnerships and new, unplanned cofinancing sources were identified, resulting in a satisfactory level of cofinancing for the project.

The M&E plan is well-designed and operational but suffers from a poorly designed results framework.

Effective partnership arrangements are established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the three countries, at regional, national and local levels.

The project is strongly country-driven (through OKACOM political and technical bodies) and there is strong awareness of the project's objectives, but also high expectations. A dynamic communication approach was taken by the PMU, using information technologies (OKACOM website, publications, social media, TV, UNDP CO office media platforms) and presence to international events, but also building on the 15 years of consultations and work realised in the region for a concerted management of CORB resources.

Sustainability

Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and no specific mitigation strategies have been defined. The project would gain from a formalised risk log identifying and updating risks and their mitigation strategies as the project goes.

There are strong indications that financial resources will be made available to OKACOM in the next few years, and the project has contributed to reinforce financial sustainability of its results through various collaborations and the involvement of key stakeholders, in particular national and local government institutions.

The MTR did not identify important political and social risks, or risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits. Climate variability and change are the most important environmental risk to the region, with potential negative impacts on project outcomes if not adequately considered in future policies, strategies and interventions.

Recommendations

Based on the above analysis, the MTR can draw a number of recommendations for the next and final period of the project. Those recommendations should be duly discussed and operationalised between the PMU/OKACOM and delivery partners, in order to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, as well as longer term impacts.

R1- Improve project management for results

As exposed in the above analysis, one of the main weaknesses of the project document stands in the proposed Results Framework (RF). As it stands the RF does not allow monitoring for results as per results-based management good practice. The RF should be adjusted to adopt a full set of SMART outcome level indicators to be monitored and reported on, and better capture outcome level results.

The inception period was used to refine baseline information and targets but did not modify the indicators set in the Prodoc RF. It is generally good practice to review the RF as set in the Prodoc at project start in order to check the links between outcomes and outputs, and ensure indicators set at outcome level are SMART, with well-established baselines.

A draft example of an adjusted RF is proposed in this report, but it should be completed using a participatory process. Given that the SAP M&E framework is now available, and considering the fact that the project is strongly aligned with SAP results, the adjusted RF would need to be aligned with the SAP M&E framework, using the same indicators as far as possible (a few project specific indicators may still be necessary however to capture some of the project expected results however). The adjusted RF should also include gender-focused indicators, in order to better capture gender mainstreaming results of the project.

The adjusted RF would allow better reporting for results, in particular in PIRs, being less descriptive and based on activities conducted, and more results focused.

R2- Identify major risks to the project and provide clear mitigation measures and management response into a risk log.

Results-based management good practice requires that risks to the project be clearly identified and mitigated through adapted and agreed management responses. This is currently lacking in the project: the Prodoc and GEF CEO Endorsement Request did not provide a real analysis of the risks to the project, of possible mitigation measures, and on the way those would be monitored and managed. PIRs reports are also deficient in terms of risk reporting.

Therefore, there is a need to identify main risks to the project, for different risk categories (political, economical, social, environmental), and propose mitigation measures, and report on those regularly.

R3- Build on and learn from the experience gained in demonstration projects

The project team is putting strong efforts in delivering substantial results in the demonstration projects. It is not easy, as there are many challenges in working with local communities in three different countries, through different delivery partners, and sometimes in very remote conditions. Whether those demonstration projects will deliver outstanding results or not is not, however, the most important in this project. What is key is for the project to carry on building on the experiences gained and to provide opportunities for ongoing OKACOM added value stemming from these experiences. In this sense, a replication strategy is planned during year 4 of the project.

It is therefore recommended to conduct an in-depth analysis of the success and failure factors of the demonstration projects, informing on the main challenges met, the solutions explored and the key parameters to consider when replicating the demos.

The three national governments, together with private and NGO implementing partners, have an important role to play in pursuing activities in the demos, ensuring their sustainability and long-term success. They also have responsibility in replicating the demos where suitable and relevant, and this is why a critical analysis of the demonstration projects will be useful. Such analysis will require to spend some time in the field, in every communities involved, and try to understand in each context the reasons for success or failure, so that implementation guidelines for future interventions can be prepared.

Linked to the above, a sub recommendation relates to the involvement of beneficiary communities in defining the interventions of the demonstration projects. Consultations did occur in this project, but frustrations relating to communities involvement into the design of the facilities to be constructed, or the equipment to be bought, were expressed. For the sake of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the demos, it is recommended to pay specific attention to the actual involvement of beneficiary communities at all steps of the project, from initial conception to the design of specifications for construction works, implementation and delivery. Employment of local workers in construction works may also need to be more systematic or more controlled. It is therefore recommended to ensure that the level of involvement of beneficiary communities in defining the interventions of the demonstration projects is appropriate and accepted by all.

R4- Identify strategies to address shortfall of time for project delivery

To compensate the important delays occurred at project start, and then because of COVID19 pandemic, the current pace of delivery is set to complete project activities as per the project completion date of April 2022. This timing seems very tight and specific strategies should be identified to ensure the project delivers on time, engaging with national and local stakeholders a well-defined project exit strategy, and ensuring sustainability of project results.

As such, OKACOM could consider hiring more staff for specific tasks, involving delivery partners more intensively in the field, subcontracting some activities and, if necessary, reducing some activities with lower impact on final outcomes (i.e. concentrate on most impactful activities).

R5- Ensure that climate change is duly considered and mainstreamed in project studies and assessments conducted, and complete a climate change sensitive IWRM plan for the basin

Climate change is a major risk to project results, and more widely in the socio-economical development and ecological balance of the CORB. In current scenarios, it is likely that the region will face more frequent and more extreme drought events, hotter conditions, and floods in the future. The latest drought events show that this has started already. It is therefore of utmost importance that all studies and assessments conducted during the project duly base their analyses on different, up-to-date climate change scenarios. This is specifically important for studies relating to water demand and water allocation, ground water assessment, sedimentation assessment, biological monitoring and socio-economic monitoring programmes. The development of an IWRM plan for the basin would constitute a major result of the project, as long as it builds up-to-date climate change scenarios, and elaborates water management options along those scenarios.

R6- Build on experience gained during this MTR when no travels are allowed

Conducting an MTR exercise without face-to-face interviews nor field visits is a challenge. Existing IT tools enable a lot, but do not replace completely real meetings and visits, which are also key moments for the consultants to more deeply understand the context in which a project is implemented.

Experience shows that conducting interviews with stakeholders in capital cities via teleconference is rather easily manageable, although sometimes impacted by connection problems or difficulties to reach people, set appointments, and more generally to get people involved.

Experience of remote field visits is interesting. The lesson learned is that for this to work really well, two main conditions must be met:

- One person should do the field visit anyways; ideally, a local consultant should be hired and travel to the project sites to meet with local stakeholders, take pictures and mini films, and ensure the link between the evaluation team and stakeholders. In such case, the international consultant is connected “in live” to the national consultant, so they can conduct interviews together, via a 3G connection. With no national consultant or dedicated person in the field for this, conducting interviews and virtual field visits is very trick for the international consultant.
- 3G Internet connection should be available. In very remote locations, this is a real problem and, in such cases, the national consultant needs to be able to conduct the work without the international consultant. Access to 3G connection can be set as one of the selection criteria for project site visits.

Table ES2. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	*Satisfactory*	The project strategy is relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results. The project is strongly embedded into the regional integration process established by OKACOM, and its objective and outcomes are clear and in line with regional and national priorities. The project design however did not consider gender aspects appropriately, and the results-framework was poorly designed, which can negatively impact project management and delivery
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: *Moderately Satisfactory*	Project objective indicators are not capturing well the level of completion of the project objective and some of them are considered as "not on target to be achieved", mostly due to lack of a solid baseline or well-defined targets (and poorly designed results-framework). The indicator on gender mainstreaming is not achieved at project mid-term. A significant achievement of the project is the agreement by the Council of Commissioners to gradually increase member States contribution to OKACOM.
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: *Satisfactory*	All indicators are on target to be achieved, and more or less on track with mid-term targets. Good progress has regarding OKACOM governance documents and institutional structure and in strengthening the technical capacity of the OKACOM for joint management and cooperative decision making. A significant achievement for the region is also the establishment of the CORB Fund.
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: *Satisfactory*	The project has achieved good progress in strengthening technical capability to manage and operated the Decision Support System (DSS) and Information Management System (IMS); and communication and information show very good achievements. SAP/NAPs M&E need to be reinforced.
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: Moderately *Satisfactory*	Results achieved to date are variable between demos, due to various challenges duly identified (drought, remote access to communities, delays). All demos are however on a fairly good trend to deliver substantial, communicable and replicable results by project end.
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: *Moderately Satisfactory*	Targets on common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies are not reached. Significant progress is noted in terms of joint monitoring of resources at the basin level (water quality and quantity, sedimentation, biological monitoring) as well as

		in assessing resources (ground water resources assessment), but important delays occurred).
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	*Satisfactory*	Putting apart the first year of the project, which weighs on the level of achievement of project results at mid-term, since 2019 the project management team and OKACOM at large, with UNDP as a supporting partner, have demonstrated excellent capacity to efficiently and cost-effectively manage the project and deal with the various challenges of a multicounty project, including the COVID19 pandemic. Finance and cofinance are on track, M&E systems are operational and effective (but suffering from a poorly designed results-framework), stakeholder engagement and country-ownership are real and communications usefully rolled out to keep awareness around the project.
Sustainability	*Highly Satisfactory*	Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and should be more clearly identified and managed. However, most risks to the project are limited and under control. Financial sustainability of most interventions after the project duration is very likely; political and social risks, as well as risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes, are limited. Environmental risks mostly relate to climate change variability and change, which have the potential to jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes in the long term.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives

1. As indicated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), this MTR aims to:
   - Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document;
   - 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 intended results; and
   - Review the project strategy and its risks to sustainability.

1.2. Scope and methodology

1.2.1 Scope

2. This MTR assesses progress with regards to:
   - Project strategy: project design, results framework/logframe;
   - Progress towards results (outcomes);
   - Project implementation and adaptive management: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, communication; and
   - Sustainability: financial, socio-economic, environmental, institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.

3. It provides conclusions and recommendations deriving from the findings and rate project's results according to the template provided.

1.2.2 Methodology

4. This MTR was implemented following a structured process that integrates data collection and data analysis, in order to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of results of the ongoing project, proposing recommendations for the remainder of the implementation. The review was conducted considering Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria and following ToRs and the *Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects*.

1.2.2.1 Data collection

5. Both primary and secondary data have been collected. Secondary data has been collected from project management staff and partners as well as through desk review of project documents, policy documents and others – a list of consulted documents is provided in Annex 5.2. Primary data has been collected mostly through interviews and direct observation, remotely and during virtual field visits, which allowed the evaluator to exchange with stakeholders and observe the project progress first-hand. Annex 5.3 indicates the consulted stakeholders. More details on the data collection process are provided in the MTR Inception report.
6. Sampling of demonstration projects for field visits was not applied as per the inception report. Due to COVID19 pandemic, travel from the international consultant was cancelled, and field visits were organized virtually, i.e. through local implementing partners and 3G connection on WhatsApp. As such, the evaluator was able to exchange with stakeholders from all project sites except for the fisheries resources management communities.

1.2.1.2 Data analysis

7. The reviewer compiled and analyzed all collected data on progress towards meeting the project targets, intermediate results achieved, and gaps reported, if any. Quantitative data, where applicable, were analysed with the appropriate tools (e.g. percentages, mean scores). To ensure that the information is collected and cross-checked by a variety of informants, data triangulation has been a key tool for the verification and confirmation of the information collected. Findings are related to pertinent information through interpretative analysis. The interpretative process will apply both deductive and inductive logic. This systematic approach ensures all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence.

1.2.1.3 Analytical framework

8. The following elements have been used as the analytical framework for this evaluation:
    - **Evaluation matrix:** Based on an initial documentation review and following UNDP Evaluation Guidance document, an evaluation matrix has been elaborated and is included in Annex 5.1. The MTR matrix is a key tool for data collection and analysis. It includes the evaluation questions as set in the ToR and details the most relevant qualitative and quantitative indicators that will inform on the evaluative questions, information sources and data collection methods.
    - **MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table:** This framework has been used to provide specific ratings for achievements to date.
    - **Triangulation** of information helped ensure the validity and accuracy of findings.
    - **A participatory and gender-sensitive approach was applied:** to ensure that the perspectives of most vulnerable populations are considered in the evaluation.

1.2.1.4 Process

9. This MTR has been structured around three phases. The consultancy started with documentation review. This allowed the reviewer to clarify the context around the project and identify the main challenges of the review mission and information gaps to be completed. The analytical framework and related evaluation matrix were developed based

on this preliminary document review. An Inception Report was then developed to clarify the evaluation process. Once the Inception Report was approved, the reviewer undertook data collection as described in Section 1.2.2.1 above. Once all relevant information was acquired, the reviewer proceeded to data triangulation, and careful analysis of all collected data, in order to establish evidence-based findings and draw well-informed conclusions and recommendations for the second half of the project. On this basis, this draft MTR report has been prepared, following the *Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects*. The report includes the contents indicated in Annex B of the ToR.

10. This draft MTR report is being submitted to UNDP and the PMU and will be disseminated to all relevant stakeholders as deemed appropriate, allowing the participation of a broader range of stakeholders than those interviewed during the MTR process. Comments received will be taken into account for the finalization of the MTR report. A comment response matrix will be provided in order to track the comments and the response given.

1.2.3 Limitations to the MTR

11. The author is confident that the findings and conclusions reached in this report are accurate and fair. However, due to the COVID19 pandemic, it is recognised that the evaluation was subject to the following constraints:

- A heavier than usual dependence on telephone (or skype) interviews. All the interviews were conducted remotely, although in some cases the sensitive nature of some issues means that face-face meetings would have been preferable;
- Virtual field visits: virtual field visits enabled the MTR process to be complete in the context of travel limitations. Whereas the PMU and implementing partners did their best to enable good consultation of stakeholders in the demonstration projects, bad internet connections and difficulty in reaching people, added to language issues in Angola (although a translation was organised), made some of the interviews difficult. Remote field visits in Botswana went very well and the evaluator could really “visit” the farms in live and discuss with farmers appropriately. Things have been more complicated in the other two countries: interviews have been conducted by phone/WhatsApp, and pictures were then sent, but the overall quality of those “visits” was really lower than in Botswana. Having a national consultant on-site to conduct the interviews and field visits in live with the international evaluator, as was done in Botswana through the Project Manager, would have probably been more satisfactory for the review process. Connection issues would have occurred in any case however, in some remote places such as the Angolan communities implementing the conservation farming demo.

1.3. Structure of the MTR report

12. This MTR report is structured along the following sections:

1. Introduction
2. Project description and background
3. Findings
4. Conclusions and recommendations
5. Annexes

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND

2.1. Context and root causes

13. 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, namely Gaborone in Botswana, Windhoek in Namibia and Luanda in Angola. The basin supports predominantly rural communities, whose livelihoods are dependent on natural resources, subsistence rain-fed agriculture and flood-recession agriculture. In this context, pressure on natural resources are increasing, requiring a joint response by the three countries though integrated river-basin management.

14. A joint assessment of the basin was conducted in 2009 (*Cubango-Okavango River Basin Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis - TDA)* under the banner of the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM). On this basis, a *Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Sustainable Development and Management of the Cubango-Okavango Basin* was produced and endorsed by the three countries in 2011. The SAP is a basin-wide policy framework document for the Cubango-Okavango river system basin that lays down the principles for the development of the basin and improvements of the livelihoods of its people through the cooperative management of the basin and its shared natural resources. The overarching objective of the SAP is to promote and strengthen the integrated, sustainable management, use and development of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin (CORB) at national and transboundary levels according to internationally recognised best practices in order to protect biodiversity, improve the livelihoods of basin communities, and the development of basin states.[2]

15. The project document states that “based on current trends, the lower reaches of the CORB (notably the previously mentioned Ramsar Sites) will cease to exist as fully functional wetlands and will lose their wilderness qualities within the next 10-15 years. Significant changes will have occurred at the regional and local scales that will have exceeded critical thresholds and changed the system into different and less desirable states. The changes will be significantly worse if development activities to be carried out in the basin did not take environmental considerations fully into account”.

16. Whereas there is a general recognition that development in the CORB is needed to improve the lives of the basin population, development interventions should not exceed the capacities of the system and reduce the ecological services it currently provides to people. Political pressures to utilise the CORB’s resources are strong and escalating, but they can be managed within a jointly agreed comprehensive Basin Development and Management Framework (BDMF), underpinned by sound knowledge of the river basin, to avoid irreversible social and environmental impacts. In line with the principles of IWRM, decision makers need to balance economic, social equality and environmental objectives of their investment decisions.

[2] The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission. 2011. *Strategic action programme (SAP) for the sustainable development and management of the Cubango-Okavango basin*. Maun, Botswana: OKACOM, 2011

2.2. Project description and strategy

17. This UNDP/GEF Project Support to the Cubano-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation was designed to support the implementation of the SAP. Started in February 2018 for a duration of 4.5 years and implemented through OKACOM, the project objective 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*. To achieve this objective, the project encompasses three components and four outcomes to be achieved, as presented in Table 1:

Table 1 Project components and outcomes

Components	Outcomes
Component 1: Construction of Basin Development and Management framework	Outcome 1: A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space Outcome 2: Strengthened management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates
Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development - Demonstration Projects	Outcome 3: Environmentally sound socioeconomic development piloted 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
Component 3: Integrated Water Resources Management	Outcome 4 : The basin's states capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) principles enhanced, supporting

18. After years of studies and negotiations around the TDA and the SAP and the elaboration of Nation Action Plans (NAPs) for the sustainable management of the Cubango / Okavango river basin, the project is an opportunity to implement the first concrete activities directly related to the SAP by the 3 countries together, through OKACOM, with its transboundary role.

19. Under component 2, the project is implementing 5 demonstrations projects in the 3 countries, as presented in the table below.

Table 2 Summary of demonstration projects

Country	Demo Designation	Location	Association/Partner
Angola	Conservation agriculture	Calai	Ndamundamu and Kafulo
	Community-based Fisheries Management	Cuangar	Candendele, Massaka and Seregany Management Committees.
Botswana	Conservation agriculture and sustainable tourism	Maun	NCONGO
	Conservation agriculture and sustainable tourism	Shakawe	NCONGO
Namibia	Community-based tourism	Kavango East	Sikerete Tourism Concession
	Community-based Fisheries Management	Kavango East	Joseph Mbambangandu Conservancy

2.3. Project Implementation Arrangements

20. The Project Management Unit (PMU), based within OKACOM Secretariat (OKASEC) in Gaborone (Botswana), ensures day-to-day management of the project. It is supervised by the Project Steering Committee (or Project Board), responsible for making, by consensus, management decisions for the project. The Project Board meets at least once a year to review and approve the Annual Work Plan, Budget, Financial Reports and Progress Reports as well as to provide strategic guidance to the Project Manager. Okavango Basin Steering Committee (OBSC) plays the role of Regional Technical Advisory Group to the project. As such, it assists in the implementation of national and regional project activities. Demonstration projects are coordinated by the Demonstration coordinator sitting at OKASEC.
21. Each demonstration project is implemented through implementing partners: NGONGO and Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food Security in Botswana; Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources and Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) in Namibia; ACADIR, Ministry of Fisheries and Ministry of Agriculture in Angola.

2.4. Basic Characteristics of the Project

22. The Project Document was signed in 2017 with a planned duration of 54 months (4.5 years). Officially started on 1st November 2017, completion is planned on 30th April 2022. Considering that the Project Information Form (PIF) was endorsed in August 2013, the preparation and validation of the project document has taken 4 years in total.
23. The Prodoc indicates that the project has several financers, as follows.

Table 3 Summary of project cofinancers as presented in the Prodoc

Financer	Type	Amount
GEF/SCCF	Grant	US$6,100,000
Government of Angola	In-kind/cash	US$ 184,000,000
Government of Botswana	In-kind/cash	US$ 103,000,000
Government of Namibia	In-kind/cash	US$ 6,376,354
OKACOM	Cash	US$ 5,260,000
UNDP Angola	Cash	US$ 320,000
CapNet UNDP	Cash	US$ 300,000
World Bank	Cash	US$ 800,000
UK AID (CRIDF)	Cash	US$ 2,416,918
KAZA (Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area)	In-kind/cash	US$ 6,802,721
USAID/SAREP	Cash	US$ 23,000,000
SIDA	Cash	US$ 2,110,828
Wilderness Safari (Private Sector)	Cash	US$ 2,251,211
Total		US$342,738,032

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Project strategy

Evaluation question: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results?

3.1.1 Project Design

To what extent is the project responding to the national priorities and context?

24. With this project, the basin States – though OKACOM – aim to operationalise and implement the SAP. As such, the project is strongly embedded within the regional strategy defined in the SAP, and benefits from more than 10 years of cooperation between the 3 member States to define a joint action plan. The project objective, outcomes and outputs are directly derived from the SAP document, which confirms its relevance towards regional and national priorities. The GEF did support the overall process, from the foundation phase (production of evidence through the TDA), to the political commitment (SAP) and now the investment phase through this project.

25. National priorities are set in the three NAPs prepared by OKACOM with Angola, Botswana and Namibia. The NAP is a critical tool for the implementation of SAP priority actions at national level and the integration of transboundary and basin concerns into national legislative, policy and budget decision making processes3. The NAPs detail the objectives of each country for the CORB and set a number of expected outcomes desired to be achieved in the coming years, the outputs to achieve the outcomes, and the proposed interventions. Outcomes (or "targets" in the Angola NAP) are distributed along the 4 thematic areas of the SAP:

    - Thematic Area 1- Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development
    - Thematic Area 2- Water Resources Management
    - Thematic Area 3 - Land Management
    - Thematic Area 4- Environment and Biodiversity

26. The review of the NAPs against the Prodoc confirms that this UNDP/GEF project is fully in line with national priorities as they are set in the NAPs. It will not, alone, be sufficient to implement all the interventions foreseen in the NAPs, but will start a significant number of them, assisting national governments and building capacities for further action. This strong alignment still remains at project mid-term.

To what extent is the problem addressed by the project relevant to its context and to the identified assumptions?

27. Barriers and baseline situation of the CORB are extensively described in the Prodoc, and can be summarized as follows:

[3] OKACOM, 2011. Okavango - Cubango River Basin. Botswana National Action Plan 2011-2016

- Development in the CORB is needed in order to improve the lives of the basin population, but for projects to be sustainable, their nature and scale must not exceed the capacity of the system to accommodate them, both singly and in combination.
- Looking at whole basin management there are a number of contradictions within government policies (both within and between policies) in CORB States, which could generate environmental and social problems with negative impacts including: land degradation; loss of scenic value and sense of place, habitat and biodiversity loss; pollution of land, water and air; over-abstraction of water; livelihood insecurity, involuntary resettlement and health impacts.
- Until now, water resource and economic development affecting the utilization of natural resources in the basin has been driven by national and sectoral development plans and strategies within each basin State with little consideration to transboundary impacts.
- In line with the SAP, much stronger coordination between member states is required. However, OKACOM and its member States face significant financial, institutional, technical capacity limitation currently to back up their high willingness to cooperate and progress further with the planning, decision-making, and coordination of future activities in the basin within the joint management framework.
- The TDA-SAP process confirmed that considerable economic and ecological benefits can be derived from coordinated, joint development at basin-wide level. The SAP, which was approved by the OKACOM in May 2011 and has been cabinet endorsed by all basin States, endeavours to address these complex issues by improving the basin governance

28. The problems addressed by the project in project sites have been designed to specifically contribute to the socio-economic thematic area 1 of the SAP. Demonstration projects cover agricultural development, fisheries management and tourism development activities, all embedded into a socio-economic development framework. Interviews underlined the utmost importance of this component of the project from the very beginning, as all the work of OKACOM needs to be supported by concrete and visible activities and investments benefitting the local people directly. Field visits also confirmed the relevance of the proposed interventions from different stakeholders and beneficiaries, provided that the ongoing support is continued and expected results are achieved.
29. The Prodoc results-framework lists two main assumptions (as part of the “assumptions and risks column of the results-framework):
    - Communities are fully motivated to take active part in the demonstration activities
    - Full engagement and support of sub-national and/or local government administration in the demonstration activities including systematic monitoring
30. Field visits and interviews revealed strong expectations from local communities regarding the demonstration projects. This is because they generally see the proposed interventions as key to poverty alleviation and socioeconomic development of their people, in particular the youth. As such, motivation in demonstration projects is generally high.
31. In addition, the MTR confirms there is also strong engagement and support from local government administration. In Botswana for example, the Ministry of agriculture is fully engaged into the demonstration project interventions and wants to learn from the project to replicate the same model for conservation agriculture development in other regions. In Namibia, the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism was directly involved in the design and construction phases of the tourism facility built within the Sikerete Tourism Concession.

32. As the first initiative to implement the validated SAP (and its component NAPS), the MTR confirms that the problems addressed by this project are directly relevant to its context.

> **Key finding:** The project is strongly embedded within the regional strategy defined in the SAP and is also relevant to national contexts and priorities. The problems addressed by the project in demonstration sites are directly relevant to local contexts.

How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results?

33. The overall project objective 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*.

34. To achieve this objective, the project is divided into three components:

- Component 1: Construction of Basin Development and Management Framework
- Component 2: Environmentally Conscious Livelihoods and Socio-Economic Development Demonstration Projects
- Component 3: Integrated Water Resource Management

35. The project is implemented by OKACOM, through a Project Management Unit (PMU) sitting in the offices of OKASEC. The multicounty/regional dimension of the project justifies this choice, and it is particularly relevant to components 1 and 3, which regional dimension is crucial. In addition, OKACOM is legitimate in leading discussions and processes relating to the governance of the CORB. This choice was also made to use the project to build the capacities of OKASEC and reinforce its credibility on the longer term, which seems very relevant.

36. The Prodoc underlines that defining the CORB development space and implementing alternative development and management options are a key objectives of the basin States through OKACOM, and this is exactly what the project intends to do in its components 1 and 2.

37. The project strategy is threefold:

- Working at the governance and political level in component 1, to define the CORB development space and ensure there is a common, long term vision of the CORB in the three States;
- Working at the local level with communities through demonstration projects (component 2), with the aim (i) to demonstrate alternative livelihood strategies for replication in other parts of the CORB; and (ii) ensure OKACOM is also responding to the immediate priorities of the basin people, and not seen exclusively as a political institution;
- Working on the enhancement of transboundary management of the CORB resources, establishing working relationships, common methodologies, joint working habits between the three countries, and generating and sharing relevant data at the basin level.

38. Methods of delivery include:

- Working in close collaboration with member States administrations at national, sub-national and local levels for project delivery; this entails the involvement of OKACOM's

Council of Commissioners (CoC), Okavango Basin Steering Committee (OBSC), Institutional Policy Development Technical Committee (IPDTC) and Water Resources Technical Committee (WRTC).

- Organising joint missions, connecting the 3 countries administrations, to create a strong working relationship.
- Working with well established local delivery partners for demonstration projects, as for example ACADIR in Angola, NNF in Namibia and NCONGO in Botswana.

39. As such, the selected methods of delivery are appropriate to the development context.
40. The Prodoc does not demonstrate the use of lessons learned/ recommendations from previous projects as input to the planning process, but there is strong evidence that it builds on the overall process of regional integration launched with the creation of OKACOM, preparation of the TDA[4], validation and endorsement of the SAP and then the NAPs. There is strong justification that the project brings another brick to this regional process, building on what ahs been achieved to date.

Key finding: The selected strategy (the 3 components of the project) and the choice of OKACOM as implementing partner were relevant and effective choices to achieve intended results

Were perspectives from all relevant stakeholders taken into account during project design?

41. All concerned national stakeholders that were contacted confirmed that the process to prepare the project was strongly participatory. It included the participation of the various government departments (ministries of environment, agriculture, water resources in particular), international partners (Sida, USAID, GIZ) and experts.
42. It is noted that demonstration sites were defined by the 3 countries independently. Involvement of local stakeholders and beneficiaries in the project design phase is not obvious, but it was confirmed that the sites for demonstration projects were identified during consultations prior and during the PPG process. Each Member State and the local communities had these demonstrations in their priorities, which related to their NAP. However, direct beneficiaries (farmers, fishing and rural communities) interacted with relevant implementing partners mostly during the project inception phase, as can be seen in the project inception report. .
43. The Prodoc identifies and details 6 demonstration projects (2 per country) to be supported along the three thematic areas defined in the OKACOM SAP document: tourism, fisheries and food security. In Botswana, it was decided during the inception phase to merge the 2 demos, with the view to link conservation farming interventions to tourism development. This was confirmed in the project inception report.

Key finding: The project conceptualization and design process (including inception) was overall good and participatory. The inception phase was however too long and suffered from staff turnover, which generated important delays in implementation.

[4] OKACOM, 2011. Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis.

To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design?

44. The Prodoc includes a Gender Analysis and Strategy section, which somehow limits the gender aspects of the project to supporting some of the key actions of the strategy, namely on gender inclusive capacity building and the development of a Gender Action Plan for OKACOM. In the results-framework, the Gender Action Plan is planned to be developed by end of year 1. However, developing a Gender Action Plan of the gender strategy of OKACOM may be a specific activity of the project to reinforce OKACOM on those aspects, but would not specifically promote gender mainstreaming and gender consideration in the project itself.
45. Annex 5 of the Prodoc, Social and Environmental Screening, includes a section on how the project does intend to improve gender equality and women's empowerment. In three lines, the document says that the project recognizes the central role that women play in the management of natural resources in their communities and that this will be reflected in the detailed design of the various community based projects. It also mentions that women and youth will be key players in monitoring the health of the river through biological monitoring programmes
46. In addition, the actual integration of gender aspects in the results-framework is very limited, as discussed in section 3.1.2 below. Gender is said to be important in the project inception report, but consideration of gender aspects is not central and mostly limited to a cross-cutting issue.

> **Key finding:** The specific role of women and how gender aspects will be dealt with during project implementation are little considered in the project design documents. This is an important weakness of the design phase, which would have gained from a real gender analysis being conducted.

3.1.2 Results Framework / Logframe

How clear, practical and feasible are project's outcomes and objectives? How realistic are the targets and timeframes?

47. The overall project objective 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
48. Looking at coherence between objective, outcomes, outputs and activities, it appears that there is a mix of the concepts of outcomes, outputs, activities and indicators in the different documents.
49. The first surprising aspect of the proposed structure for the project is that activities, as they are described in the Prodoc, are designed by outcome: there is basically one set of activities per outcome, each activity coming with its set of sub-activities. Normally a set of activities should be implemented to achieve an output, and the outputs together, if achieved, allow to achieve the outcome. The proposed structure makes it very difficult to directly link activities with the proposed outputs.
50. The defined outputs sometimes need to be reworded as results to achieve, and not as actions to implement (or activities). For example, output 1.4 Design and agreement of an Information Management Systems to accommodate both live and static data" is formulated as an activity, not as an output. The output should rather be something like "Information management system to accommodate live and static data designed and validated". The

same applies to output 2.2 “Revision of the OKACOM agreement to align its mandates and legal status to effectively monitor and coordinate SAP implementation”, which should rather be formulated as “OKACOM agreement to align its mandates and legal status to effectively monitor and coordinate SAP implementation revised”. Other examples are outputs 2.3, 2.6, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8.

51. In the results framework presented in the Prodoc, there is also a mix between outputs and indicators. The indicators set are copying the outputs and wording is not appropriate. In fact, they are not worded as indicators. For example, under Outcome 1, the first indicator is “A long-term basin vision agreed, underpinned by environmental quality objectives adopted by the countries”, which mimics output 1.1 “Agreed long-term basin vision, mission and values, underpinned by environmental quality objectives promoted widely among stakeholders at all levels and guiding all the interventions in CORB”. This is not appropriate. Indicators in the results framework should be set to measure the level of achievement of the corresponding outcome, and should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound). As a result, stated targets are output targets rather than indicators targets.

52. Interviews however reveal a good understanding of the objectives, targets and timeframe of the project, as they were set in the Prodoc. Given that this project was formulated based on the SAP, and therefore sitting on many years of joint discussions on the 3 countries’ priorities for the basin, as well as on extensive consultations from the TDA study to the SAP and then the preparation of the Prodoc, a large array of stakeholders were involved at different levels and they overall acquired a good understanding of the main challenges this project aims to overcome.

How effective are the logframe’s indicators, baselines and targets to measure effects from the project?

53. As mentioned above, the defined indicators are generally not SMART and are not defined as indicators. However, the baseline, target, source of verification and risks and assumptions are logically set. Overall, the proposed results framework and its 29 indicators – although not in line with what one can expect from this type of tool – allows to capture rather extensively the different components of the project. Used directly in the PIRs prepared by the PMU annually, it allows to provide a rather precise idea of where the project is standing with regards to its implementation.

54. Usually, during Prodoc preparation, 2-4 outcome-level indicators are proposed per outcome, which sums up to 10, maximum 15 indicators including the objective level indicators, in the results framework. The results framework was therefore not properly set in the Prodoc. Unfortunately, the inception phase was not used to correct the results framework: in the inception report, the objectives, outcomes and “indicators” (rather outputs) were not modified as compared to the Prodoc. However, additional information was added to the baseline column, the target column, and to a limited extent to the Source of verification and the Risk and Assumptions columns.

55. The use of gender-disaggregated indicators and targets is very scarce. Indeed, a quick analysis of the indicators set in the Prodoc results framework shows little attention paid to gender aspects. Out of 29 indicators, only 2 refer to gender. Both are indicators at the objective level (“# of people actively engaged in the low impact, environmentally sustainable development activities in the basin (gender disaggregated data”; and “Gender mainstreaming and women empowerment visibly advanced in the basin”). This is another important weakness of the current results framework, in a project where gender issues could be mainstreamed in many of the outputs. For example:

- Outcome 1/indicator 1.1: A long-term basin vision agreed. An indicator could ensure that the vision properly acknowledges for the specific conditions of women and youth in the basin
- Outcome 2/Indicator 2.1: SAP and NAP operationalised & M&E frameworks. The M&E frameworks should adequality capture gender aspects in the SAP and the 3 NAPs, and this could be reflected in the indicator
- Outcome 3/indicator 3.2: Community-based Tourism activities demonstrated and documented. This indicator, as the other indicators set for this outcome dealing with the demo projects, should strongly consider the role and the involvement of women in the demo projects. Any positive initiatives in this regard are not captured by the current indicators.

56. A simplified results framework, with fewer indicators, is proposed below as a first draft for further discussion. It would need however to be reworked in close consultation with the PMU and stallholders to define and select the most relevant indicators, establish their baseline level at project start and an end-of-project target.

Table 4. Example of revised and simplified results framework

	Indicators	**Baseline**	**End-of-project target**
Project Objective To strengthen~~ing~~ 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.	Number of new/revised governance documents validated	tbd	tbd
	Level of government investment into the implementation of the NAPs	tbd	tbd
	Level of member States funding into OKACOM	tbd	tbd
	Percentage of SAP delivery in each country	tbd	tbd
Outcome 1: A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space is agreed by the three member States	Common and Shared Vision document validated	tbd	tbd
	Evidence of boundaries of development space jointly agreed and validated by the 3 member States	tbd	tbd
	Examples of basin information management systems used to support DSS and decision framework	tbd	tbd
Outcome 2 – ~~Strengthened~~ Management framework strengthened with ~~including~~ enhanced OKACOM mandates	Level of integration of decision support tools into the work of OKACOM Policy Analysis and Programme Coordination Unit	tbd	tbd
	Evidence of change in legal status of the OKACOM Agreements	tbd	tbd
	Evidence of incorporation of transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) principles in OKACOM's sustainable financial mechanisms, including the OKACOM Endowment Fund.	tbd	tbd
	Number of SAP/NAP monitoring reports publicly available	tbd	tbd
	Number of permanent staff employed by OKASEC	tbd	tbd
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	Number of men and women involved in new/improved socio-economic activities as a result of the project	tbd	tbd
	Number of tourists staying in community-based tourism facilities	tbd	tbd
	Number of hectares of agricultural land under improved soil and water management	tbd	tbd
	Evidence of improved fisheries management governance in the basin	tbd	tbd
Outcome 4 - Basin's capacity to manage	Level of regional integration of water resource monitoring	tbd	tbd

transboundary water resources based on the IWRM principles enhanced, supporting the Basin development and Management Framework	Existence of data sharing protocls and common platforms	tbd	tbd
	Existence of a validated IWRM basin plan	tbd	tbd

Key finding: Project's objectives and outcomes are clear, but there is a lack of clarity and coherence with outputs, and then activities and indicators. The Results Framework (RF), as established in the Prodoc, is not respecting basic Results-Based Management (RBM) standards and therefore appears as unclear and not practical, which also impact targets and timeframes, and further reporting on results.

Conclusion on the project strategy

The MTR confirms that the project strategy is relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results. The project is strongly embedded into the regional integration process established with OKACOM, and its objective and outcomes are clear and in line with regional and national priorities. The project design however did not consider gender aspects appropriately, and the results-framework was poorly designed, which can negatively impact project management and delivery.

Overall rating of the project strategy is *Satisfactory*

3.2. Progress towards results

Evaluation Question: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? (effectiveness)

To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far?

57. As explained in section 3.1.2, the indicators of the results framework are not SMART and their baseline and targets do not allow for an easy monitoring of progress. Given that the results framework is being used by project management as it is, the MTR assessed achievement of targets on that basis, although for many indicators such assessment is unsatisfactory from a results-based management perspective. Whereas the project has achieved overall very good progress, this cannot be properly reported on using the results framework as it stands, which is a threat to project accountability.

58. In addition, the actual contribution of the UNDP-GEF funding is sometimes difficult to assess, due to the complementary nature of other projects on some of the expected results. This is in particular the case of EU support for decision support systems for example. The fact that both projects are implemented by OKACOM directly enables OKASEC staff to ensure the best complementarity possible between those two projects, which is positive, but distinguishing the contribution of each project separately can reveal difficult.

59. The table in Annex 5.5 however provides a sense of progress towards results, as well as an indication of level of satisfaction for each indicator (or output).

60. **Project objective** indicators are not capturing well the level of completion of the project objective. Overall rating of those indicators is *Moderately Satisfactory*, and some of them are considered as "not on target to be achieved", mostly due to lack of a solid baseline or well-defined targets. The indicator on gender mainstreaming is not achieved at project mid-term: whereas the OKACOM Gender mainstreaming Strategy and Implementation Plan was approved in November 2018, the plan does not include a fully developed M&E plan, and gender mainstreaming progress is not tracked systematically. A significant achievement of the project is the agreement by the Council of Commissioners to gradually increase member States contribution to OKACOM, which demonstrates the three countries' commitment to jointly manage CORB resources over the long term. Overall project delivery is on track, which draws optimistic perspectives regarding project objective delivery by project completion.

61. **Outcome 1** (A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space) indicators are rated between *Moderately Satisfactory* and *Highly Satisfactory*. All of them are on target to be achieved, and more or less on track with mid-term targets. Good progress has in particular been achieved regarding OKACOM governance documents and institutional structure and in strengthening the technical capacity of the OKACOM for joint management and cooperative decision making. A significant achievement for the region is also the establishment of the CORB Fund, which now enables the project to initiate discussions on the approach and processes to define the CORB Transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services that will be used as alternative funding stream to the CORB Fund. Overall rating for outcome 1 is *Satisfactory*.

62. **Outcome 2** (Strengthened Management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates) indicators are together rated as *Satisfactory*, two of them being rated as *Highly Satisfactory*: the project has achieved very good progress in strengthening technical capability to manage and operated the Decision Support System (DSS) and Information Management System (IMS); and communication and information show very good achievements (re-designed website, Participation in the IW:Learn organized events, production of several articles for the OKACOM and the IW:Learn websites[5]). With project support, OKACOM and its secretariat are strengthened into a reliable and well-functioning structure able to successfully drive and manage multi-country projects. On this aspect, the added-value of UNDP-GEF needs to be underlined, as delegating project implementation to OKACOM was far from obvious at project design stage: although very relevant in terms of regional visibility and role, OKACOM capacities were still limited at that time. With this project and all the processes implemented to reinforce the secretariat's capacities (from the UNDP Micro-assessment and subsequent NIM HACT Audits to the review of procedures and systems under outcome 2, and the addition of 2 staff paid by the project – and confirmed for the longer term thanks to member States new financial commitment to OKACOM), UNDP-GEF has given OKACOM the possibility to gain experience and build a credible project management structure for future initiatives in the region.

63. **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) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Despite efforts from the project team and its implementing partners to move things forward in the selected demonstration sites, results

[5] Examples are : https://www.okacom.org/enhancing-horticulture-production-and-linkage-higher-end-tourism-markets-demonstration-project; https://www.okacom.org/conservation-tourism-through-strengthened-partnerships-demonstration-project; https://www.okacom.org/aquatic-ecological-monitoring-cubango-okavango-river-basin; https://news.iwlearn.net/cubangookavango-river-basin-environmental-monitoring-framework

achieved to date are variable between demos, due to various challenges duly identified (drought, remote access to communities, delays). All demos are however on a fairly good trend to deliver substantial, communicable and replicable results by project end. Although concerning a rather limited number of farmers, the conservation farming demos in Botswana are promising, with strong engagement from the Ministry of agriculture and willingness to replicate the proposed model. Conservation farming in Angola is more tricky, mostly due to the very remote location of the communities selected for the demo (a choice that could have been revisited at an earlier stage of the project, considering the demonstrative objective of the interventions). Fisheries demos (Namibia and Angola) are on track to improve fisheries management by the communities. However, the impacts of this type of interventions usually appear several years after implementation, so they are not easy to assess at this stage. Although facing delays, the tourism development demo in Namibia seems promising. The level of involvement of communities into the tourism facility design and construction (employment of community members) is however a source of frustration. s.

64. **Outcome 4** (Basin's capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on the IWRM principles enhanced, supporting the Basin development and Management Framework) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Targets on common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies are not reached. But besides that, significant progress is noted in terms of joint monitoring of resources at the basin level (water quality and quantity, sedimentation, biological monitoring) as well as in assessing resources (ground water resources assessment). Using project resources to upgrade equipment and capacities to comparable levels in the 3 countries, and thus enabling consistency in the data collected, is a strong achievement of the project, reinforcing the joint management potential of the basin, but also standardising methodologies and tools, establishing joint working habits and opening data sharing between countries (which is far from evident from a national point of view). Despite the fact that those activities were directly impacted by the COVID19 pandemic (close-down of boarders between countries, disabling joint missions over the CORB), efforts are being implemented to continue monitoring mission in all countries and joint working habits seem to be now well established. Important delays occurred in the launch of various studies (SEA, ground a water assessment, sedimentation study), but at mid-term, conditions seem to be now on track for the development of an IWRM plan for the basin, which will constitute a major result of the project.

> **Key finding:** Project implementation is overall satisfactory and on track to achieving most of the expected results by the end of the project, provided that a no-cost extension be allocated, in consideration of the time lost at project start and due to the covid19 pandemic.

What are the main barriers to address and the main opportunities to leverage based on current progress towards results?

65. The Prodoc identifies political pressures to utilise the CORB's resources as the main barrier to avoid irreversible social and environmental impacts. As such, the Prodoc notes that such pressures must be managed within a jointly agreed comprehensive Basin Development and Management Framework (BDMF). Project implementation over three countries necessarily involved a number of issues and delays in decision making, requiring convincing approaches and persistence from OKACOM. The various interventions of the project towards joint monitoring of natural resources, clarified and reinforced governance

structure of OKACOM, and joint, increased and renewed financing of OKACOM and resources management, are strong demonstrations of the political commitment of the three countries. Bureaucracy and the fact that civil servants may not have regional issues at a top priority on their busy agenda can slow down processes, but interviews also confirm that the three countries have good working relationships and now a common understanding and responsibility to implement the project.

66. At this point of time, a major barrier to project delivery is the COVID19 pandemic and its direct consequences on travels and international exchanges. Other than that, there are many challenges when implementing such a project, with strong political dimension as well as hands-on demonstration activities, over three countries. But interviews confirm that such barriers to delivering project results are lifted when they appear, supported by a competent and committed PMU, as well as a committed UNDP Botswana country office.

67. Opportunities for synergies exist with several other initiatives. A few examples are the EU-supported project, which is partly implemented by OKACOM, in particular regarding Decision Support Systems. The CRIDF is also cooperating closely with the project on the fisheries management demonstration projects in Namibia and Angola. The CORB fund is also a promising opportunity for long-term cooperation between the 3 countries and needs to be pushed forward. Overall, the level of trust developed between the 3 members states, both at the political and the technical level, is a major achievement to build on for the region.

> **Key finding:** Trust between the three countries, strong working relationships and a common understanding and responsibility over CORB resources are key assets to overcome barriers and challenges met by the project.

Conclusion on Progress towards results

At mid-term, expected outcomes and objectives of the project are mostly on track and should be achieved by project end. Delays were incurred at project start and due to COVID19 pandemic, but many outputs will be achieved in the coming months. The level of trust and the strong working relationships developed between the three countries are a key asset for the second phase of the project.

3.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Evaluation Question: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level M&E systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation? (efficiency)

3.3.1 Management Arrangements

How effective are the management arrangements? What is the quality of execution of the project by the executing agency and the implementing partner?

68. Interviews conducted confirm that clear roles and responsibilities were established for managing this project, in line with the project document and inception report, and that decision making has so far been clear and transparent.

69. UNDP Botswana is the GEF Implementing Agency for this regional project. The UNDP Resident Representative (RR) in Botswana is responsible for the overall delivery of the project outcomes. The UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) for International Water based in Addis Ababa provides technical guidance and support. Interviews conducted confirm the strong commitment of UNDP at all levels. UNDP Botswana Country Office (CO) ensures a close monitoring of project delivery with monthly tracking at the RR level with the Project Manager and plays a facilitator role at the political level. The RTA has been strongly committed to the CORB international waters issues for many years and has therefore also been deeply committed in the project design, and now delivery.

70. OKACOM as the Implementing Partner for this regional project, hosts the Project Management Unit (PMU) and provides technical support, coordination and management function for the implementation of the project in accordance with the rules and procedures of UNDP, OKACOM, and GEF. The PMU consists of a Project manager (PM), a Senior Scientific Officer, a Demonstration Projects Coordinator, a Communication and Outreach Manager and a Project Finance and Administrative Officer. The Senior Scientific Officer and the Communication and Outreach Manager positions are planned to be maintained in the long term at OKASEC, with funding from OKACOM.

71. Difficulties arose during the first year of the project due to the resignation of both the first PM and OKACOM Executive Secretary; this generated important delays in the start of the activities: almost 6 months passed between the recruitment of the first PM (November 2017) and the inception workshop (April 2018). As a result, year 2018 was almost lost and most activities really started in 2019. From 2019 onwards, interviews confirm the effectiveness of the PMU in delivering project results.

72. The various technical committees exchange on a quarterly basis. OBSC meets twice a year (and more if needed) and Commissioners meet on an annual basis.

73. Communication with implementing partners in the three countries (local NGOs in particular) for demonstration projects are subject to quarterly appraisals, in addition to (recently agreed) monthly meetings on skype to discuss challenges and ensure a close monitoring of their activities. When national or regional administrations are directly involved in project delivery, decision making processes can sometimes take time. This relates to some level of bureaucracy as well as the need to include several ministries in decision making, and sometimes "sovereignty" issues being raised. Working with three countries, with three different governments, indubitably results in more complicated

decision processes for the project. This is a constraint that can sometimes slow down project delivery, but the project has been pretty successful in overcoming such challenges to date.

74. Overall responsiveness and quality of supervision of OKACOM are considered by most people consulted as good to very good.

> **Key finding:** Management arrangements are effective and the established roles and responsibilities a clear and transparent. There is room for improvement however in the management by delivery partners of the activities conducted in the field; close monitoring and support by the PMU are therefore important to ensure delivery of the demonstration projects.

3.3.2 Work Planning

Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, why?

75. As mentioned in different sections above, delays occurred at the beginning of the project due to staff changes at OKACOM and the time necessary to have a full team in place within the PMU. The PMU somehow tried to deliver most of year 1 activities and some of year 2 activities in 2019. The second major source of delays of the project relates to the COVID19 pandemic, which blocked some activities, meetings and missions in the three countries.

76. At this point of time, total delays are estimated around 6 months, and the project team aims to reduce it by issuing most of the remaining contracts by the end of 2020, so activities are conducted in 2021 and no time will be lost next year in procuring.

77. Although a lot of energy is being spent to reduce delays and deliver, project closing in April 2022[6] seems really tight to achieve expected results in good conditions, in particular in the demonstration projects.

Are work-planning processes results-based? Was the logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool?

78. The project logframe is mainly used in planning and quarterly basis reporting, which are against logframe targets. Reporting in PIRs are also on expected outputs. Problem is that the way outputs and indicators were defined in the Prodoc are not consistent with results-based management principles, as already indicated in section 3.1.2. Consequently, project monitoring and reporting cannot be truly results-based without an in-depth review of the project results-framework.

79. Annual workplans are presented by outcome, output, activities and sub-activities. Difficulties however stand with project activities which were not defined per output in the Prodoc, as explained in section 3.1.2. To overcome this, the PMU had to look at what realistically could be done to achieve the targets in the logframe, and adapt activities to realities, specially those that where not clear in the Prodoc. This resulted in important

[6] Project completion date set on 30th April 2022 in the project Inception report

changes to activities listed in 2019 and 2020 annual work plans as compared to 2018 work plan.

> **Key finding:** Work planning processes suffer from a poorly designed results framework, and as a result are not truly results-based. To compensate this, activities in annual workplans were redesigned to reflect reality and achieve outputs and outcomes in the most efficient way possible.

3.3.3 Finance and co-finance

Have there been any variations between planned and actual expenditures?

80. Tables 5 and 6 show that as of March 2020, the project had spent USD 2,798,815[7], that is 76 per cent of the revised planned budget for 2018-2019-2020, which is rather logical given the 9 months remaining for 2020. Total actual expenditure as of March 2020 represented 46 per cent of total GEF Trust Fund funding, when more than 53 per cent of the implementation time had been spent (29 months out of 54). This is a rather good results when looking at the delays incurred by the project during its first year. Considering the rate of contracting planned for the next few months, project expenditures should be soon on track.
81. By year, the project did spend very well in 2018 (118% of revised planned expenditures) and 2019 (101% of revised planned expenditures). The low spending rates for 2020 are linked to the date of the last figures in March 2020.
82. At the outcome level, 77% of outcome 1 budget has already been disbursed, and 60% of outcome 4. Outcome 2 (32%) and outcome 3 (33%) are less advanced.
83. Regarding Project Management Costs (PMC), as of March 2020, actual PMC for the implementation period summed up USD88,348, which is far below the planned expenditures of USD 204,500 (43% only) and represents only 29% of total PMC budget for the project. Budget allocation of some PMU staff costs was revisited early 2020 to correct this trend as well as better reflect reality.

Does the project have the appropriate financial controls to make informed management decisions regarding the budget and flow of funds?

84. Financial delivery is monitored monthly by UNDP Botswana CO, in order to detect any variance with the annual work plans and take corrective actions as needed. In addition, as part of the implementing partner procedures to which OKACOM is committed, financial audits are conducted every year.
85. Therefore, the project appears to have the necessary financial controls to make informed management decisions regarding the budget and flow of funds.

> **Key finding:** With nearly 50% of budget disbursed at project mid-term, project financial delivery is on track and closely monitored by UNDP Botswana CO through established procedures.

[7] Inconsistencies were noticed between the various documents. To ensure consistency, all figures are based on audit reports

Table 5. Cumulative project finance

	Cumulative					Total project budget	
	Planned		Actual	Percentage		Planned	Percentage disbursed in March 2020 over total budget
	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev		
Outcome 1	480,000	502,300	586,240	122%	117%	760,000	77%
Outcome 2	555,000	650,900	266,411	48%	41%	840,000	32%
Outcome 3	1,270,000	1,459,980	808,469	64%	55%	2,460,000	33%
Outcome 4	1,040,000	883,500	1,049,347	101%	119%	1,740,000	60%
PMC.	185,000	204,500	88,348	48%	43%	300,000	29%
Total	**3,530,000**	**3,701,180**	**2,798,815**	79%	76%	**6,100,000**	46%

Source: project audit reports and GEF CEO endorsement request

Table 6. Project finance per year

	2018					2019					2020				
	Planned		Effective	Percentage		Planned 2019		Effective	Percentage		Planned		Actual (Mars 2020)	Percentage	
	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev
Outcome 1	60,000	183,000	**484,459**	807%	265%	185,000	187,500	**93,189**	50%	50%	235,000	131,800	**8,592**	4%	7%
Outcome 2	10,000	232,900	**40,983**	410%	18%	270,000	217,000	**198,433**	73%	91%	275,000	201,000	**26,995**	10%	13%
Outcome 3	15,000	180,000	**159,599**	1064%	89%	585,000	694,980	**567,823**	97%	82%	670,000	585,000	**81,047**	12%	14%
Outcome 4	35,000	152,000	**245,121**	700%	161%	475,000	502,500	**770,902**	162%	153%	530,000	229,000	**33,324**	6%	15%
PMC.	50,000	63,000	**27,313**	55%	43%	65,000	75,000	**52,038**	80%	69%	70,000	66,500	**8,997**	13%	14%
Total	**170,000**	**810,900**	**957,475**	563%	118%	**1,580,000**	**1,667,480**	**1,676,980**	106%	101%	**1,780,000**	**1,213,300**	**158,955**	9%	13%

Source: project audit reports

To what extent is the project leveraging its planned co-financing?

86. Table 7 summarizes the situation of the project towards cofinancing at project mid-term.it shows that the project was able to mobilise a much larger number of cofinancers than initially planned. These are mostly new partners currently working with the Commission supporting specific SAP priorities. These interventions are coordinated by the Secretariat, which ensures synergies and complementarity. This is an illustration of the growth of OKACOM project portfolio, which is a positive trend towards sustainable management of the CORB.

87. Notwithstanding the number of cofinancers, as of October 1st, 2020, the project has been able to mobilise only 6% of planned cofinancing amounts, totalling USD18,654,474. Looking at the details of cofinancing amounts, we can see that:

- The cofinancing amount planned from UNDP Angola CO was canceled during the inception phase
- The planned cofinancing amounts from the governments of Angola and Botswana (and Namibia to some extent) were incredibly high, and this strongly impacts the percentage of realisation above (6%). The evaluator found no explanation on how those amounts were estimated at Prodoc stage. Putting cofinancing from the three recipient governments apart, the mobilisation rate of remaining planned amounts reaches 38%, which is not bad.
- OKACOM cash cofinancing is low (less than 13% realised) as compared to initial commitment. The reason why is unclear and needs to be further investigated.
- UKAID CRIDF and private sector cofinancing are over initial plans. World Bank cofinancing reached 62% of initial plans.
- A total of 9 additional sources of cofinancing have been mobilised, totalling USD5,810,741, 75% of which is EU support.

88. Overall, with more than USD 18.6M already mobilised by the project for a GEF total investment of USD 6.1M, and considering the unexplained very high estimates at Prodoc stage, mobilisation of cofinancing is satisfactory at this stage.

Table 7. Co-financing of the project as of October 1st, 2020

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount	Notes
Recipient Government	Angola	In-kind	184,000,000	655,782	0.36%	1
Recipient Government	Botswana	In-kind	103,000,000	655,782	0.64%	2
Recipient Government	Namibia	In-kind	6,376,355	823,032	12.91%	3
Beneficiaries	OKACOM	Cash	5,260,000	990,000	18.82%	4
GEF Agency	UNDP Angola CO	Cash	320,000	0	0.00%	5
GEF Agency	CapNet UNDP	Cash	300,000	60,000	20.00%	6
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	World Bank	In-kind	800,000	500,000	62.50%	7
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	UK AID (CRIDF)	In-kind	2,416,918	2,754,125	113.95%	8
Recipient Government	KAZA (Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area)	In-kind	6,802,721	750,000	11.03%	9

Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	USAID (SAREP)	In-kind	23,000,000	544,184	2.37%	10
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	Sweden (SIDA)	In-kind	2,110,828	2,110,828	100.00%	11
Other (private sector)	Wilderness Safari (Private Sector)	In-kind	2,251,211	3,000,000	133.26%	12
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	EU	Cash	0	4,377,234	n/a	13
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	GIZ	In-kind	0	328,054	n/a	14
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	The Nature Conservancy	In-kind	0	850,000	n/a	15
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	SADC GMI	In-kind	0	4,100	n/a	16
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	IGRAC	In-kind	0	5,000	n/a	17
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	IWMI	In-kind	0	4,500	n/a	18
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	University of Cape Town	In-kind	0	5,500	n/a	19
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	UNECE	In-kind	0	40,000	n/a	20
Other (bi- and multi-lateral)	Conservation International	In-kind	0	196,353	n/a	21
		TOTAL	**336,638,033**	**18,654,474**	**6%**	

Source: project team

In green: initial cofinancers as planned in the Prodoc.
In Blue: New cofinancing partners (not planned in Prodoc)

Notes:

Number	Comment/explanation
1, 2	Planned amounts at Prodoc stage were really high and the PMU found no clear explanation for that, how the estimates were calculated. Actual amounts are calculated on a yearly basis by the Secretariat by estimating costs through countries' involvement in various Commission activities at various levels.
4	For OKACOM, actual expenditure is based on member states annual contributions transferred to the Secretariat accounts
5	This amount is no longer included in the budget presented in the project Inception report. The Country Office in Angola informed that the initially planned resources were no longer available, reason why this amount was not captured in the Inception Report.
6	Covered by Waternet capacity building initiatives
9	Support still expected after signature of an MoU
10	Actual amount is co-financing from Resilient Waters Program. Support letter came from previous project SAREP, which ended a year before project start.
11	The Sweden support ended during 1st year of the Project Implementation
13	EU cofinancing is in cash to OKACOM, as EU resources are managed at the Secretariat
Others	Estimate of actual cofinancing: for most of the ICPs and Private Sector, the Secretariat requests in an annual basis their financial expenditures towards activities in the basin

Key finding: The project is not leveraging its planned cofinancing, mostly because initial plans were unrealistic. Strong effort was put in developing partnerships and new, unplanned cofinancing sources were identified, resulting in a satisfactory level of cofinancing for the project.

3.3.4 Project-level M&E systems

Is the M&E plan operational and effective?

89. The project document includes an M&E plan in accordance with the established procedures of both UNDP and GEF. The plan defines clear roles and responsibilities, and specifies the tasks to be conducted. These tasks include an inception workshop (which was scheduled for April 2018, after the inception report preparation[8]); quarterly monitoring and reporting, in the UNDP enhanced results-based management platform and the Atlas platform; and annual monitoring and reporting, through the templates of UNDP (Annual Project Review (APR)) and GEF (Project Implementation Reports (PIR)). The M&E plan also includes periodic monitoring through site visits, an MTR and a terminal evaluation. A project terminal report would also be prepared during the last three months of the project[9]. The M&E plan also includes audits, to be conducted annually or other frequency as per UNDP audit policies.
90. The M&E plan, which was not modified during the inception phase, is comprehensive and robust. Sufficient financial resources are allocated to implement the plan: USD 200,000 of GEF funding, excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses.
91. Quarterly reports have not been prepared systematically: 4 reports were prepared for 2018, but then only 3 in 2019 (Q2 not covered) and two in 2020 (Q1 and Q2 at MTR date). Their quality is adequate for keeping stakeholders up to date.
92. Two Annual reports (APRs) have been submitted for the periods July 2018-June 2019 and July 2019 – June 2020. Given delays at project start, the RTA decided that the first PIR would be in June 2019. The second PIR was produced in July 2020. Monitoring in these reports is based on the indicators defined in the Prodoc, which is good practice. However, since those "indicators" are in fact outputs, the reports are very descriptive and not really results-based.
93. The PM and other members of the PMU and OKASEC staff have been regular visitors to project activities and sites. This has enabled the PM to have an up-to-date understanding of the project progress and performance, and to provide regular and pertinent advice to project implementing partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries. The PM's regular visits have not been transformed into a systematic monitoring tool, and there are no standardized mission reports or formats.
94. Finally, this MTR is an important tool in M&E. The MTR came too late, optimally it should have taken place 6 months earlier. The MTR was however well planned and well supported.

> **Key finding:** The M&E system is well-designed, operational and effective, but suffers from a poorly designed results framework.

[8] It should be noted that no Inception workshop minutes or report seems to be available, and therefore could not be included in the analysis conducted.
[9] As per UNDP-GEF policy, the final PIR along with the terminal evaluation report and corresponding management response now serve as the final project report package.

3.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement

To what extent were effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country, district and community councils?

95. The project is implemented through or in close collaboration with different delivery partners across the three countries. Technical professionals from the 3 government administrations are directly involved in the OBSC, which acts as the Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) and assists in the implementation of national and regional project activities. It played a pivotal role in the development of the project. In November 2020, the OBSC gathers 7 professionals from the following institutions:
    - Ministry of Land Management Water and Sanitation Services (MLWS) of Botswana.
    - Ministry of Energy and Water of Angola
    - Ministry of the Environment in Angola
    - Ministry of Agriculture Water and Land Reform in Namibia
96. The project also established strong partnerships with delivery partners in the three countries for the demonstration projects, as presented below.

Country	Demonstration projects delivery partners
Angola	ACADIR
Namibia	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Ministry of fisheries and NNF
Botswana	NCONGO and Ministry of agriculture

97. At the local level, those partners are in direct contact with local communities and private sector companies.
98. The project has also established strong partnerships with other projects or interventions. Most important ones are:
    - Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility (CRIDF). CRIDF and the project are in particular cooperating in the two fisheries resources management demonstration projects in Angola and Namibia
    - EU support to SAP Implementation. OKACOM is an implementing partner on this EU project, focusing particularly on the DSS.
    - USAID Resilient Waters Program
    - The World Bank contributed to the project by funding the Multi-Sectors Investment Opportunities Analysis (MSIOA) study
    - The Nature Conservancy
    - Wilderness Safari
    - National Geographic, Okavango Wilderness Project has signed a cooperation Memorandum of Understanding with OKACOM to formalise collaborations.
99. Interviews conducted during the MTR confirmed the good quality of the interactions between the PMU/OKACOM and national and local partners. PMU staff are said to be very accessible and responsive when solicited, and the overall approach of OKASEC to project management is strongly appreciated.

Key finding: Effective partnership arrangements are established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the three countries, at regional, national and local levels.

To what extent is the project country-driven?

100. Country-drivenness of the project is very high, as it is the essence of the project to ensure the three countries take the initiative in managing the CORB. This is the reason why choosing OKACOM as the main implementing partner, and reinforcing OKACOM governance and operational capacities, are key aspects of this project. OKACOM (and by extension its secretariat and the PMU) is controlled and driven by its member States, through various bodies, starting with the Council of Commissioners.

101. In addition, interviews conducted during the MTR process confirmed the strong involvement of the three countries in project oversight and delivery. Commissioners and OBSC members play a key role in this, making sure national priorities are well considered in all OKACOM interventions. Technical bodies such as the Water Resources Technical Committee (WRTC) are directly involved in the delivery of some of the project components.

To what extent is the public /community stakeholders aware and supportive of the project's objectives?

102. Public awareness is ensured through (i) regular contacts between the project team and project stakeholders at all levels, from government officials, administration staff to demonstration sites communities; (ii) communication activities at the national, regional and international levels, which are described in section 3.3.6 below.

103. Overall, interviews conducted confirmed that public and community stakeholders are supportive of the project's objectives, and generally are more concerned with delays or the limited scope and level of investment of the project than with its objectives and approach. Expectations are high in the region and there is a constant need to explain that this single project cannot do everything, in particular in demonstration sites, but that further action and replication of successful demos will be ensured by national governments and partners, including with development assistance funding from other projects and initiatives.

3.3.6 Communications

How effective are communications to ensure stakeholder awareness about the project? Are effective external communication mechanisms in place?

104. OKACOM Communication and Information Strategy (CIS) was developed in 2012. Early 2020, the project contracted a consultant to review the CIS with a mission to formulate a new five-year Communication & Stakeholder Engagement, as well as a Social Media Strategy and a two-year Integrated Implementation Action Plan for OKACOM, which shall be designed to respond to an emerging set of challenges facing the CORB which requires prudent communication approaches.

105. According to the inception report of this consultancy work[10], over the past decade, the communication framework of OKACOM has transformed from information sharing amongst technical partners to more proactive engagement with a diverse range of stakeholders. The report states that this evolution was imperative for the organization to create awareness and motivate citizens of the riparian states to participate in, and contribute to debate on significant issues that impact the CORB.

106. To improve communication, information management and stakeholder engagement through an online platform, OKACOM website was revamped to be aligned with the current global trend of dynamic websites[11]. Three articles from the three thematic areas covered by the demonstration projects were produced and shared through the website: Conservation Tourism Through Strengthened Partnerships Demonstration Project[12]; Enhancing Horticulture Production and Linkage to Higher End Tourism Markets Demonstration Project[13]; and Aquatic Ecological Monitoring in the Cubango-Okavango River Basin.[14] The project is also active in the media (newspaper, TV[15]) and the social media (Twitter in particular). It produced a 2-page and a 4-page project brief to present the project, and publishes a newsletter.The project also contributed to several international events, such as the International Water Conference (GEF) in Morocco in 2018 and the River Symposium in Adelaide (Australia) in 2019. It is also contributing to the IW:learn platform of the GEF.

107. Interviews confirmed that stakeholders have a good level of awareness about project objectives and expected results. This is also the result of more than 15 years of consultations and work for a concerted management of CORB resources, a period during which stakeholders at all levels were consulted and involved in many occasions.

> **Key finding:** The project is strongly country-driven (through OKACOM political and technical bodies) and there is strong awareness of the project's objectives, but also high expectations. A dynamic communication approach was taken by the PMU, using information technologies (OKACOM website, publications, social media, TV) and presence to international events, but also building on the 15 years of consultations and work realised in the region for a concerted management of CORB resources.

Conclusion on project implementation and adaptive management

Project implementation and adaptive management is rated *Satisfactory*. Putting apart the first year of the project, which weighs on the level of achievement of project results at mid-term, since 2019 the project management team and OKACOM at large, with UNDP as a supporting partner, have demonstrated excellent capacity to efficiently and cost-effectively manage the project and deal with the various challenges of a multicounty project, including the COIVD19 pandemic. Finance and cofinance are on track, M&E systems are operational and effective,

[10] Review of the OKACOM Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy. Inception report. The dialogue group, 18 May 2020.
[11] PIR, 2020
[12] https://www.okacom.org/conservation-tourism-through-strengthened-partnerships-demonstration-project
[13] https://www.okacom.org/enhancing-horticulture-production-and-linkage-higher-end-tourism-markets-demonstration-project
[14] https://www.okacom.org/aquatic-ecological-monitoring-cubango-okavango-river-basin
[15] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cfzAVX-cEfk&feature=youtu.be

stakeholder engagement and country-ownership are real, and communications usefully rolled out to keep awareness around the project.

3.4. Sustainability

Evaluation Question: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? Are the risks identified in the project document the most important? Are they still up to date?

108. The project document and Request for GEF CEO endorsement document do not clearly identify the risks of the project. The risk section of the later is even left empty ("Section A6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: N/A"). The column "Risks and Assumptions" of the results framework however lists the following risks to the project:

1) Botswana and Namibia's Middle-Income Status may limit donor support to the OKACOM and/or its basin states.
2) Time required for the sustainable financing scheme to take off
3) Migration of people within the basin and beyond during the project implementation period might pose challenges in tracking the 3 of beneficiaries from the demonstration activities
4) Quantitative indicators may not provide true status of gender mainstreaming progress; thus complemented with qualitative indicators.
5) Financial constraints to staff OKASEC adequately.
6) Weak community and local administration support for the demo projects
7) Overwhelming logistical problems in demo project implementation
8) Difficulty in measuring the demo project benefits in the limited project time period

109. These risks are at different levels: some of them with low probability or impact (3, 4, 8); others are more relevant (1, 2 and 3 over the longer term); risk 5 is no longer a risk, as OKASEC could be staffed adequately thanks to the project and, in the longer term, to the commitment of the three member states to increase their contributions to OKACOM; risk 6 is still up-to-date and so far well managed; risk 7 is particularly pending in Angola conservation agriculture demonstration project. An updated risk log would be a good tool to ensure current risks are well identified, monitored and managed. For example, PIR 2020 identifies COVID19 as a critical operational risk for the project. If the MU was able to limit the overall impact of this crisis, having clearly identified mitigation strategies in a risk log would be a good practice.

Key finding: Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and no specific mitigation strategies have been defined. The project would gain from a formalised risk log identifying and updating risks and their mitigation strategies as the project goes.

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends?

110. The whole idea of OKACOM stands in a long-term vision of a sustainably and jointly managed CORB region. For almost 20 years the three member States have built up a regional organisation to promote and organise dialogue between them, and coordinate joint initiatives, and attract funding. OKACOM has been reinforced in the last few years, in particular through this project, and has become a reliable implementing partner for international donors. Considering that biodiversity conversation and water resource management are now very high on donors' agenda, it is very likely that financial resources will be available for OKACOM in the next few years.

111. This is illustrated by the ongoing support of many organisations to joint management of CORB resources: the European Union, USAid, DfiD (CRIDF), Swedish international Development Agency (Sida), World Bank, and various NOGs and foundations (The Nature Conservancy, Conservation Intentional, among others).

112. The three governments have also demonstrated their willingness to cooperate over the long term. This is illustrated not only by their recent commitment to increase OKACOM funding, but also by their engagement into the project and its cofinancing. A good example is the Botswana's Ministry of Agriculture's willingness to replicate the conservation agriculture and tourism demos implemented under this project, as they see a great potential for poverty alleviation, long-term conservation of natural resources, contribution to the tourism sector (by providing fresh local products) and decreased dependence to imports from South Africa.

113. Last but not least, the establishment of the CORB Fund is a promising achievement in order to attract external funding and limit dependency on national budgets over the long term. The Fund will be the financial mechanism for transboundary payments for ecosystem services and may become a major funding vehicle for the sustainable management of CORB resources and socioeconomic development of the region.

> **Key finding:** There are strong indications that financial resources will be made available to OKACOM in the next few years, and the project has contributed to reinforce financial sustainability of its results through various collaborations and the involvement of key stakeholders, in particular national and local government institutions.

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?

There is no important social or political risk to project results sustainability identified by the MTR mission. Considering that project was conceived with the participation and endorsement of the national governments, and through a governmental institution (OKACOM), conditions for sustainability are in place

Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits?

114. OKACOM governance and administrative processes have been improving and the project is dedicating efforts to that. Examples are: the ongoing review of the 1994 OKACOM Agreement; the discussion on the adoption of the Rules and Procedures for the

Sharing of Data and Information related to the Management and Development of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin; the review of OKACOM Communication Strategy; and the review of the Administration, Procurement, Asset Management and IT policy instruments.

115. The Biodiversity and Environment Technical Committee (BETC), the Socio-Economic Technical Committee (SETC), and the Land Management Technical Committee (LMTC) are getting more involved in project delivery as well.

116. National policy frameworks and procedures may sometimes delay decision making, but overall there are no identified risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits.

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

117. Climate change is probably the biggest environmental risk faced by the region, and climate extreme events have already impacted the project delivery. Severe drought events as it happened in 2019 are destabilising the whole system, and the project had for example to adapt the delivery of demonstration projects: in Angola, the conservation farming demo did not work out very well in the first year, mostly because of drought; in Botswana, it was decided to select an addition 6 demonstration sites upper in the delta (Shakawe) as a consequence of river drying near Maun.

> **Key finding:** The MTR did not identify important political and social risks, or risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits. Climate variability and change are the most important environmental risk to the region, with the potential to jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes if not adequately considered in future policies, strategies and interventions.

Conclusion on project sustainability

Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and should be more clearly identified and managed. However, most risks to the project are limited and under control. Financial sustainability of most interventions after the project duration is very likely; political and social risks, as well as risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes, are limited. Environmental risks mostly relate to climate change variability and change, which have the potential to jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes in the long term.

At mid-term, potential sustainability of the project results is rated as *highly satisfactory***.**

4.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Conclusions

Project strategy

The project is strongly embedded within the regional strategy defined in the SAP and is also relevant to national contexts and priorities. The MTR also confirms that the problems addressed by the project in demonstration sites are directly relevant to local contexts.

The selected strategy (the 3 components of the project) and the choice of OKACOM as implementing partner were relevant and effective choices to achieve intended results.

The project conceptualization and design process (including inception) were overall good and participatory. The inception phase was however too long and suffered from staff turnover, which generated important delays in implementation.

The specific role of women and how gender aspects will be dealt with during project implementation are little considered in the project design documents. This is an important weakness of the design phase, which would have gained from a real gender analysis being conducted.

Project's objectives and outcomes are clear, but there is a lack of clarity and coherence with outputs, and then activities and indicators. The Results Framework (RF), as established in the Prodoc, is not respecting basic Results-Based Management (RBM) standards and therefore appears as unclear and not practical, which also impact targets and timeframes, and further reporting on results.

Conclusion on the project strategy

The MTR confirms that the project strategy is relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results. The project is strongly embedded into the regional integration process established with OKACOM, and its objective and outcomes are clear and in line with regional and national priorities. The project design however did not consider gender aspects appropriately, and the results-framework was poorly designed, which can negatively impact project management and delivery.

Overall rating of the project strategy is *Satisfactory*

Progress towards results

Project implementation is overall satisfactory and on track to achieving most of the expected results by the end of the project, provided that a no-cost extension be allocated, in consideration of the time lost at project start and due to the COVID19 pandemic.

Outcome 1 (A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space) indicators are all on target to be achieved, and more or less on track with mid-term targets. Good progress has in particular been achieved regarding OKACOM governance documents and institutional structure and in strengthening the technical capacity of the

OKACOM for joint management and cooperative decision making. A significant achievement for the region is also the establishment of the CORB Fund, which now enables the project to initiate discussions on the approach and processes to define the CORB Transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services that will be used as alternative funding stream to the CORB Fund. Rated *Satisfactory.*

Outcome 2 (Strengthened Management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates) indicators are together rated as *Satisfactory*, two of them being rated as *Highly Satisfactory*: the project has achieved very good progress in strengthening technical capability to manage and operated the Decision Support System (DSS) and Information Management System (IMS); and communication and information show very good achievements. With project support, OKACOM and its secretariat are strengthened into a reliable and well-functioning structure able to successfully drive and manage multi-country projects.

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) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Despite efforts from the project team and its implementing partners to move things forward in the selected demonstration sites, results achieved to date are variable between demos, due to various challenges duly identified (drought, remote access to communities, delays). All demos are however on a fairly good trend to deliver substantial, communicable and replicable results by project end.

Outcome 4 (Basin's capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on the IWRM principles enhanced, supporting the Basin development and Management Framework) delivery is overall rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*. Targets on common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies are not reached. But besides that, significant progress is noted in terms of joint monitoring of resources at the basin level, as well as in assessing resources. Using project resources to upgrade equipment and capacities to comparable levels in the 3 countries, and thus enabling consistency in the data collected, is a strong achievement of the project, reinforcing the joint management potential of the basin, but also standardising methodologies and tools, establishing joint working habits and opening data sharing between countries. Important delays occurred in the launch of various studies (SEA, ground a water assessment, sedimentation study), but at mid-term, conditions seem to be now on track for the development of an IWRM plan for the basin, which will constitute a major result of the project.

Trust between the three countries, strong working relationships and a common understanding and responsibility over CORB resources are key assets to overcome barriers and challenges met by the project.

Conclusion on Progress towards results

At mid-term, expected outcomes and objectives of the project are mostly on track and should be achieved by project end. Delays were incurred at project start and due to COVID19 pandemic, but many outputs will be achieved in the coming months. The level of trust and the strong working relationships developed between the three countries are key assets for the second phase of the project and over the longer term.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management arrangements are effective and the established roles and responsibilities a clear and transparent. There is room for improvement however in the management by delivery partners of the activities conducted in the field; close monitoring and support by the PMU are therefore important to ensure delivery of the demonstration projects.

Work planning processes suffer from a poorly designed results framework, and as a result are not truly results-based. To compensate this, activities in annual workplans were redesigned to reflect reality and achieve outputs and outcomes in the most efficient way possible.

With nearly 50% of budget disbursed at project mid-term, project financial delivery is on track and closely monitored by UNDP Botswana CO through established procedures.

The project is not leveraging its planned cofinancing, mostly because initial plans were unrealistic. Strong effort was put in developing partnerships and new, unplanned cofinancing sources were identified, resulting in a satisfactory level of cofinancing for the project.

The M&E plan is well-designed and operational, but suffers from a poorly designed results framework.

Effective partnership arrangements are established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the three countries, at regional, national and local levels.

The project is strongly country-driven (through OKACOM political and technical bodies) and there is strong awareness of the project's objectives, but also high expectations. A dynamic communication approach was taken by the PMU, using information technologies (OKACOM website, publications, social media, TV, UNDP CO office media platforms) and presence to international events, but also building on the 15 years of consultations and work realised in the region for a concerted management of CORB resources.

Conclusion on implementation and adaptive management

Project implementation and adaptive management is rated *Satisfactory*. Putting apart the first year of the project, which weighs on the level of achievement of project results at mid-term, since 2019 the project management team and OKACOM at large, with UNDP as a supporting partner, have demonstrated excellent capacity to efficiently and cost-effectively manage the project and deal with the various challenges of a multicounty project, including the COVID19 pandemic. Finance and cofinance are on track, M&E systems are operational and effective, stakeholder engagement and country-ownership are real and communications usefully rolled out to keep awareness around the project objectives.

Sustainability

Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and no specific mitigation strategies have been defined. The project would gain from a formalised risk log identifying and updating risks and their mitigation strategies as the project goes.

There are strong indications that financial resources will be made available to OKACOM in the next few years, and the project has contributed to reinforce financial sustainability of its results

through various collaborations and the involvement of key stakeholders, in particular national and local government institutions.

The MTR did not identify important political and social risks, or risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits. Climate variability and change are the most important environmental risk to the region, with potential negative impacts on project outcomes if not adequately considered in future policies, strategies and interventions.

Conclusion on project sustainability

Risks are not well identified in the Prodoc and should be more clearly identified and managed. However, most risks to the project are limited and under control. Financial sustainability of most interventions after the project duration is very likely; political and social risks, as well as risks in terms of legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes, are limited. Environmental risks mostly relate to climate change variability and change, which have the potential to jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes in the long term.

At mid-term, potential sustainability of the project results is rated as *highly satisfactory***.**

4.2. Recommendations

Based on the above analysis, the MTR can draw a number of recommendations for the next and final period of the project. Those recommendations should be duly discussed and operationalised between the PMU/OKACOM and delivery partners, in order to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, as well as longer term impacts.

R1- Improve project management for results

As exposed in the above analysis, one of the main weaknesses of the project document stands in the proposed Results Framework (RF). As it stands the RF does not allow monitoring for results as per results-based management good practice. The RF should be adjusted to adopt a full set of SMART outcome level indicators to be monitored and reported on, and better capture outcome level results.

The inception period was used to refine baseline information and targets but did not modify the indicators set in the Prodoc RF. It is generally good practice to review the RF as set in the Prodoc at project start in order to check the links between outcomes and outputs, and ensure indicators set at outcome level are SMART, with well-established baselines.

A draft example of an adjusted RF is proposed in this report, but it should be completed using a participatory process. Given that the SAP M&E framework is now available, and considering the fact that the project is strongly aligned with SAP results, the adjusted RF would need to be aligned with the SAP M&E framework, using the same indicators as far as possible (a few project specific indicators may still be necessary however to capture some of the project expected results however). The adjusted RF should also include gender-focused indicators, in order to better capture gender mainstreaming results of the project.

The adjusted RF would allow better reporting for results, in particular in PIRs, being less descriptive and based on activities conducted, and more results focused.

R2- Identify major risks to the project and provide clear mitigation measures and management response into a risk log.

Results-based management good practice requires that risks to the project be clearly identified and mitigated through adapted and agreed management responses. This is currently lacking in the project: the Prodoc and GEF CEO Endorsement Request did not provide a real analysis of the risks to the project, of possible mitigation measures, and on the way those would be monitored and managed. PIRs reports are also deficient in terms of risk reporting.

Therefore, there is a need to identify main risks to the project, for different risk categories (political, economical, social, environmental), and propose mitigation measures, and report on those regularly.

R3- Build on and learn from the experience gained in demonstration projects

The project team is putting strong efforts in delivering substantial results in the demonstration projects. It is not easy, as there are many challenges in working with local communities in three different countries, through different delivery partners, and sometimes in very remote conditions. Whether those demonstration projects will deliver outstanding results or not is not, however, the most important in this project. What is key is for the project to carry on building on the experiences gained and to provide opportunities for ongoing OKACOM added value stemming from these experiences. In this sense, a replication strategy is planned during year 4 of the project.

It is therefore recommended to conduct an in-depth analysis of the success and failure factors of the demonstration projects, informing on the main challenges met, the solutions explored and the key parameters to consider when replicating the demos.

The three national governments, together with private and NGO implementing partners, have an important role to play in pursuing activities in the demos, ensuring their sustainability and long-term success. They also have responsibility in replicating the demos where suitable and relevant, and this is why a critical analysis of the demonstration projects will be useful. Such analysis will require to spend some time in the field, in every communities involved, and try to understand in each context the reasons for success or failure, so that implementation guidelines for future interventions can be prepared.

Linked to the above, a sub recommendation relates to the involvement of beneficiary communities in defining the interventions of the demonstration projects. Consultations did occur in this project, but frustrations relating to communities involvement into the design of the facilities to be constructed, or the equipment to be bought, were expressed. For the sake of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the demos, it is recommended to pay specific attention to the actual involvement of beneficiary communities at all steps of the project, from initial conception to the design of specifications for construction works, implementation and delivery. Employment of local workers in construction works may also need to be more systematic or more controlled. It is therefore recommended to ensure that the level of involvement of beneficiary communities in defining the interventions of the demonstration projects is appropriate and accepted by all.

R4- Identify strategies to address shortfall of time for project delivery

To compensate the important delays occurred at project start, and then because of COVID19 pandemic, the current pace of delivery is set to complete project activities as per the project completion date of April 2022. This timing seems very tight and specific strategies should be identified to ensure the project delivers on time, engaging with national and local stakeholders a well-defined project exit strategy, and ensuring sustainability of project results.

As such, OKACOM could consider hiring more staff for specific tasks, involving delivery partners more intensively in the field, subcontracting some activities and, if necessary, reducing some activities with lower impact on final outcomes (i.e. concentrate on most impactful activities).

R5- Ensure that climate change is duly considered and mainstreamed in project studies and assessments conducted, and complete a climate change sensitive IWRM plan for the basin

Climate change is a major risk to project results, and more widely in the socio-economical development and ecological balance of the CORB. In current scenarios, it is likely that the region will face more frequent and more extreme drought events, hotter conditions, and floods in the future. The latest drought events show that this has started already. It is therefore of utmost importance that all studies and assessments conducted during the project duly base their analyses on different, up-to-date climate change scenarios. This is specifically important for studies relating to water demand and water allocation, ground water assessment, sedimentation assessment, biological monitoring and socio-economic monitoring programmes. The development of an IWRM plan for the basin would constitute a major result of the project, as long as it builds up-to-date climate change scenarios, and elaborates water management options along those scenarios.

R6- Build on experience gained during this MTR when no travels are allowed

Conducting an MTR exercise without face-to-face interviews nor field visits is a challenge. Existing IT tools enable a lot, but do not replace completely real meetings and visits, which are also key moments for the consultants to more deeply understand the context in which a project is implemented.

Experience shows that conducting interviews with stakeholders in capital cities via teleconference is rather easily manageable, although sometimes impacted by connection problems or difficulties to reach people, set appointments, and more generally to get people involved.

Experience of remote field visits is interesting. The lesson learned is that for this to work really well, two main conditions must be met:

- One person should do the field visit anyways; ideally, a local consultant should be hired and travel to the project sites to meet with local stakeholders, take pictures and mini films, and ensure the link between the evaluation team and stakeholders. In such case, the international consultant is connected “in live” to the national consultant, so they can conduct interviews together, via a 3G connection. With no national consultant or dedicated person in the field for this, conducting interviews and virtual field visits is very trick for the international consultant.
- 3G Internet connection should be available. In very remote locations, this is a real problem and, in such cases, the national consultant needs to be able to conduct the work without the international consultant. Access to 3G connection can be set as one of the selection criteria for project site visits.

5.ANNEXES

5.1. Evaluation matrix

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1. Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results?			
1.1 Project Design			
1.1.1. To what extent is the problem addressed by the project relevant to its context and to the identified assumptions?	• Relevance of the problem in project sites - consistency with human development needs of the target provinces and the intended beneficiaries • Level of alignment between key assumptions made in the prodoc and situation in project sites	• Project planning documents • Local stakeholders, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and other local stakeholder groups • National government stakeholders • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP	• Desk review • Interviews • Focus groups • Field visits
1.1.2. How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results?	• Extent to which selected methods of delivery are appropriate to the development context • Level of coherence between outcomes, outputs and activities • Evidence of planning documents utilizing lessons learned/ recommendations from previous projects as input to planning/strategy process	• Project planning documents • Local stakeholders, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and other local stakeholder groups • National government stakeholders • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP	• Desk review • Interviews • Focus groups • Field visits
1.1.3. To what extent is the project responding to the national priorities and context?	• Level of alignment of the project outcomes and outputs with national priorities (a) at project inception; (b) at midterm	• Project planning documents • National policies, strategies and plans, including relevant sectoral policies • National government stakeholders • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP	• Desk review • Interviews

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1.1.4. Were perspectives from all relevant stakeholders taken into account during project design?	• Number and types of stakeholders consulted during project design • Evidence of concerns expressed being used to adjust project strategy	• Project planning documents • Local executing partners, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and other local stakeholder groups • National governments stakeholders • Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items	• Desk review • Interviews • Focus groups • Field visits
1.1.5. To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design?	• Number and types of activities undertaken during project design to assess gender-related needs for the project • Evidence of incorporation of these needs into the project document	• Project planning documents • Local executing partners, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and other local stakeholder groups • National government stakeholders • Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items	• Desk review • Interviews • Focus groups • Field visits
1.2 Results Framework / Logframe			
1..2.1 How clear, practical and feasible are project's outcomes and objectives? How realistic are the targets and timeframes?	• Coherence between objective, outcomes, outputs and activities • Feasibility of stated targets, outcomes and objectives within the project timeframe • Implementing entities' staff understanding of objectives, targets and timeframe • Local implementing partners' understanding of objectives, targets and timeframe	• Project planning documents, baseline report, monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP, other implementing partners' staff	• Interviews • Desk review • Field visit
1.2.2 How effective are the logframe's indicators, baselines and	• Use of SMART sets of indicators, baseline, target and mean of verification	• Project planning documents, baseline report, monitoring reports	• Interviews • Desk review • Field Visit

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
targets to measure effects from the project?	• Use of gender-disaggregated indicators and targets • Evidence of effects of the project on development or environment not measured by current indicators.	• PMU, OKACOM, UNDP, other implementing partner's staff	
2. Progress towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? (effectiveness)			
2.1 To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far?	• Extent to which the stated objectives, outcomes and outputs have been achieved • Progress between the most recent GEF Tracking Tool and its Baseline version	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Desk review • Focus groups • Field visits • Interviews
2.2 What are the main barriers to address and the main opportunities to leverage based on current progress towards results?	• Nature and extent of barriers hindering progress towards results • Nature and extent of opportunities generated by most successful achievements to date	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Focus groups • Field visits • Interviews • Desk review
3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level M&E systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation? (efficiency)			
3.1 Management Arrangements			
3.1.1 How effective are the management arrangements?	• Evidence of clear roles and responsibilities established • Evidence of timely and transparent decision making • Level of responsiveness of project team and of respective implementing bodies to changing project needs	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.1.2 What is the quality of execution of the project by the executing	• Level of alignment in actual and planned amount of budget and staff time devoted to the project	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP	• Interviews • Desk review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
agency and the implementing partner?	• Perceived quality of management response to project team members' inquiries, needs • Quality of supervision of IA and EA (rating on a scale), respectively • Quality of risk management by IA and EA (rating on a scale) • Quality of social and environmental management by IA and EA (rating on a scale) • Number of innovative techniques and best practices used in the project management	• Local and national stakeholders	
3.2 Work Planning			
3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, why?	• Timing and sequence of outputs against work plan • Cause and total delays (in months)	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.2.2 Are work-planning processes results-based?	• Proportion of results-based planning and reporting documents	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports	• Desk review
3.2.3 Was the logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool?	• Extent of management use of the log frame (number and type of usage)	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.3 Finance and co-finance			
3.3.1 To what extent are the outputs being achieved in a cost-effective manner?	• Cost per output compared to costs of similar projects • Level of alignment between planned and incurred implementation costs and nature of divergences	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
3.3.2 Is there any variance between planned and actual expenditures? Why?	• Planned budget per year, outcome and output • Actual budget execution per year, outcome and output	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.3.3 Does the project have the appropriate financial controls to make informed management decisions regarding the budget and flow of funds?	• Number and proportion of financial reports available • Timeliness of available financial reports • Quality of available financial reports • Availability of yearly audit reports	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports	• Desk review
3.3.4 To what extent is the project leveraging its planned co-financing?	• Amount of resources that project has leveraged since inception (and source(s)) • Number and difference between planned and actual executed co-financing activities • Degree of integration of externally funded components into overall project strategy/design	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Management teams from co-financing projects	• Interviews • Desk review
3.4 Project-level M&E systems			

3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?	• Existence and quality of:
	  ○ Roles and responsibilities;
	  ○ Budget and timeframe/ work plan
	• Proportion of executed M&E budget against planned amount
	• Proportion and types of M&E reporting materials submitted on time
	• Alignment with national systems and UNDP /GEF reporting requirements
	• Quality of M&E reporting materials
		• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports
		• PMU, OKACOM, UNDP
		• Local and national stakeholders
			• Interviews
			• Desk review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	• Evidence of consultation of all relevant stakeholders, including women and vulnerable populations • Extent to which the M&E systems that the project has in place helped to ensure that programmes are managed for proper accountability of results		
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement			
3.5.1 To what extent were effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country, district and community councils?	• Number and types of partnerships developed between project and international, national and local bodies/organizations • Extent and quality of interaction/exchange between project implementers and international, national and local partners	• Meetings/workshop minutes (Steering Committee) • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders • Project beneficiaries	• Interviews • Desk review • Field visits • Focus groups
3.5.2 To what extent is the project country-driven?	• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities • Existence and use of mechanisms to ensure national government stakeholders have an active role in project decision-making	• Project planning and management documents • Key national project partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.5.3 To what extent is the public /community stakeholders aware and supportive of the project's objectives?	• Number and type of public awareness activities • Number of people reached by these activities • Perceived benefits of the project by the public • Contribution of public awareness to the progress towards achievement of project objectives	• Monitoring reports • Community stakeholders	• Desk review • Field visits
3.6 Reporting			

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
3.6.1 How were lessons derived from the adaptive management process documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?	• Proportion of adaptive management processes documented • Proportion of these processes shared with partners • Evidence of use of lessons from these reports by partners	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.7 Communications			
3.7.1 How effective are communications to ensure stakeholder awareness about the project?	• Existence of an internal communication plan, communication protocols, and feedback mechanisms • Perceived level of awareness about project outcomes and activities by stakeholders	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDPf • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
3.7.2 Are effective external communication mechanisms in place?	• Number and type of external communication mechanisms or activities implemented • Perceived usefulness of communications by stakeholders	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • PMU, OKACOM, UNDP • Local and national stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
4. Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
4.1 Are the risks identified in the project document the most important? Are they still up to date?	• Existence of an exit strategy • Robustness of the exit strategy • Level of alignment of risk identified in the project document with (a) actual risks at project inception and (b) current risks • Appropriateness of risk rating	• Local executing team and executing partners • Project document and progress reports	• Interviews • Document Review
4.2 What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being	• Type and cost of activities that would require continued financial support after the end of the project to maintain outcomes • Existence of sources of funding for these activities	• Local executing team and executing partners • Project document and progress reports	• Interviews • Document Review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
available once the GEF assistance ends?			
4.3 Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?	• Existence and type of political and social conditions potentially affecting the sustainability of direct outcomes • Existence of mechanisms to document and exchange lessons learned (including technical knowledge) • Existence of champions that could promote the sustainability of project results	• Local implementation partners • Local communities • Project monitoring and reporting documents/data • Government stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
4.4 Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits?	• Existence and type of frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize project benefits • Type of frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes currently lacking to ensure sustainability of project benefits	• Local implementation partners • Government stakeholders, technical staff • Policy documents	• Interviews • Desk review
4.5 Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?	• Existence and intensity of biophysical conditions affecting the sustainability of project outcomes	• Local implementation partners • Government stakeholders, technical staff • Policy documents	• Interviews • Desk review

5.2. List of documents reviewed

OKACOM:

- National Action Plans : Botswana, Namibia, Angola
- HR Revised Manual
- Finance and Administration Manual
- Gender Mainstreaming Strategy
- Procurement Manual
- The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission. 2011. *Okavango River Basin Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis*.
- The Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission. 2011. *Strategic action programme (SAP) for the sustainable development and management of the Cubango-Okavango basin.* Maun, Botswana: OKACOM, 2011

Project documents:

- Annual work programs 2018, 2019, 2019 revised, 2020
- Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) Meeting Minutes, April 2019
- 2nd PSC Meeting Minutes Gaborone 2019
- ACTA DA 1ª REUNIÃO DO CDPPNUD, June 2018
- Quarterly reports (2018: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4; 2019: Q1, Q3-4; 2020: Q1, Q2)
- GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR 2019, 2020)
- Annual Progress Reports (APR 2018, 2019-20)
- English Project Brief
- OKACOM UNDP-GEF SAP Project Brief_rev
- MicroAssessment and Audit reports
- Missions reports (various missions from 2018, 2019, 2020)
- Project document (ProDoc)
- Okavango SAP prodoc signature page
- CEO_Endorsement_Request_Document
- PIF_Request_Document
- GEFReviewSheet
- STAPReviewAgency
- Minutes of the Local Project Appraisal Committee Meeting
- Final Inception Report, August 2018
- Social and Environmental Screening Template
- PIMS 4755 Annex 5 Okavango GEF IW Tracking Tool

UNDP documents:

- Draft country programme document for Angola (2015-2019)
- Country programme document for Angola (2020-2022)
- Country programme document for Botswana (2017-2021)
- Draft country programme document for Namibia,2014-2018
- Country programme document for Namibia (2019-2023)

Deliverables from consultancies:

- OKACOM_Policy and Procedure Manual_Project Scoping Report
- OKACOM_Policy and Procedure Manual_Inception Report
- OKACOM Groundwater Sector Situation Analysis Report
- OKACOM Livelihoods Demos - Final Scoping Report
- Review of OKACOM 1994 Agreement - Inception Report
- Review of OKACOM 1994 Agreement -Scoping Report
- Review of OKACOM Communication Strategy - Inception Report
- OKACOM PROJECT DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT - GroundWater Assessment Study
- OKACOM Livelihoods Demos - Final Inception Report

5.3. List of people and institutions consulted

Full Name	Institution	Position	Contact
Janeiro Avelino Janeiro	UNDP-GEF Support to the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Implementation project	Regional Project Manager	Janeiro.avelino@undp.org
Tracy Molefi	OKASEC	Program coordinator	tracy@okacom.org
Carolino Mendes	Angola Co-chair Commissioner	Técnico Superior, Gabinete para a Administração da Bacia Hidrográfica do Cunene (GABHIC)	carolinomm10@yahoo.com.br
Carlos Andrade	Co-chair OBSC	Coordinator of the Interministerial Commission for International Waters Agreements	calucarlos@yahoo.com.br
Kobamelo Dikgola	Co-chair OBSC	Chief Researcher, Ministry of Land Management, Water and Sanitation Services (MLWS)	kdikgola@gov.bw
Aun Amwaama	Co-chair OBSC	Water Quality Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)	Aune.Amwaama@mawf.gov.na
Christopher Munikasu		Water Quality Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)	Christopher Munikasu <Christopher.Munikasu@mawlr.gov.na>
Josephine Lipinge		Ministry of envt and tourism	Josephine Naambo Iipinge <andthose@yahoo.com>
Phera Ramoeli	OKACOM	Executive Secretary	phera@okacom.org
Reinhold Kambuli	UNDP-GEF Support to the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Implementation project	Demonstration Projects Coordinator	reinhold@okacom.org

Portia Segomelo	European Union Supported Programme for Transboundary Water Management in the Cubango–Okavango River Basin	Proeject Maneger	segomelop@okacom.org
Jacinta Barrins	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Resident Representative RR	jacinta.barrins@undp.org
Akiko Yamamoto	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Regional Technical Adviser	akiko.yamamoto@undp.org
Chimbidzani Bratonozic	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Programme Specialist - Environment and Climate Change	chimbidzani.bratonozic@undp.org
Bame Mannathoko	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst	bame.mannathoko@undp.org
Falkon Kiowa	WRTC Member	Gabinete para Administração da Bacia Hidrográfica do Rio Cunene (GABHIC)	elivanilsonfalkon@gmail.com
Pako Modiakgotla	WRTC Member	Department of Water Affairs, Ministry of Land Management, Water and Sanitation Services (MLWS)	pkmodiakgotla@gov.bw
Laurica Afrikaner	WRTC Member	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)	laukeis@gmail.com
Kai Collins	National Geographic, Okavango Wilderness Project	Director	kai@wildbirdtrust.com
Charles Reeve	Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility (CRIDF)	Team Leader	charles.reeve@cridf.com
Sekgowa Motsumi	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Okavango Basin Program Director	sekgowa.motsumi@tnc.org
Botswana Field visits			
MAUN			

Banabotlhe Motsholwane	Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food Security (MoA) - Dept. Crop Production		bmotsholwane@gov.bw
Keotshephile Kashe	University of Botswana - Okavango Research Institute		kkashe@ub.ac.bw
Siyoka Simasiku	NGONGO		director@ngongo.org
Fanuel Otukile	NGONGO		otukilef@gmail.com
Mr Morundu	Farmer in Maun		
Mme Otumile	Dolphies farm; Maun		
Chatiwa	Fantasia Farm; Maun		
Mr Hange	Great achievers' farm, Maun		
Mr Noseco	Farmer in Maun		
SHAKAWE			
Elisabeth P. Keabetswe	Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food Security (MoA) - Dept. Crop Production		enkisa@gov.bw
Malebogo I. Gigeon	Crop Production (MoA)		mgideon@gov.bw
Mme Motari Mohambo	Farmer in Shakawe		
Mme Mateo kanyota	Farmer in Shakawe		
Angola field visits			
CALAI			
Jaime Katonde	ACADIR team		
Isaac Mayapa	ACADIR team		
Adolpho	Farmer in Calai		
Eduardo	Farmer in Calai		
Antonio Chipita	ACADIR team		
Namibia field visits			

Mr. Laurence Lirumba	Khaudom North Complex (Muduva Nyangana and Goerge Mukoya Conservancies) Conservancies Manager		sllirumba@gmail.com
Mr. Max Muyemburuko	Conservancy chairperson Muduva Nyangana Conservancy		max.muyemburuko@gmail.com
Mr. Apollinaris Kanyinga	Project overall matters		apollinaris.kannyinga@met.gov.na
Modestus Nghipangelwa	Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism		modestus.nghipangelwa@met.gov.na
Andreas Callard	Manager for George Mukoya Conservancy		
Max Kangwaka Muyemburuko	Chairperson Muduva Nyangana Conservancy		
Festus Shikerete	Senior Headman and Acting Chief of the Gciriku Traditional Authority		

5.4. Overview of interview protocols

The table below provides an overview of the questions to be asked during interviews, and who they will be asked to. Before conducting the interviews, they will be separated into specific interview protocols per type of stakeholder. Some questions may then be rephrased to adapt to the type of stakeholder interviewed.

Questions	PMU/OKASEC	UNDP COs	PSC and key partner institutions	OKACOM bodies	Local authorities	International Cooperating Partners	Implementing partners /NGOs	Communities
Introduction								
What is your position?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
What is your relationship to the project and for how long have you been involved?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1. Project strategy								
1.1 Project Design								
1.1.1 How important is the problem addressed by the project in the region?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1.1.2 How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results? (Were lessons from previous projects integrated into project design?)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1.1.3 To what extent is the project responding to the national priorities and context? Has this changed since project design?	x	x	x	x	x			
1.1.4 In your opinion, were all people affected or concerned by the project consulted during project design?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
1.1.5 To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design? *(Were any activities undertaken to assess gender-related needs for the project during project design?)*		x	x	x	x		x	x
1.2 Results Framework/ Logframe								
1.2.1 Could you please explain in your own words the objective and intended outcomes of the project, its targets and their related timeframes?	x	x	x	x				
1.2.1 How realistic are they?	x	x	x	x				
1.2.2 Are there effects on development or on the environment that are not measured by current indicators?	x	x	x	x				
2. Progress towards results								

Questions	PMU/OKASEC	UNDP COs	PSC and key partner institutions	OKACOM bodies	Local authorities	International Cooperating Partners	Implementing partners /NGOs	Communities
2.1 To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far? (Provide a list, as needed)	x	x	x	x	x		x	
2.2 What are the main barriers to address to achieve expected results? What are the main opportunities to leverage?	x	x	x	x	x		x	
3. Project implementation and adaptive management								
3.1 Management arrangements								
3.1.1 Are the roles and responsibilities of the PMU/OKASEC, UNDP, PSC and other partners clearly established?	x	x	x	x				
3.1.1 In your opinion, is decision-making timely and transparent? How responsive are partners to changing needs of the project?	x	x	x	x				
3.1.2 How would you describe the quality of management responses to project team members' inquiries and needs?	x	x	x	x				
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by UNDP? Why? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)	x			x				
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by OKASEC? Why? (same scale)		x	x	x	x		x	
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of risk management by OKASEC and UNDP? Why? (same scale)	x	x	x	x				
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of social and environmental management by UNDP and by OKASEC? Why? (same scale)	x	x	x	x				
3.2 Work Planning								
3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, could you describe their cause and how many months of delay occurred?	x	x			x		x	
3.2.3 How often do you use the project's logframe for management and/or M&E? How do you use it?	x	x						
3.3 Finance and co-finance?								
3.3.1 Is the project being implemented in a cost-effective manner? How? If not, why?	x	x	x					
3.3.2 Have there been any variations between planned and actual expenditures? If yes, which ones and why?	x	x	x					

Questions	PMU/OKASEC	UNDP COs	PSC and key partner institutions	OKACOM bodies	Local authorities	International Cooperating Partners	Implementing partners /NGOs	Communities
3.3.3 What (and how much) co-financing is the project leveraging? How has this evolved since project design?	x	x	x			x		
3.4 Project-level M&E systems								
3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?	x	x	x					
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement								
3.5.1 How frequently do you interact/exchange with project staff / local partners?	x		x		x		x	x
3.5.1 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of your interactions? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)	x		x		x		x	x
3.5.2 Is the project as it is implemented, appropriate to your realities and capacities?			x		x		x	x
3.5.2 Are you aware of any mechanisms being in place for you to influence project decision-making?			x		x			
3.5.3 In your opinion, is the project beneficial to your community? If so, what are its benefits?					x		x	x
3.6 Reporting								
3.6.1 How many lessons from adaptive management processes were shared with partners? Which partners?	x	x	x					
3.6.1 Did you receive any documentation about lessons drawn from adaptive management processes undertaken by the project?			x		x			
3.6.2 Could you provide examples where these lessons were used by your organization?			x		x			
3.7 Communications								
3.7.1 Could you please tell me what the project expected outcomes and activities are?					x	x	x	x
3.7.2 What communication mechanisms or activities have been implemented by the project? Who has been targeted?	x							
3.7.2 How have you received information about the project? Was this information useful?			x		x	x	x	x
4. Sustainability								
4.1 Have the risks assessed during project design proven relevant? Have they evolved? (How?)	x	x	x					
4.2 Which activities would require continued financial support after the end of the project for project outcomes to be maintained?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x

Questions	PMU/OKASEC	UNDP COs	PSC and key partner institutions	OKACOM bodies	Local authorities	International Cooperating Partners	Implementing partners /NGOs	Communities
4.2 Which outcomes should normally be maintained without additional resources?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
4.3 What social and/or political conditions could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes could potentially affect the sustainability of project benefits? How?	x	x	x	x	x		X	
4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes are lacking to ensure the sustainability of project benefits? Why?	x	x	x	x	x		X	
4.5 Are there any biophysical constraints that could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x

5.5. Progress Towards Results Matrix

Indicator Assessment Key

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

Progress Towards Results rating Scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level & assessment	Achieve-ment Rating	Justification for Rating
Objective: Strengthening 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						
OKACOM governance documents and institutional structure strengthened for stronger regional cooperation and joint management	A set of governance documents including OKACOM Agreement exist but they precede the development and endorsement of the SAP. Upon the completion of the SAP, an Institutional Functional Review was conducted to better align the OKACOM structure to the SAP. OKACOM Organisational Structure Agreement was approved and signed in 2015 (and is under implementation) OKACOM Agreement Discussion Paper 2017	OKACOM dialogue on Agreement Discussion Paper (2017) and decision made on whether to Review OKACOM Agreement	A comprehensive governance review, including the legal status of the OKACOM Agreements conducted; Recommendation implemented; OKACOM's institutional and governance capacity strengthened for the joint management of the basin.		S	- The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have led to the decision to review the 1994 OKACOM Agreement - On strengthening the institutional capacity to implement the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) priorities, Terms of Reference for the Technical Committees have been completed and approved by the OBSC - The PMU has also contributed substantively to the discussion on the adoption of the Rules and Procedures for the Sharing of Data and Information related to the Management and Development of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin - As part of strengthening institutional instruments, the Secretariat is currently in the process of reviewing several governance instruments following recommendations from the Micro-Assessment, Spot-check and Audits commissioned by UNDP and the Multi-Sector Investment Opportunity Analysis commissioned by the World Bank. The USAID Resilient Waters Program is currently supporting the Revision of the OKACOM Human Resources Policy and Procedures (HRPP). Meanwhile, UNDP-GEF support is assisting OKACOM with the review of the Administration, Procurement, Asset Management and IT Policy instruments
Strengthened technical capacity of the OKACOM for joint management and cooperative decision making and policy discussions	A limited number of TB WRM issues are being translated into policy and institutional development questions due to the absence of a policy analysis unit within	At least 1 TB management issue per SAP Thematic Area translated into a formal recommendation per	At least 85% of all OKACOM derived policy advice is translated into country specific regulations or management		S	- The consulting procress with the Member States on the Data Sharing Protocol - as part of the ongoing Decision Support System (DSS) development process – is completed. Member States agreed on the format of data, type of data and frequency that must be shared between Member States, as well

	OKACOM; No evidence of policy analysis and advise mainstreamed in OKACOM TB Management practices except for SAP; No OKACOM technical products have been put through peer review systematically except for TDA and associated technical reports.	year by the end of Year 2 of project implementation. At least 85% of all OKACOM derived policy advice is translated into country specific regulations or management procedures in the CORB by the end of the project. At least 85% of all OKACOM related publications undergo a peer review mechanism by the end of Year 2 of project implementation.	procedures in the CORB by the end of the project. At least 85% of all OKACOM related publications undergo a peer review mechanism by the end of the Year 2 of the project implementation.			as with the Secretariat - 4 Joint surveys on water quality and quantity involving members of the WRTC from the 3 member states have been piloted. The data collected over these joint surveys informed the development of an Environmental Monitoring Framework (EMF). The EMF will also include other components of the SAP thematic areas and will be used as a strategic tool for policy discussions and decision-making. - A Policy Brief on "Realising the benefits of transboundary water cooperation in the Cubango-Okavango River Basin" has been developed with support from the Water Convention Secretariat hosted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE).
Increased financial investments by countries and other partners towards the basin resources management and SAP implementation	The regular income of OKACOM is limited to the country contribution ($100,000/country/year as of 2014)	-	The sustainable income flow to the OKACOM increased and diversified by 50% by 2020		HS	- The Council of Commissioners agreed in July 2019 to increase their contribution to the Commission's work[16]. The Council agreed on a phased approach with USD 150,000 per member state as the final target, starting in 2020 with USD 120,000 per member state. This shows an increment of USD 60,000 from previous years for the 2020/2021 fiscal year contributions from Member States. This is a notable achievemnet, ahead of time. - A number of projects with OKACOM have increased its financial capacity to effectively deliver on the SAP thematic areas, in particular this UNDP-GEF project and EU direct support. Other projects' financial contributions are less accurate as they are not directly managemned through OKASEC. Those include in particluar the Climate Resilient

[16] **2020 GEF PIR (Cumulative progress) + Q1 2020 Progress**

						Infrastructure Development Facility (CRIDF) - OKACOM has also advanced on the establishment of the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Fund (CORB Fund), which has been officially registered in Botswana as of December 2019, with them aim to support OKACOM thematic areas with regular resources.
# of people actively engaged in the low-impact, environmentally sustainable development activities in the basin (gender disaggregated data will be collected on participation in environmentally sustainable activities and on the improvement of socioeconomic status)	A number of community-based activities implemented in the basin, but its individual or aggregated economic impacts not yet assessed. (The baselines will be established at pilot sites within 3 months after inception workshop and approval of the annual workplan)	# of targeted people (and baseline economic status) to be determined at pilot sites within 3 months after inception workshop and approval of the annual workplan. The definition of the baseline for the demonstration projects suffered from delays. The consultancy for this work was awarded to the Okavango Research Institute, who submitted its final report in 2020.	6 demo projects successfully demonstrating significant socioeconomic impacts on the basin communities' livelihood from low- impact environmentally sensible development activities demonstrated in the basin by Year 3.		MS	- Demonstration project beneficiaries were identified. However, it is still difficult to ascertain at this point the total number of people to be directly involved in the demonstration projects. - Since there is no target number of people in the project results framework, it is not possible to assess whether the numbers provided in the Okavango Research Institute study are reaching expectations or not.
# of hectares under better management	To be determined during the inception period. (The baselines will be established at pilot sites within 3 months after inception workshop and approval of the annual workplan).	To be determined during the inception period.	Protection of water towers (TNC, CRIDF, GCF application) by Year 4 Land management interventions earmarked at addressing livelihoods thematic area of the SAP- demo projects (EU) in place by Year 3		MS	- The baseline was not determined at inception as initially planned. - A total of 20.8ha under better management in Angola and Botswana. In the absence of baseline and target, it is not possible to assess the level of achievement of this indicator

Gender mainstreaming and women empowerment visibly advanced in the basin.	OKACOM Gender Strategy approved by OKACOM in 2015, but its implementation not tracked with a systematic M&E process. OKACOM Gender Strategy under revision and production of Action Plan (GIZ).	Gender Action Plan, which includes an M&E plan, developed by end Year 1. Baseline data established for each demonstration project for selected key gender indicators before the demonstration implementation starts in Year 1.	Gender mainstreaming progress tracked systematically using the M&E Plan and reported to OKACOM as a standing item by Year 2.		MU	- The Gender mainstreaming Strategy and Implementation Plan was approved in November 2018 at the 37th OBSC meeting held in Luanda, and endorsed by OKACOM Council of Commissioners meeting in 2019. - The plan however does not include a fully developed M&E plan, and gender mainstreaming progress is not tracked systematically. - A few actions to mainstream gender aspects in demonstration sites and joint surveys tend to demonstrate specific efforts towards gender mainstreaming, but the M&E plan of the Gender strategy has not been used to date to track progress on gender mainstreaming at OKACOM. The indicator is therefore not achieved at mid-term.
Objective level overall rating					**MS**	
Outcome 1: A shared long-term basin development vision and concept of a development space						
A long-term basin vision agreed, underpinned by environmental quality objectives adopted by the countries.	A long-term basin vision not yet established. A Common and Shared Vision in place since 2015.	The Shared Basin Vision developed and adopted by the OKACOM by the end of Year 1 of the project implementation.	Operationalise Vision through delivery of the 4 outcomes of project starting in Year 1.		MS	- This indicator is normally part of Outcome 1, but it was wrongly placed in the "objective" section of the PIR. - Baseline is contradictory. The common ad Shared Vision was already in place in 2015, so the mid-term target is senseless. - End-of-term target strangely refers to the project 4 outcomes delivery. - A positive move is the dialogue on the concept of Development Space for CORB which was planned as part of the 25th OKACOM Anniversary celebration ceremony. However, due to the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic this activity has been put on hold.
Initial boundaries set for development space.	The concept of development space embraced by the OKACOM. No development space defined yet. The Multi-sector investment opportunity analysis (MSIOA) provided further guidance on boundaries/parameters for development (support from	-	Development Space discussed by the three countries and the initial boundaries determined by Year 2 based on the basin data and assessment available to OKACOM and reviewed by Year 4. Further elaboration of the development space through:		S	- CRIDF-supported Climate Vulnerability Assessment in the Cubango-Okavango River Basin led to the preliminary identification of hotspots, confirmed by the riparian states over a validation workshop. For the identified hotspots, definition of key current and future vulnerabilities and risks have been achieved by mapping and overlaying available datasets. Most of the hotspots are those already targeted for the livelihoods demonstration projects under this project outcome 3. - This assessment will be further complemented with the ongoing joint monitoring programs on water

	World Bank). Initial Climate Resilient development Pathways (CRDP) analysis in place (supported by CRIDF).		-climate vulnerability assessment to identify hotspots -Updated MSIOA models regarding development by Year 2			flows and water quality, as well as the ongoing study on the Groundwater in the CORB to engage the Member States on the dialogue to define the concept of development space for the Basin. - Moreover, the ongoing review of the 1994 Agreement as also brought relevant preliminary information that will lead to an updated Basin Management instrument that should combine both, SAP and MSIOA aspect into unique Basin Management Plan. - The OKACOM 25th anniversary celebration in April 2020 should have been an occasion for Member States to engage in a Stakeholder Dialogue on what the concept of development space would entail in the context of CORB. However, this event was postponed due to the COVID outbreak.
Customized Decision Support Systems relevant to OKACOM developed and used	Water Evaluation and Planning System (WEAP) has been used in the Okavango but on an ad hoc, project basis (e.g. in the framework of the Integrated Flows Assessment (IFA) and Cubango-Okavango River Basin Water Audit (CORBWA) project.) and no institutional or technical capacity built in OKACOM to use it as a basis for DSS. WEAP can be a suitable candidate for a water management model underlying basin management decision support system. IFA was also applied in the basin during the TDA scenario development, but no technical capacity was built in OKACOM.	Technical capacity for the development and application of WEAP (various models e.g. PITMAN) developed in OKACOM as well as in the countries by end of Year 2 of the project implementation.	Hydrological model underlying the WEAP improved to strengthen the WEAP by the end of Year 2. IFA improved. Robust DSS established and strengthened with improved WEAP and IFA by Year 3. DSS fully integrated into the work of Policy Analysis and Programme Coordination Units by Year 3.		S	- DSS specialist recruited through EU funding to ascertain the existing data and associated mechanisms for data collection, and conduct consultations on data sharing procedures and protocols at OKACOM with member states and OKASEC. - Significant progress made in relation to the modelling aspects for the DSS. - With combined EU/UNDP-GEF support, OKASEC held a last consultation workshop with Member States, OBSC, WRTC, and IPDTC on the Data Sharing Procedures / Protocol as part of the DSS. Member States agreed on data format, type of data and frequency that must be shared between member states, as well as with the Secretariat. The instrument has been endorsed by the Council of Commissioners at their last meeting held on the 2nd July 2020 and subjected for approval by the Forum of Ministers
Design and agreement of an Information Management Systems to accommodate both live	Data management and exchange restricted to static data and hosted by external	-	Basin information management systems strengthened to accommodate both live and static data.		MS	- Information Management System (IMS) for OKACOM developed through GIZ support, as well as development of the Notification and Prior Consultation (NPC) Guidelines for the CORB.

and static data	institutions Scoping exercise on information management system (ongoing and supported by GIZ)		Basin information management systems used to support DSS and decision framework.			- A regional consultative workshop/scoping exercise with key stakeholders from Member States held in Gaborone in April 2018. - At MTR stage, the actual contribution of the UNDP-GEF project to this indicator/result is unclear
Transboundary PES principles fully incorporated in OKACOM's sustainable financial mechanisms, including the OKACOM Endowment Fund	Some studies on PES conducted, but no PES scheme established. The idea of a PES scheme has evolved into an endowment fund due to the complexity of transboundary elements. Efforts to establish the Endowment Fund is underway. Fund Establishment Document (Constitution). Fund Governance Documents (draft finance manual, operational manual, M&E, grants) in place.	-	Transbounday PES principles fully incorporated in OKACOM's sustainable financial mechanisms, including the OKACOM Endowment Fund to support the SAP implementation by the end of Year 3 of the project implementation. Financing of source water protection activities (to ensure sustenance of the flow of goods and services from the system) in place by Year 4.		HS	- The CORB Endowment Fund was officially registered in December 2019, with the nomination of all member states' Board of Directors. - With the establishment of the CORB Fund, the project will now be able to initiate discussions on the approach and processes to define the CORB T-PES (Transboundary Payment for Ecosystem Services), which can be used as alternative funding stream to the CORB Fund. Part of the resources of the Fund will be directed into investments aimed at addressing livelihoods challenges within identified vulnerability hotspots across the CORB. - The Secretariat initiated the development of the Terms of Reference that will lead to the development of a comprehensive T-PES principles. - Other ICPs are also working towards finalizing the CORB Fund Business Case such as The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and the USAID Resilient Waters Program. An exchange visit with Mozambican Biodiversity Trust Fund (BioFund) was initially planned for the first quarter of 2020 with the Board of Directors from the Member States, however, the visit was cancelled due to current global emergency due to the outbreak of COVID-19.
Outcome 1 overall rating					**S**	
Outcome 2: Strengthened Management framework including enhanced OKACOM mandates						
SAP and NAP operationalised & M&E framework to monitor SAP/NAP implementation progress designed and applied	Some activities prioritized under NAPs and SAP under implementation but no systematic means to monitor, track and report the SAP/NAP implementation progress or the effectiveness of the SAP/NAP	A set of indicators to monitor, track and report the SAP and NAP implementation progress agreed by the end of Year 1 of the project implementation.	*(not set or not applicable)*		MS	- The project provided inputs to the development of an M&E framework through a GIZ funded consultancy. The exercise involved regional and national stakeholder consultative processes to scope needs and priorities for Member States with regards to a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) platform that will systematically track the status of implementation of OKACOM's activities and

	implementation Scoping exercise to determine appropriate M&E framework for SAP/NAP (and OKACOM)-GIZ ongoing support.	NAP implementation units' capacity to plan and implement NAP related activities strengthened by Year 2. SAP/NAP implementation progress reported to the OKACOM using the agreed indicators from Year 2 onwards.				programmes as outlined in the SAP. - Pilot implementation of the M&E framework were conducted in the two riparian states of Angola and Namibia, and the results were presented at the 37th OBSC meeting in Luanda. This led to the approval of the proposed M&E Workplan by the OBSC for the period of November 2018 to May 2019, and its extension to Botswana. - OKASEC has since been systematically applying SAP/NAPs M&E Framework to its various set of activities. The Framework has notably informed the demonstration projects set of indicators complementing the IW tracking tool indicators. - Specific contribution of UNDP-GEF funds to this result needs to be clarified.
Revision of the OKACOM agreement to align its mandates and legal status to effectively monitor and coordinate SAP implementation.	The original OKACOM Agreement and other governance document exist. Institutional Analysis approved by OKACOM to align OKACOM with SAP but yet to be implemented. OKACOM Organisational Structure Agreement was approved and signed in 2015 (under implementation) OKACOM Agreement Discussion Paper 2017	OKACOM agreement and a suite of governance document reviewed and revised, as necessary, to align better by the Year 2 of the project implementation. OKACOM dialogue on Agreement Discussion Paper (2017) and decision made on whether to Review OKACOM Agreement.	A comprehensive governance review, including the legal status of the OKACOM Agreements conducted; Recommendation implemented; OKACOM's institutional and governance capacity strengthened for the joint management of the basin.		S	- With the support of the UNDP-GEF project, OKACOM engaged a consultant (OneWorld) to develop a position paper that could guide the review of the OKACOM Agreement. The discussion paper strongly recommended the review of the Agreement. Building on this recommendation, a consultant was recruited in 2019 to work on its review. The consultancy is ongoing, so far an inception report and the initial Scoping Report were submitted. - OKACOM has also requested the service of an independent expert in International Water Law to provide expert peer-review of the main deliverables of the OKACOM Agreement review process, which includes the Scoping Report, the Draft Revised Agreement, and the Draft Final Agreement. - Mid-term target is slightly delayed but given the Covid-19 context, result achievement is considered on track.
Strengthened OKASEC with technical capability to manage and operate the DSS and IMS	OKASEC under resourced, limited capacity to coordinate technical initiatives, no in-house capacity to operate DSS and IMS. Recommendations for the institutional reform approved by the OKACOM (which advocates for the DSS position).	In-house DSS Specialist appointed by Year 1.	Technical capacity built to manage DSS and IMS by the end of Year 3 of the project implementation, either in-house or through a long-term agreement.		HS	- A DSS Specialist has been appointed and is leading OKACOM DSS processes. - OKACOM Secretariat relevant staff and WRTC members trained on DRIFT and ORI Inundation models - The DRIFT-LAND model development is at an advanced stage. - Two exchange visits conducted with sister River Basin Organizations to benchmark on their respective DSS, to better inform the system being

						developed for OKACOM. - EU supported programme has initiated the procurement of IT based, hydrometric and relevant tools that will be core elements to secure a well-functioning DSS. - Ecological monitoring equipment delivered to OKASEC.
Transboundary EIA Guidelines and procedures developed and adopted by OKACOM	SADC Protocols on Environment and Shared Water Courses exist. On-going exercise to develop guidelines for Notification on planned measures (GIZ ongoing support) No TB EIA Guidelines and procedures specific to the CORB exist.	-	TB EIA Guidelines and procedures in conformity with the SADC Protocols on Environment and Shared Watercourses developed by Year 2 and adopted by OKACOM by Year 3		S	- The approach of Transboundary Environment Impact Assessment (T-EIA) guidelines revealed sovereignty issues. They were proven irrelevant as Member States regulations at country level prevail in situation in which such studies are required. - Therefore, a basin SEA (Strategic Environment Assessment) revealed to be the most appropriate instrument for the CORB, adding the T-EIA guidelines as an annex to the SEA. - The process for the SEA consultancy has been initiated. The call for proposals is expected to be floated in the 3 member states by mid-July 2020
Communication and Information Strategy Implemented	OKACOM Communication and Information Strategy in place but not implemented. OKACOM actively participated in the IW: LEARN organized activities in the past. CRIDF Engagement Plan (one of the themes is on communication).	Implementation Plan for the Communication and Information Strategy developed with special focus on the women and youth empowerment through knowledge, incorporating recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy by Year 1. Functional (user-friendly) OKACOM website in place by Year 1.	OKACOM actively participated and shared its experience through various IW:LEARN organized activities.		HS	- Implementation Plan for the Communication and Information Strategy developed and is currently being reviewed. - OKACOM Website re-designed and modernized, and the publication of two electronic newsletters (so far), produced in both English and Portuguese. - Comprehensive updated Brand Manual developed - Call launched for the establishment of a pool for advertising agencies to further assist with the provision of communication, marketing and advertising needs to the Secretariat. - Participation in the IW:Learn organized events and trainings. - Several articles for the OKACOM and the IW:Learn websites produced
Strengthened OKASEC with adequate Financial, Administrative, and Procurement capacity to manage donor-funded	OKACOM has its own Finance and Administration Manual and Procurement Manual.	All recommendations made by the system-based audit as well as by the UNDP Capacity Assessment	Improved F&A capacity of OKASEC observed by the OKACOM Institutional Task Force and/or external		S	- OKACOM Financial and Administrative system significantly improved. The secretariat moved from Excel based financial process to a web-based software (Sage Evolution). In addition, internal control structures have been put in place in line with

projects.	System-based audit conducted by SIDA as well as UNDP Capacity Assessment have provided a set of recommendations to strengthen their F&A capacity. Revised OKACOM HR Manual in place.	fully implemented by Year 2.	reviewers (at MTR & TE).			the existing Finance Manual. - The Secretariat is currently working on the review of different Procedures and Operations instruments following recommendations from the Micro-Assessment, Spot-check and Audits commissioned by UNDP and the Multi-Sector Investment Opportunity Analysis (commissioned by the World Bank), - The USAID Resilient Waters Program recruited a consultant who is currently working on the Revision of the OKACOM Human Resources Policy and Procedures (HRPP). The UNDP-GEF support is assisting OKACOM with the review of the Administration, Procurement, Asset Management and IT policy instruments.
Outcome 2 overall rating					**S**	
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						
M&E frameworks designed to monitor the demonstration progress and effectiveness	The value of low impact development as an alternative to conventional development is not fully appreciated. Data not collected for reliable analysis. A number of demonstration projects have been implemented but their economic, social and environmental values have not been fully assessed systematically.	M&E Framework with some of the following elements: Socio-economic evaluation at least six (6) a range of low impact development options utilizing the basin's ecological services by Year 2 A set of indicators agreed to monitor, track and evaluate the environmental and socio- economic impacts of demonstration activities systematically by Year 1.	Progress on demonstration and its impacts monitored and reported to OKACOM annually at the OKACOM meeting and through the OKACOM Annual Report (gender disaggregated data will be collected and tracked.) starting Year 2.		MS	- Delays on this target. - The University of Botswana-Okavango Research Institute was contracted in 2019 to assist OKACOM and PMU in developing the Demonstration Projects Socio-economic and Environmental Baselines and M&E framework. - An Inception and Scoping Exercise with relevant institutions was conducted in Angola and Namibia during the first quarter of 2020, but could not be conducted in Botswana due to COVID-19. However, relevant data for the Demonstration Project in Botswana were collected. - Final Reports of the Demonstration Projects Socio-economic and Environmental Baselines received, and the detailed corresponding M&E framework informed by field data and SAP M&E Framework is to be submitted and validated. - This exercise informed the project IW Tracking Tool with indicative baseline data on the demonstration projects indicators
Community-based Tourism activities demonstrated and documented	A few community-based tourism activities emerging in the basin, but their socioeconomic and environmental impacts not	2 demonstration activities promoting community-based tourism implemented (in Namibia) with the	Environmental and socio-economic impacts from community-based tourism activities		MS	<u>Botswana</u>: - Arrangements linking tourism market to local farmer defined; demonstration farmers engaged to establish their preferred demonstration crops in line

	systematically monitored. 2017 Climate-Resilient livelihoods assessment in the KAZA (including the Okavango Delta cluster)- CRIDF.	emphasis on gender empowerment through the demonstration activities.	captured through systematic monitoring, documented, disseminated by Year 4. (gender disaggregated data collected) A basin-wide tourism promotion strategy (emphasising on lessons learnt from M&E), considering recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy, by Year 4 [SAP TA1 1.3.2] At least 2 partnerships with private sector in promoting sustainable tourism in the basin.			with higher market demands - Maun Horticulture Supply Chain Value baseline assessments conducted (CRIDF) for targeted Champion Farmers/Farms to identify critical constraints and enabling interventions required to address barriers affecting local farmers to participate in the formal markets including the tourism higher end market. - Tourism component of Botswana demo strongly impacted by COVID19 pandemic, making supplies to this market very low. However, farmers interviewed reported high demand from the local market instead, replacing imports from South Africa for fresh vegetables. This validates the large potential for horticulture products in the region, both for local market and tourist facilities. Namibia - Tourism facility under construction in Sikerete Tourism Concession. Behind schedule, - Water infrastructure rehabilitation completed - Tourism Concession Specialist procured to conduct a situation analysis of the targeted concession in consultation with the local concessionaire - Second tender to procure a local consultant to facilitate the concessionaires (conservancies) to formulate and establish a Business Plan that identify the best business operation model for the Sikerete Tourism Project
Sustainable community-based fisheries demonstrated and documented	A few community-based fisheries activities emerging in the basin, but their socioeconomic and environmental impacts not systematically monitored. Transboundary Fisheries Management Plan (USAID SAREP 2012).	2 demonstration activities implemented (1 in Angola, 1 in Namibia), with the emphasis on gender empowerment through the demonstration activities.	Environmental and socio-economic impacts from community-based tourism activities captured through systematic monitoring, documented, disseminated by Year 4. (gender disaggregated data collected) Transboundary fisheries management guidelines (being		S	Angola: - Partner ACADIR working with communities to identify sections of the river where interventions should be implemented. - Facilitated establishment of fisheries management committees (with nominated resource monitors and fish guards), in 3 communities, and prepared fisheries management plan - Procurement of boats for patrols (about to be delivered) - Partnership with CRIDF to complement the fisheries management activities in 5 locations Namibia: - Namibian nature foundation facilitated the process

			informed by the outcomes of the demo projects), taking into account recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy, developed and tested at the community level by Year 3 [SAP TA1 5.1.1; 5.2.1; 5.4]			to adopt fisheries conservation into the existing conservancy constitution. 4-5 villages are in that conservancy. - Conservancy management committee in place also recommended to perform also duties of fisheries conservation - Ministry of fisheries facilitated the recruitment of fish monitors and fish guards for enforcement of interventions - Process to establish a fisheries protected area completed. Governor gave a supporting letter for the area to be approved by the minister - Also looking at opportunities for alternative livelihood. Want to demonstrate small scale aquaculture in tanks, and water used to irrigate fields
Community-based climate change adaptation measures demonstrated to improve food security and resilience through application of alternative/conservation agricultural practices	A few community-based food security activities emerging in the basin, but their socioeconomic and environmental impacts not systematically monitored by OKACOM. Climate-Resilient livelihoods assessment in the KAZA (including the Okavango Delta cluster)- CRIDF. SAREP Livelihoods projects (specifically CA related), CRIDF Mayana CA/irrigation Interventions.	2 demonstration activities implemented (1 in Angola, 1 in Botswana), with the emphasis on gender empowerment through the demonstration activities.	Environmental, socio-economic and climate change adaptation impacts from community- based food security activities captured through systematic monitoring, documented, disseminated by Year 4. (gender disaggregated data collected) A basin-wide climate smart agriculture promotion strategy (emphasising on lessons learnt from M&E), considering recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy, by Year 4 [SAP TA1 1.3.2]		MS (HS for Botswana and MU for Angola)	<u>Botswana</u>: - Demonstration crops established for all the individual 16 demonstration farmers as per farmers' aspiration. - Investments in shed nets, access to water, irrigation and supplies delivered to all farmers - Very good feedback on both production and marketing of products <u>Angola</u> - Out of the initial 30 farmers, only 7 engaged only in 2018-19 (good production results, but not very good quality data), and only 10 are on track for this year - Main challenge with partner ACADIR sitting in a municipality 450 km from demonstration sites, with no local presence in the community, which is very remote. - Markets not functioning, no agricultural input suppliers in the area - Partnership developed with EU support to put resources together and recruit a technical conservation agriculture professional who is going to seat in the community. - Also looking at the opportunity to practice small scale horticulture, engaging with the DFID climate resilient facility.

Replication Strategies to promote further environmentally sound socioeconomic development activities in the basin	No such strategies exist	-	Replication Strategy, taking into account recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy, developed and adopted by countries by Year 4.		MS	- Building on the implementation of the demonstration projects in all three countries, documentation strategies are being considered, in close consultation with the Communications Manager, to capture each - Demonstration project's Lessons Learnt starting to be captured for communication purposes - Team working to develop a replication strategy for each demonstration site, to adequately inform basin wide livelihoods initiatives
Outcome 3 overall rating					**MS**	
Outcome 4: Basin's capacity to manage transboundary water resources based on the IWRM principles enhanced, supporting the Basin development and Management Framework						
Common demand forecasting and yield assessment methodologies established	No basin-wide data on demand forecasting. Existing and forecast demand measured based on high growth rates and usages and not linked to hydrological cycle. No common yield assessment methodologies agreed basin wide. FAO CORB Water Audit (2015) in place. CORB Water Allocation Strategy (2017) exists and yet to be implemented. World Bank MSIOA (2018) in place.	Baseline on existing use and demand by Year 2.	Consistent methodologies applied in evaluating demand and resource yield in the basin by Year 4 Water Demand Management (WDM) strategy linked to the Water Allocation Strategy (WAS) by Year 4. Mechanism set in place to track demand, abstraction, water use efficiency with prioritised large water users (champions) by Year 3.		MU	- Mid-term target not reached, but first steps initiated. Joint surveys on water quantity and availability in member States (Angola, Botswana and Namibia) have started in 2018, and baseline data have been collected on water availability. - The project has supported the 4th joint survey on water flows undertaken in November 2019. Concurrently, a Basin Wide Groundwater Assessment has been initiated through a consultancy work, which covers a basin wide groundwater resources mapping. - The Groundwater study and Surface Water quantity will inform the water availability at basin level, which would enable OKACOM to setup mechanisms to track demand and abstraction. - As part of the joint monitoring which has been aborted due to the Covid outbreak, the training of WRTC members on demand forecasting has also been differed
Assessment of hydro meteorological monitoring programmes and recommendations for strengthening. Improvements funded in Angola in specific sites	Data in the Angolan part of basin is not as strong as the other two countries. Monitoring capacity in Angola is limited compared to the other two countries to develop a basin-wide hydrometeorological monitoring system. Limited assessment on requirements (priority sites and suitable equipment) in	-	Key data gaps in hydrometeorological monitoring system filled at key basin locations throughout the basin, including Angola by Year 3. A basin-wide hydrometeorological monitoring system established by Year 3 (feeding into common		S	- The project complements other investments in the basin on hydrometeorological monitoring system on the Angolan side of the basin, notably by assisting the stations installation process, and ensuring the participation of the members of the WRTC during the installation of the stations. - The project assisted the Secretariat in procuring an ADCP (Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler) for Angola. This will allow uniformity and comparability of data generated by Member States. The device calibration and testing exercise will be part of the training to the WRTC members scheduled for

	Angola by CRIDF and WRTC. National Geographic Okavango Wilderness Project has identified and mapped potential sites for hydrometeorological monitoring (including water quality). Installation of hydro-meteorological instruments (around Menongue) by TFO and SASSCAL.		demand forecast and planning methodologies), in collaboration with EU.			November 2020.
Sedimentation Monitoring Programme	No basin-wide, long-term sedimentation monitoring programme in place.	Assessment of erosion and erodibility in the CORB completed and submitted to OKACOM by Year 2.	Sedimentation transport model developed and included in the DSS by Year 4. Basin-wide sedimentation monitoring programme developed and agreed by Year 3.		S	- The Project trained members of the Water Resources Technical Committee from Angola, Botswana and Namibia in sediment measurement using appropriate equipment. - Sediment measurement was included in the Joint water quality survey which included Angola, Botswana and Namibia that was conducted in May 2019. - Basin wide sediment assessment study started (inception report expected by end of 2020). The assessment, which will guide the development of a comprehensive sediment monitoring programme, is conducted by a consortium of Academic and/or Research Institutions within the Member States. Relevant institutions within the basin with requisite competencies have been identified and solicited to submit a proposal. Another tender was also floated to target institutions that might have the required expertise but not yet known by OKACOM. - Some delays but on track for end-of-project completion
Water quality baseline survey undertaken and monitoring programme and improvement and investment strategy determined	Water quality monitoring conducted at country level (data not shared with other countries); data availability in Angola is scarce.	Baseline Assessment/Water quality review conducted by Year 1. Water quality monitoring (at minimum twice) yearly starting Year 2.	Water quality management framework established (including possible investments by countries and others beyond EU&UNDP support) by Year 2.		S	- Four joint monitoring exercises, addressing both water quality and quantity, in Member States undertaken over 2018 (July and November) and 2019 (May and November) to set the baselines for wet and dry seasons in the CORB. - The third survey has also included sediment monitoring process after substantive theoretical and technical training on sediment monitoring to WRTC members.

						- Fourth survey further demonstrated that the quality of the water within the basin based in both chemical and physio-chemical parameters remain in good standing. - Fifth joint monitoring exercise scheduled in May 2020 was cancelled due to COVID-19. - Data from joint monitoring have been sorted and are being analysed. The process of informing the basin wide water quality monitoring plan is ongoing. - It is to note that WRTC members were in capacity to handle different monitoring equipment. - The acquirement of Multi-Parameter Water Quality Meters by Member States to ensure similarity on the data collected and comparability in different parameters across the basin - supported by the project - was delayed.
Basin wide biological monitoring and socio-economic monitoring programmes	No basin-wide biological monitoring in place. No socio-economic monitoring programme in place. Socio-economic modelling done under MSIOA (economic performance against different investments and water use scenarios)-2018. TDA – economic analysis (Jonathan Barnes)-2007. Economic valuation of Delta (Jonathan Barnes)- 2005. National socio-economic data collected by National Statistics Offices, but data is not disaggregated to fit basin's geography.	-	Basin-wide biological monitoring in place by Year 3. Basin-wide socio-economic monitoring program tracking the socio-economic benefits from the CORB ecosystem services established (disaggregated as per OKACOM gender Strategy) by Year 3. Community-based biological and socio-economic status monitoring systems established and tested (with participation of demo beneficiaries).		S	- The development of an Environmental / Biological Monitoring Framework (EMF) for the Basin has been initiated. Thematic workshops intended to define monitoring objectives, appropriate methodologies and institutional arrangements for different disciplines were conducted. - Terms of Reference for Biodiversity and Environment Technical Committee and Socio-Economic Monitoring Committee, which will play a critical role for the planning and execution of the biological monitoring programme, were approved by OBSC. However, limited progress has been made towards the establishment of these technical committees. - Sites in the Basin have been identified for the Biological Monitoring program. The biological monitoring program should start in 2020. - The baselines and monitoring framework for a basin-wide biological monitoring and socio-economic monitoring programmes will be part of deliverables expected from the SEA consultancy (for which a firm has been selected in November 2020) to further inform the Basin Environmental Monitoring Framework.
Assessment of GW resources and report on potential utilisation	No basin-wide groundwater assessment report. Poor basin-wide mechanisms in place promoting	Groundwater Assessment Report with the identification of the potential	Establish basin-wide GW monitoring mechanism (including institutional set-up,		S	- Two Groundwater Workshops conducted (third quarter 2018 and first quarter 2019), which generated information used to develop the Terms of References for the Basin Wide Ground Water

	conjunctive use of surface and GW resources. Country level GW monitoring exists but limited in scope.	options by Year 2.	protocols, amendment of OKACOM hydrological data sharing protocol to also cover GW) by Year 3 MOU between OKACOM and SADC GMI (it could be other GW related institutions) by Year 3. Explore the potential and put in place mechanism for conjunctive use of Surface and GW resources by Year 4.			Assessment. This consultancy work has started, but faced challenges at the procurement stage (all financial offers associated to sound technical proposals were above the available budget). - The inception report for this 12-months study was submitted and approved, but the scoping process has been affected by COVID-19 outbreak.
IWRM basin plan developed, incorporating a Water Resources plan	No basin wide IWRM Plan exists. SAP fails to clarify or state possible investments in the basin.	-	Basin wide IWRM Plan, incorporating conjunctive uses of groundwater and surface water resources as well as recommendations from the OKACOM Gender Strategy, developed andadopted by OKACOM by Year 4. Investment Strategy and Plan (guided by the IWRM Plan and all the interventions delivered by the 4 Outcomes) by Year 4 (providing a possible way onward on the development space concept operationalisation).		S	- The development of a comprehensive basin wide Environmental Monitoring Framework (EMF) is ongoing, and will serve as a basis to the development of a Basin Wide IWRM. The EMF, which will feed into the Decision Support System, will support the development of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), for which a firm has been selected (November 2020). - A draft outline of the Environmental Monitoring Framework was presented to the OBSC meeting in December 2019. Member states monitoring plans were drafted by their respective WRTC members and overall findings from the joint surveys on water flows and quality will be finalized. - The development of an IWRM plan for the basin is a very critical undertaking. The PMU has been engaging with OKASEC senior management with the intention to agree on a pragmatic approach towards this result. Outcomes of several formal engagements at OKASEC pointed towards a technical stakeholder engagement meeting which will guide further development of a comprehensive IWRM plan for the basin. Engagement of this nature is important since there are already many on-going IWRM activities which need to be consolidated in a plan. The current thinking is to develop a

						comprehensive IWRM Plan which will include the SEA, the TDA, and the MSIOA as a basin wide management plan, informed by preliminary consultations finding on the review of the 1994 OKACOM Agreement. Discussion on modalities and approaches are on-going.
Outcome 4 overall rating					**MS**	

5.6. MTR Terms of Reference

PIMS 4755 Final MTR
ToR for International (

Baastel

30 Years Promoting Sustainable Development

North American Office

Le Groupe-conseil Baastel ltée
92, rue Montcalm
Gatineau (Québec)
Canada, J8X2L7

P: +1 819 595 1421
F: +1 819 595 8586

European Office

Le Groupe-conseil Baastel sprl
Boulevard Adolphe Max 55
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium

P: +32 (0)2 893 0032
F: +32 (0)2 503 3183

Representation Morocco

Olivier Beucher
P: +212 (0)6 96 61 80 61
E: olivier.beucher@baastel.com

Representation Jamaica

Curline Beckford
P: +1 876 298 6545
E: curline.beckford@baastel.com