

UNDP-GEF ORASECOM SAP Implementation Project Midterm Review Terms of Reference

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission State Parties (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and South Africa)

Application Deadline: 03rd September 2021

Type of Contract: Individual Contract (**Local Consultant**)

Post Level: Regional Consultant

Languages Required: English

Estimated Starting Date: (9th September 2021)

Duration of Initial Contract: 5 Months (40 Consultancy days spread over 5 months)

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title: Support to the Orange-Senqu River Basin Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Implementation (PIMS# 5506)

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Support to the Orange-Senqu River Basin Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Implementation* (PIMS# 5506) implemented through the *Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission (ORASECOM)*, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the 1st May 2019 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/eo/SitePages/gef-evaluation-guidelines.aspx>) specifically: *(COVID) UNDP-GEF-MTR-TOR-Template-June2020 ENGLISH JobsSite (3)*.

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Orange-Senqu River Basin originates in the highlands of Lesotho and runs for about 2300 km to its mouth on the Atlantic Ocean on the border between Namibia/South Africa. In 2000, the Orange-Senqu River basin state parties signed the agreement to promote transboundary cooperation that gave birth to the Orange-Senqu River Commission (ORASECOM).

ORASECOM, with support from UNDP, managed to secure further financial support from GEF to implement selected priority activities of SAP. The UNDP-GEF project titled, Support to the Orange-Senqu River Strategic Action Programme Implementation, will be implemented by UNDP and executed by ORASECOM in the next 5 years to support ORASECOM and its member states to implement SAP. The Investment from GEF is **USD 10,815,137**. The project has been built on the TDA which has carried out the necessary causal chain analyses in order to identify the transboundary threats to the sustainable development and management

of the water resources of the Orange-Senqu Basin. Having identified and understood the threats and their causes, it was possible to identify the barriers which are preventing the removal of these threats, so that sustainable development/management of the basins water and related resources can proceed.

The overall objective of the SAP Implementation project is the strengthening of joint management capacity for implementation of the basin-wide IWRM Plan and demonstrating environmental and socioeconomic benefits of ecosystem-based approach to water resources management through the implementation of SAP priority actions in the Orange-Senqu River basin. The project is implemented through 4 Components.

Component 1 Outcomes

The objective of Component 1 is to contribute to the enhanced transboundary basin planning and joint management of the basin. Realisation of this objective will especially contribute to the removal of Barrier 1, the limited basin-wide understanding of the available resources but also to removal of the other 4 barriers because of improved management. There are several targeted outcomes for Component 1.

Outcome 1.1: ORASECOM's capacity to develop innovative financing schemes strengthened.

Outcome 1.2: ORASECOM's joint basin planning capacity strengthened through improved data and information management and basin management support systems.

Outcome 1.3: SAP and country-specific Action Plans revised and updated for next 5-year cycle.

Outcome 1.4: Transboundary Environmental and Social Assessment Guidelines endorsed by Basin States.

Outcome 1.5: ORASECOM's capacity on communication, knowledge management, south-south cooperation enhanced.

Component 2 Outcomes

The outcomes of Component 2 are mainly aimed at addressing Barrier 3, the deteriorated quality of water resources. Focus is on industrial pollution and groundwater resources but the importance of water quality monitoring is given emphasis. The component also address Barrier 2, the limited potential for additional yields in the system by looking at how groundwater resource can be better used and protected.

Outcome 2.1: Basin-wide water resources quality monitoring system established

Outcome 2.2: Point source pollution in Lower Mohokare Catchment reduced and improved industry standards implemented.

Outcome 2.3: Quantity and quality of groundwater resources determined and low-cost groundwater desalination plants piloted in Botswana.

Component 3 Outcomes

Component 3 focuses on Addressing Changes to the Hydrological Regime through the application of the "Source-to-Sea concept". This will contribute in a critical way to the removal of Barrier 4, the adverse effects of a changed hydrological regime. As indicated in Section II, the hydrological regime has been highly altered.

Key areas will include agreement on environmental flows and their implementation and the implementation of measures to sustainably rehabilitate the Orange-Senqu River Mouth.

Outcome 3.1: Basin-wide environmental Flows regime agreed, and implementation supported.

Outcome 3.2: Critical ecosystem of the Orange-Senqu River Mouth rehabilitated and sustainably managed.

Component 4 Outcome

Component 4 concerns improved land productivity and improved living conditions through community-based sustainable land management. The focus area under this project will be on the control of invasive species in pilot areas on the Fish River in Namibia and the lower Orange in both Namibia and South Africa.

Outcome 4.1: Invasive species controlled through integrated management in pilot areas in the Orange–Fish River basin and livelihood options based on invasive species control developed.

Output 4.1.1: Distribution and abundance of invasive species in the basin determined and mapped

Output 4.1.2: Prosopis in pilot areas cleared

The work required to realise this output will be planned and designed together with Output 4.1.3.

Output 4.1.3: Economic opportunities based on alien clearing created

The project had a smooth start of its implementation in May 2019 and was expected to make good progress by June 2020, but the COVID-19 significantly distorted the project's 2020 work plan. E.g. the Joint Basin Survey, which was one of major output of 2020, had to be shifted from this year to the next year. Baseline establishment work for all demonstration sites have been put on hold because of the movement restrictions. 4 consortia of consultants were procured in time for each of them to start working at the 4 different demonstration sites from 1 March 2020, but they have been put on hold. Since COVID-19, very few field work trips have been authorized in most of 2020 and 2021. The project is highly relevant to the needs of the basin and closely aligned to the ORASECOM SAP implementation. It is on track; however, under some Outcomes the progress is behind the workplan, largely due to COVID-19. Realizing that the impacts of COVID-19 will not go away soon, the project has learnt to work more efficiently through virtual means and in this regard has supported the stakeholders from the 4 state parties with procurement of internet data. Additionally, the project has had to ensure that each international consultant hired during this period has a collaborating local consultant so that activities continue even with travel restrictions since most of the restrictions are around international travel.

Brief overview of the institutional structure of the Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission (ORASECOM)

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

The MINISTER'S FORUM

The Forum of Parties is comprised of Ministries responsible for water in the four Member States. The Forum initiated regular (annual) "Ordinary" meetings in 2011 and has since been incorporated into the ORASECOM Agreement as a structure of the Commission, in its revised version, signed in 2018.

The ORASECOM COUNCIL

The Council is the principal organ responsible for defining and guiding policy as well as for the general supervision of the activities of ORASECOM. The Agreement establishes Council as a technical advisor to the Parties on matters relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of the water resources in the River System. The Parties may also assign other functions pertaining to the development and utilization of water resources to the Commission. Article 5 of the Agreement empowers Council to take all measures to make recommendations on *inter alia*; water availability in the basin, equitable and reasonable sharing of water, studies on the development of the River System, the extent to which stakeholders should be involved in management of the system, the prevention of pollution and the control of aquatic weeds and plans for emergency situations.

All recommendations provided by Council to Parties must be contained in a report, signed by the leader of each Delegation. These reports must also include estimates of the cost of implementing the recommendation

and may suggest how these costs may be apportioned between the Parties. Recommendations to Parties must therefore not only indicate what must be done, but also how it must be done.

Technical Task Teams

The Commission mostly works through a subcommittees system of four Task Teams (Technical, Communications, Legal and Financial) of which the members are technical experts or advisors nominated by each delegation. Technical working groups are formed as required. Their work is facilitated by a Permanent Secretariat with offices established in South Africa.

ORASECOM Secretariat

The ORASECOM Secretariat is an organ of ORASECOM, with the legal capacity and mandate to assist ORASECOM in implementing its decisions. It also provides administrative, financial and general secretarial services support and assumes an instrumental role in information sharing and communication. The Secretariat is responsible for the day-to-day operations of ORASECOM and is based in Centurion, South Africa. ORASECOM Secretariat core staff includes the Executive Secretary (ES), who heads the Secretariat, The Water Resources Officer, Finance and Administrative Officer and the Administrative Assistant. As and when projects funding is available, the Secretariat is complimented by Project based staff.

Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners and stakeholders

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by ORASECOM; an Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) established by the four state parties.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is hosted in the ORASECOM Secretariat. The PMU is comprised of a Project Coordinator, Water Quality Environmental Expert, Communications and knowledge Management Specialist and a Project Administrative and Finance Officer. For the project implementation to follow as closely as possible to the ORASECOM's institutional structure presented above, and avoid the creation of project-specific implementation structures, the project reports through the various task teams of ORASECOM and a Project Steering Committee

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) provides oversight and strategic guidance to the project. The Project Steering Committee has 10 Permanent Members, as follows: 4 Commissioners to represent ORASECOM Council (one Commissioner per state Party), 4 Representatives of Department of Environment from the 4 state parties and 2 UNDP officials (UNDP, as GEF Implementing Agency to be represented by officer responsible from the UNDP Regional Office and the officer responsible from the South Africa country office). The Host ORASECOM Commissioner Chairs the PSC

The PSC is responsible for making management decisions for the project when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator. Its roles include (i) to review the project progress, approve budgets and financial reports, and review and approve outputs as requested, (ii) to provide strategic guidance and policy directions to project implementation and to (iii) ensure the relevance of the project by making sure that the project is well aligned to national policies and priorities of the countries and the basin it supports.

The ORASECOM Task teams assures the PSC that the project is being implemented effectively, ensures the quality of technical outputs from the project, and assists in the implementation of national and regional activities. It supports the ORASECOM Secretariat to coordinate the UNDP-GEF project with other ORASECOM initiatives supported by other partners and/or carried out by the countries or ORASECOM themselves to ensure the effective delivery of the ORASECOM Programme and the ORASECOM SAP

Implementation. The ORASECOM Task composition comprises of technical specialists from the four ORASECOM state parties. The roles and responsibilities of the Task Teams includes: (i) ensuring the technical quality of the final project deliverables through the review of ToRs and project deliverables at the draft stage, as requested by the Project Coordinator, (ii) critically examine submitted consultancy and research work to ensure product quality, and (iii) serve as a source of objective technical advice to all those involved at the policy, planning, management and implementation levels. The Technical task Teams are accountable to the ORASECOM COUNCIL and accessible to the PMU (entrusted to contribute in their respective areas of expertise).

As indicated in the background above, COVID 19 has had a negative impact in the implementation of activities due to restricted travel. This has meant that the consultants, Project team and stakeholders from government and non- governmental institutions have had to put away travel to demonstration sites and so on. As of 27th July 2021, South Africa has had 2,383,490 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 70,018 deaths, reported to WHO. As of 26 July 2021, a total of 6,384,382 vaccine doses have been administered (<https://covid19.who.int/region/afro/country/za>). South Africa has a population of 60,041,994 (<https://www.google.com/search?q=south+africa+population+in+2021>). As of 27th July 2021, Botswana has had 102,124 COVID 19 positive cases and 1485 deaths out of a population of 2,397,241 (<https://www.google.com/search?q=population+of+botswana+2021>). As of 27th July 2021, Namibia there have been 116,964 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 2,834 deaths, reported to WHO. As of 26 July 2021, a total of 170,973 vaccine doses have been administered (<https://covid19.who.int/region/afro/country/nambia>). Namibia has a population of 2,587,344 (<https://www.google.com/search?q=namibia+population+2021>). As of 27 July 2021, Lesotho has had 12,880 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with 363 deaths, reported to WHO. As of 26 July 2021, a total of 72,948 vaccine doses have been administered. Lesotho has a population of 2,159,079 (<https://www.google.com/search?q=lesotho+population+2021>).

C. MTR Purpose

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability. Further, the MTR will assess the impact of COVID 19 on the implementation of the project and make recommendations on necessary changes in order for the project to still continue to make reasonable level of implementation progress even with the COVID 19 pandemic situation.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach & Methodology

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiary and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(ORASECOM commissioners, Project Steering Committee members, Departments of water; Departments of Environment in all the 4 ORASECOM countries, Department of Forestry in Namibia; The National stakeholders Forums in each of the 4 state parties; District Leadership; Traditional leaders in Boksbit area of Botswana, Oranjemund City Council, The NAMDEB Diamond Mine in Namibia, Alexkor Diamond Mine in South Africa, Letseng Diamond Mine in Lesotho)*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. In terms of relevant International Cooperating Partners *(Africa Development Bank funded Lesotho-Botswana Water Transfer Project, Lesotho European Union funded Integrated Catchment Management project, Global Water Partnerships, Climate Resilient Infrastructure Development Facility – CRIDE, among others)*; Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to *(Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, and South Africa and Namibia including the following project sites (Botswana (Kgalagadi District), Lesotho (Caledon-Mohokare catchment), Namibia (Karas Region) and South Africa and Namibia (Orange River mouth in Alexander Bay and Oranjemund))*. If the field mission does not take place, stakeholders will assemble in selected places to interact virtually with the consultants at the following places (Tsabong for Botswana; Keetmanshoop for the Namibia Prosopis site; Maseru for the Caledon-Mohokare site; Alexander Bay for the South African side of the River Mouth site and Oranjemund for the Namibian side of the Orange River mouth site.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues such as vulnerable group and persons with disability, and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders, and the MTR team.

Consultants are highly encouraged to travel to the sites. However, in case COVID 19 travel restrictions will still be in place during the undertaking of the Mid-Term Evaluation, UNDP South Africa and ORASECOM will ensure that virtual meetings are arranged. This will include interviews with key stakeholders at project sites to enable the MTR consultants to get an actual feel of the situation on the ground. This immediate implication of the COVID 19 situation is that the MTR consultants will need to do a lot of desk review. Additionally, the project management unit will need to submit all the necessary documents so that the consultants are able to form a clear picture about the progress made on the project from the documentation.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

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

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to each of the ORASECOM state parties has been restricted since 28th March 2020 and travel within each of the countries is also restricted. The 4 countries have kept moving up and down across the 5 alert levels of COVID-19. If it is not possible to travel to or within the ORASECOM states for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the MTR is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. Equally, qualified, and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

E. Detailed Scope of the MTR

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

1. Project Strategy

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated

³ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

- into the project design? Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, considered during project design processes?
 - Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
 - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
 - Review the impact COVID 19 has had on project implementation. What more could have been achieved in terms of project implementation had it not been for the COVID 19 pandemic that restricted travel?
 - If there are major areas of concern, recommended for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red). Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements

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

- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning

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

Finance and co-finance

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁴ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting

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

⁴ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

Communications & Knowledge Management

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

4. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than **2 weeks** before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (20th September 2021)
- MTR Field mission: 4th October to 5th November 2021
- Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (9th November 2021)
- Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes **within 3 weeks** of the MTR mission. Completion date: (26th November 2021)
- Final Report*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit **within 1 week** of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: (17th December 2021)

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

G. Institutional Arrangements

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

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements **within the** ORASECOM state parties for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. The Project team and ORASECOM will be responsible for arranging all virtual meetings to ensure that the MTR consultant have as much access to the project area as possible within the limitations of COVID 19.

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *40 days* over a time period of *20 weeks* starting *02 September 2021* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>27th August 2021</i>	Application closes (through existing roster)
<i>3rd September 2021</i>	Selection of MTR Team
<i>9th September 2021</i>	Starting date for the MTR Consultants
<i>11th September 2021</i>	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
<i>The week of 13 – 17 September 2021 (3 days)</i>	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
<i>The week of 20 – 24 September 2021 (3 days)</i>	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report - latest start of MTR mission
<i>4th October – 5th November 2021 (25 days)</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>9th November 2021 (1 day)</i>	MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission.
<i>The week of 15-19 November 2021 (exact date to be confirmed) (1 day)</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission (presentation of preliminary findings to the Project Steering Committee during ORASECOM Week)
<i>The week of 22-26 November 2021 (3 days)</i>	Preparing draft report
<i>13 -17 December 2021 (2 days)</i>	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report.
<i>10 and 14 January 2022 (2 days)</i>	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
<i>31 January 2022</i>	Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is (9th September 2021).

I. Duty Station

The International Consultant will be located at the ORASECOM Secretariat if travel is possible. In addition, the International Consultant will work with a local consultant who will be hired from within the 4 ORASECOM state parties. The work of the local consultant will be to complement the work of the international consultant including undertaking site visits wherever travel will be possible.

Travel:

- International travel will be required to (South Africa, Lesotho, Botswana and Namibia) during the MTR mission;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: <https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php> . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.

- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

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

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education (20)

- A Minimum of Master's degree in in natural resources management, water resources management, natural sciences, environmental management, environment, development studies, or other closely related field; (20 points) or other closely related field

Experience (70):

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 points)
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10 points)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to in trans-boundary water management, integrated water management, biodiversity and ecosystems, hydrology or related fields for at least 10 years; (10 points);
- Experience in evaluating projects UNDP GEF Project (Mid Term or Terminal Reviews);10
- Experience working in (*Orange-Senqu basin*) (10 points)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;(5 Points)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and international waters/transboundary water management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10 points)
- Excellent communication skills.
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5 points);
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language (10 Points)

- Fluency in written and spoken English. (10 points)

K. Ethics

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

L. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40 %
- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

APPLICATION PROCESS

M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template⁵](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form⁶](#));
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the email address ONLY : bid.pretoria@undp.org indicating the following reference “ Regional Consultant for the *Support to the Orange-Senqu River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation* project Midterm Review” by **12 noon Pretoria time (GMT+2) by the 03rd September 2021**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

N. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the technically qualified least costly proposal that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Include *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales

⁵

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- MTR Report Clearance Form
- Audit Trail Template
- Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)
- GEF Co-Financing Template (in Word)