



“MANAGEMENT OF COMPETING WATER USES AND ASSOCIATED ECOSYSTEMS IN PUNGWE, BUZI AND SAVE BASINS” PROJECT

INDEPENDENT MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND SCOPE OF WORK

Position: Consultancy to conduct an independent mid-term review (MTR) for the project: *Management of competing water uses and associated ecosystems in the Pungwe, Buzi and Save basins*

Financing Agency: Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Implementing Agency: International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Executing Agency: Global Water Partnership Southern Africa (GWPSA)

Location: Pretoria

Project Period: 48 months

Budget: The budget for the MTR should not exceed \$38000 (USD)

Procurement Type: Open call through advertisement.

Estimated level of effort: 25 working days spread over 3 months (24/04/2023 to 24/07/2023)

Applications closing by: 24th April 2023

BID Reference No: ITB – BUPUSA MTR_2023_1

1. INTRODUCTION

The Global Environment Fund (GEF) - funded project “Management of competing water uses and associated ecosystems in the Pungwe, Buzi and Save basins,” project targets the conservation and sustainable use of the transboundary water basins resources, including risk mitigation components within 3 river basins shared bilaterally by Mozambique and Zimbabwe: Pungwe, Buzi and Save river basins. The project is facilitating the ability of the two riparian countries (Mozambique and Zimbabwe) to strengthen transboundary cooperation and management of water resources and associated ecosystems for improved water security, climate change resilience and sustainable livelihoods in the shared Pungwe, Buzi, and Save basins. The project is being implemented by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and executed by the Global Water Partnership Southern Africa (GWPSA), with strategic orientation of the project being provided by the Joint Water Commission for Buzi, Pungwe, and Save River Basins, the bilateral institution for cooperation on water issues between Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Project activities are coordinated at the bi-national level by a Project Management Unit (PMU), composed of a Project Coordinator and two IWRM Technical Advisors. A Technical Specialist, Communications Specialist, Project Officer and a Finance and Procurement Officer recruited by the executing agency are also providing support. The PMU is hosted by ARA-Centro in Beira (the National Executing Agency for Mozambique). The project seeks to promote holistic approaches to the water-food-energy nexus, with specific interest on connected ecosystems. It has a double focus of developing capacities for managing water resources and to design participatory and community-based strategies.

The project is now halfway through a 4-year programme of work. This is the Terms of Reference for the IUCN-GEF Mid-Term Review of the full-size project “Management of competing water uses and associated ecosystems in the Pungwe, Buzi and Save basins,”. These Terms of Reference (ToRs) define the objectives, key questions and outputs for a mid-term review of the BuPusa project.





Mid-term Reviews (MTRs) are part of overall project monitoring and serve principally to identify challenges and outline any suggested corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results. The primary output/deliverable of the MTR is the MTR report.

As defined in the GEF's Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy¹, *"the Mid-term review is a critical milestone of project implementation that involves key project stakeholders. It takes stock of progress and performance in reaching the project objective, and supports making of decisions that strengthen progress, ownership, and commitment for the remainder of the project. This may take the form of project restructuring. The MTR is also an opportunity to discuss with the country and project beneficiaries the continued relevance of the project objective and likelihood of achievement during the remaining implementation period, considering current government and sector priorities."*

2. BACKGROUND ON THE IUCN-GEF BUZI, PUNGWE AND SAVE (BUPUSA) PROJECT

The GEF-funded project "Management of competing water uses and associated ecosystems in Pungwe, Buzi and Save basins" is being implemented by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and executed by GWPSA, together with the Government of Mozambique (GoM) and Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ). The project targets the conservation and sustainable use of the transboundary water resources, including the risk mitigation components within the Buzi, Pungwe and Save river basins, shared by Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The three basins are located along the Beira corridor, an important economic corridor that links Beira harbour to the hinterland, with associated impacts on the environment (pollution from mining activities, intensive agriculture, deforestation, saline water intrusion etc.). Populations in the basins have become highly vulnerable to climate hazards (i.e., floods, droughts, and cyclones), whose occurrence is likely to increase with climate change aggravation.

The increasing development of upstream water uses is now raising the issue of equitable water allocation and the accompanying dimension of environmental flows that have particular importance in a transboundary context. These resource aspects are of the highest importance for the communities that derive their livelihoods from ecosystem services, in a context of endemic poverty and low resilience to climate change impacts. The project seeks to promote holistic approaches to the water -energy - food nexus, with a specific interest in connected ecosystems. It has a double focus of developing capacities for managing water resources and designing participatory and community-based strategies.

The project's main objective is to strengthen the management of transboundary water resources and connected ecosystems for sustained ecological benefits and improved resilience for riparian communities. This contributes to the GEF strategic objective which seeks to conserve, sustainably use, and manage biodiversity, ecosystems and natural resources globally, taking into account the anticipated impacts of climate change – and implements the strategic directions international waters (IW) focal area, as it will contribute to the conservation of the three basins' aquatic ecosystems and wetlands through the sustainable management of transboundary water basins.

The need for developing transboundary cooperation for water resources management has been materializing for years through several initiatives, including the signing of the Pungwe and Buzi water-sharing agreements (the Save agreement is under preparation, and the wish to establish a bilateral tri-

¹ <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>



basin river basin organisation. In each component, the project will contribute to supporting transboundary cooperation for water resources management, either with the development of joint initiatives (joint hydrological monitoring campaigns), common tools development (TDA/SAP, adoption of guidelines for EFlows implementation), bilateral capacity building or through experience sharing (on community-based early warning systems for instance):

- **Component 1** will contribute to strengthening water-related risk management through the reinforcement of monitoring systems, the development of real-time operational tools, and the empowerment of communities in their flood and droughts mitigation autonomy.
- **Component 2** will focus on enhancing ecosystem services through quantitative water management, including operationalisation of environmental flows (assessment and legal framework establishment), and through water quality improvement.
- **Component 3:** National inter-ministry committees and technical advisory teams would contribute to the development of a regional Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and subsequently to the preparation of a Strategic Action Plan.

The benefits of collaboration on transboundary basins and adoption by cooperating states of a Transboundary Water Resources Management approach will contribute to strengthening community resilience to droughts, mitigation of these risks, improving water allocation, and addressing environmental issues. Results and impacts will include increased transboundary water cooperation including a coordinated approach for drought risks management and mainstreaming of these risks in the decision-making process, strengthened capacities for transboundary water resources management linking appropriate scales of intervention, increased communities' autonomy and ownership in water-related risk management, reduced vulnerability of the local communities to droughts.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID TERM REVIEW

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project expected results (outputs 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 (including its design and associated Logframe and results Framework), and its risks to sustainability.

The primary intended users of GEF-BuPuSa Project MTR are:

- The GWPSA Management (Management) and Project Management Unit (PMU) for the purpose of adaptively managing the project, and making necessary adjustments to its implementation and delivery as the designated executing entity.
- The implementing agency IUCN and Project Steering Committee (PSC), for the purpose of understanding progress in the delivery of project benefits and efficiency of scales and to evaluate the effectiveness of the BUPUSA project.
- Other important users of the evaluation are the GEF, project co-finance partners, and other stakeholders that will benefit from an up-to-date review of the BUPUSA Project progress and achievements to date.

4. MID TERM REVIEW (MTR) APPROACH AND 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



and implementation phases. The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, IUCN, and other key stakeholders.

The GEF BUPUSA Project MTR should present findings and recommendations on the topics of: **1. Project Strategy; 2. Progress Towards Results; and 3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management.**

In more details, the MTR will:

- Assess the appropriateness and relevance of the BUPUSA project strategy and design in supporting project outcomes.
- Assess whether the BUPUSA project is proving to be effective in achieving its desired results throughout its three components and provide clear insights about what has and has not worked so far and why. It should also highlight how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the project and how the project adapted to this situation.
- Assess the project implementation and management arrangements, including coordination among partners, the monitoring and evaluation system and the viability and efficiency in terms of use of funds and value for money, to identify any challenges and propose corrective actions as needed.

4.1. Project Strategy

4.1.1. Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities and country ownership (buy-in). 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 designs.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

4.1.2. Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) the midterm and end-of-project targets are, 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.
- As relevant, the analysis of the Results Framework could involve developing and reviewing results chains to understand which activities are aligned with the project's objectives in order to target future efforts and funding allocations accordingly.

4.2. Progress Towards Results

- To what extent is the BUPUSA Project progressing towards the delivery of its outputs, outcomes, and objectives²? In particular, the MTR should assess the BUPUSA Promoting good practices for project level coordination, planning, implementation, adaptive management and effective monitoring across all project components.
- The timely provision of technical support and roll out of pilot projects.
- Consolidating and sharing knowledge generated by and across all the project components.
- Supporting engagement with key decision-makers to facilitate the establishment of enabling policy environments for improved ecosystem services within the basin.
- Leveraging partnership opportunities, mobilising, and tracking co-finance and supporting the resource mobilisation process; and
- Contributing to foster complementarities with existing agreements, initiatives, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other projects, partnerships, etc., to avoid duplication of similar activities by other groups and initiatives.
- Identify and assess early signs of the BUPUSA project successes and deviations to enable prompt adjustment. Key guiding questions under this are:
 - What has been done well to date and what are some of the key reasons for this?
 - What have been the deviations to implementing the project and what are some of the key reasons for this?
 - What have been the key challenges faced in implementation of the project to date?
- Are there any barriers or risks that may prevent future progress towards and the achievement of the BUPUSA Project's longer-term objectives? What can be done to increase the likelihood and sustainability of positive impacts?

4.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

4.3.1. Management Arrangements:

- This component of the review will analyse the project's modalities for governance including the PSC, IUCN (implementing agency); GWPSA (executing agency); Project Management Unit (PMU); Joint

² To assess progress towards each outcome, the MTR team should use the standard GEF six-point rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). In terms of indicators – for both outputs and outcomes, the MTR should assess progress made towards the mid-term project targets, or end-of-project targets where mid-term targets are not available, by using the following indicator rating system: achieved – “green”; on target to be achieved – “orange”; not on target to be achieved – “red”. Each rating should be justified and in case of a “red” rating the MTR team should recommend actions to be taken.



Water Commission (the JWC is a bilateral arrangement by the two Member States i.e., Mozambique and Zimbabwe); and cooperating partners working in the basin (UNESCO, GRID Arendal, Resilience Waters Program, CRIDF etc.).

- Are the project governance structures, policies and processes in place and effective?
- To what extent are the current BUPUSA Project operational modality and governance structure efficient in contributing to the overall achievements of the outcomes?
- To what extent has the BUPUSA Project been implemented efficiently?
- Has project management been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?
- To what extent has the PSC helped guide and provided oversight of the project?

4.3.2. Work Planning:

- The MTR will look into how the project follows good practice for GEF funded projects and will examine project planning and implementation considerations. A key area to review is how the project processes and programming should be implemented moving forward given the remaining project timeframe.
- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

4.3.3. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems:

- Assess how well the Project Objective indicators and outcome indicators capture the intended results of the project, and how well this framework monitors outputs that are directly linked to the project's inputs and various interventions?
- Are the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework and related tools developed by the BUPUSA Project adequate and effective?
- To what extent has the project approach supported by the partners and stakeholders, generated cost savings and efficiencies in the provision of coordination and technical support and monitoring and evaluation?
- How effectively has the BUPUSA project performed towards the GEF core indicators identified for the project?
Examine the project's results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review proposed changes made to it since the project started? Also provide suggestions on the indicators assessing if they are working well and capturing the actions that the project is supporting.

4.3.4. Finance and co-finance:

- The assessment will consider the decision making and financial allocation process.
- Assess the appropriate financial controls, reporting planning, timely flow of funds including co-financing mechanisms?
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team



meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

4.3.5. Reporting:

- Examine if and whether the reporting mechanisms such as the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), finance and audit reporting, and Project Supervisory Mission are adhered to?
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of these project reporting mechanisms.
- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board

4.3.6. Stakeholder engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- How effectively and efficiently has the project worked together with partners and stakeholders to jointly implement the project?
- Assess the involvement, roles, and contribution of stakeholders for the successful implementation of the project?

4.3.7. Communications:

- Examine the internal and external communication of the project communication with stakeholders?

4.3.8. Environmental and social safeguards

- Has environmental and social management framework and related tools been developed and are they in use? What is the effectiveness of implementing the project environmental and social management plan (ESMP)?

4.4. Risk management

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs 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 frameworks 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 the sustenance of project outcomes?

4.5. Impact of COVID-19 on project implementation

The MTR will also offer the opportunity to assess the **impact of Covid-19** on the BUPUSA Project, as well as the adaptive measures that have been taken and should be taken going forward to address and mitigate the impact of Covid-19. Key questions to be considered include:

- In what ways has the Covid-19 pandemic impacted the BUPUSA project progress (delays, cancellation, etc.)?
- Given impacts from Covid-19, from project inception to date, will all project activities be successfully completed by the current project end date, or will there be a need for adjustments (in time frame and/or targets)?
- What are the adaptive measures that have been taken (e.g., budget reallocations, timeline adjustment, etc.), or will be taken going forward, to address Covid-19 impacts?
- What kind of support from the implementing agency (IUCN) and GEF would be most helpful in addressing Covid-19 impacts and challenges?

4.6. Conclusions and recommendations

The MTR report must have conclusions and recommendations that include:

- practical and short-term corrective actions by evaluation criteria to address issues and findings; and
- reflect best practices towards achieving project outcomes, and knowledge sharing / replication for other projects of similar scope.

5. MTR APPROACH, TIMELINE AND DELIVERABLES

The MTR is expected to take place between 18/04/2023 and 18/07/2023. It will adhere to the *GEF/GCF Project Monitoring and Supervision Requirements and Guidance* as well as *IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*.

The review will adopt a consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the MTR process. Different sources will be used to verify information, and evidence will be validated through triangulation.

Information and insights will be derived mainly from three key sources:

- Review of existing documents – both at project and program levels, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), BUPUSA project reports, information and data collected through BUPUSA MEL system and other relevant knowledge products developed by partners.
- Key informants' interviews – including interview with GWPSA Management and PMU; implementing agency (IUCN) representative and GEF BUPUSA project manager; the Project Steering Committee (PSC) members; Project Focal Points nominated by the two countries; co-finance partners; representatives of the basin institutions (ARA-Centro and ARA-Sul in Mozambique, and ZINWA Save



and Runde in Zimbabwe); research institutions, civil society organisations, community representatives and other relevant stakeholders across the three basins in the 2 supported countries (an indicative list of contacts of key stakeholders will be provided during the inception phase);

- The MTR field mission – this will entail consultations and engagements with various stakeholders in the trio-basin within the two countries (Mozambique and Zimbabwe) as well as Pretoria in South Africa where both GWPSA and IUCN offices are located; and
- Additional information needed could be collected through a combination of methodologies including (but not limited to) group discussions, online surveys, and other data collection tools.

As part of the MTR inception phase, the MTR team will then be expected to develop an **Inception Report** that will include a *methodological note* based on the suggested MTR questions above and suggesting additional questions or modifications to tailor the MTR to the GEF BUPUSA Project needs. The methodological note will include a *review matrix* presenting how each review question will be addressed, the data sources and the data collection methods and tools that will be used to gather additional data needed for the MTR and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected. Adequately addressing each key review question will be the basis for GWPSA and IUCN to sign off on the completeness of the review report.

The link between review questions, data collection, analysis, findings, and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner in the presentation of the review findings. Conclusion and recommendations should be underpinned by a strong set of evidence. The review team should ensure that the sample of project stakeholders consulted equitably represent the various possible perspectives, including in terms of gender balance.

The review team will be accountable for producing the following **MTR deliverables**:

No.	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1)	Inception report	Clarify objectives proposed methodological approach and a review matrix;	No later than 2 weeks before MTR Mission	MTR team submits to BUPUSA GEF team and IUCN
2)	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR team presents to BUPUSA GEF Team and IUCN
3)	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on report outline provided)	Within 1 week of the MTR mission	Sent to BUPUSA GEF Team for review by IUCN, GWP, JWC, GEF OFP
4)	Final Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised reports (showing how the comments on the draft report have been addressed. - Two-pager with key findings, lessons, recommendations, and messages from the MTR report, that can be disseminated to the wider public for general information on the project's results and performance to date 	Within 1 week of receiving comments	Sent to BUPUSA GEF Team



5)	Presentation	For a face-to-face or hybrid workshop targeted to PSC and key stakeholders in which the key finding and recommendations from the MTR will be presented	Within 1 week of confirmation of Final Report being accepted	MTR Team presents to Project Steering Committee
----	--------------	--	--	---

5.1. Proposed Report Outline

A template for the report will be provided by GWPSA and the report will include the following:

- Title page including project identification details.
- Table of Contents
- List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project information
 - Project Description
 - Project Progress Summary (200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings and Achievement Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendations Summary Table
- A short introduction to project/programme – context and description (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objective Issues and Questions
 - Methodology (including approach to data analysis)
 - Overview of Structure of the MTR Report
- Project description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- Findings - organized according to the key evaluation questions (8-10 pages)
 - Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
- Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications



-Environment and Social Safeguards

- Impact of COVID-19 (1 page)
- Risk management (2 pages)
- Conclusions and recommendations (5-6 pages)
 - Recommendations – Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.; actionable recommendations clearly linked to findings and lessons; proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.
- Annexes
- It is expected that the MTR team will participate in knowledge-sharing events, such as stakeholder debriefings, as needed.

6. EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Applicants can be a team or individual consultants led by an international consultant who will be supported by two local consultants (one in each country). Interested applicants for the position are required to have the following qualifications and experiences:

- At least 10 years' experience in conducting external evaluations with mixed methods evaluation skills.
- Knowledge and understanding of the planned and on-going GWPSA programmes and projects and the organisation's processes.
- Experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.
- Experience in conducting or participating in similar review processes conducted by international and inter-governmental institutions;
- Expertise in results assessment, monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects.
- Demonstrate strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. a credible evaluation and a report that can be used.
- Minimum qualification is a master's degree in monitoring and evaluation (M&E), project management, international development, water resources management, climate change, environmental protection, social development, sociology, gender, or related area.
- Understand water resources management and governance, climate change, development (SDGs), gender and related issues.
- Familiarity with GWPSA, IUCN, GEF or related projects and experience in the region.
- Experience working within multi-stakeholder platforms and supporting change processes.
- Excellent analytical and writing skills and very good organisational and task management skills.
- Demonstrated teamwork skills and the ability to work independently.
- Demonstrated ability in project management, including workplan development, tracking, budgeting, and reporting.
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English.

7. COMPLETING AND SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

Your Proposal must consist of the following documents:

- Technical Proposal (see Section 7.1 below)
- Financial Proposal (see Section 7.2 below)

Proposals must be prepared in English.

7.1. Technical Proposals





The technical proposal must address each of the criteria stated below explicitly and separately, quoting the relevant criteria reference number (left-hand column).

Proposals in any other format will significantly increase the time it takes to evaluate, and such Proposals may therefore be rejected at GWPSA's discretion.

Where CVs are requested, these must be of the individuals who will actually carry out the work specified. The individuals you put forward may only be substituted with GWPSA's approval.

GWPSA will evaluate technical proposals with regards to each of the following criteria and their relative importance:

	Description	Information to provide	Relative weight
1	Relevant thematic experience including three reputable references for previous work done	Applicants should describe relevant experience and expertise of the selected team/individual against the thematic fields described in these ToRs as well as previous experience in conducting similar MTR in the region and particularly Mozambique and Zimbabwe.	30%
2	Qualifications of the team/individual	Applicants should describe relevant past experiences and main competencies to demonstrate how they meet the technical requirements listed in section 6 of the ToRs.	30%
3	Methodology and approach to delivery	Proposal shows a clear understanding of the objectives of the assignment and a viable and sound plan to deliver the identified deliverables on time and on budget. Applicants should include an initial work plan.	40%
Total			100%

7.2. Financial Proposals

7.2.1. The financial proposal must be a fixed and firm price for the provision of the goods/services stated in this TOR in their entirety. *The financial proposal should be submitted separately from the technical proposal.*

7.2.2. Prices include all costs.

Submitted rates and prices are deemed to include all costs, insurances, taxes (except VAT, see below), professional fees, expenses (including accommodation, travel, and subsistence), liabilities, obligations, risk and other things necessary for the performance of the Terms of Reference. GWPSA will not accept charges beyond those clearly stated in the Financial Proposal. This includes applicable withholding taxes and similar. It is your responsibility to determine whether such taxes apply to your organisation and to include them in your financial offer.

7.2.3. Applicable Goods and Services Taxes

7.2.4. Proposal rates and prices shall be exclusive of Value Added Tax (VAT).



7.2.5. Currency of proposed rates and prices

All rates and prices submitted by Proposers should be in USD.

7.3. Additional information not requested by GWPSA should not be included in your Proposal and will not be considered in the evaluation.

7.4. Your proposal must remain valid and capable of acceptance by GWPSA for a period of 90 calendar days following the submission deadline.

7.5. Withdrawals and Changes

You may freely withdraw or change your proposal at any time prior to the submission deadline by written notice to the GWPSA Contact. However, in order to reduce the risk of fraud, no changes or withdrawals will be accepted after the submission deadline.

8. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

8.1. Completeness

GWPSA will firstly check your proposal for completeness. Incomplete proposals will not be considered further.

8.2. Technical Evaluation

8.2.1. Scoring Method

Your proposal will be assigned a score from 0 to 10 for each of the technical evaluation criteria, such that '0' is low and '10' is high.

8.2.2. Minimum Quality Thresholds

Proposals that receive a score of '0' for any of the criteria will not be considered further.

8.2.3. Technical Score

Your score for each technical evaluation criterion will be multiplied with the respective relative weight (see Section 7.1) and these weighted scores added together to give your proposal's overall technical score.

8.3. Financial Evaluation and Financial Scores

The financial evaluation will be based upon the full total price you submit. Your financial proposal will receive a score calculated by dividing the lowest financial proposal that has passed the minimum quality thresholds (see Section 8.2.2) by the total price of your financial proposal.



Thus, for example, if your financial proposal is for a total of CHF 100 and the lowest financial proposal is CHF 80, you will receive a financial score of $80/100 = 80\%$

8.4. Total Score

Your proposal's total score will be calculated as the weighted sum of your technical score and your financial score.

The relative weights will be:

Technical: 80%

Financial: 20%

Thus, for example, if your technical score is 83% and your financial score is 77%, you will receive a total score of $(83 * 80\%) + (77 * 20\%) = 66.4\% + 15.4\% = 81.8\%$.

Subject to the requirements stipulated in this ToRs, GWPSA will award the contract to the bidder whose proposal achieves the highest total score.

9. APPLICATIONS

- Interested applicants should submit their proposals through via email to GWPSA Procurement gwpsaprocurement@gwp.org with Reference No: ITB – BUPUSA MTR_2023_1 on the subject line
- Any questions should be directed to and cc' Mark Naidoo mark.naidoo@gwpsaf.org with the BID
- Female candidates are strongly encouraged to apply.
- The deadline for applications is 24th April 2023.