



Terminal Evaluation - Annexes

# **Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAMPLACE)**

UNDP project IDs: PIMS 4173, Atlas Award 00059705, Atlas Project No: 00074796

GEF project ID: 3737

Evaluation time frame: 6 July-31 August 2016

Date of evaluation report: 30 September 2016

Country: Republic of Namibia

GEF SO1/SP3: Strengthened National Terrestrial Protected Area Networks

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)

Evaluator: Jessica Smith

## Table of Contents

5. Annexes.....	3
Annex A: ToR .....	3
Annex B: Itinerary and notes on the selection of 3 sites visited within the TE .....	27
Annex C: List of persons consulted: .....	30
Annex D: Evaluation Question Matrix.....	32
Annex E: Questionnaire used and summary of field visit results .....	34
Annex F: List of documents reviewed .....	41
Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form.....	45

## 5. Annexes

### Annex A: ToR

#### TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

##### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE) Project, (PIMS 4173). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

##### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE)			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 4173		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	Award ID 00059705 Proj. ID 00074796	GEF financing:	4,500,000	4,500,000
Country:	Namibia	IA/EA own:	100,000	100,000
Region:	Africa	Government:	14,000,000	14,000,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other (Private sector, UNDP, Bilateral Aid Agencies):	17, 883, 000	17,983,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF Strategic Program 3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Areas; GEF Strategic Priority 1: Strengthening National Protected Area Systems.	Total co-financing:	31, 983, 000	31,983,000
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Total Project Cost:	36, 483, 000	36,483,000
Other Partners involved:	Gondwana Collection Namib Rand Nature Reserve Farm Dustenbruck Wilderness Safaris.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		3 February 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2015	Actual: June 2016

##### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The proposed project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a large scale network of protected landscapes and in doing so address threats to habitat and species loss on a landscape level approach, ensuring greater responsiveness to variability and seasonality issues around climate change. The project will directly bring an additional 15,550 ha of land under PA collaborative management arrangements designed to conserve biodiversity, including unprotected lands by establishing the five Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCA).

The objective of the project is to ensure that ***Protected Landscape Conservation Areas are established and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations.*** The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP/GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, the Ministry of Environment & Tourism. It will also cover activities that other collaborating partners are supporting as part of the co-finance to the project.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are **to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.**

## **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*in Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to at least 3 of the 5LCAs, including the following project sites: The 5 landscapes are Mudumu Landscape (northeast

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Namibia), Greater Waterberg Landscape (central east Namibia), Greater Sossusvlei-Namib Landscape (southwest Namibia), Greater Fish River Landscape (southern Namibia) and the Windhoek Greenbelt Landscape (central Namibia). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Stakeholder	Role in the project
Ministry of Environment and Tourism(MET)	MET is considered the key institution in the NAMPLACE project at various levels, potentially including the National Implementing Partner (NIP). DPWM is the directorate tasked with the conservation mandate within the state protected areas as well as management of the national Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). DEA is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the Environmental Management Act (EMA), a land mark piece environmental legislation for Namibia. DEA is also the host for several GEF Projects and provides technical support to the implementation of NAMPLACE.
Local Authorities	Traditional Authorities (TAs) play an important role in societies and are useful in the development of the PLCAs as they can effectively supervise and ensure the observance of the customary laws of that community by its members, such as uphold, protect and preserve the culture, tradition values and language; administer and allocate land.
Communal conservancies	Several communal and commercial conservancies have been part of the consultations for the preparation of the NAM-PLACE project, and numerous conservancies have expressed a keen interest in becoming partners in PLCAs in their area. Conservancies or other local community associations concerned with conservation efforts are an integral part of the PLCA concept, which aims to broaden the formal national PA network by establishing collaborative management arrangements with neighbouring conservancies and private conservation investments, and through such collaboration leverage synergistic economic and conservation effects. Consequently the below identified conservancies are key partners on the local implementation level of NAM-PLACE.
Civil Society (NGOs and CBOs)	Several NGO's are active in the conservation arena, although few dedicate resources directly to State PAs. The Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) has a number of projects and activities which support PA management and biodiversity conservation across the PAs and surrounding landscapes. Others include the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation group

	(IRDNC), World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US), The Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) amongst others.
Municipal Authorities	In Namibia Local Authorities (Municipalities) are independent and must generate their own budgets. Currently within the proposed boundaries of the five pilot PLCAs of NAM-PLACE, only one municipality namely Windhoek the capital of Namibia is implicated as a project partner.
Private Sector	A great number of private sector investors representing individual famers, private conservation enterprises, tourism operators etc. have already been involved in the consultations during the NAM-PLACE consultations and they are considered key partners in a national PLCA approach and in the project implementation. During the consultations, representatives of The Gondwana Collection <sup>2</sup> , the Namib Rand <sup>3</sup> , and Wilderness Safaris <sup>4</sup> were amongst private sector businesses that participated in discussions on NAM-PLACE, amongst others.
Protected Landscape Stakeholders.	The social sustainability of activities and outputs is addressed through the execution of a stakeholder capacity analysis and the elaboration of a detailed collaborative management involvement strategy and plan which identifies stakeholders' interests, desired levels of involvement, capacities for participation (at different levels) and potential conflicts and, responsive mitigation measures.
UNDP CO	The UNDP Namibia country office is the implementing agency for the project and responsible for the overall implementation, eligible use of project resources and monitoring and evaluation to report on progress. UNDP also advises on adaptive management, collaborations/ partnerships and, procurement.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency,**

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.gondwana-desert-collection.com/>

<sup>3</sup> [www.namibrand.com](http://www.namibrand.com)

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.wilderness-safaris.com/>

**sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of Implementation Agency Execution	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Project Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes : Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability : Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources	
Effectiveness		Socio-political/economic	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance	
Overall quality of Project Outcome Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of risk to sustainability	
<b>5. Impact: Significant (s), Minimal (M) , Negligible (N)</b>	<i>rating</i>		
Environmental Status Improvement			
Environmental Stress Reduction			
Progress towards stress/status change			
Overall project results			

## PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (Private Sector) (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual

Grants								
Loans/ Concessions								
• In-kind support	100 000	100 000	8 000,000	8 000,000	705 000			
• Other			6 000,000	6,000,000	178 000			
Totals		100 000	14,000,000	14,000,000	883,000			

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the Country Office Evaluation Plan.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project has achieved impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>5</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Namibia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 28 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	4 days	5 July 2016
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	14 days	11 July, 7-19 August 2016
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	6 days	12 September 2016
<b>Final Report</b>	3 days	31 September 2016

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

<sup>5</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)



The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	Not later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 independent international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications/ credentials:

- At least a Master degree in environment, development studies, evaluation theory or a related field;
- Minimum of 10 years directly relevant work experience (e.g. conducting project/ programme evaluations) in the environment/ development sector;
- Knowledge of doing evaluations for the UNDP and GEF is an advantage;
- Competencies in result-based management, applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, including adaptive management are essential;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent English communication skills.
- Possessing excellent interpersonal skills and the ability to engage and motivate a wide range of stakeholders
- Experience working in sub Saharan African region.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

*(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing

40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

---

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org>) by 4 June 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## Annex A: Project Logical Framework

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Objective: Landscape Conservation Areas (LCAs) are established and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations (GEF 4.5 mill USD)</b>	Changes in the movement patterns of animals in relation to corridors created	Existing research on wildlife movement of selected species in Mudumu and Greater Fish River Canyon landscapes	Changes in the movement patterns of animals in relation to corridors created	Research based evidence of wildlife movement between protected areas and adjacent land	There is limited evidence of wildlife movement between protected areas and adjacent land
	5 LCAs are established to improve biodiversity conservation at landscape level.; an additional 15,550 km <sup>2</sup> brought under collaborative management with protected areas	4 existing landscape conservation partnerships in place in ML.	5 LCAs established by year 5 with at 15,550 km <sup>2</sup> additional land brought under collaborative management with protected areas, being ML (1,469), GWL (7,500), GSNL (173), GFRCL (5,750), WGB (658)	Partnership agreements, monitoring and evaluation of related activities.	All stakeholders remain interested in the landscape concept during the lifespan of the project and support the establishment of partnerships.

	METT scores are improved in protected areas and at landscape level	Landscape management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time. Current METT scores as follows: ML (71) GWL (69), GSNL (37), GFRCL (46), WGB (30): average: 51	METT scores are improved in protected areas and at landscape level	Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government and landscape partners are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process
	Framework in place for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscapes	Draft MET Protected Area management planning policy guideline in place	Framework for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscapes / targeted 5 LCAs in place by year 5.	Copy of the framework including minutes of consultative meetings.	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop a framework.
<b>Component 1: Establish new Landscape Conservation Areas (LCAs)</b>	National level best practice guidelines in place for the establishment of LCAs	Draft MET Protected Area management planning policy guideline in place	National level best practices guidelines for the establishment of new LCAs in place by April 2015	Copy of the guidelines document including minutes of consultative meetings	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop national guidelines

	Constitutions in place for 5 landscapes	Constitutions in place for conservancies and drafts for GWC, GSNC and GFRCC.	5 LCAs with constitutions in place for 5 landscapes	5 partnership agreements	All stakeholders continue to participate in the existing partnerships during the lifespan of the project. All partners are willing to formalize the existing partnerships and to have constitutions in place.
<b>(GEF 0.674 million USD)</b>	Standards and codes of practice developed for each LCA  National level best practice codes of practice in place	Biodiversity threats defined for all LCAs - Land use zoning maps suggesting suitable land uses at conservancy, park	Standards and codes of practice developed for each LCA by Dec 2015  National level best practice codes of practice in place by Dec 2015	Copy of National level best practice codes document including minutes of consultative meetings	Stakeholders participate freely in providing best practices and lessons learned to develop national guidelines
	Infrastructure based on approved recommended priorities, are in place for 5 LCAs.	Mudumu, fire management equipment, water points; GWC - guard posts, boundary fences, fire management equipment, water points; WGB - park and farm fences, water points, guard post at DVJ; GSNC - fences, water points, guard post; GFRCC - fences,	Infrastructure is in place for all LCAs based on assessment by December 2015	Inventories of goods and services procured and the actual goods installed.	Infrastructure enhances biodiversity conservation at the landscape level.

		water points, guard posts, solid waste management and Radio communication at /Ai-/Ais			
<b>Component 2: Collaborative Governance for LCAs</b>	Key short, medium and long-term development issues identified and disseminated; Strategic Management plans, based on the key issues for each area, in place for 5 LCAs defining management objectives, standards, rules and procedures for CLA functions.	Management and development plans for parks (AHGP, NNP, BMM and Waterberg) - Draft Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill (PAWMB) and Regulations - Draft PA Management planning policy guideline in place - Environmental Management Act, Draft Regulations and guidelines in place to guide	Strategic Management plans for each LCA in place by December 2015	Copy of each strategic plan per landscape.	Planning process is supported by landscape stakeholders and they participate fully.

<b>(GEF 2.77 million USD)</b>	Management and development plans in place for interested LCA partner (e.g. conservancy, private farm, PA).	development planning - National CBNRM Framework in place - Parks and Neighbours (draft) and Concessions policies in place	Management and development plans are in place for interested LCA partner by year 5.	Copy of each partner's management and development.	Planning process is supported by landscape stakeholders and they participate fully.
	Partnership roles and responsibilities defined and agreed and "Partnership Committees" in place for each LCA.	Management committees in place at conservancy and complex level and Park Wardens appointed by MET - Roles and responsibilities of Management committees defined in Management and development plans and in the job descriptions of Park Wardens	Partnership Committee for each LCA in place by year 5.	Minutes of committee nomination and election meeting showing names and roles of each committee member per landscape.	Stakeholders support the process and participate as equals during consultations and meetings.

<p><b>Component 3: Incentives and market transformation</b></p>	<p>Key development issues defined for the SEA (drawing earlier consultation work); SEA in place with recommendations for tourism development in each LCA.</p>	<p>SEA in place for Hardap region's coastal zone which includes the Namib-Naukluft NP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tourism development plan in place for BMM Parks;</li> <li>- Draft Tourism Plan for GFRCC;</li> <li>- National Tourism policy for Namibia;</li> <li>- Tourism addressed under conservancy management plans; Integrated Regional Land Use Plan (IRLUP) for Karas Region</li> </ul>	<p>SEA of the tourism sector completed for the 5 LCAs.</p>	<p>SEA Report and minutes of consultative processes.</p>	<p>SEA draws on SEA for Hardap and Karas Regions' coastal zones and the Integrated Regional Land Use Planning (IRLUP) process supported by GTZ.</p>
	<p>Biodiversity monitoring and assessment system developed for each LCA and recommended at national level for integration into a national tourism venture certification system</p>	<p>SPAN Biodiversity indicators (yet to be developed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National CBNRM Programme biodiversity indicators published in the State of Conservancy Report (SoCR)</li> <li>- ICEMA biodiversity indicators that</li> </ul>	<p>Biodiversity monitoring indicators in place by year 5 for each LCA and across LCAs.</p>	<p>Biodiversity indicators and monitoring system</p>	<p>This process draws on existing indicators developed for Namibia and those proposed by GEF for adequate coverage at regional, national and global levels.</p>



		<p>would be adopted by MET (for long-term M&amp;E)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NBSAP in place with biodiversity management objectives – national level</li> <li>- Local level monitoring (LLM) systems in place at conservancy level; incident (monitoring) books in place for parks.</li> <li>- CPP integrated sustainable land management indicators and Land Degradation Monitoring System (LDMS) with biodiversity indicators.</li> </ul>			
<b>(GEF 0.674 mill USD)</b>	Supply chains developed based on current and potential markets for the diversification of current goods and services and/	<p>Cheetah-friendly beef initiative that could be used for lessons learnt and best practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current biodiversity-friendly off-take/ harvesting</li> </ul>	Supply chains defined and markets explored/ established for new/ diversified goods and services.	Reports on supply chain analysis and definition and potential for marketing and mobilisation.	Stakeholders are willing to provide data freely to ensure adequate analysis and definition of supply chains and exploration of market potential.

	or the development of new ones; Supply chains identified for certification; Markets established and mobilised for certified supply chains.	practices by private tourism operators/ game farmers (potentially not documented); Research by ICEMA on indigenous natural products.			
<b>MANAGEMENT COSTS 10% (GEF 0.45 mill USD)</b>	Project management in place to allow an engaged and effective process throughout	Nil	Effective project management as demonstrated in PIRs, MTR and TE	Ministry and Departmental Reports, and Project Docs. Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE) National Reports to CBD	Management will be effective and support the process throughout

---

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF) and Project Document
2. Project Implementation Plan and Reports (APR/PIR)
3. List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
4. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
5. Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
6. Mid Term Review and other relevant evaluations and assessment
7. Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Audit reports
10. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
11. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings
12. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.

### **UNDP documents**

1. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
3. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
4. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.
5. Financial and Administration guidelines.
6. M&E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;

### **GEF documents**

1. GEF focal area strategic program objectives
2. The GEF Completion Report guidelines;

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b>	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b>	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## **ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM**

### **Evaluators:**

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

### **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>6</sup>**

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

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

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

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

**Signed at Place:** \_\_\_\_\_ **on Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

<sup>6</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>7</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>8</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>9</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

---

<sup>7</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>8</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>9</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.



- Management arrangements
- 3.2** Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
  - Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
  - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance(\*)
  - Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability (\*)
  - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
  - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
  - ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## **ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by  
UNDP Country Office

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

\_\_\_\_\_



## Annex B: Itinerary and notes on the selection of 3 sites visited within the TE

Site-specific factors were taken into account selecting the min. 3 landscapes for the site visits:

Site	Shared resource / vision	Communities (conservancies or resettlement area)	Local LC planned? funding?	Other remarks	Visited by MTR?
Mudumu	Sense of a shared resource	Yes, Conservancies	Yes - dispersed donor support	Only site with retained on-site staff; issues w/ other line ministries reported at MTR	Yes
Waterberg	No - lack of wildlife, more agricultural area	Communities present; resettlement farms in landscape	CCF has offered to take on the role - may not be acceptable to all stakeholders	Lowest level of existing engagement at start-up; most challenging in terms of buy-in	Yes (1 day)
Windhoek Green Belt	Greater difference in management agendas		Yes - potentially through hiking trail	Policy change during project (WDH boundary); new farm owners	Yes
Sossusvlei	Yes		Yes - potentially though TNC grant applied for or private sector (Namib Rand) for critical tasks?	Many stakeholders of this landscape are Windhoek-based	No
Fish River Canyon	Yes	Yes, including a resettlement farm	Yes - funded by private sector?	Impressive monitoring programme, various community devt initiatives reported	No

The evaluator therefore proposed prioritizing 3 site visits to:

- **Mudumu Landscape:** example of a landscape with communities / communal Conservancies, working with a range of line ministries in a higher population density area, the original area was extended during the project due to demand. Stakeholders mainly speak English.

- **Fish River Canyon Landscape:** Example of there plans for a local landscape coordinator are underway, the site was not visited during the MTR, and the landscape includes a resettlement area and a number of community development efforts / incentives. Some stakeholders in the community mainly speak Afrikaans.
- **Waterberg Landscape:** Considerable challenges at this site were noted in the MTR and other project documents. The site struggled as the project was focusing mainly on wildlife and tourism while the location is oriented to agriculture. Have recommendations made at the MTR stage been implemented, and what has been the effect? Would another kind of intervention been / be more appropriate to the challenges of this landscape? Stakeholders speak English and Oshierero.

Windhoek-based or remote consultations were proposed for:

- **Windhoek Green Belt Landscape:** Consider how did the policy change (boundaries of the city) change the original vision for the landscape? How did the project adapt? What has been the result?
- **Sossusvlei Landscape** (as above, many stakeholders in this landscape are Windhoek-based): little information on this site - what's been the impact of the project? How will it be carried forward?

As in *Annex D. Summary of missions and field visits*, visits were conducted to the sites that the evaluator had requested.

I undertook two missions to Namibia: initially on 11 July to meet with the PCU and plan the field itinerary, then 7-12 August to carry out the stakeholder consultations.

The landscape visits spanned from central-east to the southern and northerly extremes of Namibia, driving 3200 kilometres distance during the mission, and taking one internal flight.



## Annex C: List of persons consulted:

Stakeholder	Representatives consulted
Ministry of Environment & Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teofilus Nghitila, Environmental Commissioner of Namibia / NAMPLACE PSC Chair</li> <li>Jonas Heita (PASS project)</li> <li>MET office Okakarara: George Kandingu</li> </ul>
Local Authorities, Communal conservancies, and other PL stakeholders	<p><b>Greater Waterberg Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservancy members: Kapenaa Katjiveri, Ebenhard Karita</li> <li>Farmers: Manfred Tjikuraru (resettlement farmer), A. Vindina (affirmative action farmer)</li> </ul> <p><b>Mudumu Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North Complex: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sobbe Conservancy: Members present at the Conservancy meeting</li> <li>Kwandu Conservancy: acting manager / enterprise officer, nursery manager, members</li> <li>Mashi Conservancy: Victor – manager, Robin – enterprise officer</li> <li>Mayuni Conservancy: Sihani – enterprise officer, treasurer, rangers</li> <li>Mashi Crafts / Camp Kwandu: R. Bester</li> </ul> </li> <li>South Complex: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balyerwa Conservancy: Mlozi Guares – Chairman, Chris Barnard Mkwena – enterprise office, Poreso – manager, Kashis Wupiru - secretary</li> <li>Waparo Conservancy: manager, enterprise officer</li> <li>Bamunu Conservancy: Chunga Chung – Chair, Manni - Vice-Chair, Jerome Mwalema – manager, Patience – treasurer, 2 rangers, 1 field officer, other members</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Fish River Canyon Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chris Brown, Landscape Chairman</li> <li>Community members: Joseph Bitten Swartboi (community gardener), Esmerelda Rwoe (outreach worker), members of the women's sewing group</li> </ul>
Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheetah Conservation Fund (Waterberg Landscape Secretariat): Louisa Richmond-Coogan, Matti Nghikembua, Laurie Marker</li> <li>Namibia Nature Foundation: Andrew Malherbe – via email</li> </ul>
Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gondwana Collection: Eddy Shipulwa and Philip Brand</li> <li>Namib-Rand: Nils Odendaal – via email</li> <li>Farmer Johann Vaatz – via email</li> </ul>
UNDP CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment &amp; Energy team (past &amp; present): Nelson Zakaapi, Nico Willemse</li> </ul>
PCU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Laudika Halueendo (Acting Project Manager; Landscape</li> </ul>

	<p>Coordinator: Windhoek Green Belt and Waterberg)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michael Sibatani (former Project Manager)</li> <li>• Manini Kandume (Communication Specialist)</li> <li>• Lea Ngashikuao (Project Assistant)</li> <li>• Ronnie Mora (Mudumu Landscape Coordinator)</li> <li>• Sue Cooper (GRC Landscape Coordinator)</li> </ul>
<b>PSC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teofilus Nghitila (as above)</li> <li>• Chris Brown, Chairman of Namibia's Chamber of Environment (and GFRC Chair, as above)</li> <li>• Harry Schneider-Waterberg (former Waterberg Landscape Chair)</li> <li>• Michael Sibatani (as above)</li> <li>• Nico Willemse (as above)</li> <li>• Nils Ondendaal (as above)</li> <li>• Johann Vaatz (as above)</li> </ul>
<b>Others:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP-GEF Regional Service Centre: Alice Ruhweza – via email</li> <li>• Brian Jones - Consultant to the project</li> </ul>

## Annex D: Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
Is the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time?	Uptake of study recommendations	Stakeholder respondents	Semi-structured interviews
How closely was the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded?	Degree of alignment to GEF OP	Technical documents	Expert review
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
To what extent were the project outcomes and objectives achieved?	Degree of attainment of project indicators	Project documentation, stakeholder respondents	Expert analysis, semi-structured interviews
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
To what extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy?		Review of project documents, financial information	Benchmarking against other projects Expert review
Did the project comply with the incremental cost concept?	Assessment of baseline v. incremental costs	Project documentation, financial information	Expert analysis
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
What is the ikely ability of the intervention to continue to	• Measurement of risks to	• Stakeholder	• Expert analysis



<p>deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	sustainability	feedback, analysis of the external environment	
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<p>What was the environmental change attributed to the project interventions at the five landscapes?</p>	Wildlife numbers at landscapes	Collaring / satellite data, aerial surveys, camera trap data, Event Book data	Time series analysis pre- & post- intervention

## **Annex E: Questionnaire used and summary of field visit results**

### **Questionnaire used**

The questionnaire used was modified to the context of each respondent. Some information gathering strategies were employed e.g.:

- Using a counter-factual: What would be the current situation without the project?
- Asking for case examples or detailed narrative descriptions
- Following up with some interviewees once new information was available
- Asking a number of stakeholders the same questions from different perspectives
- Sharing a thought-provoking statement from another respondent and asking for a comment on that viewpoint
- Reviewing findings from the best practices and lessons learned studies (Jones 2014 and 2015) and asking respondents to agree or disagree with the findings, providing examples
- Asking what the respondent would have done in hindsight, or if the project were to be developed today, how would it be approached

### **Summary of results**

#### **Windhoek – start**

I met with available members of the PCU on 11 July, who kindly provided their time beyond the end of their contracts. We discussed the approach to the TE, key issues that needed to be covered, and prioritising which sites to choose for the field visits. On arrival for my second mission, met with UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO), to interview on the project itself as well as the field logistics.

#### **Waterberg Landscape, 8-9 August**

The Waterberg landscape covers over 18,700km<sup>2</sup>, which represents 54% of the total area of the five locations covered under the NAMPLACE project, and encompasses a vast range of land use and land users. Met initially with 3 staff of the Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) who are hosting the Secretariat for the Landscape. Provided a set of open-ended and specific questions based on the background document review. Worked with the Landscape Coordinator to plan the following day's meeting at the MET regional office in Okakarara and with the Communal Conservancies and resettlement / affirmative action (AA) farmer representative.

The following morning had a roundtable meeting with the Conservancy participants and a representative from AA farmers, with support and translation services provided by MET. Focused the meeting around on the governance of the landscape, capacity building needs and efforts, and income-generating activities supported by the project. Also walked through the output of the Jones (2015) best practices and lessons study, which the participants agreed with. Was brought to a Conservancy just next to Okakarara where NAMPLACE had supported construction of a Conservancy office block, located next to the Traditional Authority. Visited the former Waterberg Landscape Chairman at his farm south-west of Okakarara.

Some unique circumstances and characteristics of this site include:

- High population in the landscape (24,000 noted in the pre-feasibility assessment of 2010 – likely to be more now)
- Diversity of land uses within the landscape – commercial and communal farms, resettlement/affirmative action farms, registered commercial and communal Conservancies
- Previous limited investments into establishment of Conservancies and less track record of management (as compared to other parts of the countries where Conservancies have undertaken e.g. joint ventures with tourism companies, shoot & sell agreements, etc.)
- Relative newness of the Conservancy approach in this area
- Difficult political history and present-day ongoing resettlement of previously disadvantaged communities
- Major focus on livestock farming
- Less developed tourism offering compared to the other project sites
- Not part of the typical tourist circuit apart from travelling through Otjizondjupa (the eastern site from which CCF is accessed) to reach Etosha NP

There was reported “in-fighting” on the landscape association, although all the members I spoke with said they would like to continue the initiative. Respondents felt that this landscape did not get as much support as others and that the outputs were not what they had identified – although there was seemingly not a shared vision for this landscape as elsewhere. Some debated this point and felt there was a shared vision amongst most and only some individuals self-interested prevented joint action. The landscape suffered turnover and temporary coverage of the site from Windhoek, at the same time being (one of if not the most) the most complex to manage compared. At mid-term, the PSC discussed dropping the landscape from the project but decided to refocus instead around income-generating activities.

Compared to the other landscapes I visited, Waterberg has not benefited from the same level of either public or private investments into the baseline and has not gained the same level of experience in either public-private partnership management or management of donor-funded community-level initiatives. CCF engages in the landscape through their ecology unit. The area lacks ongoing presence from the kind of Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) who provide outreach for CBNRM governance and social enterprise development, for example those registered in NACSO – the Namibian Association of

CBNRM Support Organisations<sup>10</sup>. (Contrasting for example with Mudumu which, with a similar level of population, has been well supported by NNF, IRDNC, WWF, etc. and has had tens of millions of dollars in investments supporting CBNRM and tourism development over the past two decades.) The area also has very little wildlife and lesser tourism attractions (which I feel were over-valued in the PPG pre-feasibility assessment), making the landscape have little in the way of common asset to unite it for such an approach. One proposal was that the landscape effort could have been attempted first with only the Waterberg Plateau Park and adjacent freehold farmers.

### **Fish River Canyon Landscape, 10-13 August**

First day spent driving from Windhoek to the Gondwana Village lodge, which is part of the landscape association (as are its two Gondwana Collection sister lodges in the landscape). Subsequently met with Sue Cooper the Landscape Coordinator who has been funded through NAMPLACE over the past year, with co-financing from Gondwana. Together we visited Klein Karas community cooperative, the primary year-round community residents of the landscape. The community numbers 20-20 individuals, mainly women and children, while others have progressively left the area to nearby towns for employment. The community has a number of initiatives supported through NAMPLACE: vegetable garden, sewing workshop, solar panels, communication system (radio link-up), upgraded information centre. The community has been well-supported through various projects over the years.

Via the Coordinator (and later the landscape Chairman who I met in Windhoek), I gained more insight into the impressive biodiversity monitoring system in the landscape, which has substantially contributed to understanding of wildlife populations and movements. With removal of fencing and other efforts, wildlife numbers have increased considerably in this area during the project lifespan. I also got more background on the communication systems which is substantially helping to manage issues including daily rescues within the canyon during this peak hiking season.

Later I met with two of the Gondwana Lodges staff. They relayed enormous enthusiasm (in turn crediting the Chairman for his infectious enthusiasm) and the company's support for the landscape initiative. They cited a number of successes achieved through the partnership, and contributions by the company including the donation of 10 farms (where fences were removed) within the landscape to improve connectivity of wildlife corridors. We discussed that the region has mineral wealth; also mining companies use the road through the park and their concessions are adjacent but not part of the landscape. This led to further consideration of the involvement of such companies in the landscape initiatives. Returned to Windhoek overnighting in Keetmanshoop en route.

The results at this site are impressive in terms of increase in wildlife in the area (confirmed through aerial game counts, camera trapping, etc.), and the number of metres of fencing that have been taken down since the initiation of the project – the latter was reported anecdotally but my recommendation is that the association try to quantify it.

The landscape's next AGM has been postponed until a proposal for next steps can be decided. Gondwana indicated they would be willing to provide some financial support to continue the initiative, but that this would need to be matched by other stakeholders including MET.

---

<sup>10</sup> The capacity assessment notes that CCF "is a key stakeholder in the proposed Greater Waterberg Complex PLCA, and can bring different skills and research knowledge to the management of that particular PLCA" but "this NGOs is purely for the conservation of the endangered cheetah population in Namibia". Versa-Con and IECN (2010). Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities. Report on Output 3 of the PPG phase of the NAM-PLACE Project.

## Mudumu Landscape, 14-17 August

Overnighted in Rundu en route north from Windhoek. Met with Landscape Coordinator Ronnie Mora at Sobbe Conservancy, and was introduced at their general meeting. Together we visited the anti-poaching station funded by the project, which includes a single hut for each of the 4 Northern Complex Conservancies (Mashi, Mayuni, Sobbe, Kwandu), as well as one for MET, ablutions (men and women) and a kitchen. We then visited the Mashi Tourism Hub including craft centre (that I first saw 11-12 years ago and confirm it has since had an impressive make-over funded by The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), and adjacent Mayuni Conservancy where I examined the Event Book system, discussed income generating activities, participation in the project and other familiarisation questions. We subsequently went to Kwandu Conservancy, which is also a registered community forest, with an active Devil's Claw harvesting enterprise and a nursery. Finally, we visited the Mashi Conservancy office, meeting with the manager and enterprise development officer, where we discussed the same themes. Trophy hunting is a major income source for all of these Conservancies. Tourism plays a larger role at Mashi, and somewhat at Kwandu, but the level of revenue from tourism enterprises is not as high or as reliable for example as you would find in the west of the country (with globally award-winning joint ventures between the local community and Wilderness Safaris, as a well-known model). Stayed overnight within the landscape at a lodge which operates through a Joint Venture agreement with Mayuni Conservancy.

The following day we visited the Southern Complex, first to Balyerwa, which where we met the chairman, manager, enterprise officer and secretary. This Conservancy has won a significant financial award from MET for its good governance. Next was Wuparo where met the manager and enterprise officer, and visited a bridge (one of 3 in the area) built by the project. It was reported a building was built for the Traditional Authority (did the project pay for this?) relating to a local festival, although the Conservancy felt it wasn't at the standard they had hoped to be able to attract tourists. Finally, Bamanu Conservancy organized a formal meeting with the Chair, Vice-Chair, Manager, public and taking minutes and attendance. The Conservancy office was large and well-equipped, with electricity and flush toilets and showers for men and women, as well as a large freezer. At the same time, it's one of the more recently registered and gazetted areas. Stayed in Katima Mulilo overnight then took an internal flight back to Windhoek to continue the programme.

The area has an interesting history which fits precisely the problem statement of the project, to overcome resistance to PAs: prior to Independence some of these PAs were declared off-bounds for "nature conservation" but were in practice run by the military<sup>11</sup> for

---

<sup>11</sup> From Bwabwata PA management plan, page 9: "The [former] Caprivi Strip between the Kavango and Kwando rivers was first proclaimed as a Nature Park in 1963, mostly for strategic military reasons in view of independence struggles starting in Namibia, Angola and Zambia... up until the independence of Namibia in 1990, the entire area was treated as a military zone by the South African Defence Force, which meant that officials of the Department of Agriculture & Nature Conservation were denied access to the area. Only in 1990, when the military forces left Namibia, could conservation staff work in the Caprivi Game Park."

strategic reasons relating to regional independence struggles. The trust- and relationship-building between communities and conservation actors has therefore been an ongoing process since independence. One can clearly see how the benefit-generation from conservation is an important (socio-economic) dimension that can either enable or disable the potential for co-management and improving ecological outcomes.

All of the Conservancies reported that trophy hunting was their top income source, and reviewing some of their budgeting and income statements, I could see that it was vastly more than tourism or other enterprises in northern and southern areas. Each also has a fair and transparent benefit sharing system, including cash payments, meat distribution and capital investments into rural electrification, scholarships, and other needs. Therefore there's a direct and fairly immediate conservation incentive link: game counts, surveys, monitoring and anti-poaching efforts feed in to their ability to get hunting quotas allocated by the Ministry.

Given the context, the extent of co-management and cooperation in this area is particularly impressive. The area is unfenced between the PAs and CBNRM areas, and wildlife numbers are increasing (demonstrated through Event Books, game counts, imagery from collaring research). The project worked jointly here with the MCA(which ended in 2004), including to incorporate the landscape approach in the management plans of the five conservancies (Kwandu, Mayuni, Mashi, Wuparo and Balyerwa); while the project funded the development of the management plans of the remaining two conservancies in the landscape (Sobbe and Dzoti) not supported through MCA. Bamunu was not fully included in the project, partly due to its registration process that was ongoing at project start.

The range of activities involving landscape-level cooperation includes<sup>12</sup>:

- Jointly designed logo and durable road signage "Mudumu Protected Landscape Conservation Area" at least 3 locations that I saw that were highly visible on the main arterial road from Kongola to Katima Mulilo, passing through the northern Conservancies. The southern Conservancies highlighted though that the signs were not at all on the C49 road that passes through their areas;
- Joint game counts between Conservancies and MET (with Peace Corps, NGOs and researchers also participating) – with two anti-poaching camps built by the project – though with no operational water or electricity, the Conservancies noted – it was unclear if water had been installed by the project and now broken?;
- Game translocations;
- Quota setting (using Event Book and game count data);
- Land-use planning, zoning and corridor development – including proposed naming and signage of the corridors;
- Engagement with regional planning forums and activities including KaZa;
- law enforcement – coordination of anti-poaching efforts including a formal MoU with the Namibia Defense Force;
- Fire management – including training provided by the project;

---

<sup>12</sup> From Management Plan and confirmed via consultations.

- Tourism planning and marketing (this one more on paper than in practice – there is less cooperation here than might be if the tourism product was more varied<sup>13</sup>);
- Measures to deal with human-wildlife conflict – largely information sharing and benchmarking of compensation, which is matched to MET’s compensation of N\$60k;
- Planning for provision of benefits from sustainable wildlife use to local communities – again, information sharing and benchmarking between the Conservancies; and
- Adaptive wildlife management through decision-making based on the best available information, monitoring impacts, reviewing decisions and if necessary revising the decisions based on the new information – likely will need additional support to be maintained beyond the project.

The area has now benefited from a number of considerable investments in the past 10-15 years: UNDP-GEF SPAN, MCA, UNDP-GEF PASS project, other bilateral initiatives e.g. German Development Bank (KfW)- NamParks / BMM Parks. The landscape reported that no upcoming AGM was planned due to financial constraints, although they would be willing if there was sponsorship. There were a number of proposals made during the discussions for further support (although Ronnie and I opened with and then repeatedly clarified that I was only evaluating the closed project not bringing new resources) which they asked to be passed on to the “next project”.

## **Landscapes summary**

Each landscape relayed an annual process of putting in a budget requests to the PSC, and then having these approved or not. Only one site said they clearly knew what the allocation to their landscape was and how much budget was remaining. Feedback from the landscapes was consistent that they didn’t have clear feedback on what was approved or not, and why; a number said they didn’t receive a “no” with an explanation, they just didn’t hear back. Somehow the budgeting process led to some confusion when the project ended, as the sites felt there was “unfinished business” – that landscapes were just getting started and needed 1-2 more years more support to truly get on their feet. A number felt the emphasis placed on management planning and various studies outweighed on-the-ground activities. Some noted studies where there was no budget to follow-up and address the results. There was no clear end-point agreed between the project and landscapes as to what the project would fund and what would need to be self-funded or covered by other funding.

## **Windhoek – end**

I met a number of Windhoek-based stakeholders following the field missions, again the former Project Manager, and then another PCU staff now heading the PASS project. On my final day I debriefed: The Environment Commission and project director.

---

<sup>13</sup> See also the tourism SEA for this landscape.





## Annex F: List of documents reviewed

Supplied by the NAMPLACE PCU:

Output	Documentation / means of verification
<b>Component 1 Establish new Landscape Conservation Areas (LCAs)</b>	
Output 1.1 A framework for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscape conservation areas developed.	National Policy on Protected Areas Neighbours and Resident Communities National Policies on Prospecting and Mining in Protected Areas National Policy on Game Utilization in Protected Areas and Other State Land National Policy on Community-Based Natural Resource Management Housing Policy in Protected Areas Guidelines for the Implementation of the National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities
Output 1.2 National level best practices guidelines for LCA establishment developed based on existing collaborative management arrangements.	Challenges, Lessons learned, and Best Practices in establishing Landscape Conservation Areas in Namibia (Jones 2015) Best practices and lessons learned from cooperation between MET and protected area residents and neighbours (Jones 2014)
Output 1.3 5 LCAs established and boundaries agreed	Constitutions for 5 PLCAs Draft MoU between MET and Mudumu Landscape Association
Output 1.4 Landscape specific codes of practice developed for each LCA in order to create site-specific and national level standards. (Including best practices for adaptive management based on monitoring data generated from activities in the LCAs' management partnership plans).	Legal Opinion of the City of Windhoek Boundary Extension on the establishment of the Windhoek Green Belt Landscape Water Quality and Pollution Study for the Windhoek Green Belt Baseline Study of Bush Encroachment and Available Management options for the Windhoek Green Belt Landscape The Ecological, Social and Economic Implications of Private Game Parks & Private Nature Reserves in Namibia Managing biodiversity of the Greater Fish River Canyon Landscape A tool for sustainable land management
<b>Component 2 Collaborative Governance for LCAs</b>	
Output 2.1 Strategic plans approved for LCAs defining management objectives, standards, rules and procedures for PA functions. (Participatory PA planning, joint enforcement, monitoring, dispute resolution).	Strategic Management Plans for Mudumu Landscape Conservation Area Strategic Collaborative Management Plan for Greater Fish River Canyon Landscape Strategic Collaborative Management Plan for Greater Sossusvlei-Namib Landscape Strategic Collaborative Management Plan for Windhoek Green Belt Landscape (German Version) Strategic Collaborative Management Plan for Windhoek Green Belt Landscape (English Version)

Output	Documentation / means of verification
<p>Output 2.2</p> <p>Management and development plans in place for interested partners (e.g. conservancy, private farm, etc.) forming part of a LCA in place.</p>	<p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Daan Viljoen Game Park</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Naute Recreation Resort</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Waterberg Plateau Park (through SPAN and NAM-PLACE projects)</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for /Ai-Ais Hot Springs Game Park through SPAN and NAM-PLACE projects)</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Mudumu National Park (through BMM Parks Project);</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Nkasa Rupara National Park (through BMM Parks Project);</p> <p>Management and Tourism Development Plan for Bwabwata National Park (through BMM Parks Project);</p> <p>Management Plan for Namib Naukluft Park (through NACOMA Project);</p> <p>Tourism Development Plan for Namib Naukluft Park</p>
<p>Output 2.3</p> <p>Adaptive collaborative management committees in place and operational in LCAs (PA authority and all landholder groups); LCA management capacity emplaced (covering inter alia self- regulation, and enforcement mechanisms, e.g. visitor control, wildlife sale and introduction, hunting practices, integrated fire and water management and monitoring.</p>	<p>Training Manual on Advanced Rhino Crime Scene Procedures</p> <p>Report of Advanced Rhino Crime Scene Training</p> <p>Report on MET Law Enforcement Course for Peace Officers</p> <p>Report on the Familiarization Trip of Otjozondjupa and Southern Conservancies to Kunene and Omusati Regions, 03 – 11 August 2013</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Polytechnic of Namibia on technical support to the four conservancies in Otjozondjupa Region</p> <p>Fire Training Report for Greater Waterberg Landscape</p>
<p>Output 2.4</p> <p>National LCA Coordination Unit established with members represented from each LCA, incorporating government, community and private sector stakeholders.</p>	
<p>Output 2.5</p> <p>LCA infrastructure in place (guard posts, realigned boundary fences, fire management equipment and fire breaks, water points and visitor interpretation centers)</p>	<p>Infrastructure Needs Assessments</p> <p>Assessment of Existing Electronic Communication Systems, Needs and Gaps for the Improvement of the Current Communications Systems in the Windhoek Green Belt Landscape (WGBL).</p> <p>Simplified Waste Disposal Site Design for Mudumu Landscape</p> <p>Technical Drawing for the Mudumu Landscape Waste Disposal Site Design</p> <p>Waste Management Implementation Plan for the Mudumu Landscape</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Management Plan for the proposed Solid Waste Disposal Site at Kongola, Zambezi Region</p>

Output	Documentation / means of verification
	<p>Scoping/Socio- Economic Specialist Study for the Proposed Waste Disposal Site in the Mudumu Landscape</p> <p>Vertebrate Fauna and Flora Expected in Mudumu Landscape</p> <p>Hydrological Desktop Study for the Solid Waste Management Site in Mudumu Landscape</p> <p>Environmental Management Plan for the proposed Solid Waste Disposal Site at Kongola, Zambezi Region</p> <p>Sesriem Gate Design</p> <p>Radio Communication needs assessment and design for Zambezi region</p>
Component 3 Incentives and market transformation	
Output 3.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment completed for tourism development in 5 LCAs and recommendations applied (with respect to wildlife stocking, infrastructure location, visitor controls)	Tourism SEAs for all 5 PLCAs
Output 3.2  Business plans developed for major initiatives supported in LCA based on SEA recommendations and drawing other existing work (costs quantified for management; and non-state appropriated revenue options are defined for each LCA)	Okakarara Conservancies Income Generation Viability Study
Output 3.3 Biodiversity status/ pressure indicators and management objectives integrated into national tourism venture certification system	<p>Project proposal for a study of the population densities, movement patterns and land uses of oryx, springbok and mountain zebra in and around the Greater Sossusvlei-Namib Landscape.</p> <p>Newsletter series on GSNL wildlife movement research</p>
Output 3.4  Supply chains established for game produced under biodiversity friendly production systems (zoning of hunting; off-takes account for inter and intra specific impacts at ecosystem level); certification and verification system developed for appropriate supply chains and new market opportunities are mobilized.	Web pages for each landscape
Project Management: Ensures effective project administration, M&E, and coordination have enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.	
Effective project administration, M&E, and coordination have enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.	<p>Project Document and Project Inception Report</p> <p>Project Implementation Reports: 2011 - 2012, 2012 - 2013, 2013 - 2014, 2014 - 2015</p> <p>Annual Standard Progress Reports: 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014</p> <p>Quarterly Standard Progress Reports: August - September 2011</p>

Output	Documentation / means of verification
	January - March 2012 April - June 2012 July - September 2012 January - March 2013 April - June 2013 July - September 2013 January - March 2014 April - June 2014 July - September 2014 January - March 2015 April - June 2015 July 2015 - September 2015 January - March 2016  Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting Minutes for all Sessions held in Windhoek: 1 <sup>st</sup> 18 April, 2012 2 <sup>nd</sup> 18 July, 2012 3 <sup>rd</sup> 24 October, 2012 4 <sup>th</sup> 13 February, 2013 5 <sup>th</sup> 14 August, 2013 6 <sup>th</sup> 29 April, 2014 7 <sup>th</sup> 15 May, 2014 8 <sup>th</sup> 04 November, 2014 9 <sup>th</sup> 12 February, 2015 10 <sup>th</sup> 05 November 2015  Mid-term Evaluation Report Mid-term Evaluation – Annex Mid-term Evaluation – Management Response Project Sustainability and Exit Plan  Draft final PIR Final METTs

Additional materials from the design and approval stages e.g.:

- Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities
- Market analysis, review of existing and potential markets within the five PLCAs
- Pre-feasibility assessment of areas in Namibia suitable to be established as PLCAs
- Greater Waterberg Complex Needs Assessment Questionnaire Report; Project Cheetah Conservation Fund (January 2013).
- PIF, ProDoc, CEO Endorsement Request, STAP comments, etc.

## Annex H: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

### Evaluators:

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

---

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

Name of Consultant: Jessica Smith

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): Peoplesized Ltd.

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

Signed at Place: Mbabane, Swaziland on Date: 12-09-16

Signature:



## Annex H: Audit Trail

To the comments received on 15 September 2016 from the TE of NAMPLACE:

Audit Trail Template				
Author	#	Para. No./comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE Report	TE Team Response and action taken
Munini Teferra (MT), UNDP RSC			Amendments to make sure the format of the TE were according to the template	Recommended changes made
MT			Flagged sections not addressed (or not clearly marked with a header) in the report	All requested sections added

To the comments received on 4 November 2016 from the TE of NAMPLACE:

Audit Trail Template				
Author	#	Para.No./Comment Location	Comment/Feedback On The Draft TE Report	TE Team Response & Action Taken
Martha Talamondjila Naada (MN), UNDP CO	1	4	Unclear. To clarify this statement, explain if effectiveness of targets refers to usefulness	Sentence re-wording offered
MN			Correct	n/a
MN	3	5	Lack of clarity in the sentiments being portrayed here. That the project should have conducted M&E using quantitative indicators that focuses on benefits (e.g. LV, ROI, & other forms of benefits in the LS =?	Clarification provided in-text
MN	4	5	Or does it imply that the Project M&E function or unit of some sort (if it is continued) should serve as a better indicator to indicate that the LSs are likely to continue?	No – it was meant in the sense above regarding benefits (clarified in text, with above)
MN	5	6	For corrective action, one of the top priorities that the MET LS Unit should prioritise is to conduct an assessment of the X landscape....then continue....the sentence. I am suggesting this phrasing as appropriate from an institutional aspect vis an operational (=instruct). Lets chat if it does not make sense.	Addressed per recommendation
MN	6	6	Rescue = recover stocks, spp or means ??? The scope of the assessment shall look at	Clarification provided in-text

			.....	
MN	7	6	Not major issues however it may be better to rephrase this with the mainstreaming (policy and institutional) lenses, for e.g., the scope of the new LS Unit should take up functions and tasks beyond focussing only on wildlife within the landscapes, for instance as ,.....	Addressed per recommendation
MN	8	7	This is a well articulated section. The only limitation may be availability of resources to conduct such an exercise that is valuable to determine the actual impacts.	Noted
MN	9	7	Excellent, Is the recommendation for UNDP as a global entity or UNDP CO or UNDP NAMPLACE project?	Global – clarified in text
MN	10	7	Perhaps an addition could be for UNDP to consider programming in MFA initiatives which is likely to deliver more SD benefits and or create and generate additional SD co-benefits in other targets.	Agreed – elaborated in text
MN	11	8	This is good recommendations and links with the above mentioned additional point.	n/a
MN	12	18	Is the delay depicted means ten months beyond the six months' project inception phase? 6+10 = 16 months of the project inception phase OR 10 inclusive of 6 inception phase, meaning 10 months project inception phase? Clarity and possibly for lesson learned for future stages of inceptions.	Clarified in text
MN	14	19	Whereas this issue explained in foot note 4 (from MTR) is a bit contentious (different interpretation of the problem statement) based on the thematic focus....my own as the then involved programming expert of UNDP sort of had this understanding...as directly from the Climate Smart Agriculture Source book of UNFAO. That what was being promoted in NAMPLACE was within the... <b>"A landscape approach builds on the principles of natural resource management systems that recognize the value of ecosystem services to multiple stakeholders. The principles that underpin the landscape approach provide guidance on how to pursue different land-use objectives and livelihood strategies (MEA, 2005). More recently, the term 'landscape approach' has been redefined to include societal concerns related to conservation and development trade-offs. It also includes increased integration of poverty alleviation, agricultural production and food security. The approach puts the emphasis on adaptive management, stakeholder involvement and the simultaneous achievement of multiple objectives (Sunderland, 2012)".</b> So with such understanding one would therefore be expected to understand the problem statement along with the project development objective which I think is very clear.	Noted via footnote and cross-referenced to definitions text box
MN	15	23	This statement is not clear. Does it mean it is common, usual or it implies it is too much????	Clarified (it's common / normal)

MN	16	23	Also for consistency, are there opinions on project delays, problem statement definitions (in 2.1; 2.2), etc. Or the indicators (2.4) are the only major item that deserve an opinion?	I don't think project delays were so significant and the challenge with definition was more with the MTR and the fact that UNDP had no strong precedent for such a project (discussed elsewhere) – the other issues should have been captured in objective indicators
MN	17	24	What does this mean? Verified or validated or reconfirmed? Or supported?	Reconfirmed – edited in text
MN	18		V. Good assessment as this perhaps help to validate the problem statement interpretation issue.	I'm not sure this was a mis-understanding of the problem statement, rather it was aligned to UNDP and GEF expectations at the time of what a single focal area project indicators should consist of
MN	19		Another excellent assessment. Yet, is this a limitation or constraint of a typical UNDP-GEF supported project or only for this particular NAMPLACE project? You may not have an answer however for lessons learned, it could help us to programme better in future, esp. in a manner of recommendations form this TE.	Made a personal reflection in text – however we have no study to back it up
MN	20		Another excellent assessment, would be good to have a corresponding recommendation esp. for the new LS Unit in MET to take it (marketing) up.	Added to the recommendations
MN	21		Proponents means what in this context? Foot note to explain who the proponents are?	Added definition in footnote
MN	22	25	...strategically, i.e. as a decision-making tool?, to contribute to the likelihood of attainment of the impacts beyond the project lifespan?	Clarified in text
MN	23	25	Excellent	n/a
MN	24	25	Was there a later study, even without the early one? If so, then perhaps the results of such study could be used as baseline for the future initiatives and or for the country to know its status. Meaning reflecting for future should a study be valuable even if another initiative does it, e.g. MET own funding or assessments prior to project documents being finalised?	No – no such study, clarified in text.
MN	25	27	Going forward, is this needed? It could definitely be valuable for any other project and not only for NAMPLACE.	Added as a recommendation for MET
MN	26	28	Looking back (institutional 'UNDP' introspection) this is a true reflection. I believe many Namibian-type of projects are much well ahead of time, which has both advantages (+) and disadvantages (-). What appears to be lacking in the TE is how to best assess such type of initiatives and somehow +vely impacting future innovations in programming.	Addressed in text
MN	27	29	I will wait for the next section	n/a



MN	28	29	The top down approach used some criteria but those criteria were not accepted by all stakeholders? Or that stakeholders did not accept the selection of the landscapes? Or that the noted 'top down' approach was effective and efficient in delivering the project document, however it would have been better (process wise) to come at the same conclusion with stakeholders?	The latter – specified in-text
MN	29	29	Sequencing of existing and then ongoing projects to cover key bio and ecological zones as well as GEF requirements to demonstrate differences between existing and ongoing GEF funded projects influenced the selections. And the UNDP approach to have an inclusive development approach in any country, as focussing on same sites could have been interpreted as if discriminating other socio-economic groupings. The solution now is to use SDG and make cases better with co-benefits of conservation of improved PA management.	Noted in text
MN	30	30	This PIF was written internally by UNDP CO and RSC, thus perhaps this is not good practice as it limits consultations? Or timeframe, resources and other constraints may have negatively influenced the stakeholder consultation process at a very crucial design stage?	Addressed in-text
MN	31	30	Good observation and clear direction for future programming activities.	n/a
MN	32	31	A good recommendation from this will be for PMU to follow-up advice from PSC, e.g. when there are constraints and challenges experienced in implementation, sites may require different strategies to arrive at possibly same results but using different expertise and approaches. E.g. Waterberg LS needed such.	Recommendation added, and new categories of recommendations to future PMUs also added
MN	33	32	This appears more problematic when compared to the earlier analysis, private farmers appeared to have received better support vis communal farmers. As project beneficiaries they all should have benefitted and treated with equity. Recommendations around this could be useful.	I think this varied – e.g. in Mudumu communal conservancies were the beneficiaries. I think the issue goes back to not having a clear strategy to deal with the unevenness of landscapes mentioned elsewhere
MN	34	32	Possibly misunderstanding or misinterpretations of project objectives and approach could or perhaps have also created this scenario. For e.g. the project logic of different landscapes almost assumes that there will be differences in approaches to deliver the benefits, to implement and to deal with conflicts and differences on the ground, based on concerned actors, stakeholders and land users and land use arrangements.	Noted via a footnote
MN	35	33	Excellent, but it seems the MTR exercise has contributed to the narrow in focus and or understanding of the entire business case being pursued? I could be wrong but during the MTR this issue was discussed without	Addressed in text

			being resolved fully.	
MN	36		Excellent assessment. Given that this project had a PM, three specialists, would this be a good use of resources? Or were the LSs doing PMU management and administration activities which could have limited the specialist inputs on site? This guidance would it have been better from CO or RSC (as UNDP -GEF IA)? Or from MET (as national implementing partner). As a wayward it would help in recommending actions and or responses. The second comments is well elaborated and clear.	Addressed in text
MN	37		As I did not partake in the TE interview process (as an interviewee), my views shall not be counted. However, I can explicitly put it on record that the PSC, the UNDP and MET had engaged the PMU to do exactly this, but for some reasons it appears it was not done. Waterberg LS was an issue that had separate meetings just dedicated to it, organised, rightly so by the PMU due to their diligent observations of challenges. Yet, PMU sort of treated it as a 'dead case'.	Addressed in text – possibly the PSC could have looked at any leverage to insist the PCU act
MN	38		Also the lack of the PA Wildlife and Management Bill, which was foreseen in its initial version to add a segment on protected landscape made it impossible to achieve. Perhaps a recommendation to the MET in relation to a suitable legal framework could be included?	Added the clarification – and a recommendation around the legal framework
MN	39	39	What does this mean? That Namibia can still try to implement a similar type of project however using NAMPLACE as a pilot and learning stage? This could potentially deliver increased benefits, and possibly could be done at much lower costs, given that the knowledge, skills, and lessons are now available in the country, in UNDP Co & RSC and globally, and GEF to programmatically guide its design.	Clarified in text
MN	40	39	Also UNDP has better understanding on the application of a theory of change.	Noted
MN	41	39	Excellent. Recommendation for programming future initiatives along MFA instead of single projects unless really justified, on a case by case. This could easily lend UNDP through the GEF portfolio to become a demonstrator of SD benefits and SD co-benefits. Such a future approaches that are desirable nationally, regionally, and globally. Also the cost of project design, implementation and management could be made efficient. Although, the cost of M&E could significantly increase.	Added a recommendation
MN	42	40	A footnote to explain or at least shed light on the UNDP global change management process that led to some of these can help contextualise the issue. Also it could be a lesson learned that when UNDP globally or	Noted on the explanation – but the other points are beyond my analysis

			otherwise goes through such processes, better hiring practices or short term gap fillings with institutional memory may help so as not to disturb the project implementation. Or UNDP CO exchanges could be pursued to allow gap filling (although not sustainable) and support in technically challenging areas/themes.	
MN	43	42	Excellent, perhaps a recommendation for a lesson learned report capturing briefly how this was done to serve as guidance materials could be done?	Recommendation along this line added – to capture through exit interview and inform hiring selections. Lessons learned should already be captured by the project
MN	44	44	This appears to be contradictory to an early observation that advised hiring of additional expertise????	Clarified via footnote
MN	45	44	Given these constraints, have they been included in the exit and or sustainability strategy for future uptakes????	Now noted in the recommendations – that you for noting this
MN	46	45	Excellent assessment. Recommendation around how this could be improved in future and or how it should be addressed. For e.g. PMU to have a focussed approach during inception to fully familiarise themselves with the PPG products/outputs, or UNDP CO and RSC to provide training and induction properly on projects during inception phase and not only at/during inception workshop?	Addressed in text
MN	47	45	Another possibly lessons learned and or a good recommendation of how to resolve this need to be articulated, is when PMU are not part of the PPG process. An ideal scenario although not feasible in most cases, is having a PM design the project and continue to implement it.	This is interesting but there can be conflicts of interest and also there are different skill sets involved. More universal recommendation offered in the text.
MN	48	46	The issue of this LS is much broader than the NAMPLACE generic issues. There are conflicts and also misaligned objectives of what Conservancies in these area should focus on? I think with the new land use planning for the region being developed, better perspectives would be developed. Such land use plans could have informed the activities in the WB LS better. At the core is a question of whether all conservancies in the country should be geared towards wildlife (e.g. core areas/zones) or some Conservancies may have different land uses that are conservation-friendly but not necessary wildlife based.	Added this context in a footnote
MN	49	47	Was this a 'real' resolution or more a 'carrot and stick' statement being used by the PSC to inspire action.	Noted in text
MN	50	51	When assessing this vis the exit and sustainability plan that ideal shall incorporate this element for future, is that adequate?	Noted – added to recommendations
MN	51		This section perhaps need a statement that an exit and sustainability plan exist or not, at MET or within each of the LSs. Then assess it using both the discussions and information on the plan. If not, a recommendation	Added

			around it is needed.	
MN	52		Does this mean/imply that it is a threat to long-term or medium-term sustainability of the landscapes, esp. Mudumu?	Clarified via footnote
MN	53	57	Was there any evidence beyond discussions of the sustainability plans within the LSs to continue or ensure that these are done?	No – addressed in a footnote
MN	54	59	Is this needed in the report or ending at the NAMPARK project can suffice?	Took out direct reference but kept in that there is some overlap in staff, as its helpful context
MN	55		Excellent, to be consistent in the assessment, perhaps you can introduce the missing elements of other non-ecological benefits that could have been improved but not well targeted? You do have it partially on the last para under the impact.	
MN	56		???? = game numbers, or = spp. diversity, or = distribution of spp.; or = economic returns from increasing number of wildlife/game on sites?	Clarified in text
MN	57		Does this section implies that additional results were achieved in country ownership, mainstreaming and catalytic role?	It's a prescribed section – guidance requests any findings on these topics. Clarified in text

To the comments received on 17 January 2017 from the TE of NAMPLACE:

<b>Audit Trail Template</b>				
Author	#	Para.No./Comment Location	Comment/Feedback On The Draft TE Report	TE Team Response & Action Taken
Paul Harrison (PH), UNDP RSC	1	Page 4	Thus section needs more on the component by component analysis, such as the blow, which I suggest is pasted in, as suggested here	Addressed as suggested (with updated text on Component 3 included)
PH	2	Page 10	Formatting	Addressed
PH	3	Page 14	Perhaps – PRF better?	Substituted the term Project Results Framework rather than LogFrame throughout as applicable (with a footnote providing explanation)
PH	4	Page 15	My recollection of that period was of substantial consultations and of careful reconsideration of the selected landscapes based on consultations and the 'value' of the landscapes.	Clarified in text that there are different views on this
PH	5	Page 17	I think more can be put here on the innovative nature of the protected landscapes approach and the outcome of the interaction between	Elaborated in the text

			the different landusers, namely add a little more of the positive outcomes of the innovative nature of the project (ahead of its time).	
PH	6	Page 18	Formatting	Addressed
PH	7	Page 22	What value has this remark?	Added a footnote of explanation
PH	8	Page 25	Strong statement, what supports it?	Clarified in text
PH	9	Page 35	State this again in the summary above?	Done
PH	10	Page 40	Suggest using "the evaluator" as is used above	Addressed (removed use of first person tense throughout – except in the Acknowledgements)

## Annex I: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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