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# Executive summary

## i.1. Background to the evaluation

This report presents the results of the mid-term PASS project review that was conducted between August and September 2016. The review was done according to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF)’s rules and procedures and is an integral part of the project cycle. The United National Development Programme Country Office (UNDP, CO) in Namibia, on behalf of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET, Project Executing Agency), commissioned the evaluation. The achievements of the project against its original objectives, and the effectiveness, efficiency, relevancy, impact and sustainability of the project were assessed. Furthermore, the review of identified factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the project targets.

The main focus of this evaluation was to come up with recommendations and to share lessons learned in order to assist in defining clear future direction of the project implementation during the remaining period of approximately 2 years. The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner, and over 40 people were involved in the assessment of the achievements and shortcomings, and the formulation of the way forward. Beneficiaries at intervention sites and key stakeholders including the Project Steering Committee (PSC), Project Management Unit (PMU) and project partners were consulted through face-to-face interviews, a debriefing held on 7th September 2016 and via email or telephone communication. Further, project related documents were studied.

## i.2. Project concept

The project is entitled ‘’Strengthening the capacity of the protected area system to address new management challenges’’ or Protected Area System Strengthening (PASS Namibia, in short). The project’s main objective is *to strengthen and sustainably finance the Protected Areas System (PAS) through improving current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanism and cost effective enforcement through application of enforcement economics model in Namibia*.

This goal is being achieved through the implementation of 3 broad components: (1) Improving systems for revenue generation and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms, (2) Cost effective enforcement through testing and implementing principles of enforcement economics and (3) Implementation of integrated fire management strategy.

The four-year project did not start on 1st January 2014 as scheduled. In February 2014, an external project appraisal committee consultation (e-PAC) meeting was organized and the signing of the project document took place in April 2014. After the signing, the project went through a slow start until the organization of an inception workshop in June 2014 and the recruitment of PMU between July and November 2014. The PMU conducted a baseline assessment in November 2014 but substantial activities were implemented in 2015 and 2016. Up to now, the project has disbursed 66% of the total GEF grant of 4,000,000US$ and more than half of the additional in-kind or cash co-financing from the Government of Namibia (GRN) and UNDP.

## ii.2. Overall assessment of the project

The relevancy of PASS project for Namibia and the region, its implementation efficiency and effectiveness, its impact and sustainability were assessed. Overall, the project mid-term achievements are **satisfactory** with minor shortcoming (S) (see Table 1 for details).

1. Relevancy:

In Namibia, the PASS project is clearly **relevant** and is in line with the National Development Plan (NDP), most specifically, the Outcome 7 that ‘’Namibia is the most competitive tourism destination in sub-Saharan Africa by 2017’’. At the regional and global levels, the project fits within the GEF Strategic Objective 1 of the biological focal area (BD-1) whose focus is to ‘’Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems’’ and respective outcomes of ‘‘Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected area’’ and ‘’Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management’’.

1. Efficiency and effectiveness: **Satisfactory** (S)

At mid-term, despite a late start and delay in the approval of the fire management strategy, the project has made significant progress in implementing planned activities and on budget. About 2,658,942.65 US$ (66%) of the budget has been disbursed to:

* Employ highly qualified project management unit (PMU) and consultants
* Purchase equipment based on three competitive procurement proposals
* Set up an automated revenue collection system in Etosha National Park (ENP) (95% operational).
* Build a Law Enforcement Centre in Waterberg National Park (95% completed).
* Set up patrol camps and stations that are equipped with sanitary facilities and a communication system (on-going)
* Provide necessary equipment and training in law enforcement, information technology (IT), first aid and fire management (on-going), etc.

However, bureaucracy, especially when more than one government agencies are involved has delayed the progress of several outputs.

1. Impact: **Significant**

From the field mission and discussion with stakeholders, it is evident that the project is making a **significant** impact by:

* Improving the capacity of staff at park entry and exit
* Training and providing high-tech equipment to law enforcement and anti-poaching units
* Improving facilities and working conditions for PAs staff that are working tirelessly to curb the number of elephants and rhinos poached and incidences of bushfires.

1. Sustainability: **Likely**

The project is based on a solid foundation, built on lessons learnt from previous GEF-funded initiatives in Namibia such as the Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA), the Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE) and the Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN) Projects.

The GRN is also committed to the activities of the PASS project. For the out-rolling of he park entry automated system, the GRN has allocated to the project 2,000,000 million Namibian Dollars (NAD) annually since 2013 as co-finances. The project is therefore likely to service over 10 additional PAs within the next 2 years. The out-roll cost to the remaining 20 PAs has been estimated at about 1 million US$. Beside the automated system, MET will ensure that routine maintenance and law enforcement activities are sustained beyond the project’s lifespan. GRN has also approved the allocation of additional funds to boost law enforcement activities in and around its PAs.

## ii.3. Overall lessons learned and recommendations

**Importance of starting the project on time**

The implementation of the PASS project activities registered a delay of 6-month. Problems attributed to such delay include: currency fluctuation, context change, personnel turnover, shortened implementation time, etc. that might have a negative impact to project delivery. Project stakeholders should find out how to minimize project start up delays.

**Importance of logframe revision and adequate inception workshop**

The PASS project document was endorsed with missing baseline, targets and indicators. This shortcoming impeded the day-to-day monitoring and evaluation (M&E), which is vial to GEF projects’ implementation. UNDP/GEF should ensure that the project documents are finalised before singing them and that the PMU are recruited before organizing the inception workshop. The PMU should participate in the inception workshop and in making changes to the logframe or implementation arrangements to have a good understanding of the project situation.

**Training of project staff in GRN and UNDP/GEF management procedures**

Several outputs have not been implemented due to lengthy government procedures especially when a decision has to involve multiple government agencies. Additionally, the PMU has no direct access to UNDP/GEF support system. The discussion with the RTC to secure a second CEO endorsement of the updated SRF has not been concluded yet. The use of UNDP scorecard and the METT is not coherently understood. It is imperative that the PMU get in-depth induction focused on the project risk management related to government bureaucracy and UNDP/GEF project management modalities. Periodic training or revision workshops would be useful. Furthermore, UNDP CO staff should keep adequate oversight and support to the PMU. In case of staff change, there should be ample time for a proper project handover and induction.

**Scope and focus of the project**

The PASS project is clearly ambitious as it is designed to deal with revenue generation, cost effective law enforcement and fire management strategies in all the 21 PAs of Namibia. The project is also expected to work with a number of the government institutions, the community, concessions, conservancies, local and international NGOs and local and international intelligence and law enforcement agencies. This is a daunting task for a 4-year project that was initially designed to focus its activities mainly on new PAs. To be cost effective and make a lasting impact the project should restrict its activities to a reasonable geographic coverage.

**Project management**

The PMU is made of highly qualified personnel including a newly recruited IT technician who maintains the ENP automated system. Beside their expertise in project management and the knowledge of conservation issues in Namibia, they commission baseline and feasibility studies to professional consultants. To fulfil cost effectiveness, the PMU also involves existing forums to reduce cost and build of existing expertise and improve coverage. This approach increases the project performance and accountability. PASS should secure full control of the automated system from the contractor. More NGOs, Conservancies, Embassies etc. should be invited to participate and support the project at different levels but most importantly in law enforcement sector to which the project devotes over 80% of its time and resources.

**Project sustainability**

At MET, measures are in place to ensure the sustainability of the PASS project. The co-finances and the creation of financial, anti-poaching and law enforcement units have been proposed. Owing to the urgency in law enforcement activities, many stakeholders are satisfied by swift interventions of the PASS project and wish that a similar project be immediately initiated to coincide with the termination of current one. This should be part of the project exist strategy.

**Project result dissemination**

Owing to the appropriate timing and the importance of the project in piloting the automated of permits at park entries and exits and in implementing law enforcement activities, awareness materials and lessons learned from the project should be broadly disseminated. This output should be added to the project logframe and its indicators should include a number of radio and TV programmes (in different languages), newspaper, and technical and high impact journal articles to be produced.

**Project lifespan**

Although the project is on track and on budget, a late start of 6 month has put too much pressure on the PMU. Considering the remaining activities, a 6-month extension until the 30 June 2018 is recommended. The decision should be made by the PSC considering the available budget. This additional quarter will allow project staff to work on the exit strategies of the project including impact assessment, proposal design for a follow-up project, reporting and publications.

# Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of the evaluation and issues addressed

The ToR of the MTR presented in Annex 1, states that the objectives of this review is ***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***. The MTR consultant was appointed by the UNDP. The evaluation consisted of a series of interviews with key stakeholders, a visit to intervention sites and a perusal of available studies and reports. The visit to the parks in the north and north east of the country took place between 18th and 24th of August 2016. Preliminary findings were presented at a debriefing on September 7 at UNDP Country Office in Windhoek, Namibia and feedback from this meeting was received on September 19th. Comments on this draft report from stakeholders will be incorporated in the final report with ‘audit trail’ detailing how they have been addressed.

In accordance with the UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized projects, such as the PASS project, require a MTR halfway in the project’s cycle.

The issues the MTR addressed include:

* Evaluation of the project document and potential problems related to project design
* Assessment of the project progress towards achieving the objective since its inception
* Identification of key implementation strengths and bottlenecks or barriers which have led to sound or slow progress in the project implementation
* Identification of potential mitigation measures that would improve the PASS project implementation and execution
* Development of tangible recommendations that would guide project implementation after mid-term
* Provision of lessons learned, including lessons that might improve future design and implementation of new UNDP/GEF projects.

The results of this MTR come from the analyse and review of project documents, interview with stakeholders (i.e. PSC, PMU, MET, NAMPOL and UNDP staff etc.) and field observations at the intervention sites in the Greater Waterberg Complex (Waterberg Plateau Park), the Northeast Region (Bwabwata National Park) and the Northwest Region (Etosha National Park and Kunene Concession) respectively.

## 1.2. Project development and environmental policy context

Namibia is well known for its species richness, habitat diversity and biological distinctiveness. Unfortunately, the extinction risk of indigenous plant and animal species from Namibia has risen during the recent years due to climate change and various forms of and sophistication in anthropogenic activities including illegal collecting (e.g. poaching) and habitat destruction (e.g. bush fires) across most of vast landscapes. This situation is exacerbated by a dependence on natural resources due to a high inequality that characterizes the Namibian population in terms of patterns in population distribution, access to health care, income and human capacity and gender equity.

In order to protect its unique biological diversity, the Government of the Republic of Namibia has established a system of 21 state-managed Protected Areas (PAs). The existence of a strong Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programme delivered through registered communal conservancies complements these efforts. To date, 44% of Namibia’s land area is under conservation management. The government is spending billions of Namibian dollars to conserve its wildlife and ecosystems. These developments respond to the Namibian development plan (desired outcome 7) which stipulates that ‘Namibia is the most competitive tourism destination in sub-Saharan Africa by 2017. Namibia is also benefiting from investments from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and other development partners whose support has resulted in the expansion and improved management effectiveness of the protected area system.

Due to this recent expansion of the PA estate and the plan to become a tourist hub in sub-Saharan Africa, the available funding is not sufficient for the management of PAs in terms of wildlife conservation and putting necessary infrastructure in place to receive a large number of visitors. There are also emerging management challenges such as the increasing threat of poaching of key species such as elephants and rhinoceros and fire outbreaks. Specific interventions are needed to reinforce wildlife and ecosystem protection. In addition, weaknesses in revenue collection at various entry points need to be urgently addressed.

It is in this context that the PASS project, a project of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), co-funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was executed to ensure that the protected area system (PAS) of Namibia is strengthened and financed sustainably through three complementary components and associated outputs which are in line with the GEF strategic objective and the Namibian Government national management plan in the biological sector.

## 1.3. Problems that the project seeks to address

The fundamental problems that the project is aimed at are: (a) inadequate revenue generation mechanisms and unexploited revenue opportunities, (b) inefficient enforcement and (c) inefficient fire management. At the time the project was designed (2010), it was recognized that these were the major gaps and limitations to the successful implementation of PAs management in Namibia.

Despite the impressive size of the Namibian PAS, biodiversity continues to be lost. However, there is a huge potential for protected areas to be transformed into a tight, cohesive, and effective network, providing an effective buffer against threats to biodiversity. The PAS, however, is facing new management challenges. PAS is now larger due to new proclamations – increasing the financing needs. Poaching in neighbouring countries, particularly South Africa, poses a serious threat to Namibia’s rhino species. Likewise, elephants are poached for ivory mostly in the Kavango area where large held of elephants and high density or rural human population are found.

These threats are further compounded by a general lack of awareness in the populace of the value and significance of the key species of Namibia and the need to effectively conserve them. Recent fire outbreaks have also devastated parts of ENP and some private and communal conservancy areas. Important flora and fauna were lost including rhinos and elephants. The impacts can be felt through a loss of threatened habitats and associated species and the incremental loss of the economic benefits gathered from biodiversity. The PASS project aims at tackling these problems by strengthening protected area management systems.

## 1.4. Objectives and anticipated results

The project objective as defined in the project logframe is to: *strengthen and sustainably finance the PAs through improved current systems for revenue systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the enforcement of Economics Model*.

The project aims at achieving the following three broad outcomes:

* **An optimized and accountable revenue collection system with appropriate capacities in place and functioning**

This outcome involves activities such as setting up a PAs finance planning unit at MET, a better cash reconciliation process and guest tracking systems, strengthening the system of licensing fee and revenue collection and the exploration of other sources of revenue.

* **PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective enforcement**

The logframe allows activities such as having boots on the ground (paramilitary, patrol, APU to detect and prosecute wildlife crimes), intelligence system with formal networks, strengthened communication with other law enforcement agencies in neighbouring countries, investigating and prosecuting units, surveillance system, equipment for anti-poaching patrols, legal proceedings and prosecution penalties, trainings on scene of crime procedures to target gaps in law enforcement and track poacher, and awareness activities with the community and rewards as disincentives for poaching.

* **PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective fire management**

This outcome is designed to prepare, approve and implement the fire management strategy and the PA standard operating procedures, support a paradigm shift from reactive fire fighting to an integrated fire management system, producing training manuals on fire management and site specific fire mitigation procedures including early burning methods or patch fires especially in the northeast (i.e. Bwabwata National Park). Establishing fire management forums and conducting annual fire management workshops with conservancies, communities and fire brigades are also among planned activities to achieve this outcome.

# Major findings

In accordance with the UNDP/GEF guidelines, this section of the report reviews the extent to which the project concept, design and implementation are appropriate and whether project activities have happened on schedule and on budget since its inception.

## 2.1. Project design and review history

The PASS project document contains a considerable amount of useful information but lack of tangible baseline, which are usually fundamental in project planning and monitoring tools. This is particularly evident in the incomplete logical framework (logframe) that does not include quantifiable indicators. The project was also designed to encompass an ambitious coverage, which covers all PAs of Namibia including some conservancies and concessions.

PASS, a Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was planned to began on 1 January 2014 and end on 31 December 2017. On 7 February 2014, the external project appraisal committee consultation (e-PAC) meeting reviewed the project at Windhoek Country Club and Resort (WCCR) on 7February 2014. The e-PAC meeting was chaired by Mr. Neil Boyer (UNDP Deputy Resident Representative) and co-chaired by Mr. Colgar Sikopo (Director of Regional Services and Park Management under MET and also the National Project Director of PASS). The e-PAC major amendments on the project document and recommendations were that:

* The inception workshop must update and validate the result framework, add critical stakeholders (DoT, MoF, LAC, etc.) that were omitted in the project document, proposed the location of the law enforcement centre at Waterberg Plateau Park
* The PASS project should assist MET in establishing a network of partner institutions to promote cooperation, coordination and synergy.
* The MET (Directorate of Scientific Services, Directorate of Planning and Technical Services, Directorate of Tourism), MAWF (Directorate of Forestry), MoF, Legal Assistance Centre should be added to the PSC
* A deputy project manager (DPM) from MET should be added to the PMU to serve as a link between the project and MET for sustainability beyond the project life cycle
* The DPM had to set up the project offices until the PM comes on board. To reduce project management costs, various Namibian Portfolio Projects co-funded by GEF (current CPD and NPD 4 periods) needed to share certain positions (M&E Officer, Communication and Outreach Officer, and Finance and Accounting and Administration (FAA) Officer with PASS in order to enhance efficiency. A single PM should be allocated to each project so each can be accountable to its objectives.

On 16 June 2014, an inception workshop was held at WCCR to officially mark the beginning of the project. During the inception workshop, the project management unit and stakeholders reviewed e-PAC recommendations and validated the project deliverables, activities, expected outcomes and implementation modalities including revision of the logframe, budget and work plan. The recommendations of the IW were that:

* The DPM position is nullified since other MET staff will have direct responsibility towards the project starting from the NPD and also park Wardens at intervention sites will be working with FCs on a daily basis.
* The shared FAA position suggested by e-PAC be reinstated to individual project because it may have operational limitations that could affect the project delivery
* The 2 part-time Law Enforcement and Finance Technical experts be merged in one Technical Expert or Technical Advisor and specified the roles and responsibilities and reporting lines of different implementers
* That the stations for FCs remain at Mahango and Otjovasandu as recommended by e-PAC. However, PSC can change locations to allow effective implementation of PASS.

The effective starting date of the project was July 2014 with only the PM on board. TA joined in August, AA in October and FCs in November, 2014 when the PMU was complete. Field coordinators are based Otjovasondu and Rundu and they cover protected areas in the Northwest and Northeast regions respectively. PM, TA & AA are based at MET HQ in Windhoek. The entire PMU visited the sites between November 12-26, 2014 accompanied by the UNDP and GEF focal persons to complete the baseline information that was missing in the logframe of the project in relation to the three project components.

From mid August to the end of September 2016 this mid-term review was commissioned to assess project performance at half span based of the information from the project document, inception report, baseline report, quarterly reports and quarterly PSC meeting minutes, the evaluation analysed the audit reports, work plans, feasibility study reports and the draft of the fire management strategy, interviews and field observations.

## 2.2. Project management and implementation mechanisms (efficiency)

### 2.2.1. Project management structure

MET has been responsible for setting up the project structure, recruiting projects managers and executing project activities guided by the PSC. MET also contracts additional service providers (Consultants) to carry out specific project activities such as baseline and feasibility studies. MET coordinates the activities of the project, ensures project delivery and sustainability including long-term and nation wide scaling up of successful piloting approaches as part of the project exit strategy. The UNDP ensures the delivery of the project in collaboration with RTC in Ethiopia (Figure 1 shows the organizational structure of the project).

At the project management level, the highly qualified project management team has taken on the tasks of the project in a very proactive manner. Despite the late start of the project, the PMU has made considerable improvement to the project document in collaboration and consultation with MET, UNDP and RTC in Addis Ababa. Due to the fact that the project was designed 6 years ago, the database used in setting up the project cannot be traced. Also, there are some sections of the project document that were out-dated and required a new baseline assessment. Most of activities required needs and feasibility assessments to be undertaken, such plans and assessments helped the PMU in ensuring that all project issues are considered and that appropriate priorities are identified. Project tasks were undertaken in a logical order, and based on SRF, monitoring and evaluation was conducted appropriately, timely (when possible) and on budget.

The PMU demonstrated efficiency in project procurement, financial management. The PMU was capable of carrying out effectively most tasks in components 1 & 2. Mid-targets of output 1.1 and 3.1. were not achieved due bureaucracy and staff turnover. Other current tasks that have were not completed yet during the MTR including the sustainability and development score cards and NAMETT assessment (for compatibility PMU opted to work with METT instead of NAMETT) have been included in the tasks of the 2016 fourth quarter and will be implemented in the 2017 first quarter.

Since the project was signed in April 2014 (3 month from its original starting date of 1st January 2014, it could be extended up the 31 March 2018 to complete its 4 year duration. PMU has secured the budget from the first year including tax refunds that could be used during the project closing period.



Figure. 1. Project organizational and management structure

### 2.2.2. Financial management

The review did not analyse the budget and expenditures in details but a closer look at the budget found that as of end of June 2016, the project had spent 2,658,942.65 US$. The remaining 1,342,057.35 US$ will be used during the second half of 2016, the whole of 2017 and the proposed 3-month project extension (if approved). This balance is equivalent of 34% of the total budget. The large amount of the grant was spent during the 1st and 2 years of project implementation when major equipment was purchased and the main part of the LE Centre constructed.

### 2.2.3. Country ownership

The project document and overall project outcomes are characterized by a very strong adherence to and integration into the Namibian NDP, which imply a very strong country ownership. Namibia has ratified several environmental conventions relevant to this project including CBD, CITES, RAMSAR and World Heritage Conventions. The country also prioritizes wildlife conservation and has underwritten it in its constitution, vision 2030, NDP, NBSAP placing a high priority on strengthening PA network. The project also addresses targets 1 (awareness of wildlife crimes), target 3 (incentive measures), target 11 (Protected Areas) and 12 (threatened species) of the Aichi Protocol that the Government has ratified. It is also evident that the GRN has taken the PASS project as its own through the allocation of substantial co-finances into the project activities.

**2.2.3. Stakeholder participation**

Initial project design foresees strong stakeholder participation. It was observed that at local level, stakeholder participation is strong (conservancies, community forums and concessions) mainly because they directly benefit from the project. However, at national level, many stakeholders including national and international NGOs (TRAFFIC) are not fully involved in the project activities yet as it was proposed in the project document. At the regional and international levels, it is impossible of evaluate the exchange o intelligence between countries because specialised units keep this information as top secret. However, according to NAMPOL, there are some communication difficulties with certain countries (e.g. China) through the Interpol. However, some embassies have joined the government efforts in fighting wildlife crimes including the escalation in rhino and elephant poaching (e.g. Germany Embassy). In future projects, such contributors could be included in the PSC.

## 2.1. Major achievements and project effectiveness evaluation

Project achievements against the mid-term targets and effectiveness evaluation are summarized below (Table 1).

**Table 1: Evaluation of project effectiveness**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | | **Target at mid-term** | | **Evaluation** | | **Motivation** |
| **The main objective**: To strengthen and sustainably finance the PAS through improved current systems for revenue generation, introduction of innovative revenue generation mechanisms; and cost effective enforcement through application of the enforcement economics model | | | | | | | |
| 1. Financial sustainability scorecard for the national system of protected areas (PAs) reviewed and implemented | Generic UNDP financial sustainability scorecard for PAs (2007) in place | | Score card reviewed | | U/A | | The scorecard under review |
| 2. Capacity development indicator score for protected areas system | Systemic: 72%  Institutional: 59%  Individual: 56% | | Systemic: 80%  Institutional: 74%  Individual: 71% | | S | | The systemic and institutional capacity is improving. More efforts needed to raise individual capacity |
| 3. Fire management strategy developed and implemented through SOPs at PA level | Draft fire management strategy | | Fire management strategy finalized | | U/A | | Draft not approved yet by MET |
| No SOPs for individual PAs | | At least 2 SOPs developed for 2 PAs | | U/A | | Waiting for the approval of the IFMS |
| 4. METT to be strengthened as an assessment tool for PA management | METT only consistently applied in 2 PAs (Dorobo and Skeleton) | | At least 4 additional PAs apply the METT assessment annually | | U/A | | No additional PAs assessed. The additional PAs assessment will be done together with NAMPARKS 3 |
| **Component 1**: Improved systems for revenue generation and implementing new and innovative revenue generation mechanisms  **Outcome 1**: An optimized and accountable revenue collection system with appropriate capacities in place and functioning | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1**: The MET’s Directorate of financial administration and human resources (DAFHR) is strengthened to effectively address sustainable PAS financing in Namibia | | | | | | | |
| Foundation for the establishment of the PA financing unit in place | No PA financial unit in place | | Baseline assessment for sustainable PA financing conducted | | S | | Baseline and feasibility assessment consultancy in progress. The set up of the PA financial unit will involve many government institutions including MET, MoF and OPM. |
| Output 2. Implementation of automated revenue collection system across the entire PA system and reconciliation of fees at PA entrances and exists | | | | | | | |
| Computerized and automated PA permit issuance and revenue collection system implemented in all national PAs | Approved automated park entry and revenue collection system for National Parks | | System implemented in ENP (as pilot) and in at least 2 additional PAs | | HS | | System implemented in ENP. The IT System Administrator is working with the system designer to ensure that the system can reconcile fees and PA entrances and exits. A feasibility study for out-rolling the system to other PAs has been completed. |
| **Output 3**: Fee and licensing structure revised and diversified and licensing fee collection strengthened | | | | | | | |
| Existing fee and licensing system revised | Fee and licensing system not revised | | Existing fees and licensing system revised | | HS | | Baseline and feasibility assessment in progress |
| **Output 4**: other opportunities explored including bio-prospecting, user fees, ear market taxes, corporate donations, voluntary contributions, cause related marketing | | | | | | | |
| Other PA financing mechanisms explored | PAs fully financed by the Government, with limited financial support from the Game Products Trust Fund (GPTF) | | Baseline assessment to explore other PA financing mechanisms with tangible recommendations | | HS | | Baseline and feasibility assessment completed. Recommendation will be implemented during 2017 annual activities |
| **Component 2**: Cost effective enforcement through testing and implementing principles of enforcement economics  **Outcome 2**: PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective enforcement | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1**: A state of the art detection and enforcement system is in place, with a harmonized enforcement chain and a platform for information sharing and intelligence gathering among customs, police, army, parks, communities and wildlife authorities, amongst other | | | | | | | |
| Harmonized enforcement chain, information sharing and intelligence gathering among Law Enforcement (LE) agencies | Weak enforcement chain, poor information sharing and lack of intelligence coordination among LE agencies | | Enforcement chain established, tangible and quick information sharing mechanisms in place | | HS | | Communication system (radio, satellite phones) in place but needs strengthening especially the international communication including in Portuguese. |
| Less effective LE operations and poor coordination among LE agencies | | Stakeholder consultations to establish coordination forums conducted in the target areas | | HS | | Forums existed in the north and northeast but more coordination needed between MET, NAMPOL and the community. |
| Creation of a LE Training Centre | | Inauguration of the LE Centre | | HA | | LE Training Centre almost completed. Once furnished, it will be inaugurated. |
| Output 2: Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved, and especially, there is a registration system in place for wildlife owned by private persons in the PAS | | | | | | | |
| Number of poached animals per key species reduced | In 2014 reported cases of key species poaching (78, elephants; 24 Rhinos) | | Reduction of annual poaching numbers | | U/A | | Overall wildlife crime related monitoring systems are improved. ToR for consultancy to develop a wildlife crime monitoring system (including wildlife owned by private persons) have been developed |
| Number of wildlife product confiscated reduced | In 2014 the following wildlife articles were confiscated: 720.55kg ivory, 39kg rhino horns) | | Reduction in illegal possession of wildlife products | | U/A | | Difficult to assess since the numbers are not out yet and that there were biases in counting carcasses before the intensification of patrols by PASS |
| Output 3: Game patrols, rangers, community members and other relevant staff are trained in sophisticated enforcement approaches and schemes; multifaceted arrangements are made with Interpol, NAMPOL and CITES permitting and enforcement institutions, etc. staff have the capacity to take effective enforcement actions | | | | | | | |
| Number of people trained in advanced LE techniques and improved prosecution | Low level of LE training | | 2 key LE training provided | | HS | | 3 training sessions for prosecutors and investigators held. Awareness posters with contact numbers produced |
| Lack of LE equipment | | 50% of the identified essential equipment provided | | HS | | The majority of equipment has been procured (>13million N$ spent on equipment), few more + the roll-out of CEP system to be procured in the next 2 years |
| Output 4: Appropriate mechanisms and incentives are set in place to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes, encourage public to report wildlife crimes, and to be disincentives for poaching | | | | | | | |
| Mechanisms and incentives in place to encourage public to report wildlife crimes | | Mechanisms exist but weak and need strengthening | | Existing mechanisms strengthened and new ones developed | S | | Indirect incentives such as training, awareness meetings and support to visit the park initiated. There is a plan to develop mechanisms to reduce complicity in wildlife crimes |
| Development of the parks and wildlife management bill supported | | * Draft parks and wildlife management bill * Out-dated nature conservation ordinance no. 4 of 1975 | | Strengthening of legal framework supported via review workshops and other public consultations | S | | MET to finalise the Wildlife Management Bill but the process will take time through involving all stakeholders including the Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Prosecutor General, Law Reform Commission, Cabinet etc.  Wildlife penalties out-dated |
| **Component 3**: Implementation of the Integrated Fire Management Strategy (IFMS)  **Outcome 3**: PAS sustainability enhanced through improved capacity for detection monitoring and cost effective fire management | | | | | | | |
| Output 1: Standard operating procedures for all the national parks and game reserves based on the fire management strategy developed | | | | | | | |
| Fire management strategy developed and approved and implemented | | Draft fire management strategy in place, but not finalized nor implemented | | Fire management strategy developed, reviewed and approved | S | IFMS waiting approval by the PS after proof reading. This process will most likely be completed soon. In the meantime, the project is using the draft IFMS in the in some areas such as Khaudum National Park. | |
| SOPs developed and implemented in all PAs within the project target areas. | | No SOPs for PAs | | At least 2 PAs fire management SOPs developed | U/A | ToR and advert for the development of SOPs and a fire monitoring programme for ENP drafted but SOPs will be implemented after the endorsement of the IFMS. | |
| **Overall project performance evaluation at mid-term (S)** | | | | | | | |
| Overall the evaluation of the project in the achievement of planned targets at mid term is satisfactory with minor shortcomings. Most of the shortcomings involve several key outputs that lack bases for assessment (2 & 3.1), and documents of the outputs 1.1., 1.3., 1.4., 2.5., 3.1. & 3.2. that are waiting to be approved or endorsed by the MET and outputs 2.2. & 2.4. waiting to be commissioned to a consultant or to develop a plan of action. At this stage, attention should be paid at the outputs that fall in these categories to make sure they are reviewed/approved or revised/removed to allow a smooth progress of the project during the remaining 2 years. These shortcomings should be discussed at PSC. | | | | | | | |

# Recommendations

## 3.1. Immediate recommendations

* In view to various modifications introduced throughout the project implementation and evaluation, the original project document and especially its logframe matrix should be updated
* The review is of the opinion that the content of the 3 components remain valid and should not be subject to major changes, although minor modifications should be considered to align the end of the project to the project objective.
* The implementation of component 3 depends of the approval of the fire management strategy without which, there is no framework for project intervention. There MET should therefore speed up this process.
* Other outputs that wait approval should be dealt with urgency
* Work plans and budget for the remaining project time should be reviewed and updated with appropriate detail, including milestones for close monitoring of progress
* The budgeting needs to be strictly focused on the project operations and budget lines and continue the application of the most realistic quotations and quality assurance
* Efforts should be made to review and assess the effectiveness of awareness materials (media, drama, bill boards) and analyse their importance and impact in relation to the wildlife and ecosystem conservation
* More awareness programmes on TVs and radios must be performed
* Additional visibility of GEF/UNDP on the PASS deliverables could play an important role in soliciting more support from these and other agencies.
* The inauguration of the LE Centre should be fast tracked so that LE training activities start without further delays.
* During the remaining time of the project, efforts should be made to ensure that necessary enactment of pending environmental bills and strategies takes place
* The project duration should be extended until the 30 June 2018.

## 3.2. Long term (before the end of the project)

Recommendations regarding the project exit strategy include:

* The publication of high quality articles to share project results and experience with a larger audience in journals and UNDP/GEF website and technical reports. .
* The organization of an international end-of project technical seminar or conference in which results and achievements are presented.
* The development of post-project follow-up activities to ensure sustainability of results – at the national and regional level

## 3.3. Long term (end of project and beyond)

Recommendation regarding the sustainability of project achievements:

* In order to ensure the sustainability of the project, co-finances from all contributors need to be accounted for.
* It is strongly recommend that, the end of PASS project should coincide with the beginning of a new follow-up project, which will benefit from its momentum and expertise. The new project should resume the existing activities and also introduce a broader scope addressing other PAS issues, additional target species and additional target countries (neighbours) to nurture regional cooperation and technological transfer.

# Lessons learned

This section is primarily for the benefit of UNDP/GEF, in that lessons learned from this project may be used to improve future UNDP/GEF programming.

As learned from the PASS project, when designing future UNDP/GEF projects, it could be worthwhile to:

* Shorten the project start-up time by involving stakeholders from earlier stages of the project design
* Ensure that the project document has clear and complete strategic results framework before endorsing it
* Guarantee the visibility of funding agencies
* Restrict intervention sites to a single PA or region when dealing with complex crisis (e.g. anti-poaching). The project impact will likely be more significant on smaller rather than larger scale
* Publish valuable project results in peer reviewed journals or GEF /UNDP technical papers to make these results known and useful to a wider audience.

**Final remarks**

The PASS project appears to be successfully making real changes happen on the ground. For example, the project has made tremendous improved the living condition of rangers and patrol unit through the provision of equipment and camping facilities. Although the financial impact and sustainability of the project results are still to be verified, and more efforts are still needed to accomplish project targets during the remaining duration of the project and beyond, the hard work put in so far by the project partners seems to be paying of. The last two years will obviously be crucial for the final results of the project. It is important to plan this period carefully. The PMU and PSC should set up important project milestones whose implementation is based on timely delivery and regular progress monitoring. Moreover, good results need to be documented and communicated broadly in order to gain support and exercise influence. Also for accountability purposes, the project should improve its monitoring mechanisms and apply ‘SMART’ targets and indicators to its SRF. To secure the SRF final GEF CEO endorsement, UNDP CO would be in a strong position to influence this process in close collaboration with GEF, RTC and MET.

Finally, there is a unique opportunity to reinforce and broaden the impact of the PASS project through designing a follow up project and this momentum should be taken advantage of.

# Annexes

### 5.1. TOR for the MTR

(Attached separately)

### 5.2. Evaluation schedule & field mission itinerary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Activity and participants | Venue |
| 15.08.16 | 14:30 | Inception meeting for the MTR with MET focal staff. Review of inception report. Obtaining project documents | MET Office  Windhoek |
| 16.08.16 | AM | Submission of draft inception report to MET and UNDP CO |  |
|  | PM | Meeting with project team (Project Manager, PSC Chair, etc.) |  |
| 17.08.16 | AM | Review comments on the draft inception report. Submission of the final inception report to UNDP CO |  |
|  | PM | Meeting with MET Warden and UNDP focal person |  |
| 18.08.16 | AM & PM | Travel to Waterberg. Visit the training centre, observations and interview with Warden | Waterberg/  Grootfontein |
| 19.08.16 | AM/PM | Travel to Divundu. Interview with DD, CCW, CW or W | Divundu |
| 20.08.16 | AM/PM | Observations (Patrol camps, etc.) and interview with stakeholders (W, Ranger) at Bwabwata West NP (Buffalo Core Area) | Nova and Delta camps |
| 21.08.16 | AM/PM |  |  |
| 22.08.16 | AM/PM | Travel to Etosha National park via Eenhana | Eenhana/  Namutoni |
| 23.08.16 | AM & PM | Observations in Etosha East (CEPS system, Patrol camps (Acacia, Casablanca & Mushala), camping equipment, water trailers, water containers, satellite phones, etc.) and interview with stakeholders (CW, W, Ranger) | Onkoshi |
| 24.08.16 | AM  PM | Interview with DD, CCW, CW or W and staff of the Ecological Institute, vet and pilot  Travel back to Windhoek | Okaukuejo/Outjo |
| 02.09.16 | AM | Interview at MET with DPS | Windhoek |
|  | PM | NPD |  |
| 02.08.16 | PM | Discuss preliminary results with the project team |  |
| 03-06.09.16 |  | Preparation of the draft report, more consultation with stakeholders (NAMPOL, MoD) |  |
| 07.09.16 | PM | Presentation of result to key project stakeholders (MET, UNDP, GEF) |  |
| 12.09.16 | PM | Circulate the draft report of the MTR to key project stakeholders |  |
| 19.09.16 | PM | Receive comments from key project stakeholders |  |
| 30.09.16 | PM | Submit the final MTR report + Audit trail |  |

### 5.3. List of persons interviewed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time & Location | Person | Title & Affiliation |
| 15/8/15 | PM | Jonas Heita  Raili Hasheela-Haipinge | PM, PASS Project  TA, PASS |
| 17/8/16 | 10:30, MET | Mr. Manie Le Roux | CCW, C&S Regions |
| 17/8/16 | 13:30, Safari Hotel | Nelson Zaakapi | UNDP |
| 18/8/16 | PM, Waterberg | David Massen | Chief Warden |
| 19/8/16 | PM, Popafalls | Leeverty Muyomba  Boniface Sichombe  Chrispin Konkwena  Appollus Apolonalus Kannyinga | FC, NAMPARKS 3  CW, Kavango Parks  CW, Bwabwata West  DD, North East |
| 20/8/16 | AM, PM (Bwabwata West) | Delta and Nova patrol camp members | MET, NAMPOL |
| 21/8/16 | AM, Susuwe, Mukwenyati camp | James Sambi | Warden |
|  | PM, Guesha camp  PM, Mudumu | Topis  Singwangwa Matambo | Warrant Officer  Warden |
| 22/8/16 | AM | Kosmas Shilongo | FC, NE, PASS |
| 23/3/16 | AM, PM (Namutoni, Etosha East) | Bonny Simataa (+4 W at Acacia & Casablanca camps)  Victoria Ndapanda-Jason  Uri Matundu (FC, NW) | CW, MET  IT, ENP, PASS  FC, NW, PASS |
| 24/8/16 | AM, Okaukuejo, Etosha Central | Kotting Shayne  Kotting Birgit  Hans K.  Gabriel Shatumbu  B. Ndumbu | Ecological Institute  Vet, ENP  MET. Pilot, ENP  MET, APU ENP |
|  | PM, Outjo | Elwin Tjikuua | MET, CCW, Kunene |
| 2/9/16 | AM | Louisa Mupetami (Ms.) | DPS, MET |
|  | PM | Colgar Sikopo | NPD, MET |
| 6/9/16 | AM | Lorretta Tsuses (Ms.) | NAMPOL |

### 5.4. Field mission summary report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Location | Observations | Comments |
| Central region: Greater Waterberg Complex and Etosha National Park | The Waterberg complex (400km2) has the highest number of rhinos per area. Although risk of poaching and bush fires are high, there has not been any incident during the last 2 years. The project has build the LE Centre, procured digital radios and repeaters, tents, water tanks, solar inverter, cooler, fridge, supported rhino de-horning, etc.  The 22,270km2 Etosha NP has all the 4 gates equipped with CEPS and the gates are linked to 3 pay points. Staff at the gate and pay points have received training and have day-to-day IT support. The system is sensitive to weather. 43 patrol camps have been fenced and equipped with shower, long-drop toilets, and satellite phones.  Fireball training has taken place in Etosha.  Poaching seems to be low at ENP due to CBNRM involvement, but LE should be strengthened to the risk at bay. ENP is also prone to fire outbreaks. | Most of the project interventions are related to component 2 on LE in Waterberg. The LE centre is about 95% completed (not furnished). Tents and other equipment not yet sufficient, patrol camps not fenced. The park employs local people to avoid intruders who can become poachers.  In ENP, the CEPS at some gates needs reliable generator or solar power backup and air conditioners. Each gate should have its own pay point to facilitate fee reconciliation. Some camps do not have pots, good tents, binoculars, sleeping bags, fence, water tanks, and toilets. There is still limited capacity in park management such as use of speed camera trap, scene of crime investigation, GPS, riffle handling and offering first aid, conducting foot control, basic LE. There is no fore fighting trucks and fire protective clothing, limited number of uniforms and very old monitoring hides. |
| Northeastern region: Khaudum, Tsumkwe, Popa Falls, Mahango, Bwabwata West, Bwabwata East and Mudumu | Participants from Bwabwata, Khaudum, Rundu, Susuwe were attending the fire management and LE forum workshop and shared their feeling about PASS project and what it has procured to them including amphibious boats, satellite phones, tents, boreholes, water tanks, metal detectors, etc. A prosecutors’ training was also organized in Popa Falls. Participants also reported that Bwabwata and Khaudum are hotspots for elephant poaching. In Tsumkwe and Khaudum there is still a problem of communication. So far 47 elephants have been killed in the area this year alone compared with 78 last year. Two elephants have been poached in Mudumu at the beginning of August 2016. We noticed that the borehole water at Mukwanyati is very salty and that Delta patrol camp is fenced but not used for the last 3 months due to lack of water. | There is lack of manpower, ineffective roadblocks, insufficient equipment including rifles, transboundary problem and high incident of poaching in Tsumkwe, Khaudum (for Giraffe).  The area need 200 more NAMPOL, more equipment, rifles, training in first aid, revision of fines, coordination with KAZA (in transboundary issues) and MET should register with NASA. Develop profiles for suspects. Procure min-truck for firefighting. Expedite informant payments.  PASS to join existing LE, HWV and fire management forums of the region. |
| Northwest: Kunene | Kunene is characterized by free roaming held of rhinos, lions and elephants. Should get more attention and funding.  The project has build 3 patrol camps and 2 boreholes in the area. Satellite phone have been procured plus water tank trailers.  Most trailers were in Outjo for registration. | At Opuwo (Kunene), there is a need for a tire repair kit, metal detector, game guard from conservancies not included in LE training sessions.  At Khorixas (Kunene), there is a need of file books, repair of the borehole by ICEMA (Integrated community based ecosystem management), need camera, vehicles. |

### 5.5. Mid-term evaluation question matrix

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation criteria | General performance questions | Follow up and specific questions |
| Relevance | How does the project relate to the main objectives and priorities of the main stakeholders? | * How does the project relate to the main objectives of GEF focal area? * How do the activities of the project relate to the Namibian National Development Plan? * How does the project respond to the UNDP focal area in Namibia? * How has the project contributed to the intervention objectives of MET, NAMPOL, etc. in the field? |
| Effectiveness | To what extent have the expected outcomes of the project been achieved? | * How far has the project supported MET to establish the PA Finance Planning Unit? What is the current status? * To what extent is the CEPS in ENP functional? * What is hampering the rollout of the system in other park? How can this issue be resolved? * To what extent the fee and licensing structure have been revised? * How can the PAS financing be diversified? * Have the implementation of the above activities effectively generated revenues? * To what extent have the law enforcement activities improved detection and reduced poaching of rhinos and elephants? * To what extent have training and awareness rising strengthened the capacity and effectiveness of service providers? |
| Efficiency | Are the deployed efforts and funds spent proportional to the project achievements so far? | * To what extent have the financial and human resources procured contributed to the expected results and project sustainability in terms cost-effective revenue collection and generation, law enforcement and fire management? * Has the value for money standards been efficiently applied during the first half of the project? |
| Impact | Are there indications that the project has contributed to MET activities of reducing environmental stress? | * Has the establishment of the CEPS in ENP improved customer care of the gates and pay points? * To what extent has the project contributed to the wellbeing of the APU? * Has APU’s activities succeeded in curbing the number of rhinos and elephants killed? * How many rhino and elephant poached this year compared with last year? * How many people have benefited from the project training workshops? * How many people did the project employ the project so far? How many males/females? |
| Sustainability | To what extent will the sustainability of the project results be ensured? | * What is the foundation that the project has set to ensure continuous and effective capacity building of stakeholders? * How will MET maintain and expand the CEPS after the end of the project? * Has GEF funding created a strong networking of partners that will continue collaborating with MET in especially law enforcement and fire management activities? |

### 5.6. List of documents consulted

Project document

Inception report

Draft fire management strategy

Meeting minutes

Annual work plans

Draft feasibility studies

Baseline assessment report

Quarterly and annual reports

Audit reports

Project awareness raising materials

NIM procurement guidelines

Environmental and social assessment for the development of Waterberg Training centre (Scoping report)

### 5.7. Evaluation consultant agreement form

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

Name of Consultant: Tharcisse Ukizintambara, PhD

Name of Consultancy Organization (Where relevant): N/A (Independent Consultant)\_

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

Signed at Place: Windhoek, Namibia\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ 5 September 2016\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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