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1. **Executive Summary**
	1. **Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around the Greater Kafue National Park and West Lunga National Park in Zambia |
| UNDP Project ID (PIMS #): | 4625 | PIF Approval Date: | 22nd September 2011 |
| GEF Project ID (PMIS #): | 4639 | CEO Endorsement Date: |  |
| ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID: | 00077150 | Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began): | 16th May 2014 |
| Country(ies): | Zambia | Date project manager hired: | 6th May 2015 |
| Region: | Africa | Inception Workshop date: | 28th July 2014 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation | Midterm Review completion date: | 17th July 2017 |
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective: | BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas systemsCCM-5: Promote conservation of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change and forestry LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscapeSFM REDD+1: Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services | Planned closing date: | October 2018 |
| Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]: | GEF | If revised, proposed op. closing date: | 15th April 2019(reflecting only the delayed Start Date |
| Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner: | Department of National Parks and Wildlife and Forestry Department |
| Other execution partners: | Implementing Agency: UNDP |
| **Project Financing** | *at CEO endorsement (US$)* | *at Midterm Review (US$)\** |
| [1] GEF financing: | US$ 13,148,864 | US$ 13,148,864 |
| [2] UNDP contribution: | US$ 3,040,000  | US$ 3,040,000  |
| [3] Government (in-kind): | US$ 37,396,777 | US$ 37,396,777 |
| [4] Other partners: | US$ 6,500,000 | US$ 6,500,000 |
| [5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]: | US$ 46,936,777 | US$ 43,896,777 |
| PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5] | US$ 60,085,641 | US$ 60,085,641 |

* 1. **Project Description (brief)**

The 78,1880km2 project area, comprising Kafue NP (22,480km), West Lunga NP (1,684km2) and 13 Game Management Areas (GMAs) (54,021km2) is threatened by wildlife poaching, deforestation and forest degradation, unsustainable land uses, extensive fire, and loss of a large, intact ecosystem that provides multiple benefits including forest protection, water and Hydro-Electric Power (HEP), and biodiversity.

The project seeks to address these problems by supporting Zambia’s policies of decentralised management, both of Protected Areas, and of communities living in buffer zone protected areas (GMAs). In Kafue National Park, it is a Protected Area (PA)-strengthening project. In the GMAs, the Project takes a Community Based Natural Resources (CBNRM) approach to sustainable community livelihoods focused on devolved Village-based management units (Village Action Groups)

The project Objective is: Biodiversity and carbon sinks of Kafue / West Lunga Protected Area Systems in Zambia are better protected from threats and effectively managed by national and local institutions, communities, and economic actors using sustainable forestry and land management practices.

Component 1 is: Increased management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Kafue and West Lunga PA system

Component 2 is: Sustainable land and forest management by local institutions in GMA buffer

* 1. **Project Progress Summary**

While some progress in achieving the project’s objective and expected outcomes was made, it is not yet translated into notable actual on-ground impact. The two target ecosystems, and their natural resources, are still subjected to significant threats. Activities in implementation process and planned expect to generate long-term impact, though it may not be significantly notable during the Project's duration. Good progress was made mainly in establishing the local governance structures, awareness efforts, pilot land-use planning, impact-generating pilots (CF), and gender aspects, and in providing support to enforcement and management planning and activities of the EAs, as well as enhancing cooperation between them. Implementation initiation was significantly delayed, and implementation is still much slower than planned, however, recent significant progress is very encouraging.

* 1. **MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure**  | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A | N/A |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: **S** | Impact on achieving the Project's objective through this Project's outputs and activities, is not yet notable. Progress made so far is not yet translated into impact on biodiversity and carbon sinks in the Project sites. However, activities under implementation and in planning are expected to result with notable impact by the Project end. Evident behavioural change, embedded in institutional structures throughout the Project area, gives good reason to expect significant and sustainable impact. |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: **MS** | No significant progress towards achieving the outcome of component 1, and no notable impact that can be specifically attributed to this Project's contribution, thus far. Nevertheless, enabling activities have initiated and it is expected that this Project, in synergy with other initiatives, can lead to significant and sustainable impact in improving this outcome, and that can be reflected by the selected indicators, by Project end. |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: **S** | No significant progress towards achieving the mid-term targets of component 2, that can be directly attributed to this Project, yet. However, significant progress has been achieved in establishing the enabling conditions for this components' implementation, mainly through several strategic partnerships established. Most notable are the considerable progress made in establishing the VAGs and CRBs, sensitization, and initiating and rapid dissemination of the CF practice, and the pilot ILUPs.  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | **MS** | The Project's management arrangements and financial management have resulted in significant delays in implementation of activities and therefore adequate adaptive management is required. |
| **Sustainability** | **ML** | The Project has a high potential to create sustainability of its results, if its implementation would be accelerated and focused on sustainability-enhancing activities, and its duration extended to enable sufficient progress in achieving the main results.  |
|  |  |  |

UNDP-GEF performance rating scales: HS= Highly Satisfactory; S=Satisfactory; MS=Moderately Satisfactory; MU=Moderately Unsatisfactory; U=Unsatisfactory; HU=Highly Unsatisfactory.

For sustainability: L=Likely; ML=Moderately Likely; MU=Moderately Unlikely; U=Unlikely.

**1.5. Summary of Conclusions**

The Project addresses essential national and local needs and has a high potential to achieve the objectives of improved management effectiveness, with local engagement, of the two target ecosystems, as well as to create sustainability of its results. Partnerships with key actors promote achieving the joint goals and objectives.

Nevertheless, in order to achieve the Project objectives and sustainability of its results, the Project should be extended, and its implementation must be significantly accelerated, through urgent mitigation of the identified management bottlenecks.

The Project design did not take into account significant institutional risks that emerged during the initiation of its implementation. Risks mitigation must be strengthened through further flexibility and innovative adaptive management changes, by Project team and partners.

Government attention and efforts to mitigation of existing environmental, institutional and financial risks to sustainability, must be strengthened, through reviewing policies and through a multi-sectorial approach.

Focus must be given to sustainability-enhancing activities, including – seeking innovative solutions to establishing financial and socio-economic sustainability; promoting multi-sectorial approach and close cooperation at all levels; and supporting the Government in reviewing policies, legislation and strategies, for enhancing environmental, institutional and financial sustainability.

A wider perspective, beyond the Project area, is required, including the identification and strategic addressing of demand drivers, for generating significant impact on reducing threats in the Project area.

Moreover, a communication, awareness, and visibility strategy should be developed and implemented, in close coordination with the EAs, as an important instrument to strengthen achieving the project objectives and for enhancing sustainability of the results.

**1.6. Recommendations Summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Recommendation** | **Implementer** | **Suggested timeframe** |
| ***Recommendations for the Project implementation*** |
| **1** | Urgent acceleration of implementation | Project team; UNDP; EAs; Project partners and key stakeholders | immediate and on-going |
| **2** | No-cost extension of the Project by at least 12 months (preferably 18) | UNDP CO preparation of proposal for approval by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator | According to UNDP rules and procedures |
| **3** | Revision of the Project organization structure | UNDP; Forest Department and DNPW | Immediate |
| **4** | Revision of the Project financial management system and devolution of fiduciary responsibilities to the Project organization arrangements | UNDP ; Forest Department and DNPW; Project Team | Immediate |
| **5** | Include essential upstream of strategic activities to support the EAs in reducing threats, in particular crime-related, through an integrated multi-sectorial approach | NDPW and Forest Department, UNDP, the Project Team, Sub-contracted expert/consultant | include in 2017 or 2018 AWB |
| **6** | Prioritize implementation of impact-generating/trust-building pilots with communities and extend exposure of CRBs and VAGs to a wide variety of income-generation options | Project Team; CRBs and VAGs; DNPW and Forest Department; UNDP, Sub-contracted expert/consultant | immediate and on-going |
| **7** | Elaborate and implement a communication and visibility strategy | Project Team; DNPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Sub-contracted expert/consultant | include in 2017 AWB |
| **8** | Enhance cooperation between the two EAs and with other relevant stakeholders and sectors at all levels | Project Team; NDPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Project partners and key stakeholders | immediate and on-going |
| **9** | Provide training to key stakeholders on participatory approach and conflict resolution | Project Team; NDPW and Forest Department;UNDP; Project partners and key stakeholders; Sub-contracted expert/consultant | include in 2017 or 2018 AWB |
| **10** | Revision of the indicators | Project Manager, in consultation with Project Team; UNDP; DNPW and Forest Department | before the next PIR |
| **11** | Implementation of Project activities for establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing | Project Team; DNPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Sub-contracted expert/consultant | include in 2017 AWB |
| ***Recommendations/lessons learned for national strengthening of the project*** ***results and Sustainability (recommendations for the EAs)*** |
| **12** | Strengthen significantly cooperation between the wildlife and forest sectors and coordination of both sectors with further relevant sectors, and with local stakeholders | DNPW and Forest Department; other relevant sectors; CRBs and VAGs; Project Team's support | immediate and on-going |
| **13** | Strengthen significantly the forest sector and its management and enforcement capacity | Forest Department with UNDP support and further partners | on-going |
| **14** | Develop and implement a National strategy for a holistic wildlife crime action, based on a multi-sectorial multi-agency approach | DNPW and Forest Department, UNDP, the Project Team, Sub-contracted expert/consultant | initiate driving the process during this year |
| **15** | Give Protected Areas, wetlands, forest, and wildlife appropriate status of “economic asset to the country” | GRZ and Parliament, with process driven by DNPW and Forest Department, and catalyzed by the Project and UNDP | immediate start of the process |
| **16** | Review revenue sharing policies from PAs with the Wildlife and Forest sectors and with communities | GRZ and Parliament, with process driven by DNPW, Forest Department, and Finance. | start of process during 2017 |
| **17** | Establish a graded career path with promotion horizon and training milestones for Wildlife and Forest staff (including Village Scouts) | DNPW and Forest Department; in consultation with local communities | start of process during 2017 or 2018 |
| **18** | Mainstream education for biodiversity conservation and natural resources sustainable management into the national and local formal and informal education and communication systems | DNPW and Forest Department with the Ministry of Education | start of process during 2017 or 2018 |
|  ***Recommendations for local strengthening of the project results and*** ***Sustainability (recommendations for*** ***local stakeholders’ leadership)*** |
| **19** | Promote biodiversity conservation and natural assets protection for enabling local sustainable development, trough raising awareness, education and capacity building | CRBs and VAGs | on-going |
| **20** | Actively seek sustainable and innovative livelihoods and revenue generating activities, and ways to spread them to household level throughout the area | CRBs and VAGs | on-going |
| **21** | Actively seek actively sustainable revenue generating activities and innovative solutions to enable funding of VAGs and CRBs | CRBs and VAGs | on-going |
| **22** | Lobby for strengthened mandate, authority, capacity and benefit sharing for community members’ engagement in protection and sustainable management of natural assets | CRBs and VAGs | on-going |
| **23** | Improve gender balance of leading structures | CRBs and VAGs | on-going |
| ***Systemic recommendations (Recommendations/lessons learned for UNDP*** ***CO and UNDP/GEF HQ)*** |
| **24** | Revisit the rules of GEF Projects implementation aiming to enable much more flexibility to the Project team in leading the day-to-day Project management and funding processes | UNDP HQ | to be considered by UNDP HQ |
| **25** | Define a Project's preparation phase, before initiating implementation | UNDP HQ | to be considered by UNDP HQ |

1. **Introduction**

This chapter presents the MTR objectives, scope and detailed methodology, as was designed in the MTR Inception Report, and based on the MTR assignment ToRs and on the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects.

* 1. **Objectives of the MTR**
* Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes, as specified in the Project Document.
* Assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.
* Review the project’s strategy, and its risks to sustainability.
	1. **Scope & Methodology**
		1. ***MTR overall approach and methodology principles***

The implementation of the Midterm Review was based on the detailed ToRs of the assignment and on the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects.*

The MTR aims to assess progress made toward the achievement of the objective and outcomes, identify challenges and bottlenecks and propose measures for mitigation of challenges and for improved implementation, in order to ensure that the project is on track to maximizing results for achieving the project objectives and outcomes by its completion.

The MTR further aims to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The main focus of the MTR is to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of the project implementation, highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

Project progress is assessed following the four categories detailed in the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects* with the evaluative questions, indicators, sources and methodology, as detailed in the Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template (Annex II), including Project strategy, Progress towards results, Project implementation and adaptive management, and sustainability. The MTR Report includes evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings, and recommendations for critical interventions that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. The MTR Report also includes MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table of the Project's results with brief descriptions of the associated achievements. For detailed evaluative questions, indicators, information sources, and methodology, see Annex I. UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix.

* + 1. ***Detailed Data collection methodology***

The MTR was implemented through a collaborative and participatory approach, ensuring close engagement with UNDP CO (and consultation with the RTA), the Project Team, and the Government counterparts, and through consultations with all key stakeholders, at both the national and local levels.

The following activities form part of the MTR process:

1. Review of all Project documentation, provided by UNDP-Zambia and the Project team, and further documents and sources of information that were provided by UNDP, the Project team, partners and stakeholders, including review of the Tracking Tools that were provided by the Project (Mid-Term TT).
2. Realization of the MTR mission, including consultation meetings with project team, partners and stakeholders at the national, district and local levels and field visits to the Project sites. The reconnaissance field visits aimed to assess on-site progress of implementation and impact, through first hand reconnaissance and through detailed consultations with stakeholders at the local level. The full MTR mission programme is provided in Annex II and the full list and affiliation of stakeholders consulted is provided in Annex III.
3. Two mini-workshop: for adoption of the Inception Report and for de-briefing/wrap-up of mission, presentation of initial findings to UNDP-Zambia, Project team and partners, and integration of workshop inputs.
4. Theory of Change (ToC) exercise that was held in a half day workshop with key stakeholder.
5. Following the submission of the MTR draft report, a concluding Stakeholder Workshop was held on 28th June 2017. This final MTR Report submitted for adoption, incorporates feedback and integrates inputs received in writing and during the workshop. It is submitted with the Audit Trail from feedback on the draft report.

In order to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed, feedback and input of stakeholders interviewed remains confidential, and the MTR report does not indicate the specific source of quotations or information, in order to uphold this confidentiality. Consultations included both interviews with individual stakeholders and group meetings/mini-workshops. The consultations with stakeholders were aiming to collect information on the evaluative questions detailed in the MTR Evaluation Matrix (Annex I).

The MTR evaluation methodology included realizing a Theory of Change exercise with key stakeholders. Applying the ToC at this stage of mid-term review of the project is useful for strengthening the project's evaluation through a participatory approach, and for collectively guiding its future directions, with the aim of best achieving its pre-defined desired outcomes, by the project end. The full report of the ToC Workshop is provided in Annex V.

**Distinct Task Division:** The MTR analysis and elaboration of this report, was done through distinct task division between the two MTR consultants, in accordance with their respective specific qualifications. Management arrangements, corporate governance and financial management aspects were undertaken by the National consultant (CN), an economist. Technical and other aspects were undertaken by the International consultant (TR), an ecologist, who also acted as the MTR team leader.

**2.2.3. *Limitations of the MTR methodology***

The methodology selected is mostly qualitative and based on documentations review and on consultation with stakeholders, as well as on a ToC exercise, and two mini-workshops. The methodology selected is adapted to the limited MTR evaluation timeframe and the distance from Lusaka to the Project area, which resulted in the field visits being conducted through a selective approach. Flexibility was kept and changes were made to the MTR field mission programme in accordance with changes in on-ground circumstances, including stakeholders' availability, weather-induced limited road access to field sites, etc. While the ToC exercise was very useful in supporting the MTR process, it would have been a more useful and applicable evaluation tool if the ToC would have been applied at the project design phase first. The project's defined indicators for assessing progress in achieving its objective and outcomes, were reviewed through the ToC exercise, their limits were pinpointed, and further indicators were proposed. (See Annex V)

1. **Project Description and Context**

This chapter presents the key elements of the project and is based mostly on the Project Document and on additional project documentation (for the list of documents reviewed, see Annex IV).

**3.1. Project Description and Strategy**

The Kafue National Park (KNP, 22,480 Km2), West Lunga National Park (WLNP, 1,684 Km2), and 13 Game Management Areas (GMAs, covering together 54,021 Km2) and their natural resources (water, forest, biodiversity) are threatened by wildlife poaching, deforestation and forest degradation, unsustainable land uses, extensive fires, and loss of a large intact ecosystem and its related ecosystem services. The underlying of these threats in the GMAs is open access exploitation of land and resources, exacerbated by centralized and uncoordinated resource management policies, poverty, land degradation and climate change. Kafue NP was ineffectively managed whilst West Lunga NP was neglected for many years. However, both National Parks are in the process of being re-capitalized with new models of Protected Area (PA) management, i.e., decentralized business centers and Private Public Partnerships (PPPs), respectively. The Project seeks to address these problems by supporting Zambia's policies of decentralized management of both PAs and GMAs. In the National Parks the Project is aimed at PA strengthening, and in the GMAs the Project takes a Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) approach.

The Project supports and strengthens devolved models for effective governance, management and financing of PAs, and community forest and wildlife management. The Project addresses de-facto open access resource management in GMAs by strengthening village institutions legally and with capacity for planning, protection, monitoring, and benefit generation and sharing. The Project addresses unsustainable forest use through CBNRM and Sustainable Forest Management/Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (SFM/REDD+) pilots. The Project addresses weakness in system capacity by strengthening systems and training participants in skills that include sustainable natural resource economic and institutional management, PPPs and PES for sustainable pro-poor growth, decentralized governance and management, and adaptive management through evidence-based stakeholder processes.

The objective of the project is: Biodiversity and carbon sinks of Kafue/West Lunga PA systems in Zambia are better protected from threats and effectively managed by national and local institutions, communities and economic actors, using sustainable forestry and land management practices.

The project expected outcomes are:

Component 1: Increased management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Kafue and West Lunga PA system.

Outcome 1.1.: Management effectiveness increased in Kafue NP and west Lunga NP

Outcome 1.2.: Expansion of core PAs

Component 2: Sustainable land and forest management by local institutions in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices.

Outcome 2.1.: Improved land use planning, planning and diversification of income streams over al target GMA buffer area.

Outcome 2.2.: Village Action Groups (VAGs) in target areas formally recognized and constituted.

Outcome 2.3.: SFM practices established in at least 25 VAGs as REDD+ pilots.

Outcome 2.4.: Conservation farming introduced to at least 1,600 households in 40 VAGs.

Outcome 2.5.: Fire losses reduced by at least 30% in GMAs annually.

Outcome 2.6.: Reduction of forest degradation in target GMAs from unsustainable fuel wood collection practices.

* 1. **Development Context**

Zambia is a repository of globally significant biodiversity and has very large tracts of wild areas with low human population densities. With sound management, these could be important areas for the conservation of flora and fauna that are rapidly being extirpated elsewhere in the region. As specified in the PRODOC, it is highly likely that if the economic potential of the project area is unlocked through policy and institutional reform, the combination of wild resources (i.e. wildlife and forests) and ecosystem services (e.g. carbon payments and water PES schemes) will provide a pioneering example of an integrated bio-experience (“green” economy) that exceeds the value of subsistence agriculture. National Parks, Forest Reserves and Game Management Areas cover an exceptionally large area (+40%) of the country. Zambia has approximately 50 million hectares of forest remaining, covering 66% of the proportion of total land area. However, open-access policy regimes are leading to unsustainable land use.

The greater GKNP ecosystem comprises Kafue National Park (KNP) and West Lunga National Park (WLNP) (24,164 km2) and thirteen Game Management Areas (GMAs) (54,012 km2) supporting approximately 225,394 people. The Project works directly in both NPs, in three GMAs around WLNP and in five GMAs around northern KNP (41,297km2, 160,772 people). The GKNP protected area contains some 11 main vegetation types, namely extensive floodplain and dambo grassland, thicket, extensive Miombo woodlands, mopane woodland, Kalahari woodland, deciduous Teak forest and riparian thicket/woodland. It contains examples of 16 of the country’s 24 natural habitats. It provides sanctuary for some 155 species of mammals; some 510 species of birds; some 70 species of reptiles; some 35 species of amphibians and about 60 species of fish. It is noted for having one of highest diversities of antelope species than any other protected area in Africa and it is also rated as one of Zambia’s “Important Bird Areas”. At the Project's baseline, GKNP generated an estimated $600,000 in park fees, $6.8 million in direct tourism revenues and $2.4 million in hunting revenues per year, for an economic turnover yield of approximately $9.2 million, or $1.35/hectare. It was noted that the potential for the greater park area to contribute to and grow the Zambian economy through ecotourism is largely untapped, and revenues could be increased rapidly by a factor of 5-10.

The Project is in line with the National policy frameworks, most notably the revised Zambia Wildlife Policy and the National Forestry Policy; the revised Forest Act and Wildlife Act; the Seventh National Development Plan (as well as the Sixth National Development Plan); the National Policy on the Environment - NPE (2005); the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP); the National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS); the National Adaptation Programme of Action Against Climate Change (NAPA); and the National Decentralisation Policy (NDP, 2010); the National Climate Change policy and REDD strategy. It also conforms with Zambia's commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol (KP).

**3.3 Problems that the Project Sought to Address**

Zambia records one of the highest annual rates of deforestation globally at 250,000 to 300,000 ha of the country’s forest area. In 2016 it was 270,000 ha. (Integrated Land Use Assessment Report ILUA 2005-2008). Commercial activities responsible for land degradation are mining in the Copperbelt and North Western Provinces, charcoal burning due to limited domestic energy alternatives, land clearance for agriculture, illegal logging, and unsustainable land management practices in the production of cash crops such as tobacco and maize. This project directly addresses national priorities as regards to natural resources (wildlife and forestry).

This project is directly responsive to the main threats to deforestation and forest degradation in Zambia, as identified in the Second National Communication on Climate Change to UNFCCC and the national determined contributions, namely shifting agriculture (53.6%), semi-permanent agriculture (23.7%), timber (16.8%), charcoal (4.5%) and firewood (1.4%), and further concerns about loss of wildlife and impacts on the tourism sector.

Open-access policy regimes are leading to unsustainable land use in many ‘pristine’ lands (including formal protected areas like GMAs and Forest Reserves). Consequently, these areas are being rapidly degraded as slash-and-burn agricultural practices spread into new areas, while resources are over-utilized ecologically and under-sold economically in a tragedy of the commons economy. Rural households in Zambia – including those in GMAs – are overwhelmingly reliant on biomass, primarily firewood, as a domestic cooking fuel.

The primary threats to the ecosystem integrity of Zambia’s GMAs (not just around GKNP but nation-wide) are specified in the PRODOC as follows: 1) Poaching; 2) Human encroachment; 3) Fire; 4) Agriculture – subsistence; 5) Illegal fishing; 6) Agriculture – commercial; 7) Charcoal burning; 8) Mining; 9) Water pollution; 10) Invasive species; and 11) Wildlife diseases.

The project aims to address these threats, directly and indirectly. It further aims to improve the livelihoods of rural people through sustainable environmental management and institutional empowerment, and strengthened capacity and institutions for controlling access to their resources. It is designed to entrust and empower field officers in government agencies and communities to develop concrete progress in VAGs and PAs within a set of mutually agreed performance management criteria.

**3.4. Project Planned Implementation Arrangements**

The project implementation structure, as indicated in the PRODOC, includes a Committee of the Permanent Secretaries (Inter-Ministerial Committee) at the Central level, with the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection (DNREP) acting as its Secretariat. This National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU) has the task of coordinating policy issues, calling for oversight meetings, and protecting and enhancing the devolved structure of the project. The Inter-Ministerial Committee is like a Project Board responsible for making strategic decisions and providing guidance and oversight to the Project Manager, but also in bringing Project achievements and requirements (e.g. barrier removal) to central attention. The Project Board plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality-assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning.

Later changes of the Government resulted in two EAs from two different Ministries, namely, the Department of National Parks and Wildlife at the Ministry of Tourism and Arts, and the Forestry Department is now at the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources.

The Project Manager was planned to be supported by a dedicated Project Financial Manager. The PRODOC provided as well for the recruitment of a CBNRM Manager and a small CBNRM team. The CBNRM Manager has the authority and responsibility specifically for the CBNRM-related part of the project. The Project implementation group consists of all decentralized collaborating partners, who are critical to project implementation. These are: CRBs and VAGs, District Forest Officers, Conservation Farming Unit, contracted NGOs and CBNRM associations, Copperbelt University, private sector association representatives, and TA consultants.

Work and financial disbursements are guided by the Annual Work Plan, developed through a process of performance review and work planning, and approved by the Project Board and UNDP.

**3.5. Key Project Milestones**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Start Date (actual) | 16th May 2014 |
| Project Start Date (planned) | May 2013 |
| PAC Meeting Date | 25th February 2014 |
| Inception Workshop | 28th July 2014 |
| Project Steering Committee/Board meetings  | 20th February 2014, 24th November 2015, 15th March 2016  |
| Mid-Term Review Workshop | 27th May 2017 |
| Planned Project Closing Date | October 2018 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | 15th April 2019 (reflecting only the delayed Start Date, but with no extension of the Project's duration) |

**3.6. Main Stakeholders**

| **Key Stakeholder** | **Role** |
| --- | --- |
| Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources  | Key Oversight partner and National Coordinating Agency |
| Ministry of Tourism and Arts | Key Oversight partner and National Coordinating Agency |
| Department of National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW, replaced ZAWA) | Key Implementing Partner |
| Forest Department  | Key Implementing Partner |
| Village Action Groups | Key units of benefits, action and accountability |
| Community Resources Boards | Key beneficiaries and action institutional structure |
| Chiefs / traditional authorities / Patronsin “Project” GMAs | Key collaborating and supportive partners on implementation |
| Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environment Protection;Ministry of Fisheries;Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock  | National implementing/cooperating partners  |
| District Councils in relevant districts | Cooperation on implementation |
| Zambia UN-REDD Programme | Key collaborating partner on implementation of REDD pilots |
| Copperbelt University/Zambia Forestry College | Key monitoring and capacity building partner |
| Zambia Environmental Management Agency | Sharing information |
| Embassy of Finland | Sharing information |
| Embassy of Norway | Sharing information, co-funding |
| NGOs (CFU, TNC, GRI, WWF, Zambia National CBNRM Forum) | Collaborating partners on implementation and capacity building |
| The GEF Operational Focal Point of Zambia | Policy guidance |
| Representatives of the private sector | Cooperation on implementation |
| UNDP CO; UNDP RTA | Executing Agency; Technical Assistance |
| The Project Team | Implementation |
| The Project Board/Steering Committee/Inter-Ministerial Committee members | Policy forming and guidance of implementation |

1. **Findings**

This chapter presents the findings of this mid-term review, as based on the MTR assignment ToRs and on the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects. The detailed evaluation follows the Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix (Annex II).

Rating is provided by the MTR team in accordance with the UNDP-GEF performance rating scales: HS= Highly Satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; Moderately Satisfactory (MS); MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory; U = Unsatisfactory; HU = Highly Unsatisfactory. For sustainability, the GEF scale is: L= Likely; ML= Moderately Likely: MU= Moderately Unlikely; U=Unlikely.

Rating is based on analysis of findings from Project documentation, stakeholders' interviews, and the ToC workshop results. Rating is provided to each aspect separately with detailed justification, and the overall rating of the Project performance is thus derived from the individual aspects' ratings. Specifically, the rating of progress towards results is based mostly on the Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of outcomes against end-of-Project targets), that is based on the Project documentation. The MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table is provided in section 1.2.

* 1. **Project Strategy**

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

* + 1. ***Project Design*** *(relevance; national priorities; national ownership)*

*Does the project strategy support achieving national needs and priorities?*

All of the stakeholders interviewed have stressed the importance of the Project to Zambia. The Project is designed to support the GRZ's objectives for biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation, and halting land degradation, by addressing the major threats, through promoting decentralization. The PRODOC details the conformity of the Project design with the national policy framework. As detailed in Section 3.3. of this report, the Project design was based on a lengthy consultative process and it is aligned with the Sixth National Development Plans (SNDP, 2011-2015), the National Policy on the Environment (NPE, 2005), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 1999), the National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS), the National Adaptation Programme of Action Against Climate Change (NAPA), the National Decentralisation Policy (NDP, 2010), the Zambia Wildlife Policy and the National Forestry Policy. At the time of the Project elaboration the Zambia Wildlife Policy and the National Forestry Policy were undergoing review and the updated Zambia Wildlife Act and Forest Act were issued in 2015. Nevertheless, the Project design is well in line with both the updated Wildlife and Forest Acts and supports their implementation. It is also in line with the Climate Change policy and with the recent Paris Agreement's national determined contributions.

*Does the project strategy support achieving needs and priorities of local stakeholders?*

All of the stakeholders interviewed were of the opinion that the Project is well designed to support local needs and priorities, as an integral and key component of its strategy. Specifically, the Project supports the establishing and strengthening of local level governance structures, facilitating liaison of local stakeholders with the authorities, enabling the implementation of national and local policies at the local level, and building capacities of local stakeholders to take a lead on natural resources sustainable management. Local stakeholders interviewed have stressed the importance of the project and of its accelerated implementation, to addressing essential local priorities.

*To what extent is the project complementary to government's and partners' initiatives (regional, national and local projects and programmes), addressing the same priorities?*

The Project is well coordinated with, and complementary to, existing initiatives and actors. Cooperation established with selected partners supports achieving the Project’s objectives. The Project's design supports the implementation of the Government's wildlife, forestry and decentralization policies, and the Project's implementation is coordinated with the relevant national and district authorities. Moreover, it is complementary and coordinated with other partners' relevant initiatives. The Project design was in line with the Six National Development Plan (SNDP). It now fits in well with the new 7th National Development Plan (7NDP). This Project was originally designed as one of the initiatives of the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ) II (2011- 2015). In this context, the Project was specifically designed as complementary with several initiatives funded by Finland, and mainly the Decentralised Forest and other Natural Resources Management Programme, in strengthening local institutional structures, especially in the West Lunga component. It now also fits well with the new Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (SDPF, 2016-2021). The project was further designed to fit also into the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2011-2015, and specifically with its Outcome 4 - Climate Change, Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction and Response, as well as to Outcome 2 – achieving more sustained levels of development, employment and food security. It thus contributes towards Zambia’s goals of reducing poverty, eradicating hunger, becoming a middle-income country by 2030, and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Project directly supports Conservation Farming Unit (CFU), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and their specific activities are successfully integrated as an integral part of its implementation, generating essential impact at the local level. It further supports complementary activities of the Game Rangers International (GRI) in KNP, and similar cooperation with the Trident Foundation in WLNP is being considered. It is also complementary to the CBNRM Forum initiatives, though further coordination is required. Capacity building of, and cooperation with, the Copperbelt University is built into the Project's design and implementation. The Project design also provides for initial pilot REDD+ grants. To some extent, the Project serves partly as a follow up on a previous UNDP-supported Reclassification and Effective Management of the National Protected Areas System Project. At its KNP component, it is also complementary with the World Bank's Support for Economic Expansion and Diversification (SEED) Project.

*Do the Project's outputs and management arrangements promote national ownership?*

The Project is well designed to promote national and local ownership as a key aspect of its design and implementation. The Project design supports national ownership, through capacity support to the two key IP sectors (wildlife and forestry), and local ownership, through support to the establishment and strengthening of local governance structures (CRBs and VAGs). It is based on National Implementation Modality (NIM), under the leadership of DNPW and the Forest Department. The project's outputs and activities strengthen national and local capacities and especially the establishment and empowering of local institutional structures, for enabling local ownership and sustainability. The Project development involved participation of key stakeholders, both at the national and local levels, as reflected in its design and in stakeholders' feedback at all levels during the MTR. Most of the officials interviewed at the National, District and local levels, as well as most traditional Chiefs and community leaders interviewed, have expressed great interest in the Project, in-depth acquaintance with its details, and ownership of its expected results and their sustainable continuation beyond the Project specific context and duration.

***Rating for Project strategy – Project design*** ***(Relevance; National priorities; National ownership): Highly Satisfactory (HS)***

* + 1. ***Results Framework/Logframe*** *(route towards expected results)*

*Are the Project outputs and activities relevant and feasible for achieving the Project objective and outcomes?*

In general, the Project was well designed and the Outputs and Activities were logically selected to enhance achieving the Project Objective and Outcomes and to establish their sustainability. However, the Project is very ambitious and complex, thereby not all of its components prove to be feasible within the given framework and timeframe. For example, the REDD+ pilots activity was not initiated, yet, while most activities that have initiated, are still at a rather initial phase. Most of the implementation so far was focused on creating the enabling conditions and initial phase of the Project's activities. Several key risks were pointed out by stakeholders. At the local level, most notably, stakeholders have commented that while the Project's focal structures at the local level are the CRB and the VAG, the Project would need better safeguards to assure its impact and buy-in at the household level. On the other hand, while the Project outputs and activities are very locally focused, on driving change at the actual Project sites as pilot models, it should be noted that achieving the defined objective and outcomes, would require a wider approach with more upstream interventions. E.g., while local level interventions are indeed essential components in combatting wildlife crime and in mitigating essential local-level threats, in order to achieve these objectives, a wider national integrated approach is required, focused both at the upstream and downstream levels, in a coordinated way. Similarly, other activities aimed at reducing threats and improving sustainable management practice, should be better portrayed within an overall national strategic approach. The strategic partnerships established by the Project with other implementing agencies of synergetic initiatives (e.g., CFU, TNC), have particularly proved to be strategic in improving the Project's implementation capacity and sustainability.

*Were risks well identified and mitigation measures well designed to adequately address the risks?*

**Identified risk 1:** This is a multi-faceted and complex project. Leadership from ZAWA (now DNPW) and Forestry Department is uncertain in a climate of Ministerial reorganization and turnover.

This risk proved to be much wider and more prominent than originally realized, with major political changes impact, and major institutional changes of the key EAs, resulting in significant delays in the initiation of the Project implementation, and forming a major obstacle to the Project's timely and smooth implementation. The mitigation measures suggested were insufficient to mitigate this risk and its impact, as they concentrated mostly on the decentralized approach, while neglecting the upstreaming aspects.

**Identified risk 2:** Failure to maximize value of wildlife, and to return benefit to the producer land unit (i.e. PAs, or CBNRM community) because of weak concessioning, hunting bans, absence of fiscal devolution, etc.

This risk is indeed among the major problems that the Project aims to address, and its mitigation measures are well embedded into the Project's design. While the impact generated so far is not sufficiently significant, mitigation of this risk is expected to be among the Project's main end results.

**Identified risk 3:** Landscape planning and subsequent implementation of plan will be affected by institutional inflexibility, reducing collaborative efforts between PAs, Villages.

This did not prove to be a prominent risk, as the relevant national and district authorities are most supportive of the landscape planning and promote collaborative efforts between the PAs, District Councils and VAGs. The indicated mitigation measures were embedded in the Project design.

**Identified risk 4:** Climate change could lead to changed distributions of BD components, and changes in community and private sector demands on wildlife and forest resources.

The Project's lifetime, and especially its implementation period so far, is too short to estimate the impacts of climate change. The indicated mitigation measures are embedded into the Project's design, to reduce this risk and its impacts in the long term.

**Identified risk 5:** Significant increases in externally driven pressures on forest and protected area resources e.g. logging pressures, mining, poaching.

This risk too is among the major problems that the Project aims to address, and its mitigation measures are embedded into the Project's design. Mitigation of this risk is expected to be among the Project's main end results. However, while mitigation measures proposed provide a potentially good response at the local level, addressing the upstream political level of threats is insufficient. Due to the very different nature of the specified threats, they should not be grouped but rather a breakdown to the different nature and level would enable a better mitigation strategy, addressing adequately each threat at the right level.

**Identified risk 6:**  Mining expansion and road construction pose a serious threat to the achievement of project outcomes. Licenses for mineral exploration have been granted for areas near West Lunga.

This high level threat is indeed prominent, while this Project does not provide an adequate mitigation strategy to address it. Mitigation of this threat would require upstream oriented activities, as specified in detailed in the recommendations below (e.g., recommendations 5,14, 16, 18), while this Project's activities are mostly focused at the local level. The mitigation measures proposed for this threat are based on complementary Projects. Nevertheless, this threat is quite significant currently while current mitigation is insufficient.

**Identified risk 7:** Another project risk is the possible collapse of the carbon markets or a drop in the carbon prices. This will reduce the benefits accrued to the communities but will not affect the GEBs to be accrued from the project.

This threat has not manifested so far, since this component of the Project was not yet implemented. The mitigation measures proposed seem adequate. This threat is not expected to become a major obstacle to the Project implementation, since the related component is only part of a large package of complementary different activities.

**Unidentified risks:** the two main bottlenecks that resulted in significant delay in initiating the Project implementation were (a) political changes in the country that obviously could not be mitigated at this Project's level; (b) Project corporate governance difficulties, such the centralized and prolonged finance disbursement system, and with a prolonged teething period (e.g., very long recruitment processes of key staff members, that was not yet completed by the MTR mission). These obstacles and the resulting long delays in implementation, have caused a secondary negative impact of increasing frustration, perception of failure, and loss of trust and mutual blaming between the main actors, namely, Project staff, UNDP, Executing Agencies (the implementing partners) and key stakeholders. These major threats were not indicated in the PRODOC, and therefore no remedy was designed as part of the initial Project strategy. At this stage, to avoid further secondary negative impacts and to enable the Project to reach its objectives by the Project end, urgent mitigation measures are required, as detailed in the recommendations below, including the formalization of the delay of the actual start and extension of the Project duration.

***Rating for Project strategy – Results Framework/Logframe*** ***(route towards expected results): Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)***

* 1. **Progress Towards Results**
		1. ***Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)***

*To what extent have the expected objective and outcomes of the project been achieved thus far?*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator (based on Project Results Framework)** | **Baseline Level****(based on the PRODOC)** | **Level in 2nd PIR (as self- reported on June 2016), and with updates provided by the Project Manager at the MTR and through the ToC Workshop** | **End-of-project Target (Based on the PRODOC)** | **Midterm Level & Assessment** | **Achievement Rating** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:** Biodiversity and carbon sinks of Kafue/West Lunga PA systems in Zambia are better protected from threats and effectively managed by national and local institutions, communities and economic actors, using sustainable forestry and land management practices |  |  | Efforts to put in place an effective system to remove threats continued through law enforcement, fire management, research to manage the carnivores, infrastructure development to support law enforcement, tourism and monitoring. This has contributed to the stability and increase in animal populations, particularly the elephant in KNP (National Elephant Aerial Survey Report 2015 ). In WLNP , a similar situation has occurred where more elephant, Sable and buffalo sighting have been reported (WLNP patrol and Ecological Monitoring Reports, 2016). The Project's contribution to this result has been through enhanced law enforcement effectiveness, community awareness raising activities on the need to conserve the natural resources and remove the threats to biodiversity. 5 Game Management Areas over total area of 28,910 square km of 41,297 square km have been brought under improved management, through strengthening the CBNRM, through the village scouts and promoting sustainable livelihoods (fish farming, beekeeping, conservation farming and agro forestry). The contribution of the project was through strengthening CBNRM. |  | The Project implementation has initiated with significant delay but with good notable progress since start. Progress in achieving the Project's objective is so far rather limited, but notable impact can be expected by Project end (with extension to compensate for the delayed actual start). Rapid reconnaissance evaluation during the MTR, have revealed imminent threats in both NPs. E.g., long flight distance of wildlife, indicating that poaching still prevails; evidence of heavy logging in specific areas and abundant charcoal trade. Interviews and field visits in the GMAs however on both sites have demonstrated a trend of behavioural change towards more sustainable natural resources management, as direct result of this project and of complementary projects and initiatives. On target to be achieved | **S** | Impact on achieving the Project's objective through this Project's outputs and activities, is not yet notable. That is, progress made so far in implementation is not yet translated into actual impact on biodiversity and carbon sinks in the Project sites. However, activities under implementation and in planning are expected to result with notable impact by the Project end (especially if the Project would be extended to compensate for the time lost until its effective start). The rating Satisfactory (S) is based on impact previsioned, based on current implementation. Evident behavioural change, embedded in institutional structures throughout the Project area, and in particular in selected GMAs, gives good reason to expect significant and sustainable impact. |
| **Component 1:** Increased management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Kafue and West Lunga PA system. | **Indicator 1:** Increase in Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). | 57% KNP (METTPAZ 2010) 39% KNP GMAs (2010) 28% WLNP (2010) 20% WLNP GMAs (2010) | Score of Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METTPAZ) of 59 and 30 (Zambia Wildlife Report, 2014). The project contribution has been mainly through community awareness raising activities on the need to conserve the natural resources and remove the threats to biodiversity. METTPAZ Consultancy were provided.Consultancy on Strategy for Kafue National Parks and Five GMAs focusing on improving management effectiveness initiated.Consultancy on review of Law enforcement is currently on- going. A plan to roll out Law enforcement has been prepared. 3 Law enforcement units were established by the Project with DNPW and the Forest Dept, and equipped with vehicles and computers in Mumbwa, Kasempa and Mufumbwe. Further support has initiated for providing personal equipment kits, logistical support, and food rations for patrol teamsCooperation was established with GRI and Panthera for KNP management.A consultant was contracted to develop a database and Geographic Information System and to train relevant staff. | 65% KNP 45% KNP GMAs 40% WLNP 30% WLNP GMAs | Mid Term Management Effectiveness TT(METTPAZ) score at MTR: KNP – 51% (decrease from baseline, indicating park management issues that are not related necessarily specifically to this project, e.g., increased poaching that was noted throughout the region).KNP GMAs – 53%, 53%,, 51% (significant increase from baseline, close to target).WLNP – 39% (same as baseline).WLNP GMAs – 51%, 53%, 48%, 49%, 49%. (significant increase from baseline, well above target).Notable progress in the GMAs, but no progress in the 2 NPs. However, enabling activities implemented are expected to yield impact.Additional activities for improving management effectiveness of the GKNP and WLNP ecosystem areas, has initiated as detailed here.On target to be achieved | **MS** | No significant progress in achieving the outcome of component 1, and no notable impact that can be specifically attributed to this Project's contribution, thus far. Nevertheless, enabling activities have initiated and it is expected that this Project, in synergy with other initiatives, can lead to significant and sustainable impact in improving this outcome, and that can be reflected by the selected indicators, by Project end.No progress in METTPAZ for KNP and WLNP, but some progress for KNP GMAs, and WLNP GMAs, though it cannot be attributed specifically to this Project. Enabling conditions for achieving targets were established. |
| **Indicator 2:** **2a.** Wildlife stocking rates.**2b**. Reduced area burned annually.**2c.** Reduced GHG emissions from fire | KNP=8.6% of carrying capacity (as per aerial survey 2008) KNP=56% (1,252 mill ha) KNP=1,650,000 CO2 annually from late fires | Increase in animal population, particularly elephants and buffalos, in KNP and WLNP (National Elephant Aerial Survey Report 2015 – 55% increase from from 3715 in 2011 to 6688 in 2015; Park Reports), though not specifically attributed to this Project. The project contribution to this result has been through enhancement of law enforcement and community awareness.Carrying capacity estimates have not been done. However, the MOU established with TNC will facilitate development and implementation of the Fire Management Strategy; Steps to facilitate development of the strategy were mapped out, and Situation analysis completed. | 12% of carrying capacity in both KNP and productive GMAs KNP=reduced by 50% (625,800 ha) KNP=825,000t CO2 reduced emissions annually | Increase in wildlife have been reported in the two NPs, though not specifically attributed to this Project. Nevertheless, initial Project activities contribute to this result. Activities aimed at reducing area burned and GHG emissions from fire have not initiated, however, enabling activities realized, and in particular the MoU with TNC, to facilitate development and implementation of the Fire Management Strategy, are expected to result with considerable and sustainable impact, possibly before the Project end. On target to be achieved | **MS** | No notable progress in achieving this indicator, and that can be attributed specifically to this Project, but enabling conditions established through this Project, to facilitate achieving the target. |
| **Indicator 3:** Reduction in funding gap of the targeted National Parks moving up one category (based on REMNPAS financial viability assessment) with at least one new PPP formed (WLNP). | 0 PPP in Greater KNP and WLNP revenues: approx $600,000 in KNP | Increase in KNP revenue from 600,000 US$ at baseline to 1,061,413US$ in 2016. However, this is below optimum operating budget of USD$ 3 million annually. The increase in revenue was attributed to the improvement in park infrastructure (roads, air strips and lodges) in the national park and surrounding GMAs, to the increased in animal population (elephant, lion, cheetah and buffalo), and improved marketing (KNP Annual Reports). The project's contribution has been mainly through community awareness in GMAs surrounding KNP.The process of developing land use plans that will guide different land use categories including tourism zones has commenced, and expected to facilitate the establishment of PPPs.PPP negotiations are held by GRZ with Kalumbila mine (WLNP) and with Africa Parks (KNP). | At least 1 PPP in each of core PAs of Greater WLNP and KNP at least $850,000 revenues in KNP (increase by 10% per annum) | Increased revenue in KNP from baseline is notable but not directly attributed to this Project's outputs and activities. NO PPP was established so far, but potential for PPPs has increased and negotiations are taking place. Project activities did not impact yet on reduced funding gaps of the two PAs, but are expected to contribute to improved funding of the NPs and GMAs and to the establishment of PPPs.On target to be achieved | **MS** | No notable progress in achieving this indicator, and that can be attributed specifically to this Project, but enabling conditions established through this Project, to facilitate achieving the target |
| **Indicator 4:** PES maintaining watershed / river catchments by communities in KNP benefitting ZESCO. | 0. No PES. | The process of procuring a consultancy to undertake studies and surveys on Payment for Ecosystem Services in Kafue National Park has commenced. The project is engaging stakeholders on payment for ecosystem services( PES) potential to finance biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation actions in the Kafue ecosystem. The consultations will provide inputs for the development of the strategy for PES (not only specifically for KNP and ZESCO, but also in other project areas).TORs for PES consultancy were developed. | 1 PES in KNP with ZESCO | No PES was established, but enabling activities have initiated for developing the conditions for establishing PES by the Project end, aiming to exceed the indicated initial target and to develop more PES than the one proposed at the Project design.On target to be achieved | **MU** | No progress in achieving this indicator, but enabling conditions are being established for achieving the target |
| **Component 2:** Sustainable land and forest management by local institutions in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices. | **Indicator 1:** **1a.** Community Conservancies established. **1b.** Village Action Groups (VAGs legally established).**1c.** Integrated Land Use Assessments (ILUA) and Integrated Land Use Plans (ILUPs) completed for all VAGs.**1d.** Women members in VAGs and improved livelihoods. | 0 ha. 0 legally established VAGs.No ILUAs and ILUPs in place for VAGs. Negligible no. of women representation in VAGs and governance structure  | Sustainable land and forest management by Communities in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices and sustainable livelihoods, is in progress. 77 VAGs, in 14CRBs, covering around 900,000 ha have been fully constituted and functioning in the project area (considerably exceeded the target). However, clear resource rights and delineation of legally recognized VAG boundaries and use zones, management structures and benefit sharing plans (in line with national REDD+ criteria), are not yet in place. Under the Forestry Department, ILUAs have been done. The Project facilitates preparation of ILUPs based on these assessments. The School of Natural Resources of Copperbelt University has been contracted to lead the preparation process of ILUPs. 6 draft ILUPs have been elaborated (4 submitted). The development and adoption of ILUPs' by-laws will enable their legal status and enforcement. The Average female representation in the newly constituted VAGs is 34%. Of the 53 VAGs whose formation was facilitated by the project 12 exceeded the 40 % female representation. | 557, 900 ha (5,579 km2) of intact forest ecosystems established as community conservancies in targeted GMAs; At least 25 (VAGs) in target areas formally recognized and constituted by Y2 with clear resource rights, delineation of legally recognized VAG boundaries and use zones, management structures and benefit sharing plans (in line with national REDD+ criteria);Integrated Land Use Assessment plans developed for all VAGs;At least 40% female representation in all elected VAGs in project area; Increased per capita / household income compared to 2012 baseline | The term conservancies was replaced with the wider concept of CBNRM framework. The Project has already contributed significantly to establishing the local structures of the VAGs and CRBs, and in some aspects beyond the target. In particular, the Project supported the establishment of 52 of a total of 77 VAGs established in 14 CRBs, with all 77 covering around 900,000 ha, well exceeding the defined target. The legal aspect has not been formalized. However, by-laws of the ILUPs once put in place are expected to provide the legal framework for delineating limits and zones and enabling local-level enforcement. Thus far only 6 ILUPs have been developed, though not yet implemented, however the Project has initiated creating the enabling conditions for this process to progress smoothly and achieve result with considerable achievements by Project end. Women members number in VAGs has progressed and is close to target. Activities implemented so far by this Project were not yet translated into improved livelihoods, but such impact is expected by Project end, in synergy with other initiatives.On target to be achieved | **S** | No impact of achieving outcome 2 that can be directly attributed to this Project is notable, yet. However, significant progress has been achieved in establishing the enabling conditions for this components' implementationwith significant impact and sustainability, in synergy with other initiatives. Most notable is the considerable progress made in establishing the VAGs and CRBs, in sensitization, and in initiating and rapid dissemination of the CF practice, through the partnership with CFU. Also noted are the pilot ILUPs prepared through the partnership with the Copperbelt University, and the partnership established with TNC for elaborating and implementing the fire management strategy. |
| **Indicator 2:** Conservation farming (CF) practices applied in targeted GMAs Increased yields. | 0 ha using conservation farming techniques | CF is implemented through cooperation established with the CFU, and successfully implemented, exceeding the indicated target.CF is implemented by 3,050 farmers in 40 VAGs, in 7 out of 14 CRBs, in 3 Districts. A clear flow of activities has been mapped.Impact on improved soil organic matter and field intensification in the Kafue ecosystem area, and on reduction in cumulative CO2 emissions from vegetation clearance for agriculture in targeted areas, were not yet assessed, but baseline survey was undertaken.Productivity of maize of farmers who are practicing CF is reported to increase from 2 tonnes to 8 tonnes per hectare per year, but yields for farmers practining CF under this project were not monitored yet. Communities in West Lunga game management areas have also been mobilized, sensitized and oriented for CF.  | At least 3,760 ha of conservation farming practiced by at least 1,600 HH (in 40 VAGs) by end of project. Introduction of conservation farming practices leads to improved soil organic matter and field intensification across 3,760 hectares leading to: - 40% reduction in cumulative CO2 emissions from vegetation clearance for agriculture in targeted areas resulting in 7,520 ha of avoided deforestation in targeted areas - Resulting decrease in direct lifetime avoided t CO2 emissions from clearance of vegetation for agriculture (20 years) in that same landscape = 988,128 tCO2e compared to BAU scenario | Through the collaboration with CFU, the Project has already achieved remarkable results in disseminating the CF practice in the GKNP ecosystem area, beyond the indicated target. Due to delayed implementation it has not yet translated into any notable impact on soil, yield, or deforestation and emissions. However, the exposure of the practicing farmers to successful CF of CFU projects in the same area, results in building confidence and generating mind-set change. The CFU dissemination system through the engagement of lead farmers is very effective. The Project now expects to achieve CF dissemination to 12,000 HH in 40 VAGs, covering an area of 15,000 ha in the GKNP ecosystem area by Project end. CF in the WLNP ecosystem area, was not yet initiated but isbeing planned;On target to be achieved | **HS** | Very good progress in achieving this indicator's target and in creating enabling conditions for creating significant impact. |
| **Indicator 3:** Demonstration of avoided deforestation (no net loss) in at least 25 VAGs establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing. | 0 ha / no REDD+ pilots in VAGs | Activity not yet implemented.REDD+/SFM Coordinator not yet recruited.ToRs were prepared for a consultancy for selection of REDD+ pilots, in accordance with clear criteria. | 25,000 ha leveraging additional 75,000 ha (intact forest) by protecting VAG designated forest zones - VCS and CCB standard acceptable to international brokers certifying REDD pilots and marketing for carbon financing - Potential buyers identified to purchase the REDD+ carbon credits from the VAG pilots | Activity not yet implemented.  | **U** | Activity not yet implemented. |
| **Indicator 4:** Reduced rate of deforestation from fuel wood extraction in all targeted GMAs. | Unsustainable firewood collection and SFM governance - Wood fuel collection in designated areas is ad-hoc and unsustainable - No sustainable woodlots exist in targeted areas - Knowledge of coppicing practices for fuel wood extraction among communities in targeted areas is very low. | Establishment of Wood fuel collection Zones in the VAGs is part of the ILUPs in process, led by Copperbelt University, and planned to be followed by capacity building to promote different aspects of Sustainable Forestry management. Communities sensitization, through the CRBs, is in progress. TNC is monitoring fire and impact.Monitoring the rate of deforestation from late wood extraction in targeted GMA zones will be linked to the ILUPs development.A Baseline Forestry Survey was undertaken in both the GKNP and WLNP systems, in September 2015. | Under the project designated zones for fuel wood collection will be established optimizing SFM (and testing different treatments) - Working with the Copperbelt University, the 25 VAGs will be trained in harvesting and coppice management and will each establish an auditable fuel wood use and CFM plan. - Linked to land use planning, experimental fuel wood management and collection zones will be established in 25 VAGs; systems boundaries for VAGs will be defined; and alternative operational modalities for fuel wood harvesting and use will be applied (including coppicing). Leading to the following GEBs: - Direct lifetime avoided emissions savings of 63,281 tCO2e (20 years) compared to fuel wood usage in a BAU scenario | The activity was not yet implemented and therefore no impact is attributed to this Project, yet. However, the enabling activities of preparing the ILUPs and of sensitizing the communities are in progress and expect to result with notable impact by the Project end.On target to be achieved | **MS** | No notable progress in achieving this indicator, and that can be attributed specifically to this Project, but enabling conditions established through this Project, to facilitate achieving the target |
| **Indicator 5:** Reduced rate of deforestation from late season fires in targeted GMA zones. | Late season fires and poor fire management monitoring and practices in all targeted GMA zones - 174,671 ha of forests burned in late-season fires annually in GMA areas in KNP - 627,088 ha of forests burned in late-season fires annually in PA zones of KNP - Annual estimated CO2 emissions from fire in GMA zones of KNP = 230,566 tCO2e per annum - Annual estimated CO2 emissions from fire in PA parts of KNP = 827,756 tCO2e per annum | The Land use planning consultancy being led by Copperbelt University, have resulted so far with 6 pilot ILUPs prepared. This planning system allows for community participation in the development of the plans to enable ownership of the plans by the VAGS. Review of the Law enforcement system is underway. Preliminary results indicate the need to strengthen the targeted patrol system which involves focusing on areas with high concentration of wildlife and poaching hot spots. The Project contribution to reduction of the area burnt and carbon emissions will be through supporting development of a fire management strategy and implementation, mainly through the cooperation established with TNC. Monitoring the rate of deforestation from late season fires in targeted GMA zones will be included in the ILUPs. | Land use and forest conservation plans will be developed and adopted by all VAGs, supported and monitored by Kafue Central Business Unit (CBU) - Forest and wildlife patrolling and protection will be done by Village Scouts in all targeted GMAs - Fire control action plans will be adopted and put in use in all VAGs - As a result fire losses will be reduced by at least 30% in GMA zones annually through fire protection practices (boundary and firebreak management, early burning, etc), land use planning, patrolling and education The resulting direct lifetime avoided t CO2 emissions (over 20 years) from these activities compared to a BAU scenario (in GMA zones) = 1,383,394 tCO2e | The activity was not yet implemented and therefore no impact is attributed to this Project, yet. However, the enabling activities of preparing the ILUPs, and of sensitizing the communities are in progress, and partnership was established with TNC for the elaboration and implementation of a fire management strategy. Notable impact can therefore be expected by the Project end.On target to be achieved | **MS** | No notable progress in achieving this indicator, and that can be attributed specifically to this Project, but enabling conditions established through this Project, to facilitate achieving the target |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

* + 1. ***Progress towards achieving the project objective and outcomes***

***Progress towards achieving the project Objective*** *- Is the project realistically expected to achieve its objective by project end, within the defined timeline?*

Due to considerable delays in initiating the Project implementation, derived both of management issues and of force majeure of major institutional rearrangements at political level, there is no notable progress yet, towards achieving the Project biodiversity and climate change related objective, and that can be specifically attributed to this Project. However, the Project did make good progress in implementing activities that establish enabling conditions of a sustainable nature, to achieving its objective, and as provided in detail in the *Progress Towards Results Matrix* above. Nevertheless, the designated timeframe may not be sufficient for achieving the Project's results, and its termination before the impact-generating activities can mature sufficiently to achieve sustainability, may result in adverse impact. The rating Satisfactory (S) was selected despite the slow implementation, to reflect the good potential of the Project and its objective, as based on the essential enabling activities implemented so far, especially in establishing the local-level institutional structures, capacity and mind-set change, as well as on the further planned activities.

***Rating for Progress towards Results: Progress towards achieving the Project Objective: Satisfactory (S)***

***Progress towards achieving Outcome 1****- Was management effectiveness increased and financial sustainability established in Kafue NP and West Lunga NP?*

No significant progress towards achieving outcome 1 can be noted yet. No notable progress was made so far in management effectiveness and financial sustainability in the two target NPs, that can be specifically attributed to this Project. However, enabling activities that have initiated are expected to enable achieving such impact, once the planned component 1 activities are implemented. It is expected that this Project, in synergy with other initiatives, can lead to significant and sustainable impact in increasing management effectiveness of the KNP and WLNP, that would be reflected in increased wildlife stocking, reduced area burned and GHG emissions, and improved PA financing opportunities.

***Rating for Progress towards Results: Progress towards achieving Component 1: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)***

***Progress towards achieving Outcome 2****- Was sustainable land and forest management established by local institutions in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices?*

Sustainable land and forest management, that can be attributed to this Project, has not yet established in the GMA buffer area of the GKNP and WLNP ecosystem areas. However, significant progress has been achieved in establishing the enabling conditions for this components' implementation with significant impact and sustainability, in synergy with other initiatives. Specifically, the local-level key institutional structures for this effect have been put in place though this Project's activities, strengthened by capacity building and sensitization. Moreover, rapid initial implementation and dissemination of Conservation Farming initiated, through the partnership with CFU. Also noted are the pilot ILUPs prepared through the partnership with the Copperbelt University, and the partnership established with TNC for elaborating and implementing the fire management strategy.

It should be noted, though, that the implementation of the REDD+ pilots activity did not initiate yet. Moreover, the REDD+/SFM Coordinator was not yet recruited and other enabling activities for this component were not put in place. The delay in initiating the implementation of this essential activity had a further chain of consequences, including reduced confidence in the Project of both the Forest sector and of the communities in and around forest areas in the WL ecosystem, who would both benefit from these activities. Moreover, the fact that the Forest Department did not nominate a focal point for the Project at the National level (unlike the DNPW), the fact that a REDD+/SFM Coordinator was not yet recruited, and the delay in implementing of essential forest-related activities and in particular the REDD+ pilots, are all interlinked in a negative feedback cycle.

***Rating for Progress towards Results: Progress towards achieving Component 2: Satisfactory (S)***

* + 1. ***Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective and outcomes: Risks and challenges identification and adaptive management***

*Were risks, challenges and bottlenecks adequately and timely identified and mitigated? Were any needs for adaptive management changes identified and implemented?*

Major and mostly unforeseen risks and bottlenecks have resulted in significant delays in the initiation of the Project implementation and in the on-going implementation of activities. Political changes, namely the 2015 and 2016 general elections, followed by institutional and policy framework change of the main implementing partners, have resulted in unavoidable delay of Project start and with unforeseen obstacles in its initial implementation. Considerably delayed recruitments of key Project staff, have led to centralized management and to a centralized and long finance disbursement system that have additionally aggravated the above mentioned impact and formed a critical bottleneck to the Project implementation, especially during its first phase/ inception Moreover, the resulting delays have caused secondary contagious impact of increasing frustration, perception of failure, loss of confidence in the Project among stakeholders, and loss of trust and mutual blaming between the main actors, namely, Project staff, UNDP, the Executing Agencies (implementing partners) and key stakeholders. Challenges relating to implementation bottlenecks were reported in Project quarterly reports, as well as in outstanding reports of the Project Manager, and have been discussed in board meetings, as reported in the Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings minutes. Mitigation measures were taken in revision of the Project management arrangements and increased dedicated staff at the local level. Once the Project's activities implementation started, further remedies were taken successfully for accelerating the implementation rate, resulting in good progress on several activities. Most notably, the recruitment of the CBNRM Coordinator, Project Officers, Community Liaison Assistants (CLAs), and support staff, the establishment of the CRBs, and the partnership established with CFU, have yielded impressive results in the implementation of pilot activities at the local level, followed by re-building stakeholders' confidence in the Project. At the time of the realization of the MTR, the finance assistant was not yet recruited and the Project account was not yet opened, resulting in continued delays in the implementation of essential payments and activities. However, at the MTR workshop, the MTR team was informed that the Project finance assistant was just nominated.

***Rating for Risks and challenges identification and adaptive management: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)***

**4.3 Project Implementation**

 ***4.3.1.* *Management Arrangements***

*Were the project's management arrangement and support of the partner organizations adequate for enabling efficient implementation?*

The current organization arrangements for the project involve UNDP as the implementing agency (IA); two executing agencies (EAs), being the Forest Department and the DNPW (originally ZAWA); Steering Committee; quarterly meetings; and the project team. The project oversight responsibility appears firmly vested in the EAs. The effect of this arrangement is compartmentalization of critical oversight responsibilities in the three principal players, and a serious corporate governance vacuum in the project organization structure which has no credible corporate governance organ for quarterly oversight responsibilities over the Project staff. Apart from the Steering Committee which meets once or twice a year, there is no project specific forum for joint decision making by the principal players. A detailed analysis of the Project management arrangements and a proposed revision is provided in Annex VI.

***Rating for Management Arrangements: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)***

 ***4.3.2. Work planning and Workplans implementation***

*Have the project and individual activities been implemented in line with the defined timeframe and budget, and in accordance with the Annual Workplans and Budgets?*

As evident in the project AWBs and reports, and as reported by all key stakeholders, Annual Workplans and Budgets (AWBs) are well based on the results framework and on the total budget and workplan as defined in the PRODOC. AWBs were further discussed, refined and approved in Project Board meeting, integrating the inputs of key stakeholders, and agreed adaptive management changes. Activities implementation, however, has suffered from obstacles that have reduced its effectiveness and efficiency, and resulted in long delays in implementation. Mitigation of main bottlenecks and effort at accelerating implementation has resulted in good progress in the implementation of key activities, while other key bottlenecks have not been resolved at the time that the MTR was realized, mainly the recruitment of the Finance Assistant and the opening of the Project bank account, resulting in continued prolonged financial disbursement processes and delayed implementation of activities.

***Rating for Work planning and Workplans implementation: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)***

 ***4.3.3. Finance and co-finance; financial planning and management***

*Was the project's financial management adequate?*

The GEF 5 project budget gives a total budget of US $60,085,641. Of this amount, $43,896,777 is co-financing (the detailed Co-Financing Table is provided in Annex VII, further details are provided in Annex VI). The cash funding by GEF and UNDP amounts to US$16 million. The table below shows the slow pace of utilization of budgeted funds.

Planned Budget and Funds Spent

Year Budget Amount Spent (US$) Budget Utilization (%)

2014 886,600 477,400 50,5

2015 2,221,278 1,339,484 60

2016 3,193,331 1,375,818 43.1

Since its inception in 2014, the project utilization of budgeted resources has been around 50% which indicates weak momentum towards project goal. The most significant internal challenge appears to be the financial management system under which the project has operated. The system of Direct Funding by UNDP even for small expenses has led to unnecessary delays in project implementation. A detailed analysis of the Project's financial management system and a proposed revision is provided in Annex VI.

***Rating for Finance and co-financing; financial planning and management: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)***

 ***4.3.4. Monitoring and evaluation framework***

*Were the project monitoring and evaluation plans implemented satisfactorily and did they support the project's implementation?*

The Project Monitoring and Evaluation plan, as detailed in the PRODOC, is being implemented timely and satisfactorily, and is being used to improve the project's implementation. An initial Inception Workshop was held in July 2014 and resulted in an Addendum to the PRODOC, specifying approved changes of the PRODOC, essential adaptive management changes, and changes to key Project outputs and activities. The implementation Inception Workshop was realized in July 2016, at the time that implementation was starting to get good momentum. Several key adaptive management changes and the introduction of essential new activities, were approved at the Inception Workshop, to support project implementation and sustainability. The MTR mission was implemented in February 2017, and the MTR Evaluation is being reported in this report.

***Rating for Monitoring and Evaluation framework: Highly Satisfactory (HS)***

 ***4.3.5. Stakeholders' engagement***

The Project design was based on an extensive consultation process with stakeholders at all levels, as detailed in the PRODOC. The Project itself is designed to enhance stakeholders' engagement, and especially at the local level, as a key element for achieving its objectives, through activities that motivate local stakeholders to participate in sustainable management and protection of the target ecosystems, and by establishing adequate local level institutional structures, for implementation of the Project outputs, and for securing sustainability. The Project's main office and subsidiary offices are located near the Project target areas, to enable on-going interaction with stakeholders at the local level. The CLAs in particular, and with their mobility enhanced through the procurement of motorbikes, serve as the Project's day-to-day liaison agents with all the 14 individual CRBs, thereby enabling on-going permanent interaction. On-going interactions with the traditional leadership (chiefs), further enhances the Project's on-ground impact. On-going interaction is held as well with the District Commissioners, and with the local EAs (DNWP and Forest Department) staff, and the Project supports their interventions for protection of natural resources in the two Project target ecosystem areas. District and local officials have demonstrated remarkable acquaintance with the Project details, which indicates high level of interest and engagement. Moreover, the Project contribution to strengthening enhanced coordination between the forestry and wildlife sectors, especially at the local level, was noted. At the national level, engagement with key stakeholders was verified. Nevertheless, as noted by stakeholders interviewed and at the ToC Workshop, engagement with key stakeholders at the National level must be strengthened, in particular with the sectors of Finance, Fisheries, Energy, Water and National Heritage.

***Gender considerations***

The Project design was gender sensitive in relation to the local-level activities. The local Governance structures (VAGs and CRBs) require the inclusion of at least 40% of women in these decision-making structures. Close to that ratio was already achieved in the VAGs, though to a much lesser extent in the CRBs. Interviews with several CRBs and one VAG have revealed that the biased ratio of male participation, especially in the CRBs is resulted from built-in cultural reasons, and therefore a special attention must be given to creating the required conditions for the participation of more women at this level. The Project team includes women but is biased toward men. One of 5 Project technical staff (20%), one of 2 Project support staff (drivers) (50%), and 2 of 14 CLAs (14%) are women. At UNDP however, the 3 main staff supporting this Project are all women. While the administrative structure of the main EAs (Forest Department and DNPW) and other GRZ and District stakeholders, consist mostly of men, it was refreshing to meet several prominent women in key positions, such as an Area Warden in KNP, a District Forest Officer, a Chieftainess, a District Commissioner and the PS of Tourism and Arts. Nevertheless, further effort at establishing better gender balance is required at the Project level, and in catalyzing similar change among stakeholders. Women role in the decision-making structures of the VAGs and CRBs (and in the Project, among the CLAs) is especially important to assure that the considerations of both men and women, which are essentially different, would be equally taken into account in the decision-making processes. A notable example is the Manyinga, where the District Commissioner has promoted cooperation with the remarkable Women Clubs, in enhancing sustainable livelihoods driven and implemented by women.

***Rating for Stakeholders' engagement: Satisfactory (S)***

 ***4.3.6. Communication***

*Was the project communication strategy designed and implemented satisfactorily and did it support achieving the project's objective and outcomes?*

The Project does not have a communication and visibility strategy. The need for enhanced information flow and communication between the Project Team and the Executing Agencies (implementing partners), and with associated stakeholders, was stressed in several of the interviews and in the ToC Workshop.A communication, awareness, and visibility strategy should be developed and implemented, in close coordination with the EAs, as an important instrument to strengthen achieving the project objectives and for enhancing sustainability of the results. Communication and visibility are important Project tools in general, and are specifically important for a project of this nature, that depends to a large extent on stakeholders' interest and engagement at all levels, and on raising awareness. The elaboration of a Project communication and implementation visibility strategy is essential, with the following objectives: regulate and assure on-going dissemination of information between the Project and its implementing partners and with key stakeholders; raise awareness to the Project's objectives and activities among stakeholders and the general public; raise awareness on the importance of biodiversity conservation and of forest and natural resources sustainable management, to increase stakeholders' engagement at the local level; create visibility to the Project at national, regional and international levels, and enhance engagement, support and partnerships.

***Rating for Communication: Unsatisfactory (U)***

***4.3.7. Reporting***

*Were the project reports submitted timely and satisfactorily and did they support the project's implementation?*

Quarterly reports were elaborated timely, and disseminated to key stakeholders, providing essential information on project progress and the next quarter workplan (Project Trimestral and Annual Progress Reports – 2014 (Q3, Annual); 2015 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Annual); 2016 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Annual). Annual Workplans and Budgets (AWBs) were elaborated timely by the project team and reviewed and adopted by the PIs, UNDP and Project Board. Two APR/PIRs (2015, 2016) were prepared, approved by the national project partners, the UNDP CO and the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser, and submitted to the GEF. Field visits of Project team, UNDP staff, and of thematic consultants, were reported in mission and technical reports and as part of consultancy reports, supporting the project implementation and specific activities. A full list of project reports and documentation is detailed in Annex IV. All stakeholders interviewed were generally satisfied with their timely access to the Project reporting and documentation.

***Rating for Reporting: Highly Satisfactory (HS)***

**4.4. Sustainability**

The Project has a high potential to create sustainability of its results, if its implementation is accelerated and focused on sustainability-enhancing activities, and its duration extended to enable sufficient progress in achieving the main results. Government attention and efforts to mitigation of existing environmental, institutional and financial risks to sustainability, must be strengthened, through reviewing policies and through a multi-sectorial approach.

***4.4.1. Identification and Management of risks to the sustainability of Project results***

*Financial risks to sustainability: Can sufficient financial sustainability be established before project end, to secure continuity?*

Establishing financial sustainability, for enabling continued effective management of the two target Protected Area systems (KNP and WLNP and their related GMAs), is built into the Project's design, as part of its defined objective and expected outcomes, and with the inclusion of dedicated activities for this purpose. Several activities were designed to increase the two National Parks revenues and to establish further financial tools, such as PPPs and PES. The previous autonomy of DNPW in the use of the PAs revenues was replaced with a new legal framework, that channels these revenues to the national coffer. This situation creates significant risk to the PAs financial sustainability, which therefore cannot be mitigated by increasing their revenues. Establishing financial sustainability for the PAs' management would therefore rely on increasing the Government's overall awareness to their importance. Increased PA revenues can help create this awareness. However, additional funding sources, such as PPPs and PESs agreements, become essential for securing financial sustainability. For establishing financial sustainability, an active effort must be directed by the Project team and partners at all levels, to seeking adequate solutions at the National and local levels, as well as to seeking further partners.

*Socio-economic risks to sustainability: Can adequate socio-economic sustainability be secured before project end to enable continuity?*

Establishing socio-economic sustainability is in the core of the Project's design. At the GMAs, the Project is focused on creating enabling conditions for local-level stakeholder's engagement in sustainable management of the natural resources. To this effect, the Project established local-level decision-making institutional structures (at the VAGs and the CRBs) that are based on the same structures that existed prior to the Project. The Project CBNRM team supports the establishing of these structures, as well as engaged in raising awareness and in supporting the communities in seeking opportunities for sustainable livelihoods and income generating activities, with Conservation Farming (CF) being the main flagship CBNRM practice replacing the baseline unsustainable practices. The rapid and successful dissemination of the CF, together with other sustainable livelihood strategies, such as beekeeping and goats, among others, and with the stabilizing impact of the established local decision making structures, mitigate to a large extent socio-economic risks to the sustainability of the Project results. Moreover, the development of the integrated land use plans (ILUPs) and the planned elaboration of by-laws will provide the institutional and legal framework to formalize, implement and enforce agreed sustainable land and natural resources management plan that were developed through local ownership and capacity building, and are therefore likely to be maintained after the Project end. It was noted, though, that for establishing sustainability it is essential to secure benefits at the household level. Conservation Farming and other sustainable livelihoods practiced create these conditions. The Project's enhancement of gender balance also has a stabilizing impact, by addressing both men and women's needs and priorities. Moreover, the commitment of the CLAs, who were selected from the respective communities, and whose operation is largely based on voluntary basis, to continue their action in supporting the CRBs, beyond the Project duration, is an additional essential stabilizing factor, further mitigating socio-economic risks.

*Institutional risks to sustainability: Can institutional capacity be adequately established before project end, to secure sustainability of achieved project outcomes?*

Institutional changes in the main EAs have resulted with major obstacles and delays to the initial Project implementation. The Project design aims to support institutional capacity building at both the national and local levels. Institutional structures established with the Project's support, help mitigate institutional risks. It was also noted that the Project contributes to coordination and cooperation between the two main IP sectors (Wildlife and Forests), while further coordination with other relevant sectors, is essential. Nevertheless, the changes made have increased institutional risks to the national institutional capacity to maintain the Project results sustainably beyond its duration. Safeguards for enhancing the mainstreaming of the Project results, through additional selected relevant upstreaming and activities with focus on policy frameworks, and promoting multi-sectorial and strategic integrated approach, are required for reducing the potential impact of further institutional risks.

*Environmental risks to sustainability:* *Are environmental risks identified and mitigated?*

The Project design addresses the need to mitigate environmental risks in the GKNP and WLNP ecosystems, in the two NPs and in the related GMAs in their buffer zone. The Project enhances the mitigation of environmental risks and the establishing of sustainability through support to the NPs and GMAs' in management planning, law enforcement systems, fire management, reduced deforestation through supporting alternative livelihoods and mind set change.

***Rating for Sustainability*** ***(Identification and Management of risks to the sustainability of Project results): Moderately Likely (ML)***

***Overall rating of Project Performance***

Just by summing the rating of the individual aspects, the overall rating of the Project performance would be Moderately Satisfactory (MS). However, an overall view, takes into consideration the importance of the Project to conservation, and mitigation of climate change and land degradation in Zambia, as well as to global biodiversity, and its demonstrated potential to result in significant impact and with good potential for sustainability of its results. Moreover, the Project builds on essential assets, namely, remarkably committed and dedicated team (Project team, UNDP support staff, and EAs staff) and highly engaged and passionate stakeholders at all levels (National, Provincial, District, Local, NGOs), which considerably increase its potential of success in yielding significant and sustainable impact. Taking all of these considerations into account the MTR team, therefore, rates the overall performance of the Project as Satisfactory (S). Nevertheless, for the Project to achieve its objectives, the weaknesses detailed through this analysis must be urgently addressed, as further detailed in Section 5.2.: Recommendations.

***Overall rating of Project Performance: Satisfactory (S)***

**5. Conclusions and Recommendations**

* 1. **Conclusions and summary of findings**

The Project addresses essential national and local needs and has a high potential to achieve the objectives of improved management effectiveness, with local engagement, of the two target ecosystems, as well as to create sustainability of its results. The Project design supports national ownership, and thereby sustainability, through capacity support to the two key sectors, and local ownership, through the local governance structures (CRBs and VAGs).

The Project design did not take into account significant institutional risks that emerged during the initiation of its implementation. Implementation initiation was significantly delayed, and implementation is still much slower than planned, however, recent significant progress is very encouraging. While some progress in achieving the project’s objective and expected outcomes was made, it is not yet translated into notable actual on-ground impact. The two target ecosystems, and their natural resources, are still subjected to significant threats. Good progress was made mainly in establishing the local governance structures, awareness efforts, pilot land-use planning, impact-generating pilots (CF), and gender aspects, and in providing support to enforcement and management planning and activities of the EAs, as well as enhancing cooperation between them. Partnerships with key actors promote achieving the joint goals and objectives.

The Project has a high potential to create sustainability of its results, if its implementation would be accelerated through urgent mitigation of the identified management bottlenecks and focused on sustainability-enhancing activities, and its duration extended to enable sufficient progress in achieving the main results.

Risks mitigation must be strengthened through further flexibility and innovative adaptive management changes, by Project team and partners. Government attention and efforts to mitigation of existing environmental, institutional and financial risks to sustainability, must be strengthened, through reviewing policies and through a multi-sectorial approach.

Focus must be given to sustainability-enhancing activities, including – seeking innovative solutions to establishing financial and socio-economic sustainability; promoting multi-sectorial approach and close cooperation at all levels; and supporting the Government in reviewing policies, legislation and strategies, for enhancing environmental, institutional and financial sustainability. Moreover, a communication, awareness, and visibility strategy should be developed and implemented, in close coordination with the EAs, as an important instrument to strengthen achieving the project objectives and for enhancing sustainability of the results.

A wider perspective, beyond the Project area, is required, including the identification and strategic addressing of demand drivers, for generating significant impact on reducing threats in the Project area.

* 1. **Recommendations**

 ***5.2.1. Recommendations for the Project implementation***

Specific recommendations for improving the Project’s capacity to achieve its objectives and expected outcomes, and to enhance their sustainability, by Project end**:**

**Recommendation 1: Urgent acceleration of implementation**

For the Project to achieve its objectives, a joint and coordinated effort of the Project team, the Executing Agencies, UNDP, and further Project partners is required. Innovative solutions are required at accelerating implementation. Specific recommendations for enabling such acceleration are detailed below.Acceleration of implementation requires enhanced cooperation between its partners, e.g., by approving activities and funding through joint planning workshops. Priority should be given to the implementation of sustainability-enhancing activities.

**Implementer:** Project team; UNDP; EAs; Project partners and key stakeholders

**Suggested timeframe:** immediate and on-going

**Recommendation 2: No-cost extension of the Project by at least 12 months (preferably 18)**

A no-cost extension of the Project by at least 12 (and preferably 18) months is recommended. According to the new rules regarding project extensions, they are generally not allowed unless a strong case can be made that significant progress will be made in the final years of project implementation. In the case of this Project, it is recommended that the extension be considered favorably. Considering that the main cause for the initial delay can be referred to as "force majeure", considering the momentum gained recently, considering the Project's great importance, and considering the grave negative impact if the Project will not achieve its objective by Project end, it is recommended that an extension be considered in this case, in order to allow its outputs and activities to reach sufficient maturity before Project end. As agreed during the MTR Review Meeting, the Project will now continue in accordance with the planned timeline, and the Terminal Review will analyze whether an extension can be requested, with the required justification, in accordance with the GEF requirements.

**Implementer:** UNDP CO preparation of proposal for approval by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator

**Suggested timeframe:** According to UNDP rules and procedures

**Recommendation 3: Revision of the Project organization structure**

Revision of the Project organization structure is proposed to conform to sound corporate governance principles and best practices and standard project management principles (as detailed in Annex VI). This will entail rationalization of the quarterly meetings in form of Technical Committee in an organization structure backed by written terms of reference for each organ in the structure. The structure will provide for a corporate governance organ that facilitates joint decision making by UNDP and the two EAs in the effective oversight of critical operational, strategic and financial matters of the Project. It should also be supported by project specific written management systems and procedures that reflect the core principles, systems and procedures of the two EAs and UNDP as well as the special circumstances and peculiar features of the Project. The best use for UNDP POPP and Government rules is not to substitute, but inform the project specific manuals. At the very minimum these should include Project specific financial management manual and project operations manual.

**Implementer:** UNDP; Forest Department and DNPW

**Suggested time frame:** Immediate

**Recommendation 4: Revision of the Project financial management system and devolution of fiduciary responsibilities to the Project organization arrangements**

Project fiduciary responsibilities should be shifted from the UNDP and EA silos into a project organ like the PSC supported by the proposed Technical Committee that can exercise effective financial oversight responsibilities. Immediate shift is required from Direct Funding by UNDP to quarterly releases of funds to the Project. Within the thresholds approved by the Steering Committee, the Project Management should be competent to make expenditure decisions. To facilitate this transformation, we recommend the immediate opening of a Project bank account in Mumbwa and the operationalization of the position of the newly recruited Project Accountant. (A detailed proposed revision of the Project's financial management system is provided in Annex VI).

**Implementer:** UNDP ; Forest Department and DNPW; Project Team

**Suggested Time frame:** Immediate

**Recommendation 5: Include essential upstream strategic activities to support the EAs in reducing threats, in particular crime-related, through an integrated multi-sectorial approach**

To reduce threats at the local level, a wider approach and upstream activities are required, to identify and address local, national and, when relevant, global drivers and core causes. Specifically, it is recommended to develop, with the two EAs leadership, and with the Project's expert consultancy support, a National holistic/integrated strategy to combat crime on natural resources (wildlife, forest resources, etc.), that is based on a multi-sectorial approach. Natural resources-based crime, most notably poaching, illegal logging and illegal trade in wild flora and fauna and their derivatives, is a major threat to biodiversity in the target PA systems, as well as elsewhere in the country and in the region. Nevertheless, the crime drivers are essentially national, regional and global in nature. Crime in PAs is driven by demand elsewhere. Addressing poaching and logging cannot be successful by focusing only on poaching and logging at the local level. It is recommended that the Project would support a National strategic planning process, for crimes on natural resources, through an expert's consultancy, deriving lessons learned from the Project's on-ground implementation.

**Implementer:** NDPW and Forest Department, UNDP, the Project Team, Sub-contracted expert/consultant.

**Suggested timeframe:** include in 2017 or 2018 AWB.

**Recommendation 6: Prioritize implementation of impact-generating/trust-building pilots with communities and extend exposure of CRBs and VAGs to a wide variety of income-generation options**

In the remaining time left for Project implementation, special focus should be given to sustainability-inducing activities, both upstreaming and at the local level. At the local level effort should focus of implementation of impact-generating (and thereby confidence-building) activities with the communities. In addition to the successful Conservation Farming, exposure of the CRBs and VAGs to wide variety of income-generating options must be extended. While the ILUPs would provide the overall land use planning framework for each VAG, pilot activities can initiate immediately, through a consultations process with the CRBs and VAGs and tailored at VAG and even Household level, in accordance with their specific preferences and circumstances (e.g., agroforestry and beekeeping in the WLNP GMAs forest area; dairy products with communities that specialize on keeping cattle but culturally cannot sell the cattle itself; etc.). Moreover, specific tourism and marketing strategies should be tailored to explore the full tourism potential for CBNRM practice in the two ecological systems, through specifically tailored and fine-tuned strategies (e.g., specialize on bird-watching in the forest, river activities and heritage sites where relevant, specific cultural-related activities as relevant, etc.). Income-generating activities should be based on traditional knowledge, as well as on socio-economic and environmental assessments of the full value-chain (including, e.g., markets). All of these activities should include a strong component of training, and including, e.g., small business management and bookkeeping/financial management training, and peer-based training through exchange with existing similar initiatives elsewhere. A capacity needs assessment should be realized and followed by a capacity building programme. This recommendation should be implemented in conjunction with recommendation 11.

**Implementer:** Project Team; CRBs and VAGs; NDPW and Forest Department; UNDP, Sub-contracted expert/consultant

**Suggested timeframe:** immediate and on-going

**Recommendation 7**: **Elaborate and implement a communication and visibility strategy**

Communication at all levels, is a key component for the project success and for strengthening sustainability. The Project needs to develop and implement a comprehensive and detailed communication and visibility strategy, short-term, medium-term and long-term activities. Meantime, communication with the media must be strengthened for enhancing awareness, engagement and visibility, as well as for facilitating information dissemination. The media can be continuously informed on key Project activities. Enhancing engagement with the media can include short courses for the media, and/or short courses on journalism for the Project team and key stakeholders.

**Implementer:** Project Team; DNPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Sub-contracted expert/consultant

**Suggested timeframe:** include in 2017 AWB

**Recommendation 8: Enhance cooperation between the two EAs and with other relevant stakeholders and sectors at all levels**

The Project must actively enhance cooperation between the two main EAs and with key stakeholders, in particular through the joint/coordinated use of resources provided by the Project. Coordination of the EAs local staff with the CRBs and VAGs, must be strengthened through the Project's staff, and in particular through the POs and CLAs mediation and mobility support. Cooperation and coordination of Project activities with other relevant sectors and actors must also be strengthened, both at the national and local levels (e.g., fisheries, National heritage, energy, water, lands, mines, tourism, Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs, private sector actors, etc). The Project team must strategize jointly with the EAs and further partners how best to mitigate any potential frictions between the Project Team, Executing Agencies, other key Project implementing partners and beneficiaries, that may arise from differential support.

**Implementer:** Project Team; NDPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Project partners and key stakeholders

**Suggested timeframe:** immediate and on-going

**Recommendation 9: Provide training to key stakeholders on participatory approach and conflict resolution**

It is recommended to hold a brief (2-4 days) conflict resolution training workshop for key Project team, EAs and stakeholders, both of the national and local levels. Such training would enhance coordination and cooperation between the different Project key actors, and between them and conflicting sectors. Such skills are among the essential enabling conditions for sustainable natural resources management, considering the permanent existence of conflicting use interests.

**Implementer:** Project Team; NDPW and Forest Department;UNDP; Project partners and key stakeholders; Sub-contracted expert/consultant

**Suggested timeframe:** include in 2017 or 2018 AWB

**Recommendation 10: Revision of the indicators**

Suggestions for the indicators' revision were detailed in accordance with the group discussion, in the ToC Workshop Report (Annex V). It is recommended that the Project's indicators would be revised to integrate the suggested amendments, as relevant.

**Implementer:** Project Manager, in consultation with Project Team; UNDP; DNPW and Forest Department;

**Suggested timeframe:** before the next PIR

**Recommendation 11: Implementation of Project activities for establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing.**

The planned Project activities for achieving indicator 3 of outcome 2: Demonstration of avoided deforestation (no net loss) in at least 25 VAGs establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing, should be implemented, aiming to achieve the defined target for this indicator. For this effect the REDD+/SFM Coordinator should be urgently recruited, the Forest Department should nominate a focal point for the Project, the Project should strengthen its cooperation with the Forest Department, and initial activities should be developed with the communities in conjunction with recommendation 6. Specifically, as requested by the communities initial pilot activities can focus on regeneration programmes and capacity building in this regard. Such activities and training can initiate immediately through the direct engagement of the Forest Department with the CRBs, without waiting for the recruitment of the REDD+/SFM Coordinator to be finalized.

**Implementer:** Project Team; DNPW and Forest Department; UNDP; Sub-contracted expert/consultant

**Suggested timeframe:** include in 2017 AWB

 ***5.2.2. Recommendations/lessons learned for national strengthening of the project***

 ***results and Sustainability (recommendations for the EAs)***

**Recommendation 12: Strengthen significant**

 **cooperation between the wildlife and forest sectors and coordination of both sectors with further relevant sectors, and with local stakeholders**

While one of this Project's indirect outcomes should be support to strengthening cooperation and coordination between the two EAs (DNPW and Forest Department), this is essentially a GRZ objective, for enabling better and well-coordinated Government performance in achieving the national objectives and priorities. Especially following the recent Governmental institutional changes, special effort is required at bridging gaps and enabling smooth cooperation. Cooperation and coordination must also be extended with further relevant sectors (fisheries, National heritage, energy, mining, social affairs, health, education, communication, transport, Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional affairs, etc). For this effect, joint discussion fora should be established, and a joint effort at harmonizing policy and legal frameworks should be undertaken. E.g., it was suggested that the harmonization of the updated Wildlife and Forest Acts should be improved, especially with regards to benefit sharing with communities and the mandate of the village scouts. Moreover, it was noted that both DNPW and Forest Department should strengthen their engagement with the communities, including providing regular training (e.g., re legislation), and enabling permanent information flow. Specifically, with regards to this Project, joint planning between the two EAs of the use of the Project’s support (vehicles, database, etc), especially at the local level, would facilitate the Project's implementation and achieving the Project's objectives and their sustainability.

**Implementer:** DNPW and Forest Department; other relevant sectors; CRBs and VAGs; Project Team's support

**Suggested timeframe:** immediate and on-going

**Recommendation 13: Strengthen significantly the forest sector and its management and enforcement capacity**

Considering the differential institutional and financial capacities of the wildlife and forest sectors, and the negative impact on achieving sustainable management and protection, especially of the forests and their resources, it is suggested that specialized project/s and initiatives would be developed specifically for strengthening the forest sector at the national level and in particular at the local level, and that further relevant partners and donors would be actively sought for this effect.

**Implementer:** Forest Department with UNDP support and further partners

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

**Recommendation 14: Develop and implement a National strategy for a holistic wildlife crime action, based on a multi-sectorial multi-agency approach**

Wildlife crime, i.e., poaching, illegal logging and illegal trade in wild flora and fauna and their derivatives, is a major threat to biodiversity in the target PA systems, as elsewhere in the country and in the region. A National holistic/integrated wildlife crime strategy, that is based on multi-sectorial approach, is therefore essential. Recommendation 5 suggests that an expert consultancy would be realized through this Project, to provide the technical support to elaborating a national wildlife crime strategy, based on a participatory process with extensive consultation with key stakeholders. It is hereby suggested that the development and implementation of such a strategy would be driven jointly by DNPW and the Forest Department, and that support in elaborating the strategy would be sought from this Project, as it is an essential complementing activity for achieving this Project's objectives.

**Implementer:** DNPW and Forest Department, UNDP, the Project Team, Sub-contracted expert/consultant.

**Suggested timeframe:** initiate driving the process during this year.

**Recommendation 15: Give Protected Areas, wetlands, forest, and wildlife appropriate status of “economic asset to the country”**

Considering the legal fragility of designated Protected Areas and in particular of protected forest, due to legislation that prioritizes other land uses that are defined with superior status of "economic assets to the country", it is essential that legislation and policies would be revisited, aiming to secure sustainability and protect natural assets from the potential overriding of destructive land uses. To this effect, designated Protected Areas, forest, wetlands, and wildlife, in particular threatened wild flora and fauna, must receive the legal status of ‘protection’ and/or strict utilization. Such amendment of the legislation would reflect the recognized value of biodiversity and forest natural resources as important economic assets to the country, not only in the short term, as other competing land uses may be, but in the long term as well. Protecting the natural ecosystems, wildlife and forests is further recognized as essential for enabling resilience, economic sustainable development and national security and stability.

**Implementer:** GRZ and Parliament, with process driven by DNPW and Forest Department, and catalyzed by the Project and UNDP

**Suggested timeframe:** immediate start of the process

**Recommendation 16: Review revenue sharing policies from PAs with the Wildlife and Forest sectors and with communities**

It is suggested, that considering that at this time lessons can already be derived from existing experience in the implementation of the new revenue sharing system, the new policies would be revisited, aiming to maximize the linkage of the revenues to improved management. It is suggested that a joint committee of the wildlife, forest and finance sectors, with local communities' representation, would undertake to review the revenue sharing system, to study its advantages and disadvantages in comparison to the previous system, and through a SWOT or cost-benefit analysis, and update the policy accordingly. The updated policy should secure sufficient funding for both the wildlife and forest sectors to perform their essential roles, as well as for providing sufficient incentive to local residents in PA buffer zones, GMAs and community forests, to engage in protection and sustainable management and to refrain from destructive activities. The Project can support the Government with such a review process, through advocacy as well as through an expert consultancy, including deriving lessons learned from other countries.

**Implementer:** GRZ and Parliament, with process driven by DNPW, Forest Department, and Finance.

**Suggested timeframe:** start of process during 2017

**Recommendation 17: Establish a graded career path with promotion horizon and training milestones for Wildlife and Forest staff (including Village Scouts)**

As noted by several key stakeholders, it would be useful for DNWP and the Forest Department to establish a joint clear and written career path with promotion horizon and training milestones at realistic intervals, for both the Wildlife and Forest staff, and including clear written paths for Village Scouts working with both sectors. Such a written manual could serve the staff in securing their rights in accordance with a clear and regulated path; it would assure that all staff (including community agents) receive regular training at an increasing level; and it would incentivize high level candidates to join and to remain in wildlife and forest protection careers. Consultancy support can be sought from this Project or other relevant initiatives, e.g., Game Rangers International (GRI), or can be rather mostly based on exchange communication to derive lessons learned from existing experience elsewhere.

**Implementer:** DNPW and Forest Department; in consultation with local communities

**Suggested timeframe:** start of process during 2017 or 2018

**Recommendation 18: Mainstream education for biodiversity conservation and natural resources sustainable management into the national and local formal and informal education and communication systems**

Considering the great importance of adequate relevant education and communication, and in line with the 7NDP, it is suggested that DNPW and the Forest Department would lead a national process for mainstreaming education for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources into the national and local formal and informal education and communication systems. This can be done in conjunction with the development of this Project's communication and visibility strategy (Recommendation 7).

**Implementer:** DNPW and Forest Department with the Ministry of Education

**Suggested timeframe:** start of process during 2017 or 2018

 ***5.2.3. Recommendations for local strengthening of the project results and***

 ***Sustainability (recommendations for*** ***local stakeholders’ leadership)***

These recommendations can be used in a wider National context, beyond the Project area.

**Recommendation 19: Promote biodiversity conservation and natural assets** **protection for enabling local sustainable development, trough raising awareness, education and capacity building**

The communities' leading governance structures, established partially with this Project's support should take the leading role in promoting biodiversity conservation and natural assets (forests, wetlands, wildlife, etc) protection. Their lead role in raising awareness and in education of community members can be based on leading specific activities for raising awareness to target groups and to the communities in general, and on establishing close cooperation with schools for assuring mainstreaming environmental education at the local level, in cooperation with the Governmental relevant sectors (Education, Wildlife, Forest, Fisheries, etc). Moreover, the CRBs and VAGs should actively identify capacity building needs for enabling community members to engage in sustainable natural resources management in general and in specific activities, and seek actively adequate capacity building opportunities, including through exchange between communities, with the support of this Project, or other initiatives.

**Implementer:** CRBs and VAGs

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

**Recommendation 20: Actively seek sustainable and innovative livelihoods and revenue generating activities, and ways to spread them to household level throughout the area**

The communities' leading governance structures established should take the leading role in seeking actively sustainable and innovative livelihoods and revenue generating activities, beyond the specific activities of sustainable livelihoods supported through this Project, as well as ways to spread them to household level throughout the area. Diversification of case-specific tailor-made livelihood and revenue generating options should be maximized and explored. Specific opportunities should be tailored to individual communities in accordance with their specific circumstances and preferences (e.g., agroforestry, beekeeping, dairy products, bird-watching, river activities, local art shops, etc. as relevant in each case). Capacity needs related to implementing these activities should be identified and adequate training opportunities sought, with the support of this Project and other initiatives. The land use plans (ILUPs) will serve as an important instrument for strategic sustainable development of each VAG, however, a certain degree of flexibility must bekept to enable dynamic development and openness to innovative solutions, and to initiate the implementation of pilots without waiting for the full ILUPs process to be finalized.

**Implementer:** CRBs and VAGs

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

**Recommendation 21: Actively seek sustainable revenue generating activities and innovative solutions to enable funding of VAGs and CRBs**

To sustain the CRB and VAG structures themselves in a sustainable way, the communities' leading governance structures established should seek sustainable revenue generating activities and innovative solutions to enable on-going funding of their own activities and mobility in acting as the communities' leading governance structures and in implementing activities of education and of support to households' activities.

**Implementer:** CRBs and VAGs

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

**Recommendation 22: Lobby for strengthened mandate, authority, capacity and benefit sharing for community members’ engagement in protection and sustainable management of natural assets**

The communities' leading governance structures established should act as the main liaison structure for the communities with the District and National authorities, and should take the leading role in lobbying for strengthened mandate, authority, capacity and benefit sharing for community members’ engagement in protection and sustainable management of natural assets, following consultations with the communities.

**Implementer:** CRBs and VAGs

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

**Recommendation 23: Improve gender balance of leading structures;**

More effort is required to encourage women's participation in the CRBs and VAGs and in leading roles.Women’s role in the decision-making structures of the VAGs and CRBs is especially important to assure that the considerations of both men and women, which are essentially different, would be equally taken into account in the decision making processes. Moreover, it is recommended that cooperation be established with the Women Clubs in Manyinga District, in enhancing sustainable livelihoods driven and implemented by women, and that similar initiatives be encouraged with other Districts as well.

**Implementer:** CRBs and VAGs

**Suggested timeframe:** on-going

 ***5.2.4. Systemic recommendations (Recommendations/lessons learned for UNDP***

 ***CO and UNDP/GEF HQ)***

**Recommendation 24: Revisit the rules of GEF Projects implementation aiming to enable much more flexibility to the Project team in leading the day-to-day Project management and funding processes**

The individual evaluation of every project should serve to derive lessons learned for improving the implementation of all future UNDP-GEF funded projects. As a lesson learned from this Project it is suggested that existing standard management and payment procedures and rules be re-visited with the aim to remove potential bottlenecks; facilitate approval, procurement and payment processes and significantly reduce the processing time from project concept preparation to implementation initiation; and considerably increase the flexibility of the project team in leading the day-to-day Project management and funding processes, even if to some extent at the expense of rules that are aimed at increasing accountability. Moreover, it is also suggested that continuous refreshing of training on the Project would be provided, for clarifying rules and procedures, identifying where flexibility can be deployed, and reducing unrealistic expectations, e.g., through quarterly meetings of UNDP with Project team, IPs, and key stakeholders would be realized. The same meetings can serve for on-going analyzing of needs for adaptive changes, and for facilitating administrative and approval processes.

**Implementer:** UNDP HQ

**Suggested timeframe:** to be considered by UNDP HQ

**Recommendation 25: Define a Project's preparation phase, before initiating implementation**

It is suggested that for any project, a realistic evaluation would be realized in advance to assess the time required for the project to become effective following the realization of initial key recruitment and procurement processes, and for actual implementation of activities to start. Formalizing such an initial low-cost phase for Projects, would prevent the secondary negative impact of long initial delays, such as increasing frustration, notion of failure, loss of trust and mutual blaming between the main actors, namely, project staff, UNDP, Executing Agencies and key stakeholders. Thereby, once a project's implementation actually starts, it would not be burdened by the lingering impacts of initial delays. This could also mitigate in advance the later need for a project extension, to compensate for delays at the initial phase.

**Implementer:** UNDP HQ

**Suggested timeframe:** to be considered by UNDP HQ

**Annex I. Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?**  |
| Does the project strategy support achieving national needs and priorities?  | Project objective and outcomes in line with priorities indicated in national policies, strategies and programmes | PRODOC; published relevant national policies, strategies and programmes | Documents review; consultation with UNDP CO and main government partners  |
| Does the project strategy support achieving needs and priorities of local stakeholders? | Project objective and outcomes in line with priorities indicated by local stakeholders | Project documentation; interviews with local stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with local level stakeholders |
| To what extent is the project complementary to government's and partners' initiatives (regional, national and local projects and programmes) addressing the same priorities? | Project design complements existing and planned initiatives | PRODOC; documentation of complementing initiatives  | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders and partners  |
| Are the Project outputs and activities relevant and feasible for achieving the Project objective and outcomes? | Project outputs and activities logically lead to achieving Project objective and outcomes | Project documentation; interviews with local stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Were risks well identified and mitigation measures well designed to adequately address the risks? | Verification relevance of risks and effectiveness of mitigation measures indicated in the PRODOC, through later Project reporting | Project documentation; interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders |
| Do the Project's outputs and management arrangements promote national ownership? | Project outputs support national and local capacity building; Project management arrangements are based on national ownership | Project documentation; interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| Objective:  |
| Are Biodiversity and carbon sinks of Kafue/West Lunga PA systems in Zambia better protected from threats and effectively managed?  | 65,461 Km2 protected, including the 2 NPs and the GMAs; identified threats mitigated; effective management implemented | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; KNP, WLNP and GMAs management plans and annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Is sustainable land and forest management established in Miombo woodland and dry evergreen forest ecosystems in the two PA core areas and the community managed GMAs and conservancies?  | Sustainable land and forest management practiced in 41,297 Km2 of the GMAs.  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; PAs annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Is forest corridor long-term connectivity enabled between WLNP and KNP? | Forest corridor connectivity established | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; PAs annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Is the project realistically expected to achieve its objective by project end, within the defined timeline? | At least 50% of end of project targets for project objective and outcomes, as indicated in the Project Results Framework, achieved  | Project documentation; national documentation; interviews with Project team, UNDP CO and implementing partners | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders; ToC excercise |
| Component 1:  |
| Was management effectiveness increased in Kafue NP and West Lunga NP?  | Increase in Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), to 65% for KNP, 40% for WLNP, 45% for KNP GMAs, 30% for WLNP GMAs | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; PAs annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Wildlife stocking rates increased to 12% of carrying capacity in KNP and GMAs  |
| Reduced GHG emissions from fire (KNP: 825,000t CO2 reduced emissions annually) |
| Was the core Protected Area expanded? | Core Protected Area expanded | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; PAs annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Reduced area burned annually by 50% in KNP (625,800 ha) |
| Was financial sustainability established? | Reduction in funding gap of the targeted National Parks moving up one category (based on REMNPAS financial viability assessment) with at least 1 new PPP formed in each NP and at least $850,000 revenues in KNP (increase by 10% per annum) | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; PAs annual reports; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| 1 PES maintaining watershed / river catchments by communities in KNP benefitting ZESCO. |
| Component 2:  |
| Was sustainable land and forest management established by local institutions in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices? | Community Conservancies established. (5,579 km2 of intact forest ecosystems established as community conservancies in targeted GMAs)  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Improved livelihoods (increased per capita / household income compared to 2012 baseline) |
| Are Village Action Groups (VAGs) in target areas formally recognized and constituted? | VAGs legally established. (25 VAGs in target areas formally recognized and constituted by Y2 with clear resource rights, delineation of legally recognized VAG boundaries and use zones, management structures and benefit sharing plans, in line with national REDD+ criteria)  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Women members in VAGs (At least 40% female representation in all elected VAGs in project area) |
| Was land use planning, and diversification of income streams, over all target GMA buffer area established? | Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) plans completed for all VAGs.  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Were SFM practices established as REDD+ pilots? | Demonstration of avoided deforestation (no net loss) in at least 25 VAGs establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing. Potential buyers identified to purchase the REDD+ carbon credits from the VAG pilots | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Was conservation farming introduced?  | Conservation farming practices applied (At least 3,760 ha of conservation farming practiced by at least 1,600 households in 40 VAGs in targeted GMAs applied)  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Increased yields (Introduction of conservation farming practices leads to improved soil organic matter and field intensification across 3,760 hectares)  |
| Were fire losses reduced in GMAs?  | Reduced rate of deforestation from late season fires in targeted GMA zones | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| Reduced fire losses in GMAs by at least 30% annually |
| Was forest degradation from unsustainable fuel wood collection practices, reduced in target GMAs? | Reduced rate of deforestation from fuel wood extraction in all targeted GMAs.  | Project documentation; Tracking Tools; Interviews with Project team and relevant stakeholders  | Documents review; consultation with Project team and relevant stakeholders  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** |
| Have the project and individual activities been implemented in line with the defined timeframe and budget, and in accordance with the Annual Workplans and Budgets? | Annual Workplans and Budgets (AWBs) are based on the results framework and total budget and workplan; Activities are implemented within the timeframe and budgets indicated in the AWBs | Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners, RTA | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Were the project monitoring and evaluation and reporting plans implemented satisfactorily and did they support the project's implementation? | Quarterly and Annual Reports submitted timely and provide adequate information on progress, bottlenecks, and proposed mitigation measures; M&E Plan implemented and used to improve the project's implementation | Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners, RTA | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Were risks, challenges and bottlenecks adequately and timely identified and mitigated? | Mitigation measures of identified bottlenecks and negative impact on implementation were implemented timely and effectively | Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Were any needs for adaptive management changes identified and implemented? | Adaptive management changes made and positively impacted project implementation | Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Was the project communication strategy designed and implemented satisfactorily and did it support achieving the project's objective and outcomes? | Project communication strategy elaborated, adopted and implemented; identified stakeholders and target groups were adequately informed | Project documentation; Communication materials; interviews with relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Were the project's management arrangement and support of the partner organizations adequate for enabling efficient implementation? | Project implemented smoothly. Support provided by UNDP facilitated implementation | Project documentation; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Was the project's financial management adequate? | Adequate, complete and detailed financial reports; audit | Project documentation, specifically - financial reports; Project team, UNDP CO and key national partners | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| Can sufficient financial sustainability be established before project end, to secure continuity?  | Committed permanent adequate annual government budgets; other financial resources | Project documentation; National agencies' documentation; interviews with relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Can institutional capacity be adequately established before project end, to secure sustainability of achieved project outcomes? | Adequate policy and legal framework adopted; Sufficient institutional and technical capacity established to secure continuity.  | Project documentation; National agencies' documentation; interviews with relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Can adequate socio-economic sustainability be secured before project end to enable continuity? | All relevant stakeholders at national and local levels are well informed and supportive of the project objectives | Project documentation; National agencies' documentation; interviews with relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |
| Are environmental risks identified and mitigated? | Environmental risks are analyzed and reported and mitigation measures proposed and implemented | Project documentation; National agencies' documentation; interviews with relevant stakeholders | Documents review; consultation with relevant stakeholders |

**Annex II. MTR Mission Itinerary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Activity | Location | Purpose |
| Sunday 19th February 2017 | 14:30  | Arrival on Flight ET 873 from Addis Ababa | KKIA |  |
| Monday 20th February 2017 | 09:00 -10:00  | Meeting with Project Coordinator UNDP/Programme Associate | UNDP | Overview of Project, review programme, logistics, and any other discussions |
|  | 10:00 -11:00 | MTR Team Detailed Meeting | UNDP | Planning and task division |
| 11:00 -12:00  | Meeting with Assistant Resident Representative  | UNDP | Discussion on Project |
| 12:00 -12:30 | Meeting with Resident Coordinator | UNDP | Courtesy call and discussion on Project |
| 12:30 - 13:00  | Meeting with Country Director (Officer-in-Charge) | UNDP | Courtesy call |
|  | 14:30 -15:30  | Meeting with Department of National Parks and Wildlife | DNPW Chilanga | Discussion on Project |
|  | 15:30 -16:30 | Meeting with Project Manager | DNPW, Chilanga | Overview of the Project, review programme |
| Tuesday 21st February 2017 | 09:00-10:00 | Meeting with Conservation Farming Unit  | CFU, New Kasama | Discussion on Project |
| 10:30-11:00  |  |  | Courtesy call |
| 11:30-12:00 |  |  | Courtesy call  |
| 12:00-13:00 | Meeting with Ministry of Agriculture  | Mulungushi House | Discussion on Project |
| 14:00-15:00 | Meeting with Director Forestry | Kwacha house | Discussion on Project  |
| 15:15-16:00 |  |  | Discussion on Project |
|  | 15:30 | Meeting with Permanent Secretary Ministry of Tourism and Arts |  |  |
|  | 16:00 -17:00 | Meeting with CBNRM Forum Coordinator | WWF | Discussion on Project |
| Wednesday 22nd February 2017 | 09:00-10:00 | Meeting with The Nature Conservancy  | TNC, Kabulonga/Victor | Discussion on Project  |
| 10:30-11:30 | Meeting with Finland (Cooperating Partner)  | Finnish Embassy  | Discussion on Project |
| 11:30-12:00 | Meeting with GEF Focal Point | Mulungushi House | Discussion on Project  |
| 14:00 -15:00 | Meeting with Zambia Climate Change Network (Steering Committee Member) | Mulungushi Conference Centre | Discussion on Project |
| 15:00 -16:00 | Meeting with National Heritage Conservation Commission (Steering Committee Member)  | NHCC | Discussion on Project |
| Thursday 23rd February 2017 | 10:00 -13:00 | MTR Team Planning | UNDP | Planning |
| 14:00  | Departure for Chisamba |  | For Inception Workshop  |
| Friday 24th February 2017 | 08:30-13:00  | Inception Meeting  | Chisamba | Presentation of Inception Report, discussions |
| 15:00  | Leave for Lusaka | Transit |  |
| Saturday 25th February 2017 | 09:00 – 10:00 | Director, Game Rangers International | Lusaka Ridgeway Sun Hotel | Discuss Project |
| 10:00 – 15:00  | Departure for Reconnaissance Field Visit to Kafue Ecosystem and surrounding GMAs Meeting with  | TBA | Discussing the Project |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | Warden – Chunga  | Chunga AMU Hqs and College | Discussing the Project |
| Sunday 26th February | 10:00-11:00 | Meeting with Project staff including Kafue ecosystem CLAs and POs  | Mumbwa | Discuss Project |
| 11:00 – 18:00 | Field Visit to Kafue National Park | Mumbwa | Appreciating status of National Park  |
| Monday 27th February 2017 | 09:00 – 10:00 | Senior Warden – Mumbwa  | NPW Office Mumbwa | Discussing the Project |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | DFO Mumbwa | Forestry Office Mumbwa |  |
| 10:30 – 11:30 | CFU Regional Manager for Western Region | CFU Regional Office Mumbwa |  |
| 11:30 – 14:00 | Recess/Lunch break | Place of residence |  |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | CFU Field Facilitators | CFU Regional Office Mumbwa |  |
| Tuesday 28th February 2017 | 08:00 – 08.30 | Travel to Kabulwebulwe | TRansit | Discussing the Project |
| 08:30 – 09:30 | Meet Kabulwebulwe CRB and VAG Chairpersons | Kabulwebulwe CRB Office |  |
| 09:30 – 13:30 | CFU FF Mumbwa and Lead Farmers – Mumbwa (4) | Mumbwa District Fields |  |
| 13:30 – 14.00 | Travel back to Mumbwa  | Transit |  |
| 14.00 – 15:00 | Rest/Late Lunch | Mumbwa |  |
| 15:00 – 17:30 | Travel to Itezhitezhi and overnight | Transit  |  |
| Wednesday 1st March 2017 | 08:30 – 09.00 | Meet Chilyabufu CRB with respective VAG chairpersons | Chilyabufu CRB Office | Discussing the Project |
| 09:00 – 13:30 | CFU FF Itezhitezhi and Lead farmers Itezhitezhi (4) | Itezhitezhi District fields |
| 13:30 – 17:30 | Travel to Nkeyema but overnight in Kaoma | Transit  |
| 08:00 – 18:00  | CBNRM Coordinator travels to Solwezi | Transit | Joining the MTR team in West Lunga Ecosystem |
| Thursday 2nd March 2017 | 09:00 – 13:00 | CFU FF Nkeyema and Lead Farmers Nkeyema (4) | Nkeyema District fields  | Discussing the Project |
| 13:00 – 17.00  | MTR team Travels to, and overnight in Lusaka | Transit |  |
| 08:00 – 17:00  | CBNRM Coordinator travels to Kasempa | Kasempa  |  |
| Friday 3rd March 2017  | 07:00 – 09:30 | MTR team flies to Solwezi | Transit |  |
| 09:30 – 12:00 | MTR travels to Kasempa |  |  |
| 12:00 – 12:30 | DC Kasempa | Kasempa Office | Discussing the Project |
| 12:30 – 13:00 | DFO Kasempa  | Forestry Office |  |
| 13:00 – 13:30 | Short Lunch break | Kasempa |  |
| 13:30 – 15:00 | Travel to Mubambe  | Transit  |  |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | Mubambe CRB and VAG Chairpersons | Mubambe |  |
| 16:00 – 17:30 | Travel back to Kasempa | Kasempa | Night Stop |
| Saturday 4th March 2017 | 07:00 – 11:00 | Travel to Manyinga | Transit |  |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | DC Manyinga | Manyinga Office | Discussing the Project |
| 11:30 – 12:00 | DFO Manyinga | Forestry Office |  |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Sikufele CRB and VAG Chairpersons  | Manyinga Loloma Sec Sch. |  |
|  | 13:00 | Recess | Manyinga | Night stay in Kabompo |
| Sunday 5th March 2017 | 08:00 – 17:00 | Reconnaissance field visit to West Lunga Ecosystem (up to Mayawu) | Manyinga |  |
| Monday 6th March 2017 | 07:00 – 08:30 | Travel to Mufumbwe | Transit |  |
| 08:30 – 09:00 | DC Mufumbwe | Mufumbwe office |  |
| 09:00 – 09:30 | DFO Mufumbwe and Warden Mufumbwe | Mufumbwe Office |  |
| 09:30 – 17:00 | Reconnaissance field visit to West Lunga National Park (Jivundu) | Mufumbwe |  |
| 17:00 – 18:00 | Travel back to Mufumbwe | Mufumbwe  | Night Stop  |
| Tuesday 7th 2017 | 08:00  | Leave for Solwezi |  |  |
| 11:30 – 12:00 | Provincial Forestry Officer – Solwezi | FD Solwezi Office  | Discussing the Project |
| 12:00 – 12:30 | Senior Wildlife Warden – Solwezi at NPW office | DNPW Solwezi Office | Discussing the Project |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | CLAs – West Lunga Ecosystem | DNPW Solwezi Office | Discussing the Project |
| Wednesday 8th March 2017 | 08:00 - 16:00 | **PUBLIC HOLIDAY – Women’s Day** Travel to Kabwe | Transit  | Night Stop |
| 16:00 – 18:00 | Planning for ToC Workshop | Kabwe |  |
| Thursday 9th March 2017 | 09:00 – 10:00 | Provincial Forestry Officer – Kabwe  | Kabwe | Discussing the Project |
| 10:00 – 11:00  | Travel to Chisamba | Transit |  |
| 11:00 – 15:00 | Lunch/recess | Chisamba |  |
| 15:00 – 16:00  | Meeting with Steering Committee | Chisamba | Discussing the Project |
| Friday 10th March 2017 | 11:00-13:00 | ToC Workshop | Chisamba | Participatory project planning and evaluation |
| 14:00-17:00 | ToC Workshop | Chisamba | Participatory project planning and evaluation |
| Saturday 11th March 2017 | 09:00  | Travel to Lusaka | Lusaka |  |
| Sunday 12th March 2017 |  | Analysis of Findings and presentation preparation | Lusaka |  |
| Monday 13th March 2017 | 09:00- 11:00 | **PUBLIC HOLIDAY – Youth Day**De-briefing/Wrap-up of the mission; Presentation of initial findings to UNDP CO, Project Team | UNDP |  |
| Tuesday 14th March 2017 | 09:00-11:00 | De-briefing/Wrap-up of the mission; Presentation of initial findings to FD, DNPW and key partners. Mission termination | TBA |  |
| TBA | International consultant leaves  |  |  |

**Annex III. List of People Interviewed**

**GEF 5 Project Staff**

1. Simbotwe Mwiya Mr. Project Manager Mumbwa
2. Flavian, K.C. Mupemo Mr. CBNRM Coordinator Mumbwa
3. Lucy L.Tembo Mrs. Project Officer Kasempa
4. Eneya M’simuko Mr. Project Officer Mufumbwe
5. Akabiwa Mukelabai Admin Assistant Mumbwa
6. Tedius Bulongo Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Chibuluma chiefdom
7. Gabriel Malembeka Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Mulendema chiefdom
8. Roy Mutelele Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Kabulwebulwe chiefdom
9. Ivy Mwinga Kapami Ms. Community Liaison Asst. Kaiungu chiefdom
10. Noah Sakalezhi Mr Community Liaison Asst. Shimbizhi chiefdom
11. Maclad Chuma Ms. Community Liaison Asst. Chilyabufu chiefdom
12. Peter Sinyungi Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Kahare chiefdom
13. Lemmy, M. Namukuka Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Mubambe chiefdom
14. Clinton, Munkombwe Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Kasempa chiefdom
15. Ernest Lupiya Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Matebo chiefdom
16. Alestah Mutuma Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Musele chiefdom
17. Lewis Sakuwaha Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Ntambu chiefdom
18. Alexson Kasanga Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Chibwika chiefdom
19. Brian Kamusaki Mr. Community Liaison Asst. Sikufele chiefdom

**UNDP**

Janet Rogan - UN Resident Coordinator, Zambia

Winnie Musonda - Ass. Resident Representative, Environment Advisor, UNDP Zambia

Nancy Mukumbuta - GEF V Project Coordinator, UNDP Zambia

Paul Harrison - Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)

**Ministry of Lands & Natural Resources - Forest Department**

Ignatius Makumba - Director

Wiseman Sangulube - Chief Forest Officer

Moses Kaumba - Forest Research Officer, GEF V Focal Point

Muyunda Mulako - Provincial Forest Officer, Solwezi

Godfrey Musonda - Provincial Forest Officer, Kabwe

Mwale Kachonta - Forest Officer (Mgt and Protection), Provincial

 Project Focal Point, Kabwe

Evesty Hang’andu - District Forest Officer, Mufumbwe

Kibra Mweetwa - District Forest Officer, Kasempa

Natasha Chikalaba - District Forest Officer, Manyinga

Anthony Mwewa - Ass. F.O, Manyinga

Robson Mpande - District Forest Officer, Mumbwa

**Ministry of Tourism and Arts**

Dr. Liya Mutale - Permanent Secretary

**Department of National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW)**

Paul Zyambo - Director

Phanwell Moonga - Senior Warden, KNP and GMAs

Charles Simwawa - Senior Warden, Solwezi

Mirriam Namushi - Area Warden, Chunga

Francis Samalumo - Area Warden, West Lunga

Berrington Mbwainga - WL police,Kashinankashi

**Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environment Protection**

Fishani Gondwe - Director, Environment

Muyunda Kanyata - Environmental Management Officer

**District Administration**

G.K. Sansakuwa - D.C. Kasempa

Kelvin Ndandanda - D. Adm Officer, Kasempa

Queen Manela - D.C. Manyinga

Sekeseke Chinyama - D.C. Mufumbwe

Patson Mulaisho - D. Admi. Officer, Mufumbwe

**Courtesy calls on Chiefs**

H.R.H. Chief Mubambe, Kasempa

H.R.H Chieftainess Kabulwebulwe, Mumbwa

**Cooperating Partners**

Elizabeth Ndlovu - Env. & Forest Officer, Finnish Embassy

**NGOs**

Collins Nkatiko - C.E.O, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Sinya Mbale - Commercial Manager, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Shepeard Phiri - Western Region Manager, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Josephat Banda - Field Officer, Mufumbwe, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Hitler Kalangwa - Lead Farmer, Mumbwa, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Christine Musowe - Lead Farmer, Mumbwa, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Hendrics Kambela - CFU supported farmer, Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)

Dr. Victor Siamudaala Country Director, The Nature Conservancy

Alimako Zulu - National Coordinator, Zambia CBNRM Forum

Sport Benthie - CEO, Game Rangers International

**Commercial Enterprises**

Justine Mubanga - Director, Kitebe Safaris Ltd

**Steering Committee representatives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name**  | **institution** | **Position**  |
| 1 | Chezan Suede | CBNRM | Policy working group  |
| 2 | Abba Banda Chandipo | Ministry of Energy/DOE | Snr Energy Officer |
| 3 | Maxwell Zulu | National Heritage Conservation Commission ( NHCC) | Education Officer |
| 4 | Bridget C. Mvula | NHCC | Publications Officer  |

 **Mayawu VAG Committee**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **NAME** | **GENDER** | **VILLAGE** | **POSITION** |
| 1 | Munyennu Jimmy | M | Mbunji  | Treasurer |
| 2 | Chikalavula Lawrence | M | Nyamwana  | W.D.C. |
| 3 | Samudashi Mark | M | Nyamwana  | C.D.C. |
| 4 | Ireen Munyevu | F | Mbunji  | Vice Chair |
| 5 | Helen Makayi | F | Nyamwana  | Member  |
| 6 | Lukama Juviness | F | Nyamwana  | Member  |

 **Sikufele CRB**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **NAME** | **GENDER** | **VILLAGE** | **POSITION** |
| 1 | Mutelemba Justine | M | Lunsongwa  | VAG/Secretary |
| 2 | Nawandu Billy | M | Chief’s Palace | Chief Rep. |
| 3 | Kosimu Zakewu | M | Chiteve  | V/Chair |
| 4 | Mukwakwa Kayombo | M | Chiteve  | Secretary  |
| 5 | Mutely Cardwel | M | Kashinakazhi  | C.D.C. |
| 6 | Kaleji Jackson | M | Lwasongwa | VAG Chair |
| 7 | Kufuna Caiphas | M | Kachikenge | VAG C/Person |
| 8 | Kayembi Silver | M | Mayawu | Secretary  |
| 9 | Munyenvu Elvis | M | Mayawu | VAG/Chairperson |
| 10 | Kiliyo Teddy  | M | Kashinakazhi | CRB Chairperson |
| 11 | Douglas Chipoya | M | Kachikenge | Member |

 **Chilyabufu CRB**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Name**  | **Committee** | **Position**  |
| 1 | Matildah Taguma | F.M.C | CRB Chairperson  |
| 2 | Joyce Shampule  | R.M.C | Vice Chairperson  |
| 3 | Edward Shimuunza | C.D.C | Vice Chairperson  |
| 4 | Felix Shanungu | C.R.B | Chairperson  |
| 5 | Dennis Shimuunza. | C.F.M.C | Vice Chairperson |
| 6 | Christopher S. Mwaanda | VAG | Head man (Chief Rep) |
| 7 | Sandas Munakayumba | C.D.C | Chairperson |
| 8 | Obert Nakalengwa | C.R.B | Member  |
| 9 | Dimas Nakalengwa  | C.R.B | Member  |

 **Mubambe CRB, Mufumbwe**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Name**  | **Institution** | **Position**  |
| 1 |  E.P. Mwita | F.M.C |   |
| 2 |  Chibuye Charles | C.R.B | Chairperson  |
| 3 | Zangata Jameson | C.D.C. | Chairperson  |
| 4 | Kawisha Getson | C.R.B | Secretary  |
| 5 | Haambulo Joseph | C.R.B | VAG Chairperson |
| 6 | Endani Simfukwe | C.R.B | Chief Rep/Sec  |
| 7 | Selenge Balison | C.R.B. | Chairperson |
| 8 | Benwell Kikope | C.R.B. | Member  |
| 9 | Zhovi Swaka | F.M.C | Chair VAG  |
| 10 | Mankishi Wedson | R.M.C | Secretary  |

**Kabulebwe CRB**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **NAME** | **POSITION** |
| 1 | CHAINDA JOSHUA | CRB BOOKKEEPER |
| 2 | WILSON MULOWA | RMC |
| 3 | MARK KAMENGA | VICE CDC |
| 4 | CHIBWANTU AGNESS | VICE FMC |
| 5 | CHINYAM JOSEPH | WARD COUNCILLOR |
| 6 | PRINCE LLOYD | VICE CHAIR- |
| 7 | MWIBA GETRUDE | CHAIR-NALUSANGA VAG |
| 8 | KENNETH MULAMATA | BAORD MEMBER |

**Annex IV. List of Documents Reviewed**

The following documents were provided by UNDP-Zambia, the Project team, DNPW, Forest Department, and other stakeholders, to support the MTR process.

**IV.A. Project Documentation**

1. The Project Document (PRODOC) and Annexes
2. Addendum to the PRODOC
3. Project Identification Form (PIF)
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. GEF focal area Tracking Tools (Biodiversity, November 2016; Climate Change Mitigation, November 2016; Land Degradation, November 2016)
6. METTs for KNP and GMAs, WLNP and GMAs – November 2016
7. Inception Meeting Report, July 2014
8. Project Inception Report
9. UNDP Initiation Plan
10. Annual Workplans (AWP) – 2014; 2015; 2016
11. Project Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports – 2014 (Q3, Annual); 2015 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Annual); 2016 (Q1, Q2, Q3, Annual)
12. Steering Committee Meeting Minutes (20.2.2014; 24.11.2015; 15.3.2016)
13. The Project Implementation Review report (PIR 2015, 2016)
14. Sample of Concept notes
15. Audit Reports (2014, 2015)
16. Bwalya- Mukumbuta, N. and S. Mwiya. 2017. Raising Awareness on Community Protectionof the Biodiversity of West Lunga National Park and Surrounding Areas
17. Colenbrander, W. 2016. KNP Strategic Plan for Improved Management Effectiveness and Increased Revenue
18. Mbumwae, V. 2016. Inception Report on the Consultancy to Facilitate Development of Databases for Kafue and West Lunga Ecosystems
19. Syampungani, S., L. Chama, V. Nyirenda, S. Siachooono and H. Shamaoma. 2016. Provision of Consultancy Services to Facilitate Land Use Planning Trough Development of the Integrated Land Use Assessment Planning Systems in Kafue and West Lunga Ecosystems. Copperbelt University.
20. Syampungani, S., L. Chama, V. Nyirenda, S. Siachooono and H. Shamaoma. 2016. Report on consultancy services offered on the integrated land use planning for the Kafue and West Lunga Ecosystems. Copperbelt University.
21. Syampungani, S., L. Chama, V. Nyirenda, S. Siachooono and H. Shamaoma. 2016. Training Manual in Participatory Resource Assessment and Land Use Planning
22. Munthali, S. 2016. Review of the Law Enforcement Systems in the Kafue and West Lunga Ecosystems
23. Integrated Land Use Plans (ILUPs) – Maunga VAG in Namwala GMA; Kalunzyu VAG in Mumbwa GMA; Kaminzekenzeke VAG in Kasonso Busanga GMA; Kanzenzi VAG in Chibwika GMA
24. Mwiya, S. 2015. Field Trip Report
25. Detailed ToRs of the MTR assignement
26. Quarter 1 and 2, Review Meeting Report, August 2015.

**IV. B. Other supporting documents received from stakeholders**

1. Project site maps - KNP and WLNP maps
2. The Zambia Wildlife Act, 2015
3. The Forest Act, Zambia, 2015
4. Ministry of National Development Planning, 2011 - Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP), 2011-2015
5. Ministry of National Development Planning, 2013 - Revised Sixth National Development Plan, 2013-2016
6. Ministry of National Development Planning, 2017 - Seventh National Development Plan (7NDP), 2017-2021
7. DNPW, 2016. Report on the 2015 Aerial Survey in Zambia. Population Estimates of African Elephants in Zambia.Vol.1.
8. ZAWA Guidelines for CRB elections, 2013
9. DNPW. 2016. Kafue Region Annual Report
10. ZAWA. 2014. Kafue National Park. General Management Plan.
11. Siampale, M.A., Boniface, H. and Levy, N., 2015. The Forest Survey (Inventory) Report for areas around West Lunga National Park (WLNP( and Great Kafue National Parks (GKNP(, North-western and Central Provinces of Zambia. Forestry Department
12. CFU. 2011. The practice of Conventional and Conservation Agriculture in East and Southern Africa
13. Sitambuli, E. and M. Sinyinza, 2016. Findings of a Baseline and Needs Assessment Survey for the Conservation and Climate Smart Agriculture Project. UNDP/GEF and CFU
14. Kalumbila Trident Foundation. Concept Note for the Conservation of Biodiversity in the West Lunga Management Area,North Western Province, Zambia 2016 - 2020
15. Kalumbila Trident Foundation. WLMA Support Project – Quarterly reports Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4, 2016
16. Finland Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2016. Decentralised Forest and other Natural Resources Management Programme – Introduction Project Improving natural resources – increasing values – changing lives. Summary Review of 2016 & Priorities for 2017
17. Swennenhuis, J., J. Lunda and P. White. (FCG International Ltd) 2016. Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Decentralised Forest and other Natural Resources Management Programme - Introduction Project. Finland Ministry for Foreign Affairs
18. Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects

**Annex V. Theory of Change Workshop Summary**



DRAFT REPORT ON THE THEORY OF CHANGE WORKSHOP

HELD IN SUPPORT OF MID-TERM REVIEW OF GEF V PROJECT (Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around the Greater Kafue National Park and West Lunga National Park in Zambia)

HELD AT FRINGILLA LODGE IN CHISAMBA

10TH MARCH 2017

Minutes presented by: Noah Zimba, Green Basin Naturals

**Table of contents**

[Table of contents 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280178)

[Acronyms 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280179)

[Summary 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280180)

[Summary of key discussions 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280181)

[Conclusion and Key recommendation 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280182)

[Annexures 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280183)

[Annex 1: Summary of stakeholder submissions 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280184)

[Annex 2: Analysis of indicators 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280185)

[Annex 3: Standard flow chart of payment approval and disbursement 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280186)

[List of participants 2](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CTamar%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.IE5%5CUSRSUED2%5CFInal%20Draft%20TOC%20TRAINING%20WORKSHOP%20REPORT%2024-03-17.docx#_Toc477280187)

**Acronyms**

CBNRM Community Based Natural Resources Management

CLAs Community Liaison Assistants

CRB Community Resource Board

DDCC District Development Coordinating Committee

DNPW Department of National Parks and Wildlife

EIA Environmental Impact Assessment

FD Forestry Department

GEF Global Environment Facility

GMA Game Management Area

ICT Information Communication Technology

IP’s Implementing Partners

KNP Kafue National Park

M&E Monitoring and Evaluation

MTR Medium Term Review

PA Protected Area

PDCC Provincial Development Coordinating Committee

PPP Public Private Partnership

TNC The Nature Conservancy

ToC Theory of Change

UNDP United National Development Programme

VAG’S Village Action Group

ZAWA Zambia Wildlife Authority

**Summary**

The Theory of Change (ToC) workshop was held to provide stakeholders participating in the implementation of the Global Environment Fund V (GEFV) Project aimed at reducing threats on wildlife and forestry resources that are prevalent in the Great Kafue National Park and West Lunga National Park ecosystems. Holding of the workshop was undertaken to build capacities of stakeholders as well as strengthen the Mid-Term Review process through participatory engagement and input from various stakeholders directly or indirectly associated with implementation of GEF V Project.

The workshop served as an important platform for empowering stakeholders with key participatory approaches in undertaking the Mid-Term Review using an interactive vehicle for obtaining stakeholders input on project delivery status outlook so far. Its delivery applied a participatory approach and tools that encouraged input from an array of project stakeholders and also provided stakeholder owned perspective with regards to key aspects of project delivery.

Participants in the ToC were drawn from staff of the two Implementing Partners (IPs), Forestry Department and Department of National Parks and Wildlife, other relevant government representatives, and community based stakeholders as well as non-stakeholders, thereby creating a representative blend of stakeholders. This served as a necessary attribute in generating a balanced and objective stakeholder owned Mid-Term Review of the GEF V Project.

In order to provide a knowledge based basis of common understanding, the international Consultant provided an overview on the ToC scope and approach. It was evident that the training session enriched the process of undertaking the Mid-Term Evaluation by creating an interactive and open platform that enabled objective contribution from participants. Undoubtedly the training workshop served as an instrument for delivering project evaluation of efficacy as well as build stakeholder ownership of the evaluation process as affirmed by the participants during its review.

**Summary of key discussions**

The workshop consisted of deliberations that were consistent with other submissions submitted by stakeholders during the field wide interactions that the Consultant engaged. The ToC deepened objective and triangulated diagnosis and analysis of key aspects regarding the project delivery outlook. It was clear that submissions advanced by stakeholders during the ToC workshop provided a unique and informative platform relevant in enhancing the execution of the Mid-Term Review as it directly complemented the submissions obtained from the stakeholders during the respective earlier engagement and consultations that the Consultants had undertaken.

Stakeholders used the workshop to provide their contribution and in some cases seek clarifications to illuminate delivery perspective on specific parameters and milestones espoused under the review framework including the field visits that were undertaken by the Consultants. The field visits and interactions undertaken were important to provide the Consultants with an indicative perspective and appreciation of observed transformational impacts attributed to the Project’s investments, with special attention on reducing threats on the integrity of wildlife and forestry resources. While it was evident that there were clear challenges that had been highlighted as negatively affecting the speed and scale of delivery, largely associated with bottlenecks in accessing means of implementation as well as the expanse of the area, there were notable milestones that had been recorded and remained major realities affirming the relevance and potential of the project to succeed.

Consequently the training workshop observed that the project remained an important undertaking with clear significance to strengthen sustainable management of wildlife and forestry resource in Zambia. Thus it was important to ensure that the identified operational challenges observed to constrain speedy execution of activities required to be redressed with urgency. Specifically aspects requiring speedy and enhanced disbursement of financial resources were identified as a serious bottleneck that inhibited timely delivery of activities. Of significance stakeholders identified poor cohesion between forestry and wildlife staff especially at local level causing tension. Specifically there was a strong call that the two IPs needed to strengthen coordination and cooperation in order to use their respective comparative advantages and enhance delivery.

Above all, stakeholders expressed serious concern with the lead time associated with approval of activities and disbursement of financial resources, which appeared to be out of alignment with the spirit and expectation of standard project approach and implementation.

The workshop also provided time for stakeholders to interact on the general activity approval and disbursement procedure currently being used in support of GEF V activities. The summary of this flow chart is herein contained in Annex 3.

**Conclusion and key recommendation**

Participants appreciated the ToC workshop as having an informative and open forum to enhance not only local capacities but importantly a forum that provided stakeholder perspective on the delivery trajectory of the GEF V Project. The platform was unique as it provided dual benefits through acquisition of knowledge by stakeholders as well as provision of an avenue to deepen input contribution in support of the Mid-Term Review of the GEF V Project.

Recognising the need to address the key factors identified as being some of the core drivers impeding effective execution of the GEF V Project, stakeholders called for urgent measures and action to redress key bottlenecks associated with delays in approval of activities and disbursement of financial resources. The meeting emphasised and agreed that before the recruitment of a Project Finance Officer was realized it was critical to undertake interim measures that will support speedy and enhanced delivery of activities. This was identified as the need to hold a workshop that will serve as a one stop shop to facilitate approval of activities and sanction disbursement of financial resources for enabling implementation of activities. It was proposed that such approval should cover a period of the entire year. The interim measures were considered as being necessary to address the observed challenges that had inhibited disbursement of resources and affected delivery of activities the entire quarter before the recruitment of the Finance Officer.

**Annexures**

**Annex 1: Summary of stakeholder submissions**

1. Project objective and component
	1. Objectives:

To reduce threats around the two ecosystems (KNP and West Lunga National Parks) and maintain their carbon sinks. Poaching, deforestation and fires were highlighted as the main threats to resource integrity in the Protected Areas (PAs)

2. Gaps/Bottlenecks/Challenges

Various challenges, gaps and bottlenecks that negatively impacted on delivery of the project were also highlighted and are highlighted as part of this summary

3. Outcomes/Achievements/Progress

1.2.1. Outcome 1: Management effectiveness and financial sustainability

1.2.2 Outcome 2: Sustainable forest and wildlife management around the GMAs

4. Overview of progress done so far

4.1 Component 1:

* the development of KNP strategy by the Consultant was reported to be on going
* Study to inform support to Law Enforcement had been completed and its findings had already started being rolled out. Law Enforcement value chain consisting of investigation, prosecution was attendant support to the 3 Law Enforcement units that had been formed in Mumbwa, Kasempa and Mufumbwe. 3 Toyota Land cruisers motor vehicles had been acquired, 3 computers acquired and assigned in the respective units

4.2 Component 2:

* Forestry baseline had been undertaken for the entire ecosystem which had defined the rate of deforestation and informed specific interventions
* Land use planning was initiated through Copperbelt University which had been retained as Consultant for the task which envisaged facilitating land use planning in each of the 27 VAGs. The initial ones had captured 2 in West Lunga ecosystem and 4 in Mumbwa ecosystem. Multi-stakeholder team had also been trained in land use planning.
* Crosscutting elements under the two outcomes highlighted data capture and sharing as being undertaken by the consultant and expected to culminate in development of data base that will be linked to the remote sensing centre with participation of the two Implementing Partners
* Conservation Farming had been rolled out in 3 districts, in partnership with Conservation Farming Unit with significant results already evidenced
* Fire management was being undertaken as a crosscutting concern under the two outcomes. Interventions had been started in partnership with TNC with the ultimate aim to develop a fire management strategy. Currently a situation analysis was being undertaken that will lead to establishment of the status of fire management and strategy
* Other activities done were noted be more of being process issue necessary to support delivery of the respective activities
* Procurement of protective Law Enforcement attire and camping kits had been done and distributed to the two PA systems (West Lunga and Kafue)

Additional submissions

* The significance of the existing local governance structures that the project was working with and collaboration with
* The project steering committee had been established and operational
* Project contribution to strengthening enhanced coordination between forestry and wildlife departments and creating of functional platform for discussing strategic issues around resource conservation
* On Component 2; it was observed that awareness among the local communities had been created triggering appreciation of significance of wildlife, forestry and fisheries including formation of conservation groups
* Component 1: In partnership with safari operators project investment had incentivized livelihood activities undertaken through the groups in areas of fisheries, forestry with some key opportunities in beekeeping, improved breeds of goats
* The working relationship between FD and DNPW at local level appear to face some challenges that were recognized to be impacting the local level actions including relationship with actors such as Chiefs
* Governance structures have enabled inclusion of 40% of women gender in participation in decision making fostering gender inclusion and participation
* During preparatory stage of the project support was provided towards review of the Wildlife Policy
* Some capacity building had been undertaken among the IPs through provision of vehicles, office furniture, established project management units and field offices in respective areas with aim of strengthening delivery of activities
* Additionally training of IP staff in Swaziland that empowered understanding of EIAs
* Procurement of motorbikes for Community Liaison Assistants has strengthened local level mobility
* With the Project support, reduction in the levels of illegal harvesting of wildlife and forestry resources triggering change of mindset (transformational)
* Orientation workshop for VAGs and CRB members was undertaken that enabled them to better understand their roles

*5.0 Some gaps: what can be done to address the challenges in support of the project objectives?*

* Administrative aspects of Mumbwa office require completion by ensuring that sufficient financial capacities and resources are availed
* From energy sector; need to improve relationship between the FD and charcoal producers and avoid the cat and mouse game and foster that of more of partnership
* Enhanced awareness to strengthen access of available information and existing resources among stakeholders
* Support to FD for enhanced delivery of activities especially with regards to transport is required
* Due to poor relationship between FD and charcoal producers appear to often require the protection of police whenever undertaking forestry patrols
* Building capacity of local communities in resources management is an urgent need as local communities are better placed in execution and appreciation of the resources
* Support to law enforcement: may require legal empowerment of the local communities to avoid acting out of ignorance. Enable communities undertake their own advocacy
* FD thrust: the existing capacity under Forestry Department require operational funds to enhance its performance. Suggestion included revenue retention in the respective generation areas to incentive operational support/resources. This was in view that the current levels of resources being made available to FD remained too limited and therefore inhibited delivery and undertaking of standard forestry management practices (e.g. boundaries, early burning, etc.)
* FD relationship with charcoal producers is further impaired by the dual role of Forestry Officers (Extension and law enforcement); especially that the new Forestry Act has provisions to encourage community participation
* National heritage: training of project implementers on how to identify and contribute to the conservation of heritage sites was important
* Revenue sustainability: need for strengthened and broadened measures to support income generation at scale necessary to meet sustainability needs. Also need to address the issues of appropriate infrastructure required to contribute to revenue generation and support enhanced conservation/protection of the ecosystems
* CBNRM: there was need for enhanced linkages between VAGS (CLAs) with the DNPW in deploying the CBNRM activities as it will also support sustainability
* Called for more proactive approach by the extension arms of DNPW to support the local communities
* Forestry sustainable management required strengthened staffing levels to undertake extension activities and sensitize communities. On the need for conservation it was observed that there was need to reboot the coup system to allow sustainable harvesting and management of forestry resources.
* Use of the transport procured by the Project currently expected to be under shared arrangement between the two IPs that seem to have faced some operational limitations and could be better addressed by having designated institutional transport for each partner
* Need for inclusive recognition of the respective roles of respective partners and encourage better information sharing and input
* Community forestry management; need to be strengthened by addressing issues of benefit sharing including aspects of forestry concession that is responsive to community expectations and contribution.
* Optimize on the existing opportunities

*CONT: Focused project delivery effectiveness improvement recommendations (sequencing of interventions with livelihood being central)*

* Livelihood perspective should migrate away from promoting dependency syndrome by encouraging community contribution and foster ownership
* Strengthened provision of awareness materials (posters, etc.) especially by the IPs important
* Planning: joint activity planning by the IPs should be encouraged to encourage better use of available facilities and activity delivery including use of project transport
* Strategic plan will provide important mirror on how to sequence and position the respective activities within the project timeframe and resources
* Fires: there is need to provide information parks that will be used by communities in dealing with fire with highlights of scenarios and key hot spots
* Leveraging possible existing facilities such as transport where available should be explored
* Information sharing: need improvement to ensure that all project implementing partners remained abreast of the activities. Use of existing platform such as DDCC, PDDC will assist to broaden stakeholders and benefit. Suggested the use of protocols for information sharing. Also report sharing after every activity routinely
* Speedy disbursement of financial resources to support implementation of proposed activities
* Information sharing could be strengthened by use of ITC tools such as WhatsApp
* Recommended for active engagement of existing security wings infrastructure at local level in order to strengthen execution of Law Enforcement activities
* Noted that the project should serve as a catalyst that will trigger resilient and long lasting innovations e.g. establishing of project supervisory team and deepen delivery, quarterly or monthly meeting to preview project and un lock challenges before they become deeper
* Need for the M&E to be downscaled at local level to ensure effective uptake, penetration and adherence
* Responsive and quicker attention to financial request with efficient disbursement procedures was necessary. Added that there is room to improve financial disbursement in order to address the long gestation time required to effect payment. This could be through use of more innovation and accountability approaches that ensure that response is given to every concept note submitted in order to provide not only understanding but also capacity building to generators as well as absorption rates
* Enhanced collaboration of Law Enforcement between the two resource managers to realise efficacy
* Need for IPs and project stakeholders to understand the project document sufficiently in order to deepen delivery and operate within the spirit of the Project
* CLAs should work closely with IP so that their activities are integrated and captured within the DDCC and PDDC
* Encourage GEF V Project investment to prioritise alleviation of vulnerability of local communities and empower them with transformational alternatives
* Enhance understanding of GEF V Project to avoid mal-delivery, conflicts to the design framework and orientation, by migrating more towards additionality rather than business as usual. Noted that while acknowledging the project document limitations explore and sequence the most promising measures and actions through the MTR
* Enhance information sharing and communication between project managers and Implementing Partners. Strengthen information sharing among Implementing Partners and those associated with the Project to ensure tracking and awareness
* Need to identify strategic issues of the project that will catalyse success and impact
* Law Enforcement; need to broaden attention beyond village scouts by broadening the entire law enforcement infrastructure necessary to support resource protection as project adaptive management
* Respond to the change bearing with the shift/revert from ZAWA to DNPW

**Annex 2: Analysis of indicators**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Type of indicators** | **Rating**  | **Comment** |
| Component 1 | 1. Increase in management effectiveness tracking tool
 | Yet to be assessed |  |
|  | 1. Wildlife stocking rates
 | * Improved siting of wildlife in West Lunga NP
* KNP suggest improvement and stability
 | Include wildlife fly distance as an additional indicatorBreak the second indicator into 2 aspects that identified as to (i) capture the flag ship species and (ii) general number of species |
|  | 1. Reduced *un planned area* burned annually from ***late fires***
 | Yet to be assessed but baseline in place | Indicator was enhanced by insertion of late firesWith partnership with TNC able to undertake monitoring in real time |
|  | 1. Reduced GHG emission from ***late fires*** in ***targeted areas*** of the parks and Forest reserves
 |  | The indicator should be limited to targeted areas only and limited to late fires |
|  | 1. Reduction in funding gap of the targeted NP moving up one category (based on REMNPAS financial viability assessment) with at least one new PPP formed as a result of this project
 |  | The overall funding gap strategy however may require broader interventions than simply PPP* Explore to what extent Kalumbila would extend to and distinguish it from social coprorate responsibility
* Africa Parks are currently under negotiations for the KNP
 |
|  | 1. PES maintaining watershed/river catchments by communities **“*in KNP benefitting ZESCO”*[[1]](#footnote-1)**
 |  | Currently has not moved much as call for consultant resulted in a blank with no expressed interest* Remove the specificity on KNP and ZESCO as this may be useful in other areas
 |
| Component 2 | 1. “Community ***“conservancies***[[2]](#footnote-2)”
 |  | Replacement of the indicator with the changes reflected in the addendum  |
|  | 1. VAGs legally established
 |  | * Boundary aspects require input of the village headmen without highlighting aspects of chiefdom.
* The issue of land alienation if not well attended can contribute to trigger conflicts and threaten mutual relationship with CRBs
* If attempted need to reduce to 5 from the targeted 25
 |
|  | 1. ILUA plans completed for all VAGs
 | 6 already done | Being scaled up to the targeted 25  |
|  | 1. At least 40% women representation in VAGs and increased per capita household income
 | Achieved | * Recommended to separate the indicator in 4 components
* 40 % of women participating in the VAG’s governance
* Increased per capita should be measured for women headed household
* % of women who benefit from economic activities under the VAGs
* Increase per capita increase of households
 |
|  | 1. Conservation farming practices applied in targeted GMAs with increased yields
 | Well delivered | * A consultant to assist in determining the avoided GHG emission
 |
|  | 1. Demonstration of avoided deforestation (no net loss) in at least 25 VAGs establishing REDD pilots linking to national and/or voluntary carbon financing
 |  | Consider reducing the target from 25 to 10 |
|  | 1. Reduced rate of deforestation from late season fire in targeted GMA zones
 |  | Retained to limit to the 8 GMAs |
| Additional notes:* Indicator to include number of indigenous seedling planted as part of assisted regeneration could be considered to already being covered under the regeneration project
* Efforts being done by other partners should be brought in synergy to accelerate achievement the ultimate aspirations
* Need to make a case for business/economic centre that allows resource retention within the GMAs. Suggested to reflect as one of the recommendation. Consider using the PPP as a way to actualise the case for resource retention
* Need to enhance use of the existing planning units DDCC and PDCCC
* UNDP highlighted the steps and process that will inform finalization of the MTR report by June 2017
* Facilitate a workshop to bridge accelerated approval and disbursement of the activities and financing for the entire quarter before the procurement of the Finance Officer
 |

**FEED BACK ON THE ToC**

After the training session participants were invited to provide their impressions and assessment on whether or not ToC served any value addition to not only the knowledge pool but importantly to undertaking evaluation using participatory approach and tools

* Useful and should be encouraged
* Called for continued interactive and collective participation and obtain feed back
* Very productive and enabled to highlight a number of important aspects and appreciated the space for adaptive management
* The interaction was very useful and looks forward to capture more lessons from the project landscape to address even what seemingly appear like challenges
* Need to deploy attention to the sustainability thrust and strategy

**Annex 3: Standard flow chart of payment approval and disbursement**

1.0 Community Liaison Assistant/office with in-puts of CRB’s and VAG’s (5)

2.0 Forestry /wildlife at the district office (5)

3.0 Project Officers (5)

4.0 CBNRM Coordinator/Project Manager (5)

5.0 Directorate of FD/ DNPW issue the request for payment (5)

6.0 Project Coordinator at UNDP/The Env Advisor may see it or not (5)

7. 0 Processing of requisition (5)

8.0 Approval of the requisition (5)

9.0 Preparation of purchase order (5)

10.0 Approval of voucher (5)

11.0 Preparation of the cheque or money transfer (5) = Est total 55

**List of participants**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME | ORGANISATION | POSITION | EMAIL | NUMBER |
| 1 | Absolom Sakala | MWDSEP | EMO | Absolomsakala@gmail.com | 0976365437 |
| 2 | Moses Kaumba | FD | Research officer | kaumba@ymail.com | 0977187642 |
| 3 | Francis Samalum | DNPW | Area Warden | Francis501@gmail.com | 0979281124 |
| 4 | Charles Simwawa | DNPW | SWW | simwawacs@yahoo.co.uk | 0976412251 |
| 5 | Laura Sinyama | UNDP | Programme Associate | Laura.sinyama@undp.org | 0976836616/0962306515 |
| 6 | Nancy Bwalya-Mukumbuta | UNDP | Project Coordinator | Nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org | 0977359728 |
| 7 | Bridget C.Mvula | NHCC | Publications Officer | chitalubmc@gmail.com | 0973311243 |
| 8 | Maxwell Zulu | NHCC | Education officer | zulumaxwell@gmail.com | 0977880137 |
| 9 | Winnie Musonda | UNDP | ARR/EA | Winnie.musonda@undp.org | 0977770405 |
| 10 | Chiselebwe Ng'andwe | Consultant MTR |  | chiselebwen@yahoo.com | 0966859433 |
| 11 | Tamar Ron | Consultant MTR |  | tamarron@bezeqint.net |  |
| 12 | Mwale Kwachenta | FD | Forestry Officer | kwachomwale@gmail.com | 0977789708 |
| 13 | Moonga Phanwell | DNPW | Senor warden | mosungazooq@yahoo.co.uk | 0977827430 |
| 14 | Crissy Niamwiza | FD | Principle tech | C\_niamwiza@yahoo.com | 0977530574 |
| 15 | Santos C. Misnkombwe | GEF V | CLAs | santosmonkombwe@gmail.com | 0977446799 |
| 16 | Lemmy H Masiy |  | CLAs | lemasiye@yahoo.com | 09660217462 |
| 17 | Alestah Mutuma |  | CLAs | Alestahmutuma2016@gmail.com | 0971581173 |
| 18 | Roy Mulelele |  | CLAs | roymulelele@yahoo.com | 0978649421 |
| 19 | Peter Sinyongu |  | CLAs | Sinyongu2005@gmail.com | 0979924576 |
| 20 | Eversty Hangandu | FD | District Forestry officer | everstyhangandu@yahoo.com | 0977470308 |
| 21 | Flavian Mupemo | GEF V |  | fmupemo@yahoo.com | 0977753622 |
| 22 | Kasanga Alexson | GEF V | CLAs Chibwika | alecsonkas@gmail.com | 0974678489 |
| 23 | Lupiya Ernest |  | CLAs Matebo | ernestolupiya@gmail.com | 0964116180 |
| 24 | Akabiwa Mukelebia | GEF V | Admin assistant | akabiwam@yahoo.com | 0977801744 |
| 25 | Sinya Mbale | CFU | Lusaka | sinya@conservationagriculture | 0965238008 |
| 26 | Anna Banda C | Dept of Energy | Snr. Energy Officer | Chandipobanda.ac@gamail.com | 0979400771 |
| 27 | Chezen Suede | CBNRM forum | PWG Member | chezensuedeoyyu@gmail.com | 0950398247 |
| 28 | Lucy tembo | GEF V | Project officer kasempa | lucytembo@yahoo.co.uk | 0977497350 |
| 29 | Brian Kaiyysaki | GEF V | CLAs | kamusakib@gmail.com | 0977921795 |
| 30 | Gabriel Malembeka | GEF V | CLAs | gabrialmalembeka@gmail.com | 0972024556 |
| 31 | Victor Siamudaala | TNC | Country Director | vmsiamudaala@tnc.org | 0966701239 |
| 32 | Mulako Muyunda | FD | Forestry Officer | kingmuyunda@gmail.com | 0977525797 |
| 33 | Maclady Chuma | GEF V | CLAs | macladychuma@gmail.com | 0978058056 |
| 34 | Bulongo Teddius |  | CLAs | teddiusbulongo@yahoo.com | 0972500064 |
| 35 | Ivy M. Kapami |  | CLAs | Ivykapami2016@gmail.com | 0972918658 |
| 36 | Natasha Chikalaba | FD | DFO | nchikalaba@yahoo.com | 0977661493 |
| 37 | Lewis Sakuwaha |  | CLAs | Lewissakuwaha2017@gmail.com |  |
| 38 | Noah sakalezhi |  | CLAs | noahsakalaelm@gmail.com | 0979340619 |
| 39 | Likukela.S.Lubinda | DNPW | Senior Planner Focal Point person | likusum@yahoo.co.uk | 0977533364 |

**Annex VI: Proposed revision of the Project's Organizational Structure and Financial Management System**

**CURRENT PROJECT ADMINISTRATION**- **Management Arrangements**

In the assessment of project administrative and management arrangements, the Mid Term Review Team has relied on standard corporate governance principles and best practices as well as the standard principles and best practices of project management.

A. **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

Consistent with global trends, the government of Zambia has embraced corporate governance as a national strategy for the promotion of transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness not only in public service delivery but also in the private sector. The essential elements of corporate governance include systems and procedures for the regulation and harmonization of various operational roles to promote an operational environment in which accountable conduct of all leads to optimal efficiency and effectiveness of human and other resources in a given organization. Effective controls are an active ingredient in corporate governance system. It is a basic principle of corporate governance to codify the key systems and procedures for easy guidance of all involved.

For a project like GEF V which has its own autonomous audits, independent of the audits of its principals, it is necessary for the project organization to conform to basic principles and good practices of corporate governance. The MTET has therefore reviewed the corporate governance systems and practices of the project as an autonomous entity. The analysis is premised on two assumptions:

1. A fundamental principle of management by project is to free project activities from the bureaucracy of the parent organization by creating an autonomous subsidiary organization structure with a specified budget of human and other resources. In the case of GEF V project it is freedom from the bureaucracies of the key organizations UNDP, Forest department and DNPWL which have the final responsibility for the effective implementation of the project activities. The rationale for shifting specified activities from the regular organizational arrangements of the parent organization(s) to a project is often the realization of limitations of the organizational capacities of the parent institution(s) to cope effectively with the demands of these activities especially since these are often transitory rather than permanent activities.
2. Under corporate governance principles, a project which has original accountabilities and is subject to independent audits that are separate from those of the parent organization(s) should have autonomous organization structure that conforms to sound corporate governance principles.

**Review of current organization arrangements**

The current organization arrangements for the project involve UNDP as Implementing Agency; two executing agencies (EAs) being the Forest department and the DNPWL (originally ZAWA); Steering Committee; quarterly meetings; and the project team. The project document provided a role for the Kafue Business Centre which disappeared after the transformation of ZAWA into the DNPWL. The resultant changes in the original organization structure have been absorbed without clear written direction. Indeed, the current effective organizational arrangements do not appear to be systematically codified, and the analysis is mainly based on the practices of the project key players rather than any written formal organization structure.

**Steering committee**

No terms of reference for the Steering Committee were availed to the consultants. The minutes of the 1st Steering Committee meeting held 20/02/2014 specifically queried the absence of the Terms of Reference. The authoritative answer given to consultants was that there are no codified TOR for the Steering Committee beyond those contained in the Project Document. A review of the Project Document shows no mention of a steering committee, but inter-ministerial committee whose role was specified in the Project Document. The apparent substitution of steering committee for the inter-ministerial committee may have been driven by standard practice of UNDP projects, but appears not to have been formally sanctioned.

The absence of formal written terms of reference has the risk of creating ambiguities in the expectations of the key players. Indeed, many people connected to the project believe that the steering committee is supposed to meet twice a year, while the Project Document provides for one meeting a year for the inter-government committee to receive project manager’s report.

Although the project document referred to the inter-ministerial committee which has been operationalized as the steering committee as “Board”, this organ cannot qualify as a primary oversight organ mainly because it only meets once or twice a year. An oversight body that conforms to good corporate governance principles must meet at least once a quarter and as necessary to monitor performance, and make decisions for necessary remedial measures.

From the nomenclature of inter-ministerial committee and the prescribed role of “linking the project to national processes” the committee appears to have been conceived primarily as a policy organ. It is not unusual in project management to have a steering committee that meets quarterly and fulfills oversight responsibilities in addition to a policy role. The MTR team has noted the common practice in UNDP projects of steering committees that meet twice a year, and therefore finds it more practical to maintain the steering committee as a fundamentally policy organ with ultimate responsibility for strategic decisions. It may be more practical to consider other options for addressing any observed vacuum in primary oversight responsibilities in the project organization structure.

In the standard government practice, any inter-ministerial committee is usually set at high level representation of Permanent Secretaries or Director level. A review of the minutes and attendance lists of steering committee meetings shows that Ministries have often been represented by officials lower than the rank of Director. This is not consistent with the high mandate associated with the steering committee. Indeed, inappropriate or ineffective representation of Ministries can undermine basic decision making of the Committee. The minutes of the Steering Committee of 24November, 2015 show that the Committee meeting felt inadequate to take decisions on issues which were within the competence of the Committee mainly because of the low level of representation of Ministries. The meeting resolved to ask the most senior person at the meeting who was the only Director and Chair to refer the issue to two Permanent Secretaries and “seek guidance”.

Moreover, many member institutions have been represented at these meetings by different individuals. This practice has the effect of robing the committee of some continuity. It is observed that during this MTE mission, a meeting of the steering committee scheduled for interaction with the consultants was aborted because many key institutions were not there, and the only four individuals who attended appeared to have been “casually” chosen among staff members who had not even attended a single steering committee meeting. While the evaluation team could not read much from this situation, it raised the question about the general attitude towards the steering committee.

**Quarterly meetings**

Quarterly meetings involving UNDP, the two EAs and other stakeholders are conducted to review progress of GEF V and other projects under a workshop format that involves presentation of each project’s performance to the same panel of stakeholders.

No special terms of reference for these meetings or minutes were availed to the consultants, but the authoritative position given was that these are strictly monitoring functions. Specifically, these are no meetings where significant operational or strategic decisions are taken. The activities are consistent with the M & E framework provided for in the Project Document.

The MTR Team recognizes the significant role of these meetings in fulfilling the M & E objectives of the project. However, since these are the only quarterly meetings held, there appears to be some vacuum in the standard corporate governance system that requires quarterly comprehensive oversight meetings that take critical decisions in addition to monitoring progress. This may be explained by the general attitude and approach to the project that tends to vest oversight responsibilities over the Project Manager in the EAs rather than in the Project organization structure.

**Proposed organization structure for GEF V Project**

The Evaluation Team found no structured project governance organ with a codified mandate for quarterly monitoring and guidance of the Project Team. It is noted that UNDP and the EAs meet quarterly. However, these quarterly meetings, important as they may be, do not meet the corporate governance criteria for a credible corporate governance oversight organ. There is no written mandate with clear powers; responsibilities and accountabilities for these quarterly meetings. Significantly the project oversight responsibility appears firmly vested in the EAs. The effect of this arrangement is compartmentalization of critical oversight responsibilities in the three principal players: UNDP, Forest department and DNPWL. In practice there is no project specific forum for joint decision making by the principal players.

The proposed organization structure is premised on basic principles of “management by project” and standard corporate governance principles. The major point of departure from current system is to moderate the compartmentalization of decision processes and promote joint decision processes among the key players notably UNDP and the two EAs. This proposal also takes full account of, and seeks to operationalize the first recommendation of the project inception meeting held on 28 July 2014 in the context of sound project management principles and good corporate governance principles. The recommendation was “The Project should encourage joint planning among the actors which will foster practical integrated delivery approach” In recognition of the current Quarterly meetings, this proposal can be seen as rationalizing and institutionalizing the Quarterly meetings in accordance with sound corporate governance principles through formalization of the Technical Committee as the organ with formal quarterly oversight responsibilities.

Within the project organization structure there should be governance organ(s) that provide a platform for joint decisions by the key players. The revised organization structure is shown in figure I.

**FIGURE 1: PROPOSED ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR GEF V PROJECT**
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The bold lines are the corporate governance reporting lines indicating channels for strategic and operational decision making and control while the thin line is for routine administrative interactions.

**Steering Committee**

The Steering Committee is basically a policy organ that also takes ultimate responsibility for strategic decisions. For government ministries it should be at Permanent Secretary level and proxies should be limited to Director Level. This should meet twice a year.

**Technical Committee**

The next layer is the Technical Committee which shall be the main oversight organ providing regular oversight over the Project Manager. It should also be responsible for joint decisions on operational and financial matters above the threshold of the Project Manager. For instance, it should be competent to approve concept notes or expenditures above Project Manager’s threshold and expenditures above budgetary provisions that may arise due to inflation.

The current practice of compartmentalized decision processes leads to unnecessary delays in decision making. Moreover, the joint decision process has the potential of enriching the final decisions through informed debate.

The proposed joint decision making platform does not lead to any surrender of critical decision making powers of the key players but provides a forum for pooling their expertise and powers to facilitate “integrated delivery approach”. The Technical Committee should conform to two basic tenets and principles of corporate governance. The first is equitable and effective representation of the key players i.e. UNDP and the two EAs. Equitable representation means the size of the committee should be such that the three critical players are not unduly outnumbered by other members of the committee. This will mean the total number of committee members is 5 – 6. This is also a practical number for smooth decision processes. Effective representation would mean the Directors of Forest Department and DNPWL and a senior UNDP official who can authoritatively represent their institutions.

The second corporate governance principle is appropriate skills mix. This is a body that will make major decisions on wide ranging issues. If for instance there is over concentration of skills in core technical areas, the decisions of the committee may not do justice to non-technical issues that have a bearing on the performance of the project. Therefore, beyond the key players, other essential skills could come from other stakeholders or independent members appointed on the basis of the required skills. Other skills could include rural sociology, business management, financial management etc.

**Project Manager**

Project manager has the responsibility of day to day supervision of project staff to achieve project objectives. Within limits and financial thresholds approved by the steering committee, the Project Manager should be competent to make operational and fiduciary decisions that promote smooth implementation of project activities. For operational and financial decisions above his threshold, the project manager should get approvals and decisions from the technical committee.

**Written terms of Reference for Various Organs**

Within the current organization structure only the project manager has specified written roles and accountabilities. The other key organs notably the steering committee and quarterly meetings have no written terms of reference. The proposed structure needs to be backed with clear terms of reference for all decision making organs.

Absence of clarity of roles and accountabilities leads to different interpretations of the roles of critical organs with the high risk of negative consequences on harmony in operations. It will be helpful to ensure optimal clarity of roles by written terms of reference for key organs notably the steering committee and the technical committee. At a minimum, the terms of reference should specify

* Composition and criteria for membership together with acceptable ranks for proxies
* roles and accountabilities
* regulations to govern conduct of meetings

As the primary oversight organ, the Technical Committee should be competent to approve expenditure thresholds for project manager and other senior project officers and to approve expenditure (and concept notes) above the limit of the project manager. It should also be the approval authority for matters to be recommended to the steering committee.

In day to day activities, the project staff should be guided by well codified management systems and procedures notably project financial management manual; project operations manual, project procurement manual. The project specific manuals will normally draw from the core principles and procedures of the parent organization(s), while reflecting the specific and peculiar circumstances of the project.

The evaluation team was informed that GEF V has not developed any project specific systems and procedures; notably there is no project financial manual or project operations manual. Apparently this is because UNDP projects are guided by systems and procedures of UNDP. It is observed that this practice is not in line with standard principles of management by project or corporate governance principles.

It is noted that while every project should be guided by the management systems and procedures of the parent organization(s) it is common and good practice for projects to develop own project management systems and procedures and manuals that reflect the core principles of the parent organization(s), but also articulate the peculiar or special circumstances of the project. It is observed that much smaller projects than the GEF V project, including World Bank funded projects have project specific written management systems and procedures and manuals.

In the particular case of this project which has three parent organizations, the case for project specific management systems and procedures and manuals may be even stronger. The absence of these tools can lead to confusion especially where there are differences in the guiding principles of the parent organizations, and in the case of project organization peculiar characteristics.

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

Our review of the project financial management is premised on standard principles and good practices of project management. It is recognized that since all project activities have some financial implications, the project financial management has a significant bearing on the efficiency and effectiveness of the project. The GEF V project budget is US $60,085,641 (as detailed in Annex VII)

Of this amount $43,896,777 is co-financing by the Government of Zambia in form Government inputs through the Forest Department and ZAWA then( now the DNPWL) and Norway which was funding the Conservation Farming Unit (CFU) .which is now mainly funded by DIFD. The CFU is actively supporting farmers in many, but not all project areas. The other co – financiers are WWF which has been supporting CBNR in Mufunta which is a target area for the Project; and the Nature Conservancy which has been supporting Game Rangers International which has undertaken fire management activities and ariel surveys. The contributions of the co- funders are duly recognized here, but the focus of this section is on the management of the cash funding by GEF and UNDP amounting to US$16 million. The table below shows the slow pace of utilization of budgeted funds.

**Planned Budget and Funds Spent**

**Year Budget Amount Spent ( US$) Budget Utilization (%)**

2014 886,600 477,4oo 50,5

2015 2,221,278 1,339,484 60

2016 3,193,331 1,375,818 43.1

Since its inception in 2014, the project utilization of budgeted resources has been around 50% which indicates weak momentum towards project goal. Significant external challenges to the smooth project implementation include the general elections of 2015 and 2016. The most significant internal challenge appears to be the financial management system under which the project has operated.

**Current Financial Management System**

Although the project design anticipated some financial management autonomy for the project, and provided for a project accountant in anticipation of a Project Account, there is still no project account, and until June,2017 there was no Project Accountant. All the financial management responsibilities are handled by UNDP under the Direct Funding system.

Under the current system, approval of payments for concept notes by UNDP takes an estimated period of 55 days from the initiation of the request. It is duly noted that this time frame can be modified by human factors. The consultants came across a request for a utility bill for a project field office that took six months to process payment.

The 2015 Audit report found this financial management system notably the concept notes approval process inappropriate “for a project which had a steering committee.” The report noted the high risk of delays in financial management and consequences for cost escalation in project implementation. During the field visits, the MTR Team was inundated with concerns about the delays in funding project activities. The Team noted with concern a few examples notably the 6 months delay in the approval of utility bill for a project field office and a situation where a decision by the Project Manager for a field officer to represent the Project at a meeting close to the field office was frustrated by the lengthy procedures for getting necessary approval for travel money.

Of course the 6-month delay in approving utility bill may be explained by human factors, but it is the firm opinion of this MTR Team that the genesis of this and other delays lies in the financial system that has not devolved sufficient fiduciary responsibilities to the project team. The current financial management system is at variance with the fundamental principle of management by project which is to free project activities from some of the bureaucratic practices of the parent organization(s). The standard justification for managing activities through a project is the realization that the normal organization and management capacity of the parent organization would be unduly over stretched if those activities were to be done directly by the organization. Thus the project approach is to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the implementation of the targeted activities. If this basic tenet of management by project is violated through micro management, the risk of inefficiency is very high and is quite evident in GEF V project.

Field consultations indicate strong affinity by UNDP and EAs to compartmentalized decision processes. This culture of compartmentalized decision processes tends to breed excessive institutional self-confidence or even institutional superiority complex which undermines mutual confidence among the key institutions involved in the project. There may be legitimate grounds among key players for anxiety over fiduciary responsibilities, but micro management of project activities and the resultant tight control of payments arrangements by the parent organization(s) is not a realistic solution. This approach can lead to transparency at a high cost in efficiency and effectiveness. A more realistic management solution that ensures both transparency and project effectiveness lies in establishing a credible project organization structure that is premised on sound corporate governance principles that include effective fiduciary control systems.

**Proposed Project Financial Management System**

The proposed financial management system is premised on the following:

1. Devolution of fiduciary responsibilities to project organization structure. This will entail a shift from the current system of Direct Funding by UNDP to a system of quarterly release of funds to a Project account.
2. Joint rather than compartmentalized approach to fiduciary responsibilities of the project. This will entail the Technical Committee rather than the IA or EAs providing oversight responsibilities over the Project staff in financial matters.
3. Joint rather than compartmentalized decision processes on major operational and strategic issues.
4. Effective controls in financial management to ensure “transparency with efficiency”. Transparency should not be targeted in isolation of, or at the expense of efficiency and effectiveness.

The current financial system may have succeeded in promoting transparency, but at high cost of efficiency and effectiveness. The proposed financial system seeks to redress this by promoting all the key management objectives: transparency; efficiency and effectiveness through a credible corporate governance system.

The proposed financial management system is anchored on the corporate governance system for the proposed organization structure where critical oversight responsibility is transferred from the silos of EAs and UNDP into the Technical Committee. As part of its overall governance mandate, this Committee will exercise the critical fiduciary oversight responsibilities.

The Committee will be competent to approve Project financial management systems and procedures including spending authority thresholds for the Project Manager and other qualified senior Project personnel, and to approve all expenditures above the limit of the Project Manager. In particular, the Committee will be competent to approve concept notes with values above the threshold of the Project Manager.

Under the overall responsibility of the Project Manager, there should be a Project account in Mumbwa into which UNDP should release operational funds on quarterly basis based on approved annual work plan and budget. The Technical Committee, as Board, should approve signatories (among senior Project personnel) for this account. Funds for major capital items need not be transferred to the Project account. UNDP could take advantage of its experience and status to, for instance bring in project motor vehicles at a competitive cost.

Within the Project structure, there is need to avoid over centralization of fiduciary powers in Mumbwa. To ensure timely execution of modest operational activities, the field offices will need to control modest funds. This could be achieved with an appropriate level of petty cash or Project accounts at the field offices. The Technical Committee will approve limits of petty cash for field offices and signatories for field office accounts (if deemed necessary) and other pertinent rules.

The proposed system can improve the speed at which necessary expenditure approvals are given without compromising transparency. Thus the proposed financial system will improve project performance. The proposal is consistent with standard corporate governance and project management principles and good practices and is strongly recommended.

**Annex VII: Co-financing Table**

Total Allocated Resources: ***US$ 60,085,641***

 Regular: *US$ 16,188,864*

 GEF US$ 13,148,864

 UNDP US$ 3,040,000

 Other: *US$ 43,896,777*

 Government US$ 37,396,777

 Norway US$ 5,000,000

 The Nature Conservancy US$ 1,100,000

 WWF US$ 400,000

**Annex VIII: Interview Guide**

Interviews were based on the evaluative questions and indicators detailed in the Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix. The specific questions were addressed to interviewees selectively, in accordance interviewed group or individual specific engagement with the Project. Stakeholders were further interviewed on the overall context of their engagement with and relation to the Project and its results. Whenever relevant, specific interviewees were asked more detailed and quantitative questions on specific aspects. All stakeholders were further asked what conditions or adaptive management changes do they think should be put in place for the Project to better achieve its objectives and to establish its results' sustainability.

**Questions relating to Project Strategy:**

* Does the project strategy support achieving national needs and priorities?
* Does the project strategy support achieving needs and priorities of local stakeholders?
* To what extent is the project complementary to government's and partners' initiatives (regional, national and local projects and programmes) addressing the same priorities?
* Are the Project outputs and activities relevant and feasible for achieving the Project objective and outcomes?
* Were risks well identified and mitigation measures well designed to adequately address the risks?
* Do the Project's outputs and management arrangements promote national ownership?

**Questions relating to Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?**

* Are Biodiversity and carbon sinks of Kafue/West Lunga PA systems in Zambia better protected from threats and effectively managed?
* Are identified threats mitigated? Is effective management implemented?
* Is sustainable land and forest management established in Miombo woodland and dry evergreen forest ecosystems in the two PA core areas and the community managed GMAs and conservancies?
* Is forest corridor long-term connectivity enabled between WLNP and KNP?
* Is the project realistically expected to achieve its objective by project end, within the defined timeline?
* Was management effectiveness increased in Kafue NP and West Lunga NP**?**
* Were wildlife stocking rates increased?
* Were GHG emissions from fire reduced?
* Was the core Protected Area expanded?
* Was area burned annually reduced?
* Was financial sustainability established?
* Were new PPPs formed? Were PESs established?
* Was sustainable land and forest management established by local institutions in GMA buffer areas through selected CBNRM practices?
* Were CBNRM structures established? Over what area size?
* Were livelihoods improved (increased per capita / household income compared to 2012 baseline)**?**
* Are Village Action Groups (VAGs) in target areas formally recognized and constituted?
* Are women members in VAGs increased (At least 40% female representation in all elected VAGs in project area)**?**
* Was land use planning, and diversification of income streams, over all target GMA buffer area established?
* Were SFM practices established as REDD+ pilots?
* Was conservation farming introduced? (At least 3,760 ha of conservation farming practiced by at least 1,600 households in 40 VAGs in targeted GMAs applied)**?**
* Were yields increased?
* Were fire losses reduced in GMAs?
* Was forest degradation from unsustainable fuel wood collection practices, reduced in target GMAs?

**Questions relating to Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?**

* Have the project and individual activities been implemented in line with the defined timeframe and budget, and in accordance with the Annual Workplans and Budgets?
* Were the project monitoring and evaluation and reporting plans implemented satisfactorily and did they support the project's implementation?
* Were risks, challenges and bottlenecks adequately and timely identified and mitigated?
* Were any needs for adaptive management changes identified and implemented?
* Was the project communication strategy designed and implemented satisfactorily and did it support achieving the project's objective and outcomes?
* Were the project's management arrangement and support of the partner organizations adequate for enabling efficient implementation?
* Was the project's financial management adequate?

**Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?**

* Can sufficient financial sustainability be established before project end, to secure continuity?
* Can institutional capacity be adequately established before project end, to secure sustainability of achieved project outcomes?
* Can adequate socio-economic sustainability be secured before project end to enable continuity?
* Are environmental risks identified and mitigated?

**General: What conditions or adaptive management changes, should be put in place for the Project to better achieve its objectives and to establish its results' sustainability?**

**Annex IX: Minutes of the Stakeholders' Workshop on the Draft MTR Report**

**Comments from GEF5 Midterm Review Meeting Discussions - Summary provided by Project Team, as captured during the meeting**

**The MTR review meeting was held on 28th June; Venue: Fringilla Lodge, Chisamba**

Opening remarks by four speakers: The project is all about:

* Utilization of the grant to benefit the community around the resource.
* Biodiversity and carbon sinks areaconserved and managed.
* Climate change adaptation and mitigation
* The aforementioned are well elaborated in the SNDP

General Comments from participants

1. The consultant should be commended for doing a good work.

**Consultant answer**.: thanks

**Answer from UNPD**: Thanks for the work done. But some of the activities where not undertaken such as REDD , we would love to have answers to that.

With regard Project administration, we acknowledge that there are limiting procedures that we can’t do without thresholds. We would like you to give us some areas where we can be flexible so that we can try to work on.

**Answer from the community**: As the community, we are happy to take ownership of the project, we are asking FD to support us do regeneration program and as such we need training in this area. We feelas the community we need capacity building in this area.

**Follow-up comment from the consultant**: Let the people who have given us these comments, we may need some written comments so that we can improve on the report.

1. What approach/ model resource board used in the project area to link to the project?

Consultant answer.:Its one of the strengths for the project because its creates ownership for the community.

1. In general the consultant captured most of the challenges, but most of the recommendations picked are not linking to any of the specific challenge.

Consultant answer.: We need the specific enlighting on the challenges.

1. All the issues have been captured but communication aspect between the community and the implementing agencies.

**Consultant answer.:** We have actually noted it as consultants. We feel it’s the job of anybody to maintain the chanel of commuinication. CRBs had a feeling that the project will put money in the pockets of community members, this thought is wrong, But the community can take advantage of income generating activities identified and sustain them. The point is that its everybody’s work to contact.

1. Consultations by the consultants where not done with the forestry
2. The challenge coming imminently is project sustainability; we need to come up with a way to sustain the project.

**Specific Comments from participants**

1. Financial management: The consultants should be specific on where the challenge is especially with the 2 months delay.

**Consultant answer: FMS** is thick and as such you can’t move. Remedy the financial systems so that money can move so fast.

1. REDD officer is not employed yet: FD feels this may make forestry programme within the project to suffer.
* This slow recruitment locked the small grant for community livelihood related to forestry.
* The other problem is that the project lacks project manuals of the parent organisation
* FD feels that there is need to quickly recruit the REDD officer
* The community will would want to have indabas with forestry department.

**Consultant answer:** please send us a written comment so that can consider that for engagement in future.

1. To what extent has FD been involved?
2. Landuse plans

**Consultant answer:** We have actually outlined in our recommendation that the communities have not seen any impacts from the project and so the community would want to see the benefits as soon as possible. To mitigate that, the project can identify income generating activities that the communities can ride on and sustain them

1. Meaning the word Impact **Consultant answer: The** project should have an impact by now if it was implemented in time such as income generating activities, reduced poaching and so on and so forth. However, we have rated it moderately because everything is in place such as funds, personnel and the potential.

**Recommendation on objectives**

2.No cost extension of the project for 12 to 18 years

**Comment from the community:** Yes the project may be extended but we need the disbursement of funds should be done in time.

**UNDP comment:**It’s not merely ‘no cost extension parse’, but need to show how we can do things differently so as to hold justification. We actually know that the project is a five year project and so if we can extend, the project may spill over in 2020. For now we can go by with the planned timeline but at the time we will have a terminal review, we can ask for an extension but with a proper justification. Only one extension can be done per project from GEF 5. Another condition is that the project cost should remain the same during the extended period.

**3 Recommendation 3: Proposed organisation structure**

**W**hat is wrong with the current structure?

**Comment from the consultant:**The current one does not conform to corporate governance principle as such meeting once a year because there is a gap for oversight. Understanding that this is a big project that might have ramification on the implementation of the overall project.

**Comment from UNDP.** In a typical country, UNDP has corporate governance for projects. Usually the in steering committee structure is made of UNDP representatives, Government representatives, NGO representatives, academic institution representatives. Because the project steering committee is the structure with accountability and is made of individuals that speak on behalf of various institutions, they can make decision to use the funds and as such the recommendation is that they should meet twice for decision making. The assumption is that the project manager has power make decisions between steering committee meetings.

**Comment from PM:** the minutes are not there for quarterly meeting.

**Community comment:** let the UNDP not defend itself because at the moment the PM has nowhere to get information. We propose of a committee just below the PM so that the PM can get information on how things are moving.

Final recommendation> the middle layer need to be organised and the PM must be given powers to do most of the things

**4 Recommendation on expenditure MGT System**

**PM comment:** The PM is not empowered by the steering committee to do actual activities. Employ an accountant. And create an accountant.

**Consultants comment>** Lets release the money into the project account.

Final comments agreed: change the direct modality to cash advance into the project account.

**List of Participants**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Participants Name** | **Organization** | **Title** |
| 01 | Crissy Niamwiza | Forestry | Principal Tech |
| 02 | Chabu Sumba | Forest Research | Senior Research Officer |
| 03 | Zimba Samson | Forestry | District Forest Officer |
| 04 | Phemo Kgomotso | UNDP RSCA | REG Tech Advisor |
| 05 | Winnie Musonda | UNDP Zambia | Environment Advisor |
| 06 | Simbotwe Mwiya | UNDP GEF Project | Project Manager |
| 07 | Mindenda Pande | Forestry  | Principle Forestry Officer |
| 08 | Chuma Simukonda | DNPW | Asst. Director, Research |
| 09 | Chimuka Nyanga | UNDP GEF Project | Project Finance Officer (as of 10 July 2017) |
| 10 | Andrew Songiso | Ministry of Agric | Principal Irrigation Engineer |
| 11 | Kibra Mweetwa | Forestry | District Forestry Officer |
| 12 | Muyumbwa Ndiyoi | NHCC | Chief Natural Heritage Officer |
| 13 | Andrew Nkole | DNPW | Senior Conservation Officer |
| 14 | Nyambe Partina | Matebo CRB | Chairperson, Kisokelo VAG |
| 15 | Shanungu Felix | Chilyabufu CRB | Chairperson |
| 16 | Mwiba Getrude | Kabulwebulwe CRB | Chairperson |
| 17 | Miriam Namushi | DNPW | Area Warden |
| 18 | Kasempa Elliot | DNPW | Area Warden  |
| 19 | Kamuti Simushi | DNPW | Area Warden |
| 20 | Doubt Chibeya | WWF Zambia | Project specialist |
| 21 | Lucas Zubu | MOTA | P/Planner |
| 22 | Tamar Ron | GEF V MTR | MTR Consultant |
| 23 | Chiselebwe Ng’andwe  | GEF V MTR | MTR Consultant |
| 24 | Simwawa Charles | DNPW | Game Warden |
| 25 | Samalumo Francis | DNPW | Area Warden |
| 26 | Khutapa Emmah Chilila | Forestry | Technician |
| 27 | Kaumba H Chaka | DNPW | SNR GIS Officer/FPP |
| 28 | Phanwell Moonga | DNPW | Senior Warden |
| 29 | Chongo Simpasa | UNDP | Programme Associate  |

**Annex X**

**UNDP-GEF MTR Report Audit Trail**

Audit trail to the comments received in writing and during the MTR Review Meeting to the draft Mid Term Review Report of the project titled "Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Generating Multiple Environmental Benefits within and around the Greater Kafue National Park and West Lunga National Park in Zambia" (UNDP Project ID- PIMS#4625).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment Author** | **Comment# and Date** | **Comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR Reviewer****response and actions taken** |
| Colleen McNally-Murphy, UNDP HQ, NY(CM) | #1, Received 13.6.17 | Opening page (pp.2-3) | Amendments to basic Project information | Amended as indicated |
| CM | #2, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary (Section 1.1.) |  Project information table is missing | Project Information Table added to Executive Summary  |
| CM | #3, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary(Section 1.2.) | Project description can be condensed | Project description condensed  |
| CM | #4, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary(Section 1.3.) | Project progress summary is missing | Project progress summary added to Executive Summary  |
| CM | #5, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary(Section 1.4.) | MTR ratings & achievement summary table is in the wrong format, missing the achievement description column.  | MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table amended as indicated, and the table used was replaced by the table indicated. |
| CM | #6, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary(Section 1.5.) | Conclusions section is very dense; suggest breaking up into paragraphs/themes. It is hard to tell what the general conclusions are without getting lost in the details. | The Conclusions section was revised accordingly. |
| CM | #7, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary(Section 1.6.) | Recommendations are clearly stated and understandable; advise putting them into a table per ToR guidelines and to increase legibility | The recommendations put into a table, as indicated. |
| CM | #8, Received 13.6.17 | Executive Summary, Section 3.6., Section 5.2., and Recommendation 2 | Recommendation 2: No-cost extension of the project – has this already been submitted/granted?; Revised planned closing date is 6 months later than the planned closing date. Does this mean an extension has already been granted? | No. Project planned closing date was revised in accordance with the actual Project start date, with no extension of the Project's duration |
| CM | #9, Received 13.6.17 | Section 2.4.1. | Well written, but with excessive detail. Suggest condensing. | Condensed |
| CM | #10, Received 13.6.17 | Section 3. | Project description & background context: This section is twice as long as it should be, per ToR guidance. | Section condensed as indicated |
| CM | #11, Received 13.6.17 | Section 4.2.1. – Progress Towards Results Matrix | Please make sure each of the indicators has been given a rating as well as the color-coded assessment of if it is on track to be achieved. | Amended accordingly and rating given to each indicator |
| CM | #12, Received 13.6.17 | Section 4.2.1. – Progress Towards Results Matrix – Indicator 3 | Include recommendation for this indicator, since it is rated not on track to be achieved. | Recommendation added (Recommendation 11) |
| CM | #13, Received 13.6.17 | Section 4.3. | Reporting section is missing | Reporting section added (4.3.7.) |
| CM | #14, Received 13.6.17 | Section 5 | Conclusions and Recommendations: condense this section | Section significantly condensed. |
| CM | #15, Received 13.6.17 | Annexes | Please remember to include an example questionnaire or interview guide as an annex in the final version of the report. | Annex added (Annex III) |
| CM | #16, Received 13.6.17 | Annexes  | Happily, the midterm tracking tools were completed and finalized in advance of the MTR mission, and were able to be used by the evaluators. These should be included as annexes to the final report. | Annex added (Annex XI) |
| CM | #17, Received 13.6.17 | Annexes  | Co-financing table should be included either in the body of the report or as an annex | Annex added (Annex VII) |
| CM | #18, Received 13.6.17 | Throughout the document | Minor editorial amendments  | Amended as indicated |
| CM | #19, Received 13.6.17 | Overall comment | Length: the MTR ToR states that the report should not exceed 40 pages without annexes; this draft is 75 pages before annexes. The length requirement is not strict, but nonetheless the report should be made more concise where possible to more closely adhere to the guidelines (page limit suggestions are provided in the ToR). Some of this can also be achieved through formatting changes, i.e. removing large blank spaces from the report after each section. | The report was revised, condensed and shortened from 75 pages to 50 pages (including the sections added, as indicated above), before annexes. |
| CM | #20, Received 13.6.17 | Overall comment | The draft midterm review of 4625 Zambia is very solid overall, well organized, and is clearly aligned with the ToR guidance despite a few missing pieces. The report is very comprehensive, and is evidence of a careful and thorough approach. | No action required |
| Winnie Musonda, UNDP CO (WM) | #21, Received5.7.17  | Section 3.2.  | Add 7th National Development Plan ,Climate change policy and REDD Strategy ,revised forest and wildlife acts | Added  |
| WM | #22, Received 5.7.17 | Sections 3.3., 3.4.  | Editorial and factual amendments | Amended |
| WM | #23, Received 5.7.17 | Section 4.1.1  | Factual amendments re more recent national strategies to be included | Amended and included |
| WM | #24, Received 5.7.17 | Section 4.1.2.  | Provide more analysis and examples  | Amended accordingly |
| WM | #25,Received 5.7.17 | Overall comment | There is need to provide for some analysis for the issues raised which can be regarded as manifestations, and having root causes will be helpful to appreciate the problem and also to ensure the implementations of the recommendations.  | Sections 4.2 and 4.3 amended to include root causes of key issues discussed. Annex VI provides an in-depth analysis in regard with the Project's management arrangements and financial management, which were identified as the main source of bottlenecks. |
| WM | #26,Received 5.7.17 | Overall comment | The report is factual and balanced | No action required |
| Comments from the MTR Review Meeting Summary provided by the Project Team. (MTR RMS) | #27,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. Summary received 8.7.17 | Overall comment | The consultants should be commended for doing a good work | No action required |
| MTR RMS | #28,Received 8.7.17 | Overall comment | In general the consultant captured most of the challenges, but most of the recommendations picked are not linking to any of the specific challenge. | The MTR RMS overall comments were followed by an in-depth analysis of all of the recommendations. Comments on specific recommendations and action taken are detailed below. |
| MTR RMS | #29, Received 8.7.17 | Overall comment | All the issues have been captured, but not the communication aspect between the community and the implementing agencies. | This issue is referred to in the draft MTR Report (See e.g., Section 4.1.2. unidentified risks, Section 4.2.3., Section 4.3.6., Recommendations 1 and 8). |
| MTR RMS | #30,Received 8.7.17 | Overall comment | To what extent has FD been involved in the MTR process? | FD was extensively consulted during the MTR process at HQ, District and local levels. See Annex III: list of people interviewed. |
| MTR RMS | #31,Received 8.7.17 | Overall commnet | The challenge coming imminently is project sustainability; we need to come up with a way to sustain the project. | This aspect is referred to extensively in the draft MTR Report (see e.g., Sections 4.4., 5.1., and Recommendations 5,7, 12-23. |
| MTR RMS | #32, Received 8.7.17 | Overall comment | What does it mean that the Project did not yet generate impact? | The Project does not yet have notable impact on achieving its defined Objective and Outcomes, and as can be measured by its defined Indicators. Nevertheless, it was rated favorably (overall rating: Satisfactory), taking into account that most enabling conditions were already put in place for the Project to generate such notable impact, by Project end. |
| MTR RMS | #33,Received 8.7.17 | Section 4.2.  | Some of the activities were not undertaken, such as REDD pilots. The report should analyze the root causes | Section 4.2 amended to include root causes of key issues discussed. Specific reference to root causes for that the REDD pilots activity didn't initiate (the only activity that is not on-track), is included. Recommendation 11 was also edited accordingly. |
| MTR RMS | #34,Received 8.7.17 | Section 4.2.2. and Recommendation 11 | The FD engagement in the Project is hampered by the fact that the REDD Coordinator is not employed yet. The communities request FD to support them with regeneration progammes and related training | Section 4.2.2. revised with specific reference to root causes for that the REDD pilots activity did not initiate. Recommendation 11 was also edited accordingly. |
| MTR RMS | #35,Received 8.7.17 | Section 4.3., recommendations 3, 4, 24, and Annex VI  | Re Project administration, and considering that there are limiting procedures and thresholds, we would like you to give us some areas where we can be flexible, for improving implementation rate;The UNDP RTA provided information on the standard structure.  | Section 4.3., Recommendations 3 and 4, and Annex VI were revised accordingly. See also recommendation 24 re assimilating lessons learned for revisiting limiting procedures for improved flexibility, beyond this specific Project. Annex VI provides an in-depth analysis in regard with the Project's management arrangements and financial management.  |
| MTR RMS | #36,Received 8.7.17 | Section 4.3.1. | The Project Manager is not empowered by the Steering Committee to do project activities. | Section 4.3.1. was revised, and Annex VI provides an in-depth analysis in regard with the Project's management arrangement. |
| MTR RMS | #37,Received 8.7.17 | Section 4.3.2. | Financial management: the consultants should be specific on where the challenge is especially with the 2 months delay.Employ an accountant and open project account. | Section 4.3.2. was revised, and Annex VI provides an in-depth analysis in regard with the Project's financial management.The report is specific that the current Direct Funding system by UNDP is the cause of delays in funding and project activities. |
| MTR RMS | #38,Received 8.7.17 | Recommendation 2 | "No-cost" extension of the project by 12 to 18 years: there is general support to this recommendations, but with the condition that mitigation of the identified bottlenecks will be put in place, in particular re Project management and financial management. UNDP RTA provided further details on conditions for extension. It was agreed that the Project will now continue in accordance with the planned timeline, and the Terminal Review will analyze whether an extension can be requested, with the required justification.  | Recommendation 2 revised accordingly. |
| MTR RMS | #39,Received 8.7.17 | Recommendation 3 | Management arrangements: what is wrong in the current structure? The assumption is that the Project Manager must have power to make decisions between Steering Committee meetings.The middle layer needs to be organized, and Project Manager should be given power to do most of the things.  | Recommendations 3 revised. The current structure does not conform to good corporate governance principles and standard project management principles.The report noted a corporate governance gap in quarterly oversight provision. Middle layer provided for in the form of Technical Committee.  |
| MTR RMS | #40,Received 8.7.17 | Recommendation 4 | Agreed position: Change Direct Payment modality by UNDP to cash advance into Project account that should be opened urgently, with the immediate deployment of the recently recruited Project Accountant/Financial Assistant. | Recommendations 4 revised.The report acknowledges the recent recruitment of a Project Accountant, and recommends immediate change from Direct Funding to cash advances into project account |
| MTR RMS | #41,Received 8.7.17 | Recommendations 6, 11. | The communities need to see real benefit from the Project. The importance of the Land use plans is recognized, but there is also need to see immediate benefit.  | Recommendation 6 and 11 revised accordingly |
| Further comments picked up by the consultants during the MTR Review Meeting(MTR RM) | #42,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Section 4.3.1. | The Steering Committee (SC) is the project oversight organ.Quarterly meetings already existed, but were not formalized. | Section 4.3.1. was revised, and Annex VI provides an in-depth analysis in regard with the Project's management arrangement.The report recognizes the SC as the supreme governance organ, but it does not meet corporate governance criteria for a credible oversight organ.The report proposes to rationalize and institutionalize the quarterly meetings in accordance with corporate governance principles. |
| MTR RM | #43,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 5 | EAs commented that the recommended upstream activities are not included in the original Project design. RTA: The Project can support a National strategic planning process, e.g., for a National wildlife crime action strategy, through an expert's consultancy, deriving lessons learned from the Project's on-ground implementation. The term "wildlife crime" should be revised to "crimes on natural resources", to stress the inclusive and holistic strategic approach required.  | Recommendation 5 revised accordingly |
| MTR RM | #44,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 6 | Income-generating activities should be based on traditional knowledge, as well as on socio-economic and environmental assessments of the full value-chain (including, e.g., markets). A capacity needs assessment should be realized and followed by a capacity building programme. | Recommendation 6 revised accordingly |
| MTR RM | #45,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 8 and 12 | Add cooperation with the Ministry of Chiefs and Traditional Affairs | Added |
| MTR RM | #46,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 15 | Revise the recommendation in accordance with existing policies. A qualitative and quantitative assessment of the natural assets' short term and long term value to the country would provide a well-informed basis for their valuation in comparison to other competing and potentially destructive land uses. The Project can include an expert consultancy to support the government for this effect. | Recommendation 15 revised accordingly. |
| MTR RM | #47,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 16 | The Project can support the Government with such a review process, through advocacy as well as through an expert consultancy. | Recommendation 16 revised accordingly. |
| MTR RM | #48,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 24 | RTA: There is much more flexibility of the rules and procedures than recognized. There is need for further training of COs, EAs and key stakeholders. | Recommendation 24 revised accordingly. |
| MTR RM | #49,MTR Review Meeting held on 28.6.17. | Recommendation 25 | RTA: the tendency now is to define longer projects from start, to avoid the need for later extension. Recruitment and procurement process can initiate before the Project's start. Further training of COs and EAs is needed. | The recommendation remains. The training needs are referred to in the revised recommendation 24. |
| RRBM /&RSC | # 50 Received 10.10.17  | Recommendation 3 Draft report | UNDP POPP and Government rules and procedures should serve as project manuals | Comment is not professionally acceptable. UNDP/ Government rules should inform, but not substitute project specific manuals  |
| RRBM/ RSC R | #51Received 10.10.17 | Recommendation 4 Draft report | Emphasis on role of PSC/ Board in fiduciary responsibilities  | Comment accommodated in revised final report |
| RRBM/ RSC | #52Received10.10 17 | Item 4.3.1Draft report | Clarity of findings that justify the rating | Already addressed in final report |
| RRBM/RSC | #53 Received 10.10 .17 | Item 4.3.3Draft report | Clarity of findings that justify the rating | Already addressed in final report |

**Anne XI: Mid Term Tracking Tools** (Annexed separately)

GEF focal area Tracking Tools (Biodiversity, November 2016; Climate Change Mitigation, November 2016; Land Degradation, November 2016);

METTs for KNP and GMAs, WLNP and GMAs – November 2016

**Annex XII: MTR Terms of Reference** (Annexed separately)

**Annex XIII: Power Point Presentation of Initial Findings** (Annexed separately)

**Annex XIV: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct Form** (Annexed separately)

**Annex XV: Signed MTR Final Report Clearance**

(to be signed by UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA and annexed to the final report)

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**UNDP Zambia**

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

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

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

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

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

1. Propose to remove the aspects that highlight specificity to KNP and ZESCO [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Conservancies not used in Zambia and hence need to align it with the CBNRM [↑](#footnote-ref-2)