



REPORT

FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION (TE) OF THE PROJECT

STRENGTHENING THE PROTECTED AREA NETWORK IN SOUTHERN TANZANIA:
IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NATIONAL PARKS IN ADDRESSING THREATS TO
BIODIVERSITY PROJECT

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR/REPORT AUTHOR:

MARIA ONESTINI

REPORT DATE: DECEMBER 25TH 2017

NATIONAL EVALUATOR: MICHAEL MUGANDA

I. OPENING PAGE

Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:

Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania:
Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to
Biodiversity

GEF PROJECT ID: 3965

UNDP PIMS #: 3253

Evaluation time frame: September – December 2017 (timeframe)

Date of the evaluation report: December 25 2017

Region and countries included in the project: Africa, Tanzania

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

Implementing Partner: Tanzania National Parks Authority
(TANAPA)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The international evaluator would like to acknowledge and thank all who cordially shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of the evaluation process.

DISCLAIMER

This document represents the analysis of the sole author of this report (Maria Onestini) and does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Project, the Government of the Tanzania, the United Nations Development Programme, GEF, nor any other person or UN Agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	OPENING PAGE	2
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
	DISCLAIMER	2
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
	PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE	5
	SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	6
	EVALUATION RATING TABLE	9
	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
III.	ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	13
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	14
	PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	14
	SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	14
	STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT	17
2.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	18
	PROJECT START AND DURATION AND BUDGET.....	18
	INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEMS THAT PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS	18
	IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT	19
	BASELINE INDICATORS ESTABLISHED	19
	MAIN STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED AT THE DESIGN LEVEL	22
	EXPECTED RESULTS	22
3.	FINDINGS.....	23
3.1	PROJECT DESIGN / FORMULATION	23
	ANALYSIS OF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH/RESULTS FRAMEWORK (PROJECT LOGIC /STRATEGY; INDICATORS).....	23
	ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	24
	LESSONS FROM OTHER RELEVANT PROJECTS (SAME FOCAL AREA) INCORPORATED INTO PROJECT DESIGN	26
	PLANNED STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	26
	REPLICATION APPROACH	26
	UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE	27
	MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS	28

LINKAGES BETWEEN PROJECT AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITHIN THE SECTOR	28
3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.....	29
ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT (CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESIGN AND PROJECT OUTPUTS DURING IMPLEMENTATION)	29
PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS (WITH RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN THE COUNTRY/REGION).....	29
FEEDBACK FROM MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES USED FOR THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	30
PROJECT FINANCE	30
MONITORING AND EVALUATION: DESIGN AT ENTRY AND IMPLEMENTATION	31
IMPLEMENTING PARTNER AND UNDP IMPLEMENTATION / EXECUTION COORDINATION, AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES	32
3.3 PROJECT RESULTS	33
OVERALL RESULTS	33
RELEVANCE	39
EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY	40
COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	41
MAINSTREAMING.....	41
IMPACT	41
SUSTAINABILITY	42
4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45
4.1 CONCLUSIONS	45
4.2 LESSONS LEARNED.....	48
4.2 BEST PRACTICES	49
4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	50
5. ANNEXES	54

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity			
GEF Project ID:	3965		at endorsement (US\$)	at completion (US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	3253	GEF financing:	5300000	5300000
Country:	Tanzania	IA/EA own:	1000000	750000
Region:	Africa	Government:	11100000	10000000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	300000	400000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP3	Total co-financing:	12100000	11150000
Executing Agency:	Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA)	Total Project Cost:	17400000	16450000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual: December 2017 ¹

¹ It is planned that some products will be achieved after this date, therefore actual closing will take place in early 2018.

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The “*Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project*” (also known as SPANEST) in Tanzania addressed several issues related to protected areas’ management in the country. The Project was designed to increase the effectiveness of National Parks in Tanzania in protecting biodiversity and to provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system as well as to be able to reduce anthropogenic pressures on the sites and secure biodiversity status within them. The focus was on the new and developing Southern Circuit of Tanzania’s National Parks, reflecting the fact that --with some exceptions--, the management effectiveness of National Parks in this region remained sub-optimal, and that (relative to the Government of Tanzania’s desired levels for this zone) tourism activity remained low.

The Project has been designed to address Protected Area (PA) management barriers, such as:

(a) a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs, for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts, and;

(b) lack of management capacity and financial planning to bring people to the area and to prevent the various threats to the area.

The Project Goal was to ensure the Southern Tanzania’s biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and to provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity. The Project was responsible for achieving the following project objective: *The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks*. It was designed to lift the barriers to the establishment of a landscape approach to the management of biodiversity.

This was to be achieved through two complementary and interrelated components:

Component 1: Integrating management of National Parks and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania.

This first component entailed the creations of an inter-sectoral district land management coordination mechanism between TANAPA, district authorities and the Wildlife Division (WD) and would also involve planning, implementing, and monitoring by key state and civil society partners on biodiversity management measures for the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo Kipengere landscapes. The Project would set up inter-sectoral district land administration mechanisms and develop land use plans to ensure that land in ecologically sensitive areas is allocated to conservation-compatible land uses through an integrated landscape management planning process. Development impact assessments were to be undertaken, to define acceptable land uses and management practices. Support

was to be rendered to strengthen the enforcement framework, to ensure compliance and guard against chaotic and unplanned economic development, which is leading to habitat degradation and loss elsewhere in Tanzania. This component was to also ensure that TANAPA had the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes and have improved, staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities.

Specific expected products of the first component were anticipated to be:

- A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes piloted and adapted in 7 Districts in Southern Tanzania and secured wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km² in the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo-Kipengere ecological landscapes
- Integrated landscape management approach replicated by TANAPA in at least one additional ecological landscape in southern Tanzania.
- No net loss of natural habitat in major habitat blocks identified as critical for wildlife dispersal and at least 40% reduction in hunting pressures in these blocks.
- PAs expanded to encompass two ecologically sensitive wildlife corridor areas linking Kitulo NP to Mt Rungwe and to Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve), creating a linked 'Greater Kitulo-Kipengere landscape' totalling over 2,000 km².

Component 2: Operations support for National Park management in Southern Tanzania.

This second component focused on addressing threats within the NP boundaries by engineering the delivery of an integrated package of PA management functions. Based on needs assessment commissioned at the start of the Project, funding was to be provided for basic infrastructure and field equipment across the Southern Circuit Sites. An emphasis was to be placed on building operations capacity at PA sites that have not previously benefitted from such investment (i.e. Ruaha expansion and Kitulo NPs). This support was to be accompanied by the development of business plans for the sites, to define the optimum operations support needed to address threats in a cost effective and sustainable manner.

Specific expected products of the second component include the following:

- Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km² leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks. This is evidenced in a reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed.
- Management effectiveness core for NPs in Southern Tanzania increased over the baseline score by at least 40%.

Specifically, the Project was to deliver twelve outputs, organized within the two components and summarized in the Project Logical Framework (as found in annexes: Annex 7: Project Results Framework Per Project Document).

Implementation of SPANEST was planned for five and a half years project that began in June 2011² and will have an actual conclusion in December 2017 (since the Project had a one year no-cost extension). The Project had the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as its GEF Executing Agency and the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) as its Implementing Partner. It was implemented in a NIM modality with the Government of Tanzania as the executor.

² Formal approval of the Project was in February 2011.

EVALUATION RATING TABLE

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA & EA Execution	Rating
M&E design at entry	MS	Quality of UNDP Implementation - Implementing Agency	S
M&E Plan Implementation	MU	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	S
Overall quality of M&E	MS	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	R	Financial resources	ML
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-political	L
Efficiency	S	Institutional framework and governance	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental	ML
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	ML

Explanations for ratings for relevance, performance criteria and sustainability are found in annexes (Annex 6: Ratings (relevance, performance criteria and sustainability)). Accounts of these ratings are imbedded in this report's narrative in each of the pertaining sections.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

The *Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project* is about to conclude after six and a half years of implementation. The Project addressed operational issues that hinder integrated sustainable management of the country's protected areas, focusing on the country's Southern Circuit. These threats to protected areas in the country are multiple and the Project addressed several issues related to protected areas' management in the country. The Project was designed to increase the effectiveness of National Parks in Tanzania in protecting biodiversity and to provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system and to be able to reduce anthropogenic pressures on sites as well as to secure biodiversity status within them. The focus was on the new and developing Southern Circuit of Tanzania's National Parks, reflecting the fact that --with some exceptions--, the management effectiveness of National Parks in this region remained sub-optimal, and that (relative to the Government of Tanzania's desired levels for this zone) tourism activity remained low. The threats and barriers identified were a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs, for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts as well as a lack of management capacity and financial planning to attract tourism to the zone and to prevent the various threats to the area.

The Project had a series of design deficiencies which continued to cause difficulties into implementation. The first design failing identified has been the matter of expected results, log frame and how to operationalize these through adequate indicators. The design of the results framework was not actually expressed as robust expected results, and this matter continued to have an impact on the implementation modality throughout the life span of the Project, whereby the focus was on obtaining products and not so much on obtaining effects or results.

The products and processes that the Project implemented (or sought to implement) mainly focused on improving management of protected areas and promoting tourism in the region. A general indicator for achieving the former of the two broad areas of work are the sought METT scores. Although as in many other topics of the Project where effect is measured, this cannot be solely attributable to this project given that there are many activities and stakeholders dealing with exactly the same issues in the target zone, the Project reports improvement of METT scores which can be in part attributable to SPANEST.

A series of processes and products were also implemented with a fair level of efficiency. In particular, activities/training and support for patrolling against poaching, law enforcement, facilities for reporting poaching, upgrading of physical resources and infrastructure to deal with several aspects of PA management. The latter included vehicle donations and installation of digital communication resources. Furthermore, a number of studies and baseline analysis were commissioned for the development of monitoring and policy instruments. Key studies include elephant monitoring analysis (collaring) and census as well as ecological baseline studies in the Project landscapes. Outreach materials and outreach activities were else conducted with a high visibility.

A number of studies and documents have been produced, bridging both areas of work (i.e. protected area management and tourism promotion), promoting visibility, and fostering a series of knowledge management products. These have included (among others) business plans, financial plans, and other such studies that attempt to set an economic background and promote financial sustainability of the processes being implemented in the target region.

A key area that straddles promotion of tourism as well as improved management of protected areas in the country has been work with the communities that surround the national parks in Tanzania's South West. Although livelihood promoting activities were minor and piloted and this was one of the gaps identified throughout several monitoring and assessment exercises that this project has had, work with the communities has been quite extensive and have created the relations and outreach that should be promoted in the future. The demarcation and clearing of boundaries between villages and protected areas, which reduces conflicts and mitigates encroachment into PAs, has been one of the most evident processes of work with neighbouring communities. At this level, the Project also assumed training and education of community members.

The immediate next stages of follow up should further advance the adoption of the products and processes that SPANEST has achieved (as laid out in the exit strategy) in order for this intervention to maintain effects and continuity. The Project is concluding with several key achievements, mainly at the output and at the local pilots' levels, that have laid the groundwork for better management of protected areas and for development associated with growth in Southwest Tanzania. Although SPANEST is evidently ending, it would greatly benefit the country to channel post – project activities in order to build upon what has been attained and to seek continuous tangible results from these accomplishments.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONCLUSION AND FOLLOW UP

1. Accelerate the adoption of the exit plan sustainability plan in order to fulfil achieving results from SPANEST.
2. Impel the finalization of the Project outstanding and pending activities soonest.
3. Promote the upscaling and replication of good practices throughout the protected areas environment in Tanzania.
4. Assure that there is continuity (dove tailing, and up taking) of achievements and processes in future projects, processes, and donor driven interventions in the area and nation-wide.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING

5. Design of future programming needs to be robust if effects and outcomes are to be properly achieved.
6. An exit strategy or sustainability plan should be drafted early on in the programming process, beginning at design, and its adoption should be promoted throughout implementation.
7. A project's aims, objectives, outlook and scope should be made known from inception in a transparent manner.
8. Development projects should clearly establish mechanisms and concrete processes to ensure that livelihoods are enhanced.
9. Future programming should formalize and attempt to sustain all processes related to communities and their relation to protected areas, formalizing community outreach modalities and –most importantly-- providing alternatives to issues that engender many poaching activities and the reduction of human wildlife conflicts.
10. Given that the mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not necessarily nor automatically translate into results or outcomes, the latter should be sought as part of a results-based project.
11. Project reformulations, changes, reforms and other such alterations need to be precise, and implemented (not only analysed) as soon as early signs of failings manifest themselves.
12. Future programming should base its capacity building activities based on a needs assessment and in conjunction with other interventions from other actors and donors in the areas where a project is being implemented.
13. Future programming should promote the upscaling and replication of lessons learned and good practices throughout the protected areas environment in Tanzania, beyond the Southern District.
14. Future programming should cautiously be based on sustaining achievements, within UNDP programming but also with other donors, actors, and stakeholders intervening in the Southern District and in Tanzania as a whole while avoiding duplication and repetition of efforts.
15. UNDP needs to work with and assist the countries where interventions take place in order to aid them in applying processes that support projects' technical and implementation capabilities (specially support project implementation and efficient decision – making capacities). UNDP should guide the uptake process of the products that a project generates, ascertaining that products are translated into outcomes and results. UNDP should provide information on project management, monitoring and reporting and other such project requisites in order to adequately account for achievements and generate adaptive management as needed.

III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Project Report
APR/PIR	Annual Progress Report/ Project Implementation Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CO	Country Office
EA	Executing Agency
EoP	End of the Project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GKKL	Greater Kitulo-Kipengere Landscape
GRL	Greater Ruaha Landscape
IA	Implementing Agency
IP	Implementing Partner
KINAPA	Kitulo National Park
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MKGR	Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRNR	Mount Rungwe Nature Reserve
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NP	National Park
PA	Protected Area
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PPR	Project Progress Report
ProDoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RTA	Regional Technical Adviser
RUNAPA	Ruaha National Park
SPANEST	Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project
TANAPA	Tanzania National Parks Authority
TORs	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNPAF	United Nations Partnership Framework
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WD	Wildlife Division (MNRT)
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

1. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The varied purposes of evaluation exercises include monitoring results as well as monitoring effects/impacts and promoting accountability. This evaluation centres, therefore, upon evaluating the outcomes, outputs, products, and processes achieved by the *Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project* in Tanzania. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to determine if and how project results were achieved, and to draw useful lessons and assemble lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project as well as to aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This final evaluation has primarily focused on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, and relevance of the project considering the accomplished outcomes, objectives, and effects. It includes the following scope:

- Assess progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document.
- Assess signs of project success or failure.
- Review the project's strategy considering its sustainability risks.

The scope of the work centres upon assessing the following criteria:

Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

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

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

The approach for the evaluation of the *Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project* has been determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this assignment and it follows methods and approach as stated in UNDP guidelines and manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects* and *UNDP's*

Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The analysis entails evaluating distinct stages and aspects of the Project including design and formulation, implementation, results, and the involvement of stakeholders in the Project's processes and activities. It has been carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with counterparts of the Government of Tanzania, with the UNDP Country Office, project team, and other key stakeholders. The time scope of the final evaluation is for the whole project as such, including its planned implementation period together with the extension period granted.

To carry out this evaluation exercise several data collection tools for analysing information from the principles of results-based evaluation (including relevance, ownership, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability, impact) were used. Following UNDP/GEF guidelines, the relevant areas of the Project were evaluated according to performance criteria and prospects of sustainability with ratings as summarized in the tables found in annexes (Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix, Annex 3: Evaluation Guidance Questionnaire, Annex 6: Ratings (relevance, performance criteria and sustainability)). The tools chosen for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allowed for in-depth exploration and yielded information that facilitated understanding of observed changes in outcomes and outputs (both intended and unintended) and the factors that contributed to the achievements or the lack of accomplishments.

Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

- *Document analysis*. In depth analysis of documentation was carried out. The documentation analysis examined documents prepared during the planning and implementation phases of the Project. A list of documents consulted is found in annexes (Annex 5: List of consulted documents).
- *Key informant interviews/Individual and group discussions*: Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, government actors, strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiary groups, and local actors. The interviews were carried in person during the evaluation mission. They were either individual interviews or group discussions. Stakeholders to interview were chosen to be the key actors from every single cluster of organizations directly and tangentially involved in the Project. The array of stakeholders, therefore, was a representative sample of actors involved from organizations such as the implementing agency, national government representatives, and local government representatives, project management unit, project staff, as well as representatives from organizations that directly and indirectly participated in different capacities in the Project selected along criteria (availability, role, etc.)

A series of site visits took place as part of the evaluation mission in order to visit areas where direct interventions took place as well as where the Project was effectively based (Iringa, Ruaha National Park, Kitulo National Park, Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve, and Mbeya) and where interviews, focal groups and direct observation of implemented interventions could take place. The sites were chosen according to several different variables. The main variables being learning possibilities from the chosen sites, diversity between the local projects, as well as logistics and resources available for site visits.

A first tool developed for this process was an evaluation matrix (which can be found in annexes in Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix). This matrix guided the data collection process and, as the evaluation proceeded, the matrix was used to collect and display data obtained from various sources that relate to relevant evaluation criteria and questions. This tool was developed not only as a guide for systematizing data collection but also to make the evaluation process transparent. The matrix contains evaluative criteria questions (that is questions and sub questions related to each of the evaluation criteria enclosed in the evaluation); indicators; sources; and methodology. Furthermore, an evaluation questionnaire was prepared and it is found in annexes (Annex 3: Evaluation Guidance Questionnaire). This questionnaire operationalizes the evaluation matrix guiding questions regarding achievements and criteria. It was mainly a guide for interviews with relevant stakeholders at different institutions and for prospective site visits or interviews with project beneficiaries.

As it occurs in most of these sort of evaluations, there are a series of limitations. The evaluability was average given access to inputs (although input access from stakeholders through interview processes was adequate, the access to documentation that this evaluation had access to was average). Also, the Project was still carrying out activities at the same time as the mission and, therefore, the availability of inputs at that time, during evaluation preparation, and after the mission was limited by these factors.

A seventeen-day mission took place, including international travel time, mainly maintaining meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders. A mission and meeting agenda is found in annexes (Annex 4: Itinerary/Mission and Meetings held as part of the Evaluation Process).

STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

This evaluation report is structured beginning with an executive summary, an introduction and an evaluation scope and methodology section. A second section contains an overall project description within a developmental context, including an account of the problems the Project sought to address, as well as its initial objectives. Furthermore, indicators and main stakeholders involved in the Projects are described, as well as what were the expected results. Essentially, this segment of the report deals with the design stage and design concept of the Project. A third core section of this report deals fundamentally with the evaluation findings, analytically observing the results framework and its reform, as well as linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector. Furthermore, this segment also deals with findings relating to the actual implementation of the Project, including strategic issues such as adaptive management and partnership agreements, and monitoring. This third section concludes with findings on actual project overall results and findings related to the criteria established for evaluations such as relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, ownership at the national level, mainstreaming and sustainability. A fourth core section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues and recommendations. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation support documentation.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

PROJECT START AND DURATION AND BUDGET

SPANEST has had an implementation period of six and a half years, with a start on June 2011, a planned closing date of December 2016 and an actual closing date of December 2017 (the latter given the one year no-cost extension granted).³

It had a total planned project cost of 17 400 000 US Dollars, with planned GEF financing of USD 5 300 000. The rest of the funding was expected co-financing from other sources, such as UNDP and the Government of Tanzania.

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEMS THAT PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS

The Project's goal was to promote the conservation and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels of Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity. The Project Document establishes that the Project would be responsible for achieving the following as an objective: *"the biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks."* This objective was to be achieved by two interrelated components⁴ (or overarching outcomes). These were:

Component 1. Integrating Management of National Parks and Broader Landscapes in Southern Tanzania.

Component 2. Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania.

The problems and issues that the Project sought to address relate to the variety of threats to Tanzania's biodiversity as well as to the development deficits in the target geographic zones of the Project (that is, in South West Tanzania). For threats to biodiversity, the Project's planning documents identify these at different levels, such as at the national level as well as at the Greater Ruaha Landscape and the Greater Kitulo – Kipengere Landscape (which is where the intervention was mainly focused on). The specific threats to biodiversity identified, related to overall natural resource management shortfalls and due to habitat alterations and unsustainable wild harvesting of natural resources, were (among others): declining wildlife connectivity, deforestation and forest degradation, siltation and sedimentation, and wetlands contamination. Other specific threats per landscape were else identified at design. For instance, for the Greater Ruaha

³ Although the Project is nearing its conclusion, at the time of the evaluation there were a series of activities still pending and, therefore, an actual closing date of June 2018 was being contemplated.

⁴ The wording of the Project Document designates overarching outcomes as components, and calls sub components as components. Also in some documents outputs are designated as outcomes. As will be seen elsewhere in this report, and as indicated in other evaluations, this generates confusion as to what were the expected results of SPANEST.

Landscape biodiversity-related threats were identified as water flow issues and illegal irrigation, animal disease, wildfires, illegal wildlife off take, soil erosion, and mining. The threats to biodiversity in the Greater Kitulo – Kipengere Landscape were identified as threats to endemic species for illegal trade (for example, orchids), land use conflicts, human wildlife conflict, and poor infrastructure planning.

The threats are linked to barriers such as the lack of integrated Protected Area management at the landscape level and operations that lack capacity and adequate funding. Threats to biodiversity are of course framed within general development issues in Tanzania. The dependency on natural resources for growth and development further enhances the issues, threats and barriers posed to the country as a whole and to the Southern District. Tourism is a key and growing part of Tanzania’s development, since it contributed to over 13 percent of the country’s GDP in 2016 with a forecast of rising contribution in the coming years. Direct employment in the tourism industry is 4 percent of total employment for the country. Furthermore, visitor exports generated over 21 percent of total exports in 2016. Tourism in the country is greatly based on natural resources, wildlife, and biodiversity. Therefore, the importance of addressing threats and barriers goes beyond basic conservation issues. Moreover, the Southern District has been focused as a perspective development area in the country, with tourism based on wildlife and biodiversity as one of its foundation for growth.

Implementation of SPANEST was planned for a period of five and a half years, beginning in mid – 2011 with an expected conclusion in late 2016. The Project was granted a one year no cost extension and it is in the midst of finalizing implementation and closing (at the time of the evaluation). The Project had the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as its GEF Executing Agency and the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) as its Implementing Partner. It was implemented in a NIM modality with the Government of Tanzania as the executor. The Project was designed to formally collaborate with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism as other partner.

IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The overall immediate aim of the Project was to support Tanzania to promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, primarily in protected areas within the country’s Southern District. The development objective of the Project is that, through improving conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as well as land management in and around protected areas, development of those targeted zones can be underpinned. Tangentially, the development objectives of the Project entailed building human and institutional capacity for sustainable management of protected areas and enhancing opportunities to link protected areas with the country socio-economic developmental priorities.

BASELINE INDICATORS ESTABLISHED

In the Project Document (ProDoc) baseline and indicators were established for SPANEST. These are found in the chart below.

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline
Objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks.	Two landscape level coordination mechanisms are formalised to improve biodiversity conservation in GRL and GKKL; two wildlife corridors are created in GKKL (Bujingijila and Numbe); two WMAs are consolidated in GRL.	Within the GRL, TANAPA have management plans for RUNAPA; WCS and local government supporting development of Mbomipa and Umemaruwa WMAs. In GKKL, KINAPA, MKGR and MRNR have management plans.
	Two national parks (RUNAPA and KINAPA) and one game reserve (MKGR) have increased operational capacity to manage themselves sustainably.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations and poaching is common; MKGR is in a vulnerable state of management and all three PAs open to risks of fire and poaching; tourism is nascent and complaints about service levels are common.
	Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR.	Landscape level management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time within PAs and buffer areas. Current METT scores as follows: RUNAPA (53), KINAPA (52), MKGR (21), MRNR (40): average: 42
Component 1: Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania	Biodiversity management in NPs, GRs, NRs, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decision-making governing land use management.	Management activities are carried out on WMA, district, regional government and TANAPA level but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism
	Development impacts in sensitive areas have been mitigated, monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and enforcement measures are operational in GRL and GKKL landscapes.	Monitoring of species and habitats is managed on an individual PA level; understanding of wildlife corridor functions, species movements and dispersal areas limited.
	Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit	TANAPA has community conservation service and ecology departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however, lacking adequate coordination functions with external parties.
	Relations with neighbouring communities to PAs considerably improved: lower instances of human wildlife conflict, fires and poaching	TANAPA has community conservation service departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however, park-community relations remain strained in some crucial border areas.
	Public consultations are completed in an open and fair manner; beacons mark PA boundaries clearly	Recent developments in PA status, especially in western Kitulo area, Mpanga Kipengere and Usangu mean boundaries are not clear; conflicts are a result.
	Mpanga Kipengere GR is upgraded to NP through consultative process, tourism improves as do wildlife numbers as a result	Mpanga Kipengere GR is managed on a meagre budget, fires and poaching are rife; tourism is minimal

	Bujingijila and Numbe valley corridors gazetted, the Kitulo Kipengere NP is agreed and gazetted as a NP.	Wildlife are not able to move from GRL to GKKL, linkages are weak within GKKL PAs
Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania	Ranger and staff training in g programme in existence in RUNAPA and KINAPA; MKGR has joint TANPA-WD programme; guide training and documentary programmes in existence.	Rangers have insufficient capacity in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services.
	Finance and business planning has established management costs for different PAs and WMAs, and provides accurate revenue forecasts for each PA and the wider landscape (GRL/GKKL) and matches revenue to priority management needs.	Business planning in southern Tanzania's PAs lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited a s result.
	The input of increased HR capacity and funds for equipment following a business planning approach has lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness of park operations in RUNAPA and KINAPA.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations in a sustainable manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem.
	Stakeholder groups in both GRL and GKKL landscapes are engaging positively and constructively on biodiversity, land use and management and social and economic growth issues, such as tourism planning.	There is a marked lack of communication largely due to insufficient funding between different PA authorities, local government, communities, civil society and the private sector, causing inefficiencies, misunderstanding and occasional conflict.

Fifteen baseline indicators were established at design. However, only one of them is considered entirely SMART (S: specific; M: measurable; A: achievable; R: relevant; T: time-bound). This is the following indicator: *“Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR”* with a starting point established at *“Landscape level management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time within PAs and buffer areas. Current METT scores as follows: RUNAPA (53), KINAPA (52), MKGR (21), MRNR (40): average: 42 is the indicator for METT scores”*. All other baseline indicators are not specific nor measurable.

The lack of appropriate indicators, in particular point of departure indicators which were not specific nor measurable, has lingered as an issue throughout the whole implementation process. Except for the indicator mentioned above which is standard for these sorts of project, other starting point indicators did not establish a concise and concrete reference point that allowed for measuring achievements throughout implementation. Therefore, reporting and even ascertaining achievements attributable to SPANEST has been difficult if not impossible in many cases. This could also be the reason why the Project was not as results-oriented as it should

have been, and dealt mostly with attainments at the product level and not at the outcome/results levels.⁵ Furthermore, this lack of precision resulted in an inexact use of the log frame / results framework since it could not be used for periodic reviews as it is intended to be.

MAIN STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED AT THE DESIGN LEVEL

At the design level, a series of specific main stakeholders were identified. These were, at the time of project development, as follows:

- Individual Households
- Local Communities
- Village Councils
- District Councils
- Government Departments
- Central Government
- Private Sector
- Community Based Organizations
- National NGOs
- International NGOs
- Government Ministries.

Departing from this identification, which also included each type of stakeholders' roles and responsibilities, a thorough analysis of stakeholder joint involvement was drafted at design. With the expressed purpose of generating ownership and promoting eventual sustainability of processes, activities and outputs to be generated by the Project, the stakeholder involvement plan also set the starting point for an inclusive participative approach throughout the full implementation of SPANEST.

EXPECTED RESULTS

Overall, it was expected that SPANEST would result in improved conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources in Tanzania's Southwest region through improved management of protected areas.

⁵ This issue is brought up repeatedly at the mid-term review.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 PROJECT DESIGN / FORMULATION

ANALYSIS OF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH/RESULTS FRAMEWORK (PROJECT LOGIC /STRATEGY; INDICATORS)

As all projects of this sort, a key aspect of its design is the inception log frame/results framework which includes Project strategy and the intervention's logic as well as baseline and target indicators. SPANEST's project logic and strategy at the design and formulation level was fitting overall. The formulation documents effectively identify the key issues, threats, and other matters that hinder adequate, sustainable management of protected areas in Tanzania (in particular in the South West region of the country) within a developmental framework. The results framework, therefore, bases its logic and strategy upon identified threats and barriers and the ways to act upon them to improve management of PAs.

The threats, barriers, as well as underlying causes that hinder biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use (within which protected areas are key components) in Tanzania were identified at design. Regarding threats to biodiversity, the Project's planning documents identify these at different levels, such as at the national level as well as at the Greater Ruaha Landscape and the Greater Kitulo – Kipengere Landscape (which is where the intervention was mainly focused on). The specific threats to biodiversity identified, related to overall natural resource management shortfalls and due to habitat alterations and unsustainable wild harvesting of natural resources, were (among others): declining wildlife connectivity, deforestation and forest degradation, siltation and sedimentation, and wetlands contamination. Other specific threats per landscape were else identified at design. For instance, for the Greater Ruaha Landscape biodiversity-related threats were identified as water flow issues and illegal irrigation, animal disease, wildfires, wildlife illegal off take, soil erosion, and mining. The threats to biodiversity in the Greater Kitulo – Kipengere Landscape were identified as threats to endemic species for illegal trade (for example, orchids), and use conflicts, human wildlife conflict, and poor infrastructure planning. Threats to biodiversity are of course framed within general development issues in Tanzania. The dependency on natural resources for growth and development further enhances the issues, threats and barriers posed to the country as a whole and to the Southern District. Tourism in the country is greatly based on natural resources, wildlife, and biodiversity. Therefore, the importance of addressing threats and barriers goes beyond basic conservation issues but are also closely related to development issues. The design of SPANEST was carried out in a participatory and collaborative way between major stakeholders, and it involved key actors.

More recently, climate change is also present as a threat to biodiversity in Tanzania, impacting negatively also on PAs, and this is also identified in the design as a threat and a barrier to management matters. All-encompassing issues identified were also the human – wildlife conflict within protected areas and (to some degree although not as fully as it could be expected out of a development intervention) the potential social and economic benefits that biodiversity (including PAs) can bring to the region and to Tanzania as a whole.

SPANEST was designed to lift the barriers for the establishment of a landscape approach in management of biodiversity. Overall, the identified barriers that Project was to deal with were a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs (for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts) as well as a lack of management capacity and of financial planning to bring tourism to the area and to prevent the various threats present.

The Project's logic and strategy therefore was to confront these issues through specific outputs and expected outcomes that would, plausibly, deal with threats and barriers for adequate protected area management in a sustainable development context in Tanzania. Therefore, in terms of overall logic and strategy the design responded to an adequate rationale and it was designed as a strategic intervention. Gender issues were absent at design.

In general (as previously indicated also for starting point indicators), the end-of-project/target indicators established at design were not fully SMART⁶. Except for the METT indicator, the other target indicators are not adequately specific nor measurable. The lack of appropriate end-of-project indicators (for the most part) and, added to that, the lack of robust point of departure indicators which were also for the most part not specific nor measurable, has lingered as an issue throughout the whole implementation process. This not only hindered results-based monitoring and reporting (that is, monitoring and reporting what effects the Project might have had) but it also pervaded to an approach of implementing (and reporting) mainly activities or products.⁷ Furthermore, the results framework had an additional matrix dealing with outputs, and the connection between the two was not fully coherent.

Due, in great part, to this lack of concise and concrete reference points that allowed for measuring achievements throughout implementation and the lack of coherence between the log frame and the outputs matrix, a reformulation of the results framework was done after the Project's mid-point. The changes made, however, were minor. No substantial changes to outcomes, outputs, nor of indicators were made.

ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

At the design stage, a series of risks and assumptions were identified. This risk analysis included classifications (High (High Risk), Med (Modest Risk), and Low (Low Risk) as well as basic strategies for mitigation. These and their ranking in severity as perceived at the design stage are indicated below.

⁶ SMART (S: specific; M: measurable; A: achievable; R: relevant; T: time-bound

⁷ The Mid Term Review of the Project also takes up this same sort of analysis and recommends a log frame /results framework reformulation based, to a great degree, on these issues.

Table 1: Risks, assumptions and mitigation measures as stated in Project Document

Risk	Rating	Risk Mitigation Measure
Landscape planning and subsequent implementation of plans will be affected by institutional intransigence, reducing collaborative efforts between NPs, District Councils and Villages.	Med	TANAPA has selected to work in landscapes where this risk will be muted, and builds on strong Government will to strengthen management of the NP Southern Circuit. The project will invest in building conflict avoidance and resolution skills, and build on existing institutional mechanisms such as district environmental committees, and seek to cost economic tradeoffs between wildlife, tourism, agriculture and other land uses and to reduce opportunity costs thus reducing the prospects that institutions will not find common ground. Institutional buy-in between government departments and ministries is secured and will be ongoing.
The tourism down-turn continues for longer and at deeper levels than expected, thus even further reducing financial viability of the Southern Circuit.	Low	The NP system is heavily dependent on the tourism industry. The project strategy aims at building Tanzania's capability to weather the economic crisis, including by improving the cost effectiveness of operations, expanding the tourism product in the Southern Circuit, supporting TANAPA to enhance the tourism products available such as through walking safaris and tapping into the under-served domestic tourism market and assisting TANAPA to build its Operating Reserve during high tourism years.
Land pressure from local communities and short term gain seekers reduce attempts for rational landscape level conservation.	Med	Feasibility studies will be undertaken as part of the Systematic Conservation Plans that will be prepared under component 1. These plans will be mandated at national and local government level. The project will seek to manage trade-offs between real development needs and conservation actions within the PA system. Improved enforcement will serve as a deterrent against rent seeking; the project will therefore strengthen the enforcement capabilities of Government.
Climate change could lead to changed distributions of BD components, and changes in community and private sector demands on wildlife and forest resources.	Low	A focus on landscapes (as opposed to small patches), with sufficient buffer zone protection militates against short-term change. The maintenance of forest cover is a good adaptation policy in the face of uncertainty (because rainfall in this region is expected to increase; the maintenance of watershed integrity is critical to avoid major floods).

Some of the risks were correctly identified and graded. However, other ones which manifested themselves early on were not correctly identified and ranked. For instance, in relation to Outcome 1.6 *"Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is upgraded to National Park . . ."* and Outcome 1.7 on linking wildlife corridor. Although this outcome was not achieved and it was identified as unachievable at the mid-term review, the risk of administrative and organisational opposition to these changes was not only not identified at design, but it was not redefined during implementation. Although this risk was evident even at the mid-point of the Project implementation process, there was no attempt to redefine risks in light of actions taking place. While the Project Document did identify the risks above, and generated a series of proposed mitigation of risks, there was no thorough risk reporting throughout the life span of the Project. Therefore, assessing mitigation is not possible.

LESSONS FROM OTHER RELEVANT PROJECTS (SAME FOCAL AREA) INCORPORATED INTO PROJECT DESIGN

SPANEST draws from lessons from other relevant projects (either explicitly or tacitly). For instance, other GEF-financed projects are identified at the design stage which may pose lessons for SPANEST⁸. Specific lessons were drawn from these projects, such as linking protected areas through corridors, lessons from conservation through community-based approaches and linkages with communities, as well as financial sustainability issues. Although there were aims for the Project to link with other similar GEF – funded initiatives in Africa (outside of Tanzania), there is no evidence that this has taken place. Overall, therefore, the Project had a series of GEF-financed experiences and projects to draw upon for its design and implementation. The aim to build upon these is made explicit in the Project design. At design, there were no specific lessons raised from non – GEF funded relevant projects. It could have benefitted project design to also draw upon these, and through that generate bridges with other projects that deal with the same issues and in the same geographic area as SPANEST.

PLANNED STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

At the design stage there was a framework of planned stakeholder participation. First, participation was planned for the Project’s decision-making processes (Project Steering Committee) and ad-hoc technical committees as the Project progressed in implementation. The ProDoc states in a summarized manner what were the expected inputs and expected participation of several stakeholders. This participation framework was fairly comprehensive. Stakeholder involvement was drafted at design. With the expressed purpose of generating ownership and promoting eventual sustainability of processes, activities and outputs to be generated by the Project, the stakeholder involvement plan also set the starting point for an inclusive participative approach throughout the full implementation of SPANEST. The implementation of the planned stakeholder participation closely followed what was planned in a comprehensive manner and at different levels.

REPLICATION APPROACH

The mid-term review indicated, for instance, that project experiences from pilot sites should be replicated in conservation landscapes in Tanzania. Yet, there is no evidence that this has taken place as of yet fully and in a planned manner.

At the design level, what the Project Document catalogues as a replication strategy was included for each of the two expected outputs. For the first component (*“Integrating*

⁸ The Project Document specifically refers to the following: • Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests; • The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor; • SFM Sustainable Woodland Management in the Miombo Areas of Western Tanzania; • SFM Extending the Coastal Forests Protected Area Subsystem.

management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania”) this hypothetical strategy entailed capturing, distilling, documenting, and widely dissemination lessons learned for TANAPA and other partners elsewhere. For the second component (*“Operations Support for NP Management in Southern Tanzania”*) the hypothetical strategy also entailed the drafting of a lessons learned exercise from business planning approaches and from some of the training initiatives. Since the lessons learned documents are not drafted yet, an assessment of them cannot be made at this time.

Although these mentions are made implying that this is a replication strategy, what was proposed is just a lessons learned exercise. A full-fledged formalized approach for replicating results was not part of the design. Furthermore, no specific concrete approach (at design and planning) to upscale, replicate or expand outcomes and outputs was implemented.

UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

UNDP’s comparative advantage in relation to GEF – funded projects (and as relevant to this project) lies in its practice in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, engaging government in the generation and strengthening of capacity, and sustaining non-governmental and community participation. UNDP assists countries in promoting, designing and implementing activities consistent with sustainable development plans. UNDP’s comparative advantage in this case also pertains to its programming experience in Tanzania on the subject. Project design contemplated UNDP’s comparative advantage, in particular as it relates to GEF – funded projects. Also, the Project was aligned with UNDP planning documents for Tanzania, such as UNDAP, which have as an underlying theme UNDP’s mandate and comparative advantage in capacity building, sustainable development, as well as strengthening and improving institutional effectiveness.

The Project (through design and through implementation) had a strong emphasis on material implementation such as infrastructure building and upgrading, vehicles and other such donations. Therefore, some of the design and implementation mechanisms do not particularly correspond to the full components that a GEF-funded UNDP-implemented project is expected to have. For instance, the emphasis on capacity building directed through UNDP strategic mandates is present to some degree, but it is in addition to more “brick and mortar” implementation. Notwithstanding this emphasis, and as will be seen in other sections of this report and as the Project itself monitored, there was little or no understanding that a UNDP-implemented project has or should have an emphasis on capacity building. This resulted in a continuous demand from partners and beneficiaries on infrastructure and equipment support to other forms of capacity building, which was the Project’s focus.

UNDP (at the Country Office as well as at the Regional Office levels) also provided technical backstopping. This has been in addition to the Project assurance roles in financial matters and general implementation support. As indicated in the mid-term review, UNDP could have had a more solid role in aiding the Project in seeking and reporting results-based outcomes in the first stage of implementation. This improved to some degree during the second stage of

implementation given that UNDP generated improved mechanisms and templates for tracking, monitoring and reporting progress towards results.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The management arrangements set out at design and formulation were fairly standard arrangements for GEF – funded UNDP – implemented National Execution (NEX) / National Implementation (NIM) modality projects. The lead implementing agency was TANAPA, not only overseeing matters of implementation but also actively supporting the Project. TANAPA also had a strong role in management through the seconding of personnel. A Project Board and Project Steering Committee (PSC) were set up with the aim of it being a strategic decision-making body for SPANEST that would provide overall guidance and direction as well as be responsible for decision making.

Given that protected areas fall under the realm or have influence by and of different national and district-level agencies, these institutions were also partners of the Project, not only at the decision-making process (such as in the Project Screening Committee) but also in direct implementation of activities and products.

The design arrangements also provide guidelines for the functioning of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) as well as staffing guidelines. The original management arrangements indicated that the PCU would be responsible for the overall coordination of project activities, and that it would coordinate national and intra-landscape level activities that are largely linked to policy and systematic as well as institutional capacities for managing protected areas landscapes.

LINKAGES BETWEEN PROJECT AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITHIN THE SECTOR

As could be expected for a subject that links issues such as natural resource management, tourism as a development factor, protected area management and financing, combatting wildlife crime and poaching, and community-related issues regarding their relations with PAs, as well as land management, a myriad of other interventions within the sector(s) are in place in Tanzania as a whole and specifically in the country's Southern Circuit. There are projects in combatting wildlife crime, infrastructure development, land management, community development, anti-poaching and wildlife crime (just to mention a few of them).

Although this is the case, very few linkages through the Project were found with these other interventions, except for a few exchanges. Although TANAPA indicates that all interventions within the sector are channelled through that institution, better linkage between SPANEST and other donor-supported projects could have contributed to meaningful exchanges, avoidance of duplication of efforts, coordination and improved possibilities for outcomes sustainability.

3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT (CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESIGN AND PROJECT OUTPUTS DURING IMPLEMENTATION)

Adaptive management is defined as the Project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (*project objective, outcomes, or outputs*) during implementation resulting from: (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions that changed, due to which change was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original expectations were overambitious; or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress⁹. If this definition is followed, then it can be said that adaptive management did take place to a certain degree, in particular regarding the latter two points [(c) and (d)], but not to a large degree.

The adaptive changes mainly took place after the Project's mid-point. They entailed a minor review of the log frame and a new monitoring and evaluation plan. None of the two were major. Another change, although not strictly an adaptive management measure, was the termination of the technical advisor role. Since the Implementing Partner and the PSC understood that a technical advisor was not needed and that the allocated funds could be used in other activities, the Project operated in its concluding stages without a technical advisor. There were no major implications of this decision identified by this evaluation given that, first, the advisory role was necessary in the beginning and set up of the Project and, second, technical issues were covered by consultancies and staff after this decision was made. Therefore, it cannot be stated that this decision negatively affected the achievement of project outcomes.

Given the above it can be said that adaptive management in a strict sense was not applied in the implementation period since there were no substantial formal alterations at the objective, outcomes and outputs levels. Yet some re-structuring was implemented as needed which can be construed as adaptation.

PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS (WITH RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN THE COUNTRY/REGION)

As established in the Project Document and at inception, a broad framework for stakeholder analysis was carried out at Project design. The main partnership arrangements with relevant stakeholders involved in protected areas, in national and subnational government, in the tourism private sector, as well as with communities in the targeted region were not only prescribed at design but adhered to throughout implementation. The partnership arrangements worked positively for the most part. The only partnership arrangement that did not resolve itself as expected was with the Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve stakeholders. It should be stated that

⁹ Source: *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. UNDP and GEF. 2014.

an expected outcome of SPANEST was “PAs expanded to encompass two ecologically sensitive wildlife corridor areas linking Kitulo NP to Mt Rungwe and to Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve), creating a linked ‘Greater Kitulo-Kipengere landscape’ totalling over 2,000 km²”. This did not occur and in part was due to misunderstandings between and among the main stakeholders as to the scope of the Project and what the PA expansion would entail. This not only in management matters but –perhaps more importantly– in policy and administrative issues.

FEEDBACK FROM MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES USED FOR THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The monitoring/evaluation plan as set at design was considered to essentially follow achievements, indicators, outputs and outcomes. There were, therefore, frequent opportunities for feedback of M & E activities to be used for adaptive management. However, there has been no strong adaptive management nor substantial changes to project design to specify (as seen in the section on adaptive management above).

PROJECT FINANCE

The Project had a total planned cost of 17 400 000 US Dollars, with planned GEF financing of USD 5 300 000. The rest of the funding was expected co-financing from other sources, such as UNDP and the Government of Tanzania. The table below indicates the amount of funds confirmed at approval and the amount of funds spent as reported to the terminal evaluation.

Actual expenditures, as reported at the time of the Terminal Evaluation, were 94.7 percent of the financing expected upon approval. Considering that the final evaluation took place before project ended and that there were a series of activities still planned to take place after the evaluation, it can be expected that expenditures (and therefore leveraging of funds) would be nearly or slightly above what was expected upon approval.

Name of Cofinancer	Type of Cofinancing	Amount Confirmed at approval (in US Dollars)	Amount Reported at TE (in US Dollars)
GEF	Grant	5,304,500	5,285,397
UNDP	Grant	1,000,000	750,000
TANAPA (Nat Gov.)	Cash	10,700,000	10,000,000
Wildlife Div. (Nat Gov.)	In-kind	150,000	423,818
PO-RALG (Nat Gov.)	In-kind	210,000	0
Total Project funds		17,364,500	16,459,215

An audit of SPANEST by the National Audit Office of Tanzania was carried out in early February 2014. Issues such as delays in procurement (and its subsequent impact on expenditure and delays implementation as well as equipment to be purchased delays) were noted by this audit.¹⁰ After this audit no further issues were reported nor identified by the Project for this evaluation, and therefore overall financial management practices were applied.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION: DESIGN AT ENTRY AND IMPLEMENTATION

Planned monitoring and evaluation design at entry defines and proposes tools and methodologies in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures for this sort of project. These included Inception Workshop and Report; Project Implementation Reports (PIRs); Periodic status/ progress reports; Mid-term Evaluation; Final Evaluation; Project Terminal Report. Although some of these tools were not fully well-defined with little guidance on content, results based monitoring, etc., they do follow a prototype applicable to the sort of project being implemented. Therefore, at entry, the ranking is *Moderately Satisfactory (S)* given that it had some shortcomings.

Monitoring has had shortcomings, not only in observing project achievements but also in reporting said achievements¹¹. Although reporting was done on a timely manner, and formally following templates, progress towards results was not fully reported as such. There was an overemphasis on reporting on activities and not on outcomes/results/effects and less so on impact. This was the case throughout the whole of the implementation process, from inception to the Project's mid-point and also (albeit to a lesser degree) at the Project's second stage (i.e. from mid-point to the time of the evaluation). This will also be seen in the sections further along this report when analysing impact, effects, and outcomes. The means of verification for whatever effects the Project was supposed to have were very weak. Although the perception abounds that the Project had an impact on increased tourism in the area and a reduction in poaching, there are no indicators nor means of verification that can fully attest to that.

The mid-term review and the terminal evaluation have taken place at the times it was assumed they would take place. They were both undertaken under the guidance of the UNDP Country Office in Tanzania as planned.

Due to the shortcomings in the achievement of the monitoring plan at implementation it is considered that implementation of the M & E plan was *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*. A composite ranking that considers monitoring and evaluation design at entry together with the M & E plan's implementation for the overall quality of M&E is *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*.

¹⁰ The Project's mid-term review indicates that some irregularities in records of stores management, fuel purchase and contract register, were found and that actions were recommended. The midterm review indicates that corrective actions were taken.

¹¹ This was an issue that was also pointed out repeatedly in the mid-term review.

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER AND UNDP IMPLEMENTATION / EXECUTION COORDINATION, AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The Project Document sets up coordination and operational issues as well as proposed management arrangements. The coordination and management implementation system is set following standard processes for NEX (National Execution)/NIM (National Implementation Modality) projects, with guidance on project coordination, steering committee, board, staffing, and implementing partner's roles.

By all accounts, the implementing partner's (i.e. TANAPA) implementation and execution as well as all that it relates to coordination and operational issues worked very well thorough the whole project. TANAPA guided implementation and most importantly adopted the execution of the Project with a very high degree of ownership and collaboration not only towards UNDP but also with project coordination.

The project management coordination was set up following guidelines in the Project Document establishing a rather small staffing arrangement. Indication of ownership and commitment is manifested by TANAPA assuming co-financing and management through the secondment of most staff, for instance. The role of leadership assumed by TANAPA is also a key in execution issues.

Given that the Project was implemented in a NEX/NIM modality, the role of TANAPA was key as it regards to management and operative matters, not only as they relate to the project management unit but also in terms of operational processes (including contracting, procurement, and approvals needed to execute work plans) and decision-making processes. These processes were carried out in concordance with UNDP with UNDP's role in project assurance. Some delays were identified at start-up due to procedural and procurement issues. These were the main reasons for the one year no-cost extension requested and granted and seemingly for the extension for a few months after December 2017 which ostensibly will be granted for finishing some products and project closing.

UNDP (at the Country Office and at the Regional Office levels) provided technical backstopping, evaluation assurance, and other general management oversight. Again, as indicated in the mid-term review, UNDP could have had a more forceful role in seeking outcomes and effects, and not so much activities and products as the Project and the Implementing Partner sought. Although this was to a great degree a design failure, it could have been more forcefully rechannelled throughout the implementation period. Furthermore, there could have been more forceful roles in making UNDP's comparative advantage understood (i.e. capacity building) which in turn could have helped the Project and TANAPA present project modalities and comparative advantage and avoid misunderstandings with expectations.

Therefore, the quality of execution by the implementing partner/executing agency is deemed *Satisfactory (S)* as is the quality of UNDP implementation/implementing agency. Therefore, as an amalgamated review, the overall quality of implementation and execution, of the executing agency as well as the quality execution of UNDP is *Satisfactory (S)*.

Regarding risk the quality of risk management by both TANAPA and UNDP, some issues were identified throughout implementation. As seen in the section of this report specifically dealing with assumptions and risks, some of the risks were correctly identified and graded at design. However, other ones which manifested themselves early on were not correctly identified and ranked.¹² Also, although some of the risks and further impact upon implementation and achieving outcomes were evident even at the mid-point of the Project implementation process,¹³ there was no attempt to redefine risks in light of actions taking place. Also, while the Project Document did identify the risks above, and generated a series of proposed mitigation of risks, there was no thorough risk reporting throughout the life span of the Project and therefore no thorough risk management with which to mitigate threats.

3.3 PROJECT RESULTS

OVERALL RESULTS

Bearing in mind that the goal of SPANEST was *“Southern Tanzania’s biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity”* and that the Project was to achieve the following objective *“The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threats within National Park”*, an analysis of results entails understanding what has been achieved in terms of outcomes.

SPANEST was intended to achieve expected results articulated through anticipated outcomes and these, in turn, are operationalized through the generation of outputs (products, activities, processes, etc.). The PIR 2017¹⁴ reports a series of what the Project conceived as results, although many if not most of them, are outputs. These are indicated below as extracted from the 2017 PIR for the objective and for each of the two expected outcomes and an analysis by this evaluation is made following on what the results (evident or not) have been.

¹² As indicated in that section, for instance, in relation to Outcome 1.6 “Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is upgraded to National Park . . .” and Outcome 1.7 on linking wildlife corridor. Although this outcome was not achieved and it was identified as unachievable at the mid-term review, the risk of administrative and organisational opposition to these changes was not only not identified at design, but it was not redefined during implementation

¹³ And also identified specifically in the mid – term review carried out.

¹⁴ That is the last Project Implementation Report available since SPANEST has not produced a final report at the time of the evaluation.

Description of Indicator	Cumulative progress since project start ¹⁵
METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KNP and MKGR	RUNAPA 70% out of the targeted 60% by EoP. KNP 63% out of the targeted 60% by EoP. MKGR 56% out of the targeted 50% by EoP. MRNR 63% out of the targeted 50% by EoP.

This overall result, where METT scores are tallied at the end of the Project indicate that expected outcome of improved scores was achieved to some degree (from 63 to 70 percent of expected target at end of project –EoP--). Therefore, in general it can be inferred that (together with other initiatives and actors in the area) SPANEST has led to some level of improved protected area management effectiveness in Tanzania’s Southern District’s PAs, through increasing management capacity. The latter not only via institutional and individual capacity building but also through the equipping of facilities and through the provision of funds for management activities. It is interesting to note that, as seen in the sections on indicators and as will be seen in the following sectors of this report, the only truly SMART indicator is mainly this individual result that can be tallied and that is reported as a measurable indicator. This further makes the case for robust design, which will not only have impacts on monitoring and reporting but – perhaps more importantly—will have a large influence on results-based management.

Description of Indicator	Cumulative progress since project start ¹⁶
Outcome 1:	Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania.
Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit	Training for the TANAPA staff and Districts officer around the protected areas were invited in the training/workshop conducted in Dodoma. The training was conducted by technical experts from the National Land Use Plan Commission on how to bridge the gap that exists in the land use plan around the protected areas.

¹⁵ Source: 2017 PIR.

¹⁶ Source: 2017 PIR.

Relations with neighbouring communities to PAs considerably improved: lower instances of human wildlife conflict, fires and poaching	The project has significantly improved engagement between Protected Areas (RUNAPA, RKMGR, MKGR and MRNR) and respective adjacent communities through operations of the Landscape Community Conservation Units that comprise members from the Protected Areas and District Councils. The units have provided more efficiency in conservation education delivery by cutting down operation costs and drawing together different skills and knowledge. The improved relations led to establishment of Voluntary Community Based Wildlife Protection groups in 4 villages. The groups have managed to apprehend poachers in their villages and confiscating weapons and trophies. These groups are also involved in controlling problem animals in their villages in liaison with the adjacent protected areas. More community members are volunteering information leading to faulting planned illegal activities in and outside PAs and apprehending poachers.
Public consultations are completed in an open and fair manner; beacons mark PA boundaries clearly	Placement of beacons in both. The Mpanga -Kipengere area, Kitulo National and Ruaha National Park, is continuing and expected to be completed in all the suggested areas in numbers which have been described and explained.
Mpanga Kipengere GR is upgraded to NP through consultative process	This is still under discussions with the Ministry and other relevant government institutions.
Bujingijila and Numbe valley corridors gazetted	Bujingijila area that was thought to be an unprotected corridor connecting KNP and MRNR was found to lie legally within the 2 PAs following survey work that involved the 2 PAs and the adjacent District Councils. As a result, a shared boundary of the 2 PAs that runs through the area was identified and demarcated with concrete beacons. Some work has also been done as part of the process to secure Numbe Valley wildlife corridor including carrying out reconnaissance and socioeconomic surveys that confirmed validity of the corridor and little dependence of communities on the valley for livelihood. Presently an ecological study is going on to establish movement patterns of animals between KNP and MKGR through the Valley. The process towards securing Numbe corridor has been participatory involving the 2 PAs and Makete District Council. This gives cause for optimism that even if the process does not conclude within the project tenure, the PAs and the District council shall manage to secure the corridor

For expected Outcome 1, the last project implementation report describes (as cumulative progress since project start) a series of products/outcomes and not necessarily results/outcomes. Therefore, results and outcomes need to be inferred or deduced. Also, to some degree the products have had an impact on improved METT scores to the degree reported for meeting with Project Objective. The activities carried out mainly entailed training of protected areas' personnel, public awareness actions, information compilation, and other such activities. Within this outcome, a series of processes were supported, including capacity building for protected areas' personnel, securing a wildlife corridor, and improving community relations. The latter is a

good practice identified for SPANEST, which not only has reduced conflict between some target communities and protected area management (mainly through demarcation) but also by piloting some livelihood enhancement activities.

Description of Indicator	Cumulative progress since project start ¹⁷
Outcome 2:	Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania
Ranger and staff training programme in existence in RUNAPA and KNP; MKGR has joint TANAPA-WD programme; guide training and documentary programmes in existence.	So far 64 rangers from the RUNAPA, KNP and MKGR have been trained in professional walking safari guiding whereas 224 have been trained on operational skills related to antipoaching tactics and techniques. There is more training of walking safari guiding coming up before project closure that will comprise 20 staff hence reaching the projected number of 300 trained rangers.
Finance and business planning has established management costs for different PAs and WMAs, and provides accurate revenue forecasts for each PA and the wider landscape (GRL/GKKL) and matches revenue to priority management needs.	Business and Finance Plans for the 2 Landscapes with guidelines for best practice are in place.
The input of increased HR capacity and funds for equipment following a business planning approach has lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness of park operations in RUNAPA and KINAPA	Since the inception of the project, TANAPA has noticeably increased the number of staff in RUNAPA and KNP. The project has undertaken number of activities to enhance operational capacity of the 2 PAs including installation of digital radio communication systems in both, which has significantly enhanced planning and monitoring of patrols. The motor grader donated to RUNAPA by the project has facilitated 2,584 kms of roadwork, opening up more of the park for tourism while enhancing patrols and other park operations. Patrol vehicles donated to RUNAPA (2) AND knp (1) have maintained good working condition ever since, contributing significantly to anti-poaching effort. The 2 PAs and MKGR have been supported to demarcate their boundaries whereby a total of 345 kms have been cleared and 550 beacons installed. Well demarcated boundaries eradicate accidental encroachment while denying excuse those who do so intentionally. Moreover, the project is improving a picnic site at RUNAPA by provisioning infrastructure consisting of flush-toilets and resting bandas. The project has also significantly improved signage within and outside the 2 PAs thereby enhancing visitors' experience

¹⁷ Source: 2017 PIR.

Stakeholder groups in both RUNAPA and KNP are engaging positively and constructively on biodiversity management	The project has been supporting operations of the Ruaha-Rungwa Law Enforcement Unit, a government that oversees the whole of project area and beyond. The project has particularly been supporting planning meetings and joint patrols. Joint patrols are proving to be more cost effective and yielding better patrol outcomes than when the law enforcement units used to operate separately
Biodiversity management in NPs, GRs, NRs, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decision making governing land use management.	The project has continued monitoring activities of previously established regional and district tourism committees. Under the influence of the project, the public and private sectors were able to host a tourism fair for the Southern circuit for the first time after 3 years of learning from their counterparts in the Northern circuit. The Tourism and Marketing Strategy for Southern Tanzania previously developed is being customized by the specific regions within project area. Njombe region now has own strategy whereas Mbeya and Iringa regions and on the process of developing their own strategies as well. The project has continued facilitating functioning of the Law enforcement Unit for Ruaha-Rungwa Ecological Zone which basically encompasses both the GRL and GKKL. 2 planning meetings and 2 joint patrols were facilitated for the unit. In collaboration with other conservation institutes, the project has established youth volunteer groups in Chamwino district for antipoaching - The Ruaha Round Table forum which bring together researchers from within the project area to exchange experiences, has continued to meet regularly under influence of research partners from within the project area, enhancing a coordinated ecological monitoring at landscape level. Previously formulated conservation education groups for GRL and GKKL have continued functioning. For instance in the last year of the reporting period they were deployed alongside District Security and defense Committees in public awareness meetings that are necessary to ensure protected area boundaries are demarcated in a participatory manner in the GKKL. In the GRL committee members conducted an awareness campaign in 9 villages in Manyoni district in collaboration with the publicity unit from Tanzania wildlife Authority (TAWA) in which various conservation topic were taught and also posters with the toll-free number designated to receive poaching reports, were disseminated
Development impacts in sensitive areas have been mitigated, monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and enforcement measures are operational in GRL and GKKL landscapes.	Business and Finance Plans detailing strengths and opportunities for sustainable enterprises and financing have been developed for the project area to provide guidance to conservation stakeholders. The Landscape Coordination Committee (LCC) for Njombe has been developed and operational whereas Mbeya and Iringa are also in the process of developing own LCCs

The last project implementation report describes, also for expected Outcome 2, as cumulative progress since project start a series of products/outcomes and not necessarily results/outcomes. Therefore, results and outcomes need to be inferred or deduced. Also, to some degree the products have had an impact on improved METT scores to the degree reported for meeting with Project Objective. The activities carried out mainly entailed training of protected areas' personnel (here also in tourist-related activities), work with local governments, public awareness actions, information compilation and drafting of studies business plans, and other

such activities. Infrastructure and equipment upgrading also took place within this outcome. Within this expected outcome, a series of processes were supported, including capacity building for protected areas' personnel in tourist-related activities, as well as tourism awareness. Full evidence and systematic assessment of use of some of the products is still not available (for example incidence on poaching, on reducing fire risk, on the use of business plans, and so on). Therefore, effects/results/impacts cannot be fully inferred. Again, as expressed in other sections of this report, not all change in the target region can be attributed to SPANEST since there are multiple actors and stakeholders acting on the same issues and in the same area, yet there is some reporting that would tend to infer some effects.¹⁸

Therefore, an overall general assessment of results is that the Project concentrated on outputs and was not – result oriented, yet some effects/outcomes/results can be inferred. Although, given the lack of adequate data and indicators, these cannot be accurately described and considering that the Project still has not ended, it would benefit the Project (as well as the Project's sustainability factors) to draw as soon as possible an end of project report that is results oriented and that it would contain as much data as available on results and not only on activities/products.

As a summary, it can be said that SPANEST has been a positive project for developing products: upgrading infrastructure and equipping protected areas and personnel, reports, plans, studies, background information, boundary demarcations. However, at the results, outcomes and effects levels the Project there are some difficulties ascertaining what these are at this point due to a lack of indicators (a problem that is related to design issues) and a lack of overall data on key issues. Nevertheless, some effects can be deduced, including a degree of improvement in METT scores, capacity built at different levels, decreased conflict with some communities in protected areas buffer zones and consequently improved relations with these, as well as general awareness raising. Generally, therefore, two levels of analysis can be made regarding overall results / attainment of objectives. One at the outputs/products/processes level and another at the results/effects/outcome level. While SPANEST has been successful to a certain degree (and therefore *Satisfactory (S)*) at the output level, it has been less successful at the results / effects levels with significant shortcomings in obtaining results at outcome level at the time of the evaluation (and therefore *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*). An overall composite ranking for results is *MS (Moderately Satisfactory)*.

COMMUNICATIONS AND VISIBILITY

A project's external communication not only attends to the visibility of the intervention, it also gives an account of a project's progress and intended impact through communications, outreach and even in some cases through public awareness drives. SPANEST has had by all accounts a positive external communication and visibility.

¹⁸ For instance, in association to a toll-free telephone line that was promoted by the Project, there are indications that reporting of poaching incidents have increased.

Internal communications (i.e. account of a project's progress for instance) however was not strong, yet external and overall visibility was high. Although at times the visibility and communication products did not have attribution to the Project partners in many products or outputs (no indication that this was an international project supported by the UN system, no UNDP/GEF/Implementing Partners' logos, just the word SPANEST for instance, etc.), there was very good visibility in other realms. The Project was and is well known in the areas where it intervened (i.e. the Southwest of Tanzania) and it was highlighted in official UNDP visits. Also, the communications and visibility implemented by the Project Coordination were highly imaginative and creative (music, football matches, etc.). Therefore, it can be assessed that visibility was high.

RELEVANCE

When analysing relevance for SPANEST, the scrutiny can be done at two levels. First at the level of needs for Tanzania and second at the level of formal aligning of the Project with development plans and UNDP/GEF corporate mandates. The latter relates as to the extent to which a project and its interventions and activities are suited to local and national development priorities and needs as well as programmatic UN priorities.¹⁹

Regarding the former, relevance vis – a – vis the country's needs, it can be stated that the Project was relevant. Firstly, this project was positioned in an area targeted for development by the Tanzanian Government. Secondly, the sustainable management of protected areas is an issue within Tanzania with barriers and threats identified. This is not only an issue of conservation per se but also due to the fact that natural resource tourism (primarily wildlife) is a key socio-economic sector in the country. Furthermore, the Project is and remains relevant due to its alignment with national policies. The Project aligned with international conventions that Tanzania is committed to (such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna).

A whole series of policies with which the Project was aligned with were identified at design. Among them, the following can be highlighted: National Land Policy, Land and the Village Land Act, Land Use Planning Act, Land Act, National Environmental Policy, Environmental Management Act, National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, Wildlife Conservation Act, Wildlife Policy, Wildlife Management Area Regulations, and National Policy for Tourism. These are, evidently, in addition to policies strictly related to the protected areas targeted by the Project.

The Project was aligned with explicit corporate and programmatic UN policies, several of which are indicated below, current at the time of design and formulation:

- Common Country Programme Document (CCPD) for 2011-2015.

¹⁹ In a formal sense, relevance is analysed at the time of project planning and design (i.e. if a project is a good fit with national policies current at the design stage). In this case, as indicated here it was. SPANEST is also relevant with regard to newer planning instruments and projects, which is important for sustainability and for follow up.

- UNDP's Strategic Plan's Programme Component, Environment and Energy for Sustainable Development, specifically the sub component aligning with "Local capacity for mainstreaming environment and energy provision into national development policies plans and programmes" and "Relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Local Government Authorities (LGAs) and non-State actors improve enforcement of environment laws and regulations for the protection of ecosystems, biodiversity and the sustainable management of natural resources."
- UNDAP I (2011-2016) Specifically Output 3, "Improved capacity for sustainable management of protected areas, coastal forests and marine ecosystems including policy and regulatory frameworks."

Given the relevance of the issue for the country as well as the alignment of the Project with UNDP, GEF, and national mandates, the rating for SPANEST for this criterion is *R (Relevant)*.

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Effectiveness and efficiency are two very inter – related concepts in project evaluations. The effectiveness of a project is defined as the degree to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved. The valorisation of effectiveness is used as an aggregate for judgment of the merit or worth of an activity, (i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives proficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact). While efficiency is defined as the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into *results*.

Regarding effectiveness, the Project has been fairly effective in achieving outputs/products and less effective in achieving outcomes. As some stakeholders indicate and previous assessments emphasize, the Project had issues in harnessing lasting sustainable and systematic effects of most of the products achieved. Although some products are producing outcomes (for example, it can be inferred that METT scores improvement are related to this) other effects cannot be inferred, or are not occurring to the level expected.²⁰ Therefore, the ranking of effectiveness for SPANEST at the outcome level is *MS (Moderately Unsatisfactory)* while the ranking of effectiveness of SPANEST at the output/products level is *Satisfactory (S)*. Therefore, as a composite the Project's effectiveness is ranked as *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*.

The efficiency analysis of SPANEST is analysed vis-à-vis the scope of the evaluation, that is for the Project as a whole, from beginning to its conclusion. The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible was satisfactory since only minor

²⁰ These issues are further discussed in the sustainability section.

shortcomings in this criterion have been identified. Therefore, a composite ranking of efficiency for the full scope of implementation is *S (Satisfactory)*.

COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

Assessed country ownership for SPANEST has been very high. Government's explicit involvement and support of the Project, and the involvement of different institutions that deal with protected areas, local management, and tourism is indicative of high ownership factors within this scope. Furthermore, the high level of co – financing that the Government of Tanzania has placed into the Project is a strong indicator of ownership at the country level. As seen in the section on relevance (above), country ownership is also related to the alignment of SPANEST with national priorities (relevance) and alignment with specific policies related to land management and natural resource management.

MAINSTREAMING

Given that UNDP -- supported GEF -- financed projects are key elements in UNDP country programming, project objectives and outcomes should align with UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required global environmental benefits. When dealing with mainstreaming, evaluations also explore whether project outcomes are being mainstreamed into national policies.

SPANEST has created products that, if implemented, could be attuned with UNDP priorities of improved governance and improving natural resource management. Other UNDP priorities, such as women's empowerment were not part of the outcomes within SPANEST and improving livelihoods (a part of UNDP mandate as it relates to human development in general) was solely piloted.

Other effects related to some degree to mainstreaming also involve local populations. For instance, communities in buffer zones and in protected areas surroundings, through actions impelled by SPANEST such as demarcation of territories vis-à-vis protected areas, reduced conflict between government and local populations. This can lead, conceivably, to improved governance in the future. The latter is identified as a good practice given that it not only has reduced conflict between some target communities and protected area management (mainly through demarcation), but also by piloting some livelihood enhancement activities.

IMPACT

An evaluation assesses the extent to which the Project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that are to be brought out in an evaluation include whether the Project has demonstrated:

- (a) verifiable improvements in ecological status,
- (b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or

(c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²¹

Within the Results – Based Management chain, UNDP defines impact as “Actual or intended changes in human development as measured by people’s well-being; improvements in people’s lives”.²² In short, impact assessment for GEF – funded UNDP implemented projects is defined as: “A fundamental and durable change in the condition of people and their environment brought about by the project.”

As seen in the narrative before this section, neither the Project nor national/local partners have verifiable improvements in ecological status with robust means of verification. TANAPA reports, for instance, a series of antipoaching activities and poaching figures. Yet they don’t show a verifiable reduction in stress on ecological achievements nor verifiable improvements.²³ [See Annex 9: Antipoaching and Poaching figures for RUNAPA as provided by TANAPA]. For instance, in RUNAPA poached animals reported are 3 in 2010, 27 in 2011, 92 in 2012, 48 in 2013, 43 in 2014, 26 in 2015 and 19 in 2016.

Therefore, if analysing impact following guidelines for outcome analysis, it cannot be ascertained that there has been such a verifiable and demonstrated process *as a result* of the Project. Nevertheless, at the effect level (that is defined as “the short to medium term behavioural or systemic effects that the Project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the Project’s impacts”), there have been some changes attributable to SPANEST, as is seen in the sections dealing with effectiveness in this report.

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability of an intervention and its results are examined to determine the likelihood of whether benefits would continue to be accrued after the completion of the project. Sustainability is examined from various perspectives: financial, social, environmental and institutional.²⁴

Financial sustainability: Financial risks to sustainability relate to the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the assistance ends. Regarding financial sustainability prospects, it must be pointed out that the Project had embedded some expected results which would provide financial sustainability of the products and processes achieved. This was to be, mainly, through increased tourism in the Southern District. Although this is a longer process (i.e. increased tourism) than what it was hoped it would be, data does not support the premise that tourism has increased substantially in the area. Also, tourism-related actors at the

²¹ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: *ROTI Handbook 2009*.

²² UNDP. *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. 2009.

²³ Some years poaching increases instead of decreasing.

²⁴ It is expected that there will an uptake of some of these issues in the exit strategy that the Project is drafting to hand over to TANAPA once the intervention has concluded.

local level (private sector and sub national government) do indicate that they do not have funds to support all of the processes at future. Nevertheless, TANAPA has made commitments to maintain infrastructure and equipment donated by the Project, yet it is not clear that they could or would provide the financial incentives to staff or other stakeholders to continue processes. The main factors that could underpin financial sustainability (with proper coordination) are the other donor – driven and international loans that the Government of Tanzania has secured to continue with infrastructure development, protected area management, combatting wildlife crime and poaching, landscape and water resource management, and tourism development processes in the target region(s). Therefore, the ranking for financial sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*, given that, although there are moderate risks, there are also expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained financially over time.

Socio-economic sustainability: When analysing socio-economic risks to sustainability, an examination is made of the potential social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes. The level of stakeholder ownership (both from national and subnational government as well as with non-governmental actors) as seen in the narrative of this report, is strong. Only in some minor areas of national government there was a lack of ownership and risks to sustainability. The buy-in from most sectors was high regarding the true need to sustain management of protected areas vis-à-vis sectors of the economy which are deemed as highly important (such as tourism). The wildlife – human conflict (which in many cases manifests itself through poaching of different natural resources such as wood or consumption of wildlife for subsistence) is still high and by no means it has been faced in all of its complexities. There are many risks still to be addressed in these issues which could jeopardize socio – economic related sustainability. Therefore, the ranking for socio – economic sustainability is *Likely (L)*, given that, although there are risks, there are also expectations that key outputs are expected to continue into the foreseeable future.

Institutional framework and governance sustainability: At the time of the final evaluation there were no major overall institutional and governance risks identified that would undermine the probability of governance sustainability. Although the policy related achievements are expected to be continue²⁵, there are others that were not achieved and were not expected to be achieved in the short run nor to –evidently–continue. Although not part of the project design, no policies dealing with landscape management have resulted from the Project. The landscape approach is new in Tanzania, and without formal lasting policy there is no certainty that institutionally and governance in this matter can be secured. Therefore, the ranking for this sort of sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*.

Environmental sustainability: Environmental risks to sustainability conflicts are identified regarding natural resource management and regarding climate change. Regarding the former, conflicts arise and continue to arise substantially. Here also, the wildlife – human conflict (which in many cases manifests itself through poaching of different natural resources such as wood or

²⁵ For instance, achieved corridor.

consumption of wildlife for subsistence and trade) is still high, continues to be a high environmental risk and by no means it has been faced in all of its complexities. Furthermore, climate change related risks to protected areas continue to be high in the Southern District and no thorough adaptation nor extenuation of negative impact mechanisms are in place (for instance, as they relate to water resources and their impact on wildlife and wildlife-related tourism). There are many risks still to be addressed in these issues which could jeopardize socio – economic related sustainability. Threats and increased environmental risks that can and do increase environmental risks and issues associated to climate change vulnerabilities and, in turn, associated to the management of protected areas are very present. Therefore, given the moderate risks faced, the ranking for environmental sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*.

With regards to sustainability, it is noteworthy to observe that the Project has just developed a document dealing with an exit plan. Although late since it was called for in earlier assessments, the recently developed exit plan in some areas it is not as reflective as an exit strategy or sustainability strategy should be. However, if applied it can generate settings to promote the adoption of strategies to underpin sustainability in many ways. This plan, that mainly deals with what needs to be implemented for the Project’s outputs to be adopted and have effects, but it profoundly takes into account the above sustainability issues. If the plan would be implemented, then the likelihood of sustainability would greatly increase.

Taking a composite view of the rankings for financial, socio – economic, institutional as well as environmental sustainability probabilities, the overall likelihood of sustainability is ranked as *ML (Moderately Likely)*. This is assuming that although there are generally moderate risks expectations there are expectations that at least some outputs and results will be sustained.

4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The *Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity Project* is about to conclude after six and a half years of implementation. The Project addressed operational issues that hinder integrated sustainable management of the country's protected areas, focusing on the country's Southern Circuit.

These threats to protected areas in the country are multiple and the Project addressed several issues related to protected areas' management in the country. The Project was designed to increase the effectiveness of National Parks in Tanzania in protecting biodiversity and to provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system and to be able to reduce anthropogenic pressures on sites as well as to secure biodiversity status within them. The focus was on the new and developing Southern Circuit of Tanzania's National Parks, reflecting the fact that --with some exceptions--, the management effectiveness of National Parks in this region remained sub-optimal, and that (relative to the Government of Tanzania's desired levels for this zone) tourism activity remained low. The threats and barriers identified were a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs, for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts as well as a lack of management capacity and financial planning to attract tourism to the zone and to prevent the various threats to the area.

The Project had a series of design deficiencies which continued to cause difficulties into implementation. The first design failing identified has been the matter of expected results, log frame and how to operationalize these through adequate indicators. The design of the results framework was not actually expressed as robust expected results, and this matter continued to have an impact on the implementation modality throughout the life span of the Project, whereby the focus was on obtaining products and not so much on obtaining effects or results. This design issue also impacted on proper reporting and monitoring. Some aspects of design were deemed as either overly ambitious or not feasible within the Tanzanian context. Regarding the latter, for instance, an expected outcome was to be that the Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve would be raised to a higher protected area status as a national park. Nevertheless, this was not achieved due to its over ambitiousness and due to the matter that the structural and administrative configuration of Tanzania protected areas' administration and policies obstructs such a re organization. Besides these matters, the design of SPANEST fairly properly identified the issues and problems faced in adequate sustainable management of protected areas within the country's so – called Southern District. This was relevant, in particular, due to the focus that the Government of Tanzania is placing in developing that area and orienting economic growth, infrastructure expansion and protected areas – oriented tourism for the South West zone of the country.

Although the Project from design onward clearly deals with piloting activities and processes, there was a general misunderstanding about what it was that it “was supposed to do”. While SPANEST had more emphasis on infrastructure and donations of tangibles²⁶ than other similar projects, it was not understood that UNDP’s comparative advantage, value added, and mandate generally focuses on capacity building rather than infrastructure or donations. Also, the perception that the Project would ‘develop’ the area, undertake direct major infrastructure activities, and direct processes was misunderstood throughout the whole implementation process, even at the conclusion and after over six years of implementation. Lastly, a perception that SPANEST would operate under a charity-like management style still prevailed when the Project was nearing conclusion. That is, a perception prevailed that the Project would donate materials to those institutions/individuals who needed them the most was still pervading at conclusion. These perceptions and expectations caused and continued to cause severe misunderstandings between and among partners and key stakeholders. Together with this, the perception that the Project was a continuous process (not an intervention which was finite in time and resources) also prevailed, with expectations that the Project as such would continue to operate in the region after its planned conclusion, hindering at this point sustainability approaches.

The products and processes that the Project implemented (or sought to implement) mainly focused on improving management of protected areas and promoting tourism in the region. A general indicator for achieving the former of the two broad areas of work are the sought METT scores²⁷. Although as in many other topics of the Project where effect is measured, this cannot be solely attributable to this project given that there are many activities and stakeholders dealing with exactly the same issues in the target zone, the Project reports improvement of METT scores which can be in part attributable to SPANEST.²⁸

A series of processes and products were also implemented with a fair level of *efficiency*. In particular, activities/training and support for patrolling against poaching, law enforcement, facilities for reporting poaching, upgrading of physical resources and infrastructure to deal with several aspects of PA management. The latter included vehicle donations and installation of digital communication resources. Furthermore, a number of studies and baseline analysis were commissioned for the development of monitoring and policy instruments. Key studies include elephant monitoring analysis (collaring) and census as well as ecological baseline studies in the Project landscapes. Outreach materials and outreach activities were else conducted with a high visibility.

As to the advancement of tourism in the targeted area, a series of capacity building activities as well as tourism promotion activities were implemented. Mainly trainings for the

²⁶ Such as vehicles, communication systems, etc.

²⁷ And as seen in the section on design, the only fully SMART indicator included in design.

²⁸ At mid - 2017, the Project reports improved METT scores in the PAs focused on at or above end of project targets (Source 2017 PIR). A final project METT scoring exercise was not carried out.

former (capacity building) and participation or organization of events to endorse tourism in the Southern District for the latter (participation/organization of tourism-related fairs, work with private sector organizations, working with district level governments). Materials, signage, brochures, tourism related gear, donation of vehicles, as well as infrastructure upgrading etc., were also a series of products which the Project funded and/or delivered.

A number of studies and documents have been produced, bridging both areas of work (i.e. protected area management and tourism promotion), promoting visibility, and fostering a series of knowledge management products. These have included (among others) business plans, financial plans, and other such studies that attempt to set an economic background and promote financial sustainability of the processes being implemented in the target region.

A key area that straddles promotion of tourism as well as improved management of protected areas in the country has been work with the communities that surround the national parks in Tanzania's South West²⁹. Although livelihood promoting activities were minor and piloted and this was one of the gaps identified throughout several monitoring and assessment exercises that this project has had, work with the communities has been quite extensive and have created the relations and outreach that should be promoted in the future. The demarcation and clearing of boundaries between villages and protected areas, which reduces conflicts and mitigates encroachment into PAs, has been one of the most evident processes of work with neighbouring communities. At this level, the Project also assumed training and education of community members. Furthermore, proposals for the establishment of community wildlife management areas were explored and (as stated above) some pilot livelihood activities were spearheaded. These activities have had unexpected positive effects, mainly (by engaging with communities) a channel of communication has been opened between the villages and the different areas of national and local government which deal with protected areas in the Southern District of Tanzania. This can lead not only to co – management activities, but also to further engaging with communities to reduce poaching and encroachment and, at the same time, that their livelihoods are improved and buy-in into protected area management is generated.

As seen in the section on project design, from the very inception of SPANEST and from its design there was a focus on products and not effects. Therefore, the effects and results were not specifically nor explicitly sought, and this has hindered monitoring and reporting as well as hindered a thorough evaluation of efficiency. This does not mean that the Project has not had any results nor effects. It implies, however, that they were unexpected since they are not exhaustively included in design and (except for METT scores) these were not included as specific indicators. Therefore, defining effect, results and outcomes as part of the Project outputs is and has been difficult. Also, and as indicated elsewhere, there are many actors (governmental, non – governmental, national and international) dealing with exactly the same issues in the same targeted area. Consequently, attributing effects to SPANEST exclusively is not a suitable exercise.

²⁹ As seen in other areas of the report, the rapport and activities with the communities have been some of the best practices that SPANEST has engaged in.

Yet, and beyond the METT Scores improvements indicated above, there is a general perception that SPANEST has contributed to changes in the Southern District. Two areas can be selected for this effect analysis: tourism and poaching. Regarding tourism, although stakeholders follow more their perceptions than data or indicators, and the means of verification of change are weak and not comprehensive, a general perception prevails that within the life span of the Project tourism has increased in the target area. Government officials, private tourism operators and other stakeholders attest to this.³⁰ Regrettably, there is no data to fully support this perception.³¹ Regarding poaching, and bearing in mind that illegal activities are extremely difficult to determine, there is also the perception that it has decreased due to activities fostered by SPANEST (together with other stakeholders and actors in the target zone). Again, although full-fledged data is not available, there are some encouraging proxy indicators that control has increased yet no indicators that poaching has decreased overall.³²

Nonetheless, even when products were achieved, there is still a prevailing vision that the Project is just these. There is yet a need to instil that this sort of project is not only a product delivery means but an intervention that should seek results and effects.

The immediate next stages of follow up should further advance the adoption of the products and processes that SPANEST has achieved (as laid out in the exit strategy) in order for this intervention to maintain effects and continuity. The Project is concluding with several key achievements, mainly at the output and at the local pilots' levels, that have laid the groundwork for better management of protected areas and for development associated with growth in Southwest Tanzania. Although SPANEST is evidently ending, it would greatly benefit the country to channel post – project activities in order to build upon what has been attained and to seek continuous tangible results from these accomplishments.

4.2 LESSONS LEARNED

There are a series of learned lessons that can be assimilated in the future for enhanced project planning and implementation. These lessons are listed below.

1. To avoid misunderstandings between stakeholders, and to minimize the generation of false expectations, a project's outlook needs to be made known clearly from its very beginning (from design and inception). A project needs to be made known starting by

³⁰ Unfortunately, reliable encompassing tourism data for the whole of the district is not available.

³¹ The little data made available to this evaluation, however, disproves this perception. For Ruaha National Park, the main tourism zone of the Southern District, ex ante visitor data (i.e. number of visitors before the intervention began and at its conclusion) indicate that tourism decreased 18 percent.

³² For instance, in association to a toll-free telephone line that was promoted by the Project, there are indications that reporting of poaching incidents has increased.

providing transparency to what it is expected to achieve, what its outputs are to be, what modality of implementation will be rooted, and what direct and indirect beneficiaries can expect out of a project. If necessary, due to changes in stakeholders associated with a project, expected achievements, outputs, and modalities sought should be revisited as new actors come in contact with a project.

2. Design processes cannot be underestimated, and design should be robust at all levels. A lack of robustness in design will have impacts throughout the whole implementation process of a project. Without a clear, outcome and results-based oriented design it cannot be fully expected that a project would be outcome and results – based. Proper strong instruments can properly guide implementation, and for these they should include outcome indicators and accurate means of verification to determine results and be able to attribute outcomes to the Project.
3. The mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not automatically translate into results or outcomes. Studies, reports, plans, documents and processes need to be accompanied by clear mechanisms that promotes knowledge assimilation, knowledge sharing, and clear-cut mechanisms to inform and promote policy processes for adoption of outputs.
4. A forward-looking project should promote, pilot and implement innovation (such as new technologies, novel approaches) in order to encourage adaptation to changing circumstances and conditions.
5. An integrated project cannot just concentrate on specific targets (for example, just a protected area), but it should summon and assume that the intervention should focus on cohesive issues and an integrated approach. For instance, acknowledging that there are issues outside of the confined protected area that affect it greatly and should be acted upon (such as issues dealing with integrated water management, landscape management, buffer zones, etc.).
6. The integration of varied stakeholders such as direct and indirect project beneficiaries as well as communities adjoining protected areas cannot be underestimated for the success of project. When working with these communities not only command and control issues should be realised, incentives should also part of the work with communities.
7. Promotion of sustainable livelihoods, especially as it regards to communities, should be an integral part of a development project.
8. Buy in, ownership and sustainability can be aided by suitable and wide spread visibility of a project and its accomplishments.

4.2 BEST PRACTICES

1. SPANEST’s work with communities, in particular with those communities in buffer zones and in protected areas surroundings, was one of the intervention’s best practices. It not only reduced conflict and facilitated future work and participation channels with communities for TANAPA and district – level government stakeholders, but also it has

opened participation and opportunities for future work (with strong replication and upscaling possibilities) for UNDP and other donors.

2. Project management staff implemented activities and approach in a very committed, continuous, and creative manner, piloting activities and encouraging innovation.
3. SPANEST's visibility was a good practice not only because it let the Project be known, but also because it generated buy in and wide-spread ownership of the interventions and of its accomplishments.
4. Anchoring the work at the local level, decentralizing the Project management and coordination unit directly where the intervention took place and working not only at the national but also at district and local level was a good practice since it promoted a proper project entry point of actions in the areas where effects were to take place.
5. Apprehending that work within a protected area cannot be encapsulated was a good practice given that it underlines the realisation that PAs are not natural resource 'islands'. For instance, work with water forums of basins reinforced the idea that natural resource issues outside the protected area can and do have great impact on the PA itself.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations within final evaluations are usually proposed for corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of forthcoming projects as well as for highlighting and reinforcing project benefits in future programming. However, since SPANEST has not been fully concluded, in this case recommendations are made for immediate tasks and for follow up well.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONCLUSION AND FOLLOW UP

1. Accelerate the adoption of the exit plan sustainability plan in order to fulfil achieving results from SPANEST. It would be key to:
 - a. Ascertain that institutions formally (at the national and at the district levels) take over and sustain the processes and outputs achieved, generating policies as needed institutional framework and governance sustainability.
 - b. Generate formal commitments (memorandums of understanding or other such instruments) for institutions to maintain and upgrade as necessary donated materials, infrastructure and equipment.
 - c. Promote budget allocations at the different relevant government spheres to maintain and sustain not only donations provided by SPANEST, but also fund processes and policies promoted by the Project.
 - d. Formalize, upscale, and sustain in all aspects processes related to communities and their relation to protected areas, formalizing community outreach modalities and by-laws, boundaries demarcation processes, and providing alternatives to issues that engender many poaching activities, as well as supporting livelihoods of

those communities in contact with protected areas so that they fully benefit from them and from the growth processes taking place.

- e. Promote the application of studies and plans drafted within the Project's implementation process, such as business plans, land use planning instruments, management plans, livelihood studies, and so on, as relevant.
2. Impel the finalization of the Project outstanding and pending activities soonest.
 3. Promote the upscaling and replication of good practices throughout the protected areas environment in Tanzania.
 4. Assure that there is continuity (dove tailing, and up taking) of achievements and processes in future projects, processes, and donor driven interventions in the area and nation-wide.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING

5. Design of future programming needs to be robust if effects and outcomes are to be properly achieved.
 - a. Future programming design exercises should ensure that design is developed keeping to its aims: to foster results – based implementation and to be able to monitor implementation with adequate forewarnings to redirect whatever needs to be redirected throughout the implementation processes.
 - b. To generate this, design should include SMART baseline and end-of-project indicators and it should be clear, coherent, outcome and results-based oriented, and contain proper strong instruments that can properly guide implementation. Indicators as well as output to outcome processes need to be determined and robust measures for seeking results needs to be imbedded from the design and inception stages.
 - c. Design should also properly guide monitoring and reporting so that it is specific and so that it accounts for progress towards outcomes and results.
 - d. Design needs to be realistic, and log frame tools need to be credibly developed in order to guide implementation and tally achievements, not only to determine accomplishments but to correct the course of implementation when needed.
6. An exit strategy or sustainability plan should be drafted early on in the programming process, beginning at design, and its adoption should be promoted throughout implementation. The adoption of its components should not be left to take place after a project ends. An exit strategy or sustainability plan should contain information on all aspects of sustainability (financial and costing aspects, socio – economic, institutional and governance-related, environmental) in order to plan adoption of outcomes in alignment with each of these aspects.

7. A project's aims, objectives, outlook and scope should be made known from inception in a transparent manner. A project needs to be made properly known starting by providing transparency to what it is expected to achieve, what its outputs are to be, what modality of implementation will be rooted, and what direct and indirect beneficiaries can expect out of a project. The mandates, comparative advantage, and value added of the agency that promotes and/or funds a project should be made clear and disseminated from the beginning of a project.
8. Development projects should clearly establish mechanisms and concrete processes to ensure that livelihoods are enhanced. This should be achieved supporting livelihoods of those communities in contact with protected areas (for instance) so that they fully benefit from them and from the growth processes taking place. These sorts of projects cannot lose sight that they are sustainable development projects after all. Developmental issues should be interweaved as a priority, in the products and outcomes that result and that should result out of a project, including issues of livelihoods, and the support that protected areas should sustain for development and wellbeing of communities.
9. Future programming should formalize and attempt to sustain all processes related to communities and their relation to protected areas, formalizing community outreach modalities and –most importantly-- providing alternatives to issues that engender many poaching activities and the reduction of human wildlife conflicts. This can also be achieved through the specific support of enhanced livelihood aspects, working with them to fully apprehend the opportunities and potential social and economic benefits that biodiversity management (including PAs) can bring to them. When working with local community groups and local communities a project needs to be aware of the skills, knowledge, and institutional capacity these organizations have. Interventions at the local level should also receive ongoing technical support in order for local communities to be able to implement, upscale, and replicate piloted demonstrations.
10. Given that the mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not necessarily nor automatically translate into results or outcomes, the latter should be sought as part of a results-based project. Studies, reports, management plans, business plans, documents and so on, need to be accompanied by clear mechanisms that promote knowledge assimilation, knowledge sharing, and clear-cut mechanisms to inform and promote policy processes for the adoption of these studies and plans. A project needs to establish clear links between studies, products or outputs and the expected outcomes (such as policy generation and adoption, policy commitments, public – private partnerships, livelihood enhancement, investments, etc.).
11. Project reformulations, changes, reforms and other such alterations need to be precise, and implemented (not only analysed) as soon as early signs of failings manifest themselves.

12. Future programming should base its capacity building activities based on a needs assessment and in conjunction with other interventions from other actors and donors in the areas where a project is being implemented. Capacity building needs to be systematic and respond to needs in coordination with all stakeholders (internal, external, donors, etc.).
 13. Future programming should promote the upscaling and replication of lessons learned and good practices throughout the protected areas environment in Tanzania, beyond the Southern District.
 14. Future programming should cautiously be based on sustaining achievements, within UNDP programming but also with other donors, actors, and stakeholders intervening in the Southern District and in Tanzania as a whole while avoiding duplication and repetition of efforts.
 15. UNDP needs to work with and assist the countries where interventions take place in order to aid them in applying processes that support projects' technical and implementation capabilities (specially support project implementation and efficient decision – making capacities). UNDP should guide the uptake process of the products that a project generates, ascertaining that products are translated into outcomes and results. UNDP should provide information on project management, monitoring and reporting and other such project requisites in order to adequately account for achievements and generate adaptive management as needed.
-

5. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT/TEAM LEADER

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

■ INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of **the Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity** (PIMS 3253)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

■ PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Protected Area Network in Southern Tanzania: Improving the Effectiveness of National Parks in Addressing Threats to Biodiversity			
GEF Project ID:	3965		<i>at endorsement</i>	<i>at completion (Million</i>
			<i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3253	GEF financing:	5.3	5.3
Country:	Tanzania	IA/EA own:	1.0	TBD
Region:	Africa	Government:	11.1	7.2 TBC
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0.3	0.4
FA Objectives , (OP/SP):	SP3	Total co-financing:	12.1	TBD
Executing Agency:	Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA)	Total Project Cost:	17.4	TBD
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual: December 2017

■ OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to increase the effectiveness of the National Parks in protecting biodiversity and provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system. The focus was on the new and developing Southern Circuit of Tanzania's National Parks, reflecting the fact that with some exceptions, the management effectiveness of NPs in this region remained sub-optimal, relative to the Government's desired levels and tourism numbers remained low. The project aims to increase the effectiveness of the National Parks in protecting biodiversity and provide for the long-term ecological, social and financial sustainability of that system that are able to reduce anthropogenic pressures on the sites and secure biodiversity status within them. The project has been designed to address PA management barriers of (a) a lack of proper connectivity between isolated PAs, for larger mammal movements and to buffer against climate change impacts and (b) lack of management capacity and financial planning to bring people to the area and to prevent the various threats to the area through two complementary components namely:

1. **Integrating Management of NPs and Broader Landscapes:** This first component entailed the creation of active and functioning inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism between TANAPA, district authorities and the Wildlife Division (WD) and involved planning, implementation, and monitoring by key state and civil society partners on biodiversity management measures for the Greater Ruaha Landscape (37,000km²) and Greater Kitulo-Kipengele Landscape (2,150k m²). This approach would secure PAs, wildlife corridors and dispersal areas.
2. **Strengthening NP Operations:** This second component will engineer the delivery of an integrated package of PA management functions., The project will initiate financial and business planning on both landscape and individual PAs and will provide funding for basic infrastructure and field equipment across the Southern Circuit Sites

- **PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOME, COMPONENTS AND OUTPUTS**

The Project Goal is to ensure the Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity.

The project is responsible for achieving the following project objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks. The project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a landscape approach to the management of biodiversity. The project objective will be achieved through the implementation of two complementary components namely:

Component 1: Integrating Management of National Parks and Broader Landscapes in Southern Tanzania. This first component entails the creations of an inter-sectoral district land management coordination mechanism between TANAPA, district authorities and the Wildlife Division (WD) and will also involve planning, implement, and monitoring by key state and civil society partners on biodiversity management measures for the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo Kipengere landscapes. The project will set up inter-sectoral district land administration mechanisms and develop land use plans; to ensure that land in ecologically sensitive areas is allocated to conservation compatible land uses through an integrated landscape management planning process. Development impact assessments will be undertaken, to define acceptable land uses and management practices. Support will be rendered to strengthen the enforcement framework, to ensure compliance and guard against chaotic; unplanned economic development, which is leading to habitat degradation and loss elsewhere in Tanzania. This component will also ensure that TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and

monitoring in landscapes and have improved, staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities.

Specific outcomes of the first component are expected to be:

- A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes is piloted and adapted in 7 Districts in Southern Tanzania and secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km² in the Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo-Kipengere ecological landscapes
- Integrated landscape management approach is replicated by TANAPA in at least one additional ecological landscape in southern Tanzania.
- No net loss of natural habitat in major habitat blocks identified as critical for wildlife dispersal and at least 40% reduction in hunting pressures in these blocks.
- PAs expanded to encompass two ecologically sensitive wildlife corridor areas linking Kitulo NP to Mt Rungwe and to Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve), creating a linked 'Greater Kitulo-Kipengere landscape' totaling over 2,000 km².

Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania. This second component focuses at addressing threats within the NP boundaries by engineering the delivery of an integrated package of PA management functions. Based on needs assessment commissioned at the start of the project, funding will be provided for basic infrastructure and field equipment across the Southern Circuit Sites. An emphasis will be placed on building operations capacity at PA sites that have not previously benefitted from such investment (i.e. Ruaha expansion and Kitulo NPs). This support will be accompanied by the development of business plans for the sites, to define the optimum operations support needed to address threats in a cost effective and sustainable manner.

Specific outcomes of the second component include the following:

- Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km² leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks. This is evidenced in a reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed.
- Management Effectiveness Score for NPs in Southern Tanzania increased over the baseline score by at least 40%.

Specifically, the project will deliver 12 Outputs, organized within the two components and summarized in the Project Logical Framework (Annex A)

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

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

▪ EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method³³ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to **Dar es Salaam, Iringa, Mbeya and possibly Arusha & Dodoma**, including the following project sites (*Ruaha, Mpanga Kipengele and Kitulo*). Interviews will be held with the following organizations (see table below) and individuals at a minimum.

List of stakeholders to be consulted (look at this)

Category	Stakeholder	location
Government stakeholders (National)	Dar: UNDP, MOF, MNRT, DW, VPO Arusha: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TANAPA Dodoma: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PO-RALG 	Dar Arusha Dodoma
Local governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional government • District Councils 	Iringa Njombe Mbeya Mbarali
NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) • World Wildlife Fund (WWF) • African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) • World Elephant Centre (WEC) 	Dar/ Mbeya DAR Arusha Arusha/Ruaha
Development Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USAID • World Bank 	Dar

³³ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tour operators • Lodge owners • Film and media producers, local artists 	Iringa, Ruaha and Kitulo
----------------	---	--------------------------

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

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project

▪ **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

▪ **PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table 03 below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Table 03: Project co-financing (in US\$)

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancer	Type of Cofinancing	Amount Confirmed at approval	Actual Amount Materialized at MTR June 2016	Amount Materialized at TE August 2017	Amount % of Expenditure
Donor	GEF	Grant	5,304,500	2,930,240	5,285,397	99.64%
Donor	UNDP	Grant	1,000,000	422,802	611,197	61.12%
National Government	TANAPA	Cash	10,700,000	7,180,112	TBD	67.1%
National Government	Wildlife Division	In-kind	150,000	423,818	TBD	282.5%
National Government	PO-RALG	In-kind	210,000	Not available	TBD	TBD
Total Project funds			17,364,500	10,956,973		
Total Co-finance funds			12,060,000			
Ratio Co-finance: GEF funds			2.27			

Source: data supplied by UNDP CO and PCU

- MAINSTREAMING

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

- IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has

demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.³⁴

▪ CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

▪ IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

▪ EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days over the time period of about 8 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	15 - 17 August
Presentation of Inception Report	1	18 August
Evaluation Mission	14 days	19 – 1 September
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	2 – 9 September
Presentation of Initial Findings	1 day	11 September
Allow 2 weeks for draft circulation to obtain comments from Partners	-	12-22 Sept 17.
Consultant respond & incorporates comments	3 days	23-25 Sept 17
Submission of the Final Report Final Report	-	26 September

▪ EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

³⁴ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	TE clarifies objectives, methodology and timing for the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. (by 18 Aug 2017)	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission by 01 Sept 2017)	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (by 09 Sept 2017)	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (by 11 Sept 2017)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

▪ TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluators. The international consultant will be designated team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the final report submitted to UNDP. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluators will be recruited separately however, the two consultants will form a team making a joint presentation to a project Steering Committee that shall be planned to take at the end of the in-country mission. The selected consultants should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The International consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Master's degree or higher in relevant area such as Biodiversity Management, Wildlife Conservation & Natural Resources Management or Environmental sciences with minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience at the international level **(25%)**
- Knowledge and experience in developing projects, specific experience in UNDP and GEF project Evaluation **(25%)**
- Experience in evaluating similar projects with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies in the recent past engagement; **(25%)**
- Knowledge on Wildlife Conservation and Management & tourism in Tanzania and its related policies **(25%)**

▪ EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

- **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

%	Milestone
10%	No later than 2 weeks following contract signature
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

- **APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to apply online. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of an e-mail address and a phone number for contact.

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

ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
<p>Do project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level?</p> <p>Does the project address needs of policy makers, state and non-state practitioners active in the field of protected areas management?</p> <p>Were the project indicators relevant to the designed outputs?</p> <p>Were the intended results (outputs and outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable (indicators)?</p> <p>To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?</p> <p>Does the project address needs of policy makers, state and non- state practitioners active in the field of protected areas management?</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.</p> <p>Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities</p> <p>Addressing gaps in capacity framework.</p>	<p>National policies</p> <p>Project Document</p>	<p>Document analysis</p>
<p>How relevant the project's intended outcomes?</p> <p>Were the project indicators relevant to the designed outputs?</p> <p>Were there gender disaggregated indicators?</p> <p>Were the intended results (outputs and outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p>	<p>Document analysis</p>

<p>Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?</p>	<p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</p>	<p>Government of Tanzania, UNDP, Project Management</p>	<p>Interviews</p>
<p>Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?</p> <p>Were the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Tanzania?</p> <p>To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs</p> <p>Were there relevant adjustments to timeframe, log frame, etc.?</p>	<p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Coherence UNDP and GEF operational programming</p>	<p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>UNDAF, UNDP/GEF Programming statements</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Document analysis</p>
<p>Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p>			
<p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</p> <p>Are there any success factors for the achievement or reasons for non-achievement of project outputs?</p> <p>What were the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project generally?</p> <p>To what extent has the project achieved its intended and unintended objectives and results?</p> <p>Are specific outputs operational at this stage?</p> <p>Was there replication and upscaling from site level to national level?</p> <p>What are the positive and negative, long term effects of the project on direct beneficiaries?</p>	<p>Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators</p>	<p>PIR 2017</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Site Visits</p> <p>Interviews</p>

<p>What, if any, progress has been made toward the achievement of the agreed project outcomes?</p> <p>What adjustments and changes have been made as part of adaptive management? Which of these have result of monitoring and evaluation processes?</p>			
<p>Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in PA management in general and in the sites in particular?</p> <p>Were the sites chosen in Tanzania relevant?</p>	<p>Indication of policy guidance in project outputs, documents, products.</p> <p>Changes in policy attributable to project regrading climate change adaptation in the tourism sector</p>	<p>Project outcome indicators</p> <p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholders interviews</p>
<p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to PAs?</p> <p>Were there gender issues considered from the design stage?</p>	<p>Involvement of beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, etc.).</p> <p>Effect of project aspects implemented at sites</p>	<p>Project outputs and outcomes indicators</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p>
<p>Were there delays? Extensions?</p> <p>Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'?</p>	<p>Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome and actual achievements</p>	<p>Findings in project documents, achievement indicators</p>	<p>Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)</p> <p>Site visits observation</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>
<p>Partnerships for implementation</p>	<p>Working relationship between project management, UNDP, and other strategic partners</p> <p>Board/PSC functions</p>	<p>Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings)</p> <p>Indications in interviews</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>

<p>In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</p>	<p>Government of Tanzania, Project team, UNDP</p>	<p>Interviews</p>
<p>Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project? How does the project impact gender equality in the local context?</p> <p>How does the project engage with women?</p> <p>Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men?</p> <p>What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits? Why are the issues addressed by the project particularly relevant to or important for women? How are women and girls benefiting from project activities (even if these are unplanned/unintended results? Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women's empowerment? What can the project do to mitigate this?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</p> <p>Role of committees in guidance</p> <p>Harness effectiveness by analysing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives</p> <p>Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results</p>	<p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p>

Efficiency: 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?

<p>Were project risks identified during project development? Were other risks identified during the project and were mitigation measures implemented?</p> <p>Were management arrangements appropriate and to what extent did they support the efficiency of the project? What financial management barriers or challenges were experienced during the project period?</p> <p>Was project funding spent as planned? Were all activities addressed with the respective budget?</p> <p>Did the project M&E systems and practices allow for in-time corrective actions and tracking of the progress towards the expected results (outputs)?</p> <p>Issues that caused delays (such as procurement processes, etc.)</p>	<p>Policies adopted / enacted</p> <p>Policies implemented</p> <p>Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn</p>	<p>Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented)</p> <p>Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Documentation analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>
<p>Adaptive management</p>	<p>Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project 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? How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results</p>	<p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>Project documents</p>
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>			
<p>Sustainability possibilities</p>	<p>In what way may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?</p>	<p>See indicators in project document results framework and log frame.</p>	<p>Project documents and reports</p>

	Was there a sustainability plan drafted? Implemented?		
Financial Sustainability	Processes implemented to sustain financial means for management of protected areas in Tanzania.	Indicators in revised log frame	Project documents and reports, in particular board/steering committee minutes
Social sustainability factors	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages would be sustained	Government of Tanzania, Project team, UNDP
Political/financial sustainability	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Evidence that particular practices would be sustained	Government of Tanzania, Project team, UNDP; tourism endeavours
Replicability	Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices sustained	GoT, Proj.team, UNDP
Has a sustainability plan been developed? Was this plan implemented? Is there a sustainability programme for the sites that received grant funding under the project? Were the grants effective as a tool for sustainability at the relevant sites? Are the beneficiaries committed to continuing working towards project objectives after the project ended? Are services developed under the project likely to continue, be scaled up or replicated after the project funding ceases?		Project documents Interviews with local stakeholders	Government of Tanzania, Project team, UNDP Stakeholders receiving grant funding at sites
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/ improved ecological status?			
Is there any evidence of project impact? If not, does the project have the future potential in impacting the relevant sector(s)? In what ways? How should it be measured?			

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

- (1) How relevant is the project for Tanzania?
- (2) What have been the project's achievements (at the output, outcome, results levels)?
- (3) How were these results achieved?
- (4) What adjustments and changes have been made as part of adaptive management?
- (5) Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project?
(ownership)
- (6) Were the relevant country stakeholders, from government and civil society, as well as the private sector involved in the project preparation and execution?
- (7) What planning instruments were designed, adopted and / or implemented to deal with institutional and financial upgrading of protected areas in Tanzania because of the Project? Management plans status? What remains to be done to sustain achievements? How can UNDP help sustain achievements?
- (8) What effects or impacts (change) have occurred due to the project (policy, investments, etc.?)
- (9) How did the partnership and management arrangements between different institutions work and when it did not (institutions such as UNDP, GEF, Government of Tanzania, etc.)? Was it effective? Efficient?
- (10) To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- (11) What have been the issues or problems encountered in the implementation of the project? How were they dealt with? What adaptive management has occurred in dealing with these issues? Resulting from monitoring/midterm evaluation?

- (12) What were the hiring/procurement process issues that caused delays in implementation?
- (13) Have gender issues been incorporated in the Project?
- (14) What have been the projects weaknesses, if any?
- (15) What are the probabilities that results would be sustained over the medium/long term?
- (16) What would be the recommendations for sustainability, follow up and future programming?
- (17) If something could have been done different, in hindsight what could this have been (lesson learned)?

ANNEX 4: ITINERARY/MISSION AND MEETINGS HELD AS PART OF THE EVALUATION
PROCESS

**ITINERARY/MISSION AND MEETINGS HELD AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS BY
THE INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR**

FRIDAY OCTOBER 13TH 2017 TO MONDAY OCTOBER 29TH 2017

Date and Time	Activity
Friday Oct 13 th	International evaluator departure from Argentina
Saturday Oct 14 th	International evaluator arrival in Tanzania
Monday 16 th Oct Morning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organizational Meeting at UNDP
Monday 16 th Oct Afternoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings UNDP Country Office and UNDP Regional Office
Tuesday 17 th Oct AM	Travel to Iringa
Tuesday 17 th Oct PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Briefing Project Coordination Unit ▪ Meetings Project Coordination Unit
Wednesday 18 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings local authorities, district focal points, protected areas officers, landscape specialists, beneficiaries, consultants, private sector, civil society members
Thursday 19 th Oct. AM	Travel to Ruaha National Park

Thursday 19 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Ruaha National Park Officials ▪ Visit Project Sites
Friday 20 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visit Project Sites ▪ Meetings local beneficiaries
Saturday 21 st Oct.	Travel to Kitulo via Mpanga Kipengere
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Mpanga Kipengere Officers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Kitulo National P Officers ▪ Meetings landscape specialist
PM	Travel to Mbeya
Sunday 22 nd Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings local authorities ▪ Meetings civil society representatives, private sector
PM	Travel from Mbeya – Dar
Monday 23 rd Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Tuesday 24 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Ministry of Finance
Wednesday 25 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Thursday 26 th Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meetings TANAPA ▪ Meetings Project Coordination Unit
Friday 27 th Oct.	International evaluator departure from Tanzania
Monday 29 th October	International evaluator arrival in Argentina

ANNEX 5: LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS

Project Documents

- 3253 PIMS_Tanzania EBD_MID TERM REVIEW SPANEST-FINAL-June2015
- Aegis - Course Report One
- APPROVED AWP JAN-DEC 2017
- APPROVED NO COST EXT AWP JAN-DEC 2017
- Approved SPANEST AWP 2013-2014 ver 05-08-2013
- Assessment Report - DevtTourism Mrkg Strategy - Southern Circuit - FINAL
- Business Plan Draft 15122016
- Draft 1st Collaring OPS Report 2015
- Draft 3rd Walking Safari Guide Training Report2017
- Draft Proposal for WMA in Chamwino May 2016.doc
- Draft SPANEST AWP 2014 2015
- Draft SPANEST Exit Strategy-August 2017
- Final Report - DTMS Southern Circuit - Tanzania
- HACT Micro Assessment for TANAPA 2013
- Inception Report Project 3253 Southern Tanzania Protected Areas Network July 2010
- Interim Report for Year 1 May2016 (Draft)
- Kitulo NP Progress Report Installation of Comn System July 2017
- MTR SPANEST Management Responses September 2015
- Project Document. Strengthening the protected area network in Southern Tanzania
- Project Implementation Report (PIR) 2017.
- Ruaha NP Progress Report Installation of Comn System August 2015
- SIGNED AWP 2014-2015-SPANEST
- SIGNED AWP 2015-2016- SPANEST
- SPANEST Presentation for TANAPA Board of Trustees May 2017
- SPANEST Inception report May 2012
- TOR for PSC Protected Areas Southern Tanzania
- Training Program on communications in Ruaha NP August 2015
- WALKING SAFARI GUIDE TRAINING REPORT FOR SPANEST
- Walking Safari Training article in paper 1st June 2017

Other Documents

- GEF Evaluation Office: *ROTI Handbook 2009*.
- <http://tz.one.un.org/media-centre/news-archive/115-administrator-helen-clark-visits-ruaha-national-park>
- UNDP and GEF. *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. 2014.
- UNDP. *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. 2009.
- UNDP. *UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results*.
- UNDP/GEF. *Project-Level Evaluation: GEF Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-Financed Projects*.
- World Travel and Tourism Council. *Travel Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Tanzania*

ANNEX 6: RATINGS (RELEVANCE, PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND SUSTAINABILITY)

Relevance ratings

Rating	Explanation
R	Relevant
NR	Not relevant

Performance criteria ratings

Rating	Explanation
Highly satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

Sustainability ratings.

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

ANNEX 7: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK PER PROJECT DOCUMENT

Results Framework for Southern Tanzania PA Project: Outcomes and Indicators

Project Goal:	<i>Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity.</i>
Objectively Verifiable Indicators	

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks. (GEF 5.3 mill USD)	Two landscape level coordination mechanisms are formalised to improve biodiversity conservation in GRL and GKKL; two wildlife corridors are created in GKKL (Bujingijila and Numbe); two WMAs are consolidated in GRL.	Within the GRL, TANAPA have management plans for RUNAPA; WCS and local government supporting development of Mbomipa and Umemaruwa WMAs. In GKKL, KINAPA, MKGR and MRNR have management plans.	A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes is piloted and adapted; secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km ² in the GRL and GKKL ecological landscapes.	Partnership agreements and constitutions of coordination mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation of related activities; creation of two wildlife corridors in the GKKL landscape and documented support to WMA establishment in the GRL.	All stakeholders remain interested in the concept of landscape level conservation during the lifespan of the project and support the formalisation of coordination initiatives and the promotion of wildlife corridors to enhance ecological sustainability.
	Two national parks (RUNAPA and KINAPA) and one game reserve (MKGR) have increased operational capacity to manage themselves sustainably.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations and poaching is common; MKGR is in a vulnerable state of management and all three PAs open to risks of fire and poaching; tourism is nascent and complaints about service levels are common.	Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km ² leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks.	Documented reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed, good reports from tourist industry and tourists on customer care; tourism options enhanced through the addition of walking safaris; films promote the southern circuit.	TANAPA management and staff will be open minded to developing their capacity in new and ongoing areas; relationships can be built successfully to allow greater TANAPA - WD operational coordination.

	Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR.	Landscape level management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time within PAs and buffer areas. Current METT scores as follows: RUNAPA (53), KINAPA (52), MKGR (21), MRNR (40) : average: 42	An increase in METT scores in four PAs across the two landscapes by 40% on average; monitoring indicates species diversity either unaffected or increased; Integrated landscape management approach is replicated by TANAPA elsewhere in southern Tanzania.	Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, PA and Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government and their community, civil society and private sector partners in GRL and GKKL are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process
--	---	---	---	---	--

Component 1: Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania (GEF 0.77 million USD)	Biodiversity management in NPs, GRs, NRs, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decisionmaking governing land use management.	Management activities are carried out on WMA, district, regional government and TANAPA level but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism	Inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism is emplaced in the GRL and GKKL in Southern Tanzania.	Existence of landscape level management plans and institutional mechanisms, minutes of meetings and subsequent actions. Ministerial consent and ratification of plans at MNRT and PMORALG	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and other related government institutions support a landscape approach to biodiversity management, ratified at national and local government level.
	Development impacts in sensitive areas have been mitigated, monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and enforcement measures are operational in GRL and GKKL landscapes.	Monitoring of species and habitats is managed on an individual PA level; understanding of wildlife corridor functions, species movements and dispersal areas limited.	TANAPA, WD, 7 pilot District Authorities and civil society partners plan, implement, and monitor biodiversity management measures for these landscapes	A systematic conservation plan for both landscapes that defines wildlife corridors and dispersal areas, with EIA and M&E systems has been ratified and is in use by GRL and GKKL.	TANAPA and MNRT are willing to engage a specialist assessment of ecological situation for both GRL and GKKL PAs, buffer areas and their connectivity.
	Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit	TANAPA has community conservation service and ecology departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however lacking adequate coordination functions with external parties.	TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes	Land Use Planning and Ecological Monitoring Units set up on a landscape level; decisions and actions documented	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.

	Relations with neighbouring communities to PAs considerably improved: lower instances of human wildlife conflict, fires and poaching	TANAPA has community conservation service departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however park-community relations remain strained in some crucial border areas.	TANAPA has a staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities and dispute resolution.	Community Conservation Unit set up and running, decisions and actions documented.	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.
	Public consultations are completed in an open and fair manner; beacons mark PA boundaries clearly	Recent developments in PA status, especially in western Kitulo area, Mpanga Kipengere and Usangu mean boundaries are not clear; conflicts are a result.	Agreed boundary beacons are in place around three PAs: RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, including newly gazetted areas such as Usangu.	Equitable public consultations are completed and management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both.	Consultation process is managed with due care and process; community and intra-ministry cooperation is secured.
	Mpanga Kipengere GR is upgraded to NP through consultative process, tourism improves as do wildlife numbers as a result	Mpanga Kipengere GR is managed on a meagre budget, fires and poaching are rife; tourism is minimal	Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is raised to higher protected area status as a national park	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; rise in wildlife numbers, rise in tourism revenues	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and other stakeholders agree that upgrading MKGR the right step
	Bujingijila and Numbe valley corridors gazetted, the KituloKipengere NP is agreed and gazetted as a NP.	Wildlife are not able to move from GRL to GKKL , linkages are weak within GKKL PAs	Mpanga Kipengere linked through Numbe valley corridor to Kitulo NP to enable merging the two parks. Bujingijila also allows linkages to Mount Rungwe Nature Reserve	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; agreement to merge KINAPA and MGR; gazettement notice of merged parks, if agreed.	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and agreement on a merger of MKGR with KINAPA.
Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania (GEF 4 million USD)	Ranger and staff training in g programme in existence in RUNAPA and KINAPA; MKGR has joint TANPA-WD programme; guide training and documentary programmes in existence.	Rangers have insufficient capacity in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services.	Systematic staff training programme covering all aspects of PA operations ensures 300 rangers, guides and other field staff meet necessary competencies.	Staff training programmes are in place across spectrum of operations in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, covering necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement.	TANAPA , WD and partners are willing to take lessons learned from other countries and from NGOs, tour operators and other private sector partners on best practices for PA staff in core and new competencies.

	<p>Finance and business planning has established management costs for different PAs and WMAs, and provides accurate revenue forecasts for each PA and the wider landscape (GRL/GKKL) and matches revenue to priority management needs.</p>	<p>Business planning in southern Tanzania's PAs lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited as a result.</p>	<p>A sustainable finance plan is developed, approved and implemented for the PA system in both GRL and GKKL landscapes. Business Planning is mandated for four PAs as well as for two adjacent WMAs, along approved best practice guidelines.</p>	<p>Business and financial plans for each landscape, with a focus on each PA; a full and comprehensive understanding of the revenue generating options for each PA and WMA in the context of each landscape.</p>	<p>TANAPA, WD, FBD and other government and community partners willing to support the development of an objective planning process for the sustainable financing of PAs in GRL and GKKL and support implementation.</p>
	<p>The input of increased HR capacity and funds for equipment following a business planning approach has led to greater efficiency and effectiveness of park operations in RUNAPA and KINAPA.</p>	<p>RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations in a sustainable manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem.</p>	<p>Funds, human resources and equipment are provided and deployed to address threats to RUNAPA and KINAPA in a cost-effective manner, utilising business planning.</p>	<p>Business plans exist for both parks in operational management. New staff recruited. Surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and fire fighting equipment purchased, trained on, logged and in use.</p>	<p>Business plans set cost coefficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans define site management priorities.</p>
	<p>Stakeholder groups in both GRL and GKKL landscapes are engaging positively and constructively on biodiversity, land use and management and social and economic growth issues, such as tourism planning.</p>	<p>There is a marked lack of communication largely due to insufficient funding between different PA authorities, local government, communities, civil society and the private sector, causing inefficiencies, misunderstanding and occasional conflict.</p>	<p>A joint (TANAPA Community-District Private Sector) stakeholder group formed to address overall management issues in both RUNAPA and KINAPA, MKGR, MRNR, wildlife corridors and adjacent WMAs is established for each landscape.</p>	<p>Stakeholder committee formed, joint management plan developed, and joint enforcement systems implemented using the Management Orientated Management System (MOMS) in and around Ruaha and Kitulo NPs (covering a total area of at least 23,000 km²).</p>	<p>TANAPA and partners are willing to work together, both between different PA authorities, but also between civil society actors, communities and the private sector (especially tourism).</p>

ANNEX 8: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK REVISED AFTER MTR

Project Goal:	<i>Southern Tanzania's biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels through the establishment of landscape planning mechanisms and enhanced operational capacity.</i>
	Objectively Verifiable Indicators

Project Components	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Objective: The biodiversity of Southern Tanzania is better represented and buffered from threat within National Parks. (GEF 5.3 mill USD)	Two landscape level coordination mechanisms are formalised to improve biodiversity conservation in GRL and GKKL; two wildlife corridors are created in GKKL (Bujingijila and Numbe); two WMAs are consolidated in GRL.	Within the GRL, TANAPA have management plans for RUNAPA; WCS and local government supporting development of Mbomipa and Umemaruwa WMAs. In GKKL, KINAPA, MKGR and MRNR have management plans.	A working model for integrating management of NPs and wider productive landscapes is piloted and adapted; secures wildlife corridors and dispersal areas covering over 39,000 km ² in the GRL and GKKL ecological landscapes.	Partnership agreements and constitutions of coordination mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation of related activities; creation of two wildlife corridors in the GKKL landscape and documented support to WMA establishment in the GRL.	All stakeholders remain interested in the concept of landscape level conservation during the lifespan of the project and support the formalisation of coordination initiatives and the promotion of wildlife corridors to enhance ecological sustainability.

Two national parks (RUNAPA and KINAPA) and one game reserve (MKGR) have increased operational capacity to manage themselves sustainably.	RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations and poaching is common; MKGR is in a vulnerable state of management and all three PAs open to risks of fire and poaching; tourism is nascent and complaints about service levels are common.	Core NP operations strengthened in Southern Tanzania covering over 22,000 km ² leading to the effective detection and deterrence of poaching and fire risks.	Documented reduction in poaching activity, retaliatory wildfires set by poachers, and grazing of cattle where proscribed, good reports from tourist industry and tourists on customer care; tourism options enhanced through the addition of walking safaris; films promote the southern circuit.	TANAPA management and staff will be open minded to developing their capacity in new and ongoing areas; relationships can be built successfully to allow greater TANAPA - WD operational coordination.
--	--	---	---	---

	Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values; METT scores are improved in the 4 target PAs, especially RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR.	Landscape level management remains uncoordinated and biodiversity is lost over time within PAs and buffer areas. Current METT scores as follows: RUNAPA (53), KINAPA (52), MKGR (21), MRNR (40) average: 42	An increase in METT scores in four PAs across the two landscapes by 40% on average; monitoring indicates species diversity either unaffected or increased; Integrated landscape management approach is replicated by TANAPA elsewhere in southern Tanzania.	Fauna and Flora Monitoring procedures, Biodiversity resources assessments, Ministry and landscape level Reports, and Project Docs, PA and Landscape plans, maps and GIS files, MTE and Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Government and their community, civil society and private sector partners in GRL and GKKL are effectively supported in training and management to ensure ongoing support and engagement in the process
--	---	---	---	---	--

Component 1: Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania (GEF 0.77 million USD)	Biodiversity management in NPs, GRs, NRs, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decisionmaking governing land use management.	Management activities are carried out on WMA, district, regional government and TANAPA level but with a lack of a landscape level coordination mechanism	Inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism is emplaced in the GRL and GKKL in Southern Tanzania.	Existence of landscape level management plans and institutional mechanisms, minutes of meetings and subsequent actions. Ministerial consent and ratification of plans at MNRT and PMORALG	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and other related government institutions support a landscape approach to biodiversity management, ratified at national and local government level.
	Development impacts in sensitive areas have been mitigated, monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and enforcement measures are operational in GRL and GKKL landscapes.	Monitoring of species and habitats is managed on an individual PA level; understanding of wildlife corridor functions, species movements and dispersal areas limited.	TANAPA, WD, 7 pilot District Authorities and civil society partners plan, implement, and monitor biodiversity management measures for these landscapes	A systematic conservation plan for both landscapes that defines wildlife corridors and dispersal areas, with EIA and M&E systems has been ratified and is in use by GRL and GKKL.	TANAPA and MNRT are willing to engage a specialist assessment of ecological situation for both GRL and GKKL PAs, buffer areas and their connectivity.
	Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit	TANAPA has community conservation service and ecology departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however lacking adequate coordination functions with external parties.	TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes	Land Use Planning and Ecological Monitoring Units set up on a landscape level; decisions and actions documented	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.

	Relations with neighbouring communities to PAs considerably improved: lower instances of human wildlife conflict, fires and poaching	TANAPA has community conservation service departments in RUNAPA and KINAPA; however park-community relations remain strained in some crucial border areas.	TANAPA has a staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities and dispute resolution.	Community Conservation Unit set up and running, decisions and actions documented.	TANAPA, PMORALG, WD, FBD and communities work together in these units.
	Public consultations are completed in an open and fair manner; beacons mark PA boundaries clearly	Recent developments in PA status, especially in western Kitulo area, Mpanga Kipengere and Usangu mean boundaries are not clear; conflicts are a result.	Agreed boundary beacons are in place around three PAs: RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, including newly gazetted areas such as Usangu.	Equitable public consultations are completed and management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both.	Consultation process is managed with due care and process; community and intra-ministry cooperation is secured.
	Mpanga Kipengere GR is upgraded to NP through consultative process, tourism improves as do wildlife numbers as a result	Mpanga Kipengere GR is managed on a meagre budget, fires and poaching are rife; tourism is minimal	Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is raised to higher protected area status as a national park	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; rise in wildlife numbers, rise in tourism revenues	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and other stakeholders agree that upgrading MKGR the right step
	Bujingijila and Numbe valley corridors gazetted, the KituloKipengere NP is agreed and gazetted as a NP.	Wildlife are not able to move from GRL to GKKL , linkages are weak within GKKL PAs	Mpanga Kipengere linked through Numbe valley corridor to Kitulo NP to enable merging the two parks. Bujingijila also allows linkages to Mount Rungwe Nature Reserve	Gazettement notice of MKGR as a NP; agreement to merge KINAPA and MGR; gazettement notice of merged parks, if agreed.	WD and TANAPA, with MNRT, communities and agreement on a merger of MKGR with KINAPA.

Component 2: Operations Support for National Park Management in Southern Tanzania (GEF 4 million USD)	Ranger and staff training in g programme in existence in RUNAPA and KINAPA; MKGR has joint TANAPA-WD programme; guide training and documentary programmes in existence.	Rangers have insufficient capacity in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR to gather intelligence on poaching and fires; relations with tour operators and tourists often strained because of lack of customer care capacity; lack of value-add services.	Systematic staff training programme covering all aspects of PA operations ensures 300 rangers, guides and other field staff meet necessary competencies.	Staff training programmes are in place across spectrum of operations in RUNAPA, KINAPA and MKGR, covering necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement.	TANAPA, WD and partners are willing to take lessons learned from other countries and from NGOs, tour operators and other private sector partners on best practices for PA staff in core and new competencies.
---	---	--	--	---	---

	<p>Finance and business planning has established management costs for different PAs and WMAs, and provides accurate revenue forecasts for each PA and the wider landscape (GRL/GKKL) and matches revenue to priority management needs.</p>	<p>Business planning in southern Tanzania's PAs lacks local context and full understanding of the international dimension of financial and business planning requirements; business planning is limited as a result.</p>	<p>A sustainable finance plan is developed approved and implemented for the PA system in both GRL and GKKL landscapes. Business Planning is mandated for four PAs as well as for two adjacent WMAs, along approved best practice guidelines.</p>	<p>Business and financial plans for each landscape, with a focus on each PA; a full and comprehensive understanding of the revenue generating options for each PA and WMA in the context of each landscape.</p>	<p>TANAPA, WD, FBD and other government and community partners willing to support the development of an objective planning process for the sustainable financing of PAs in GRL and GKKL and support implementation.</p>
	<p>The input of increased HR capacity and funds for equipment following a business planning approach has led to greater efficiency and effectiveness of park operations in RUNAPA and KINAPA.</p>	<p>RUNAPA and KINAPA lack operational capacity to manage park operations in a sustainable manner, gaps exist in HR across park operations, lack of equipment means difficulty to manage fires, poaching and monitoring the ecosystem.</p>	<p>Funds, human resources and equipment are provided and deployed to address threats to RUNAPA and KINAPA in a cost-effective manner, utilising business planning.</p>	<p>Business plans exist for both parks in operational management. New staff recruited. Surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and firefighting equipment purchased, trained on, logged and in use.</p>	<p>Business plans set cost coefficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans define site management priorities.</p>
	<p>Stakeholder groups in both GRL and GKKL landscapes are engaging positively and constructively on biodiversity, land use and management and social and economic growth issues, such as tourism planning.</p>	<p>There is a marked lack of communication largely due to insufficient funding between different PA authorities, local government, communities, civil society and the private sector, causing inefficiencies, misunderstanding and occasional conflict.</p>	<p>A joint (TANAPA-Community-District-Private Sector) stakeholder group formed to address overall management issues in both RUNAPA and KINAPA, MKGR, MRNR, wildlife corridors and adjacent WMAs is established for each landscape.</p>	<p>Stakeholder committee formed, joint management plan developed, and joint enforcement systems emplaced using the Management Orientated Management System (MOMS) in and around Ruaha and Kitulo NPs (covering a total area of at least 23,000 km²).</p>	<p>TANAPA and partners are willing to work together, both between different PA authorities, but also between civil society actors, communities and the private sector (especially tourism).</p>

Output	Indicative Activities (carried out on a national and/or landscape level as appropriate)				
Component 1: Integrating management of NPs and broader landscapes in Southern Tanzania					
<p>Output 1.1. Inter-sectoral District land management coordination mechanism between Tanzania National Parks authority (TANAPA), district authorities and Wildlife Division (WD) is instituted, emplaced and enacted in the Greater Ruaha and Greater KituloKipengere landscapes of Southern Tanzania, to ensure that biodiversity management in National Parks, Game Reserves, wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas is factored into decision-making governing land use management and coordinated action plans are followed.</p>	<p>1.1.1 Review of governance systems of existing landscape management approaches</p>	<p>1.1.2 Review of operational practices in existing institutions in GRL and GKKL landscapes</p>	<p>1.1.3 Consultative process to agree on, and document coordination mechanism formalisation framework</p>	<p>1.1.4 Draft and final framework mechanism, accepted by stakeholder, in place for formalisation, disseminate and finalise with stakeholders</p>	<p>1.1.5 Initiate activities and action plans for the newly established coordination mechanism</p>
<p>Output 1.2. TANAPA, WD, 7 pilot District Authorities and civil society partners plan, implement, and monitor biodiversity management measures for these landscapes (systematic conservation plan is in place which (1) defines Greater Ruaha and Greater Kitulo-Kipengere landscapes wildlife corridors and dispersal areas, (2) EIA and impact management stipulations in place to avoid and/ or mitigate development impacts in sensitive areas, (3) monitoring and reporting systems are in place, and (4) as a result, enforcement measures are operational).</p>	<p>1.2.1. Comprehensive oversight study carried out on ecological context of both GRL and GKKL landscapes and linkages, with particular focus on species abundance and documenting wildlife movements.</p>	<p>1.2.2. Consultations to design conservation management plan work plans with framework and strategic goals; plan defines habitat zones species movements, wildlife corridors and dispersal areas</p>	<p>1.2.3. Management plans ratified, roles and responsibilities agreed and actions determined and resultant measures are introduced</p>	<p>1.2.4. Feasibility and impact study carried out for the exact location, appropriate PA legal format and management of Bujingijila and Numbe wildlife corridors</p>	

<p>Output 1.3. TANAPA has the competence and staff skills to lead land use planning, management and monitoring in landscapes; working with partners to assess hydrological dynamics, make predictions of climate change trends and gauge long term impacts on biodiversity conservation. Two specialist units are developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit, and are in place.</p>	<p>1.3.1. Selected TANAPA staff provided with comprehensive training on national land use planning acts and policies and in GRL/GKKL contexts: LUP unit created</p>	<p>1.3.2. Selected TANAPA staff provided with comprehensive training on management and monitoring in landscapes; ecological and water monitoring unit created under the Ecology Department</p>	<p>1.3.3. Land Use Planning Unit sets up, under landscape planning mechanisms, a land use coordination committee with WMA leaders, district representatives (PMORALG, WD, FBD) and civil society observer-advisors.</p>	<p>1.3.4 Ecological Unit, sets up, under planning mechanisms, an monitoring committee with WMA leaders, district representatives (PMORALG, WD, FBD) and civil society advisors.</p>	<p>Monitoring landscape ecological observer-</p>	<p>1.3.5 LUP and Ecological Monitoring Units coordinate respective activities and report back to TANAPA and the landscape management coordination committees.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--	---

<p>Output 1.4. TANAPA has a staffed community extension services to ensure effective engagement between communities and park authorities and dispute resolution. A specialist community conservation unit is developed by TANAPA with partners; a land use planning unit and an ecological monitoring unit, and are in place and parkcommunity relations improved.</p>	<p>1.4.1. Current TANAPA Community Conservation extension staff numbers are at least doubled in both Ruaha and Kitulo NPs and provided training o best practices in CBNRM and the local context</p>	<p>1.4.2. CCS staff in both GRL and GKKL landscapes set up a community consultation coordination unit with district and communities to link TANAPA activities with developments in WMA areas and PFM (CBFM and JFM)</p>	<p>1.4.3. Community Consultation Units coordinate respective activates and report back to TANAPA and the landscape management coordination committees.</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

<p>Output 1.5. For Ruaha and Kitulo NPs, boundaries for recent /planned PA extensions (being Usangu Game Reserve and Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve respectively) are demarcated, associated public consultations are completed and respective management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both.</p>	<p>1.5.1. Community consultation process on boundaries with District LUP teams defines boundaries</p>	<p>1.5.2 Management plans updated if necessary to reflect any changes</p>	<p>1.5.3 Demarcation of boundaries around Ruaha and Kitulo NP and Mpanga Kipengere GR with beacons</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

<p>Output 1.6. Following a government-driven feasibility assessment, with transparent community consultations, Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve is raised to higher protected area status as a national park.</p>	<p>1.6.1 Costs benefit analysis and feasibility study commissioned to weigh up whether Mpanga Kipengere should be raised to NP status</p>	<p>1.6.2. Consultative process carried out with communities on the proposed upgrade is carried out, costs and benefits discussed</p>	<p>1.6.3 If agreed, Mpanga Kipengere GR elevated to NP status through government gazette notice and due process</p>	
<p>Output 1.7. Three PAs; Mount Rungwe, Kitulo and Mpanga Kipengere are linked ecologically through the development and demarcation of (1) Bujingijila and (2) Numbe valley wildlife corridor extensions. Further public and government consultations lead to the merging of Kitulo National Park and the Mpanga Kipengere National Park under one management.</p>	<p>1.7.1 Costs benefit analysis and feasibility study commissioned to weigh up MRNR, KINAPA and MKGR can be ecologically linked</p>	<p>1.7.2 Following due consultation and process, wildlife corridors legally gazetted and established in Bujingijila and Numbe corridors</p>	<p>1.7.3 Through the Numbe valley corridor, if feasible, Kitulo and Mpanga Kipengere PAs merged under TANAPA management</p>	
<p>Component 2: Operations Support for NP Management in Southern Tanzania</p>				

<p>Output 2.1. Systematic staff training programme covering all aspects of PA operations ensures 300 rangers, guides and other field staff meet necessary competencies for planning, administration, marketing, customer care, conflict resolution, policing and enforcement in Ruaha and Kitulo National Parks and Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve.</p>	<p>2.1.1. Following feasibility assessment of numbers required, new rangers recruited in RUNAPA and KINAPA; ranger training provided in both parks and to visiting rangers from MKGR. Special focus given on intelligence and enforcement aspects of operations</p>	<p>2.1.2. Dedicated guide training centre set up in RUNAPA as a national level pilot. >100 TANAPA and WD rangers trained as guides to internationally recognised criteria for trails guiding including problem animal management, ballistics, ecology and customer care.</p>	<p>2.1.3. Dedicated nature documentary film until set up and installed in RUNAPA to produce in-house documentaries for sale and for promotional purposes, aimed at the southern circuit in particular.</p>	<p>2.1.4 Specialist training provided to selected admin, ranger and guiding staff in RUNAPA and KINAPA on customer care, conflict resolution and other aspects of tourism management, with guests from MKGR.</p>	<p>2.1.5 Specialist training provided to selected admin, management and planning staff in RUNAPA and KINAPA on integrating all aspects of operations through an integrated planning mechanism, with observers from MKGR.</p>
<p>Output 2.2. A sustainable finance plan is developed approved and implemented for the PA system in both landscapes. Together, these define management costs, provide accurate revenue forecasts (from gate fees, concessions, film rights, improvements in tourism offers and other permissible uses to public and private sector investments), and match revenue opportunities to priority management needs. Results are incorporated into landscape planning mechanisms and acted upon by TANAPA and partners.</p>	<p>2.2.1. Finance plan is commissioned by TANAPA/UNDP to external specialists and developed for RUNAPA and KINAPA</p>	<p>2.2.2. In collaboration with WD, WMAs and other partners, GRL landscape level financial plan is commissioned and developed</p>	<p>2.2.3. In collaboration with WD, FBD and other partners, GKKL landscape level financial plan is commissioned and developed</p>	<p>2.2.4. PA and landscape level financial plans are discussed and agreed in plenary.</p>	
<p>Output 2.3. Business Planning is mandated for Ruaha and Kitulo National Parks and Mpanga Kipengere Game Reserve along approved best practice guidelines and utilising the sustainable financing plan. Business plans set cost co-efficients for all prescribed PA functions and rolling operations plans define site management priorities.</p>	<p>2.3.1 Comprehensive business planning process is undertaken to provide cost-benefit analysis and prioritise HR and equipment needs according to operational requirements.</p>	<p>2.3.2 Business plans for individual PAs and GRL and GKKL landscapes are produced, agreed and implemented.</p>			
<p>Output 2.4. Based on business planning, funds, human resources and equipment (surveillance equipment – radios, repeaters, GPS, cameras, night vision and firefighting equipment) are provided and deployed to address threats to NPs in a cost effective manner.</p>	<p>2.4.2. In RUNAPA, >10 new staff recruited according to business planning requirements; equipment bought, installed, trained on and in operation.</p>	<p>2.4.3. In KINAPA >10 new staff recruited according to business planning requirements; equipment bought, installed, trained on and in operation.</p>			

<p>Output 2.5. A joint (TANAPA-Community-DistrictPrivate Sector) stakeholder group formed to address overall management issues in both Ruaha and Kitulo NPs and adjacent Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) is established (committee formed, joint management plan developed, and joint enforcement systems emplaced using the Management Orientated Management System (MOMS) in Ruaha and Kitulo NPs (covering a total area of at least 23,000 km²). The group utilises in practice the government landscape plans initiated in component 1.</p>	<p>2.5.1. A GRL Stakeholder group set up involving TANAPA, WD, PMORALG, WMA management, tour operators and active NGOs formed to address biodiversity, land and economic management issues including tourism.</p>	<p>2.5.2. A GKKL Stakeholder group set up involving TANAPA, WD, FBD, PMORALG, community, tour operators and active NGOs formed to address biodiversity, land and economic management issues including tourism.</p>	<p>2.5.3. GRL stakeholder group is operationalized and works with landscape coordination mechanisms and business planning processes to advise on landscape management issues.</p>	<p>2.5.4. GKKL stakeholder group is operationalized and works with landscape coordination mechanisms and business planning processes to advise on landscape management issues.</p>	<p>2.5.5 A lessons learning coordination body allows biannual meetings between GRL and GKKL stakeholder groups</p>
<p>Project Management: Ensures effective project administration, M&E, and coordination have enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.</p>					
<p>Effective project administration, M&E, and coordination have enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.</p>	<p>5.1.1 Ensure all requisite facilities and communication channels for effective project management are in place.</p>	<p>5.1.2 Produce annual work plans for the timely achievement of project objectives.</p>	<p>5.1.3 Develop and implement a detailed project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, based on the shortened version articulated in this Project Document.</p>	<p>5.1.4 Produce quarterly and annual technical and financial reports for GEF and GRL/GKKL landscape stakeholders.</p>	<p>5.1.5 Liaise with UNDP CO, and UNDP - GEF to organize mid and end-of project reviews and evaluations</p>

ANNEX 9: ANTIPOACHING AND POACHING FIGURES FOR RUNAPA AS PROVIDED BY
TANAPA

Table 1. Poachers arrested and Weapons Confiscated from Poachers

S/N	TPYES OF WEAPON	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1	Poachers	737	747	669	378	505	406	323
2	Muzzle Loader	61	35	27	20	30	26	53
3	Bows	4	1	11	0	0	0	0
4	Arrows	6	27	15	5	4	0	0
5	Knives	233	370	138	175	21	163	57
6	Matchetes	169	274	70	140	20	119	5
7	Fish nets	7934	12,412	29,618	10,651	3,429	18,24	2,510
8	HakSaws	40	8	42	3	29	0	6
9	Bicycles	11	3	3	14	6	15	14
10	Hoes	46	37		0	0	0	1
11	Round Ammunition	288	113	183	174	0	0	30
12	Fish Hooks	13,539	49,346	21,185	17,530	267	13,83	340
	MARK 4	0	0	0	0	6	0	1
13	Vehicles	1	5		3	0	4	0
14	Gun powder (in Kgs)	9.5	0.5	3	1.76	0	0	0
15	Canoes	378	649	368	242	342	285	184
16	Spears	12	24		0		0	2
17	Axes	109	255	114	81	15	50	11
18	Hunting Riffles	23	2	5	2	0	0	8
19	Shotgun	2	6	13	4	12	2	8
20	Motorcycles	0	3	1	7		12	18
21	SAR	0	2	1	0	3	0	
22	Poison	0	0	2650grs	0		0	0
23	SMG	0	0	2	0	0	2	1
24	Kokoro	394	790	164	237	39	334	o
25	Wire snares	35	12	2	2	0	1	0
26	Powertiller	1	0		0		0	0
27	0.404					14	3	0
28	Pistol					1	1	0
29	G 3			1	1	1	0	1
30	0.458	1	0	0	0	11	5	2
31	4.6						1	0
32	30-06						1	0
33	22-250						1	0
34	22L/R						1	0
35	0.223						1	0
36	0.303						1	0
37	0.416						1	0
38	0.375	0	0	2	1	10	10	8
	AK47	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Table 2. Animal Poached

S/N	NAME OF ANIMAL	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1	Elephant	3	27	92	48	43	26	19
2	Zebra	1	0	5	0	2	0	3
3	Giraffe		5	2	2	0	0	4
4	Eland	1	2		0	0	2	1
5	Hippos		1		2	0	0	2
6	Impala	9	6	3	5	3	0	3
7	Kudu	6	7	1	8	2	2	3
8	Waterbuck		1		0	0	0	0
9	Redbuck		0		0	0	0	0
10	Grant gazzele		0		0	0	0	0
11	Sable antelope		0		2	0	0	0
12	Roan antelope		0		0	1	0	0
13	Leopard		0		0	0	0	0
14	Lion		1		2	1	0	2
15	Dikdik	6	4	3	6	0	9	2
16	Bushbuck		0		0	0	0	0
17	Buffalo	3	8	2	1	0	1	5
18	Warthog	1	1		2	0	2	1
19	Porcupine		0		0	0	0	0
20	Crocodiles	0	0		0	0	0	0
21	Ground Pangolin	0	0		0	0	0	
22	Python		0		0	0	0	0
23	Bush Pig	0	0		0	0	1	2
24	Ducks	0	0		3	0	0	0
25	Doves	0	0		2	0	0	0
	Wild Cat	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Fish	39722kgs	29920kgs	34851kgs	16379kgs	2771kgs	6070	350
26	Guine fowl	0	0	0	34	0	0	0

ANNEX 10: INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION CONSULTANT/TEAM LEADER AGREEMENT
FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁵**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System****Name of Consultant:** Maria ONESTINI**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**Signed at *Buenos Aires, Argentina* on *September 11 2017*Signature:  _____³⁵ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct