

Terminal Evaluation Report

Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (NAFOLA)

UNDP PIMS ID: 4626

GEF Project ID: 4832

Country:	Namibia
Region:	Africa
Focal Area:	Land Degradation
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Development Programme
Executive:	Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry
Implementing Partner:	Directorate of Forestry
Project Timeframe:	Aug 2014 – Dec 2019

Prepared by:

Richard Sobey, International Consultant / Team Leader
Victor Mufita, National Consultant

January 2020

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	16
1.1. The project	16
1.2. Purpose of the evaluation and report structure	16
1.3. Scope and Methodology	16
2. Project Description	17
2.1. Development Context	17
2.2. Problems that the Project Sought to Address	18
2.3. Project Description and Strategy	20
2.4. Implementation Arrangements	21
2.5. Key Partners & Stakeholders	21
3. Findings	21
3.1. Project Strategy	21
3.1.1 Project Design, Objective & Approach	21
3.1.2 Design Assumptions & Risks	22
3.1.3 Results Framework Indicators & Targets	23
3.1.4 Gender Design	24
3.2. Project Implementation	24
3.2.1 IA and EA Coordination & Operational Management	24
3.2.2 Institutional Mechanisms	26
3.2.3 Local Partnership / Stakeholder Engagement	27
3.2.4 Finance & Co-finance	28
3.2.5 M&E Systems – Design & Implementation	28
3.2.6 Adaptive Management (Work planning, Reporting & Communications)	29
3.3. Project Results	30
3.3.1 Overall Result – Achievement of Objective and Outcome Indicators	30
3.3.2 Effectiveness – Achievement of Outcomes 1-2	31
3.3.3 Training and Awareness	42
3.3.4 Efficiency, Relevance and Ownership	42
4. Sustainability	42
4.1. Financial Risks to Sustainability	42
4.2. Socio-economic Risks to Sustainability	43
4.3. Institutional & Governance Risks to Sustainability	43
4.3. Environmental Risks to Sustainability	43
5. Impact & Catalytic Effect	43
5.1. Impact	43
5.2. Catalytic Effect	44
6. Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations	45
6.1. Conclusions	45
6.2. Lessons Learned	46
6.3. Recommendations	47
7. Annexes	49
Annex 1: Delivery of Project Objective and Outcomes against Performance Indicators	49
Annex 2: Delivery of Outputs	56
Annex 3: Co-financing Table	59
Annex 4: Planned Budget and Expenditures at End-term	60
Annex 5: Brief review of Sectoral plans, Technical reports, Training materials, Misc.	61
Annex 6: List of Persons Interviewed	68
Annex 7: List of Documents Reviewed	69
Annex 8: Stakeholder List	70
Annex 9: Rating Scales	72

Annex 10: Mission Itinerary	75
Annex 11: Map	77
Annex 12: Indicative TE Evaluation Matrix	78
Annex 13: Signed UNDP Code of Conduct Agreement Form	82
Annex 14: Signed TE Final Report Clearance Form	83
Annex 15: Terms of Reference	84

Annexed in a separate file: Tracking Tools

Annexed in separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft TE report

Exhibits:

- Exhibit 1: Project Information Table
- Exhibit 2: Ratings Summary Table
- Exhibit 3: Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Exhibit 4: Recommendations Table

Disclaimer

The TE views were discussed with UNDP, PSC members, representatives of Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry, local government partners and key stakeholders. There was a debriefing / stakeholder workshop held to present views and refine findings. The PMU, UNDP and their RTA provided comment on the draft report before finalization. The views held within this report are those of the TE team.

Acknowledgement

The evaluation team would like to acknowledge all project partners who supported the development of this TE. In particular, the TE team leader would like to thank the members of the PMU, in particular Jonas Nghishidi, the PMU Project Manager.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAC	Annual Allowable Cut (of timber / poles within a CFMP)
ATLAS	UNDP tracking system
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CF	Community Forest
CFMC	CF Management Committee
CFMP	CF Management Plan
CLB	Communal Land Board
DAPEES	Directorate of Agriculture Production, Extension and Engineering Services (MAWF)
DARD	Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (MAWF)
DPBD	Directorate of Planning & Business Development (MAWF)
DoF	Directorate of Forestry (as the designated IP on behalf of the EA)
EA	Executing Agency (MAWF)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoN	Government of Namibia
HACT	UN Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (for financial agreement between UNDP & the IP)
IP	Project Implementing Partner (MAWF / DoF)
LRC	Land Right Certificate
LUP	Land use plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAWF	Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry (the EA)
MLR	Ministry of Land Reform
MTR	UNDP Mid-term Review
MURD	Ministry of Urban & Rural Development
Nacso	Namibia Association Community-based Natural Resources Management Support Organisation (an NGO)
Nafola	Sustainable Management of <u>N</u> amibia's <u>F</u> orested <u>L</u> ands (Project title abbreviation and 'the project')
NCA	Northern Communal Area
NIM	UNDP National Implementation Modality
PIF	GEF Project Identification Form
PIMS	UNDP Project Information Management System
PIR	UNDP Project Implementation Report
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRF	Project Results Framework (~logframe / Strategic Results Framework)
Prodoc	Project document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RP	Responsible Party (ies) (implementing on behalf of the IP)
RFO	Regional Forest Office
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor (of UNDP)
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (Indicators)
TE	UNDP Terminal Evaluation (of the project, and this report)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme (GEF Implementing Agency (IA), member of PSC)
UNDP CO	UNDP Country Office
UNDSS	UN Department for Safety and Security
UNITS	US\$ - US dollar; NAD – Namibian Dollar; m - million or meters; ha - hectare (100 m x 100 metres)

Executive Summary

The executive summary is a 14-page summary of the the Terminal Evaluation (TE) report.

Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola)		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #)	4626	PIF Approval	Mar 2012
GEF Project ID (PMIS #)	4832	CEO Endorsement	Dec 2013
Country	Namibia	Project Document Signature	Aug 2014
Region	Africa	Project manager hired	Mar 2015
Trust Fund	GEF-5	Inception Workshop	Apr 2015
Focal Area	Land Degradation	Terminal Evaluation	Dec 2019
Strategic Program	LD2 - Enabling environment within the forest sector in drylands (2.1); Improved forest management in drylands (2.2); Functionality & cover of dryland forest ecosystems maintained (2.3)		
Modality	National Implementation	Closing Date	31 Dec 2019
Executing Agency / Implementing Partner	Ministry of Agriculture Water & Forestry (MAWF) / Directorate of Forestry (DoF)		
Other Partners	Directorate of Agricultural Production, Engineering, Extension Services (DAPEES)		
Project Financing:	at CEO endorsement (USD)	at Terminal Evaluation (USD)	
[1] GEF financing	4,446,000	3,489,717	
[2] UNDP contribution	500,000	498,033	
[3] Government	17,500,000	2,805,810	
[4] Other partners	4,500,000	1,339,144	
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]	22,500,000	4,642,987	
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	26,946,000	8,132,704	

Expenditures and co-financing through to 15 Dec 2019

Project Description

A. Problem to Solution

The main drivers of deforestation and degradation are from a lack of food security. The threats are: over-grazing; over-exploitation of wood (for fuel and building); and land conversion (agriculture expansion). As a result of over-grazing, bush encroachment is also a problem in the open woodland-savanna landscape. Over-grazing causes the loss of palatable grass species, changing to a dominance of unpalatable species. Over-grazing of cattle also pushes out wildlife-browsing species, which keep a check on woody tree and bush growth. Bush encroachment is the increase in coverage and density of woody vegetation at the expense of grasses and forbs, and trees.

An issue with large livestock farming (on communal land) is that cattle yearlings are often sold-on to be fattened up before sale, meaning less profit for the farmers, and the sale of their future breeding stock. The large cattle that the farmers do sell when they need income, tend to be old and only attain lower prices.

The de-bushing activity assumed that once the dense thicket is removed, then the land will be restored to grazing land with suitable grass species. In reality, the bush stumps just regrow. If the stumps are removed mechanically at great expense, then the topsoil is damaged, but it also needs re-seeding with palatable grass species, for the rains to come, and for livestock to be kept out until the grass has grown. This has only been possible within the private farming sector, and not to date, within the communal land and CF areas.

Uncontrolled fires are widespread, often caused by farmers clearing fields for cultivation and grazing. Hot late fires are common and destroy grazing and browsing resources, particularly in woodland areas. Most damage is done during the dry winter months. The result is suppressed grass growth, and greater bush growth, with the eventual loss of grazing land.

Agriculture is limited by the high proportion of sandy soils, with little capacity for water retention, and with nutrients limited to the thin topsoil layer. Combined with the low rainfall (~600mm / year), this makes rain-fed crop production (millet, sorghum and maize) a low yield – high-risk enterprise. As nutrients and water are easily lost from these soils, farmers tend to expand cultivation areas, which reduces grazing land and woodlands needed to maintain the ecosystem balance (for temperature, water retention, dry season fodder etc). Population pressures and new settlement exacerbate the problem.

In the northern communal areas (NCAs), the cultural norm is for Traditional Authority (TA) leaders to informally allocate land for cultivation and grazing. With increasing population pressures, and inducements, more land is

being parceled out, where traditionally communal grazing was undertaken.

B. Project Description

In Namibia, in the communal areas, small-hold farming systems are integrated with livestock and crops, and as such, forest management solutions alone, can't meet the criteria for climate-smart approaches. This is in part due to the fact that community forests (CFs) encompass farming plots and free-ranging livestock. Thus Nafola, was designed as a cross-sector project with land use planning (LUP) and sustainable land management (SLM) aspects. The Nafola design was based on the GEF-3 project - 'Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Sustainable Land Management', especially concerning rangeland management. CPP was said to influence the National Development Plan (NDP4) in terms of mainstreaming SLM into national development policies. The project was also based on the lessons learnt from the KfW Government of Namibia (GoN) Community Forest Programme (CFP), which indicated bottlenecks, such as the difficulty in attaining gazetted status.

The project goal was to 'Maintain dry forests and their ecosystem goods & services in 13 CFs covering 5,000 km² (i.e. 0.5 million ha) of land, through the adoption of sustainable land management (SLM) and sustainable forest management (SFM)'. The project objective was to 'Reduce pressure on forest resources by through policy and capacity building to improve practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry in the community forest (CF) areas.'

C. Project Location and Map

The project was located in seven regions in 15 CFs to the north and north-east of Namibia:

Region	Municipality / Town	Village	Community Forest Name
Kunene	Opuwo	Otjokavare	Ehi-Rovipuka
		Otjiu	Otjiu West
Omusati	Outapi	Onesi	Uukolonkadhi
			Ongandjera
Oshana	Oshakati	Eengombe	Otshiku-Tshiithilonde
Ohangwena	Eenhana	Omundaungilo	Omundaungilo
	Okongo	Okongo	Okongo
Oshikoto	Onankali	Omahya	Oshaampula
		Onkumbula	Onkumbula
Otjozondjupa	Okakarara	Okondjatu	African Wild Dog
	Grootfontein	Ongongoro	Otjituuo
Omaheke	Gobabis	Talismanus	Otjombinde
		Eiseb Pos 10	Eiseb
		Okatumba gate	Omuramba Ua Mbinda
		Epukiro Pos 3	Epukiro

See map in **Annex 11**.

D. Project Management

The UNDP-supported GEF-financed project was titled 'Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola) (PIMS 4626)'. The 5-year project was under National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) as the Executing Agency, and their Directorate of Forestry (DoF) as the designated Implementing Partner (IP). The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was chaired by the Directorate of Forestry (DoF) Director, who was also the Nafola Project Director. The PSC members included UNDP, GEF Focal Point, MAWF (DoF, Directorate of Agriculture Production, Extension & Engineering Services (DAPEES), and Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (DARD)), Ministry of Land Reform (MLR), Ministry of Urban & Rural Development (MURD), and Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET). The project established a Project Implementation Unit (PMU) with a Project Manager, Accountant and M&E Officer. The PMU hired 13 Project Liaison Officers (for 13 CFs).

Purpose and Methodology

The objective of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) was to gain an independent analysis of the achievement of the project at completion, as well as to assess its sustainability and impact. The report focuses on assessing outcomes and project management. The TE additionally considered accountability and transparency, and provides lessons-learned for future UNDP-GEF projects, in terms of design and implementation. The overall approach and methodology of the TE followed the guidelines outlined in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (2012). The TE was an evidence-based assessment and

relied on feedback from persons who were involved in the design, implementation, and supervision of the project¹. The TE determined if the project's building blocks (technical, financial, management, legal) were put in place and then, if together these were catalysed sufficiently to make the project successful.

Evaluation Ratings Summary

GEF-UNDP projects of this type require the TE to evaluate implementation according to set parameters and ratings. The result of this, is presented in Exhibit 2 below. (see **Annex 9** for rating scale):

Exhibit 2: TE Ratings Summary Table

1. Monitoring & Evaluation	Rating	2. Implementing Agency (UNDP) & Executing Agency / Partner (DoF) Execution	Rating
Overall quality of M&E	MU	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MU
M&E Design at entry	MS	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MU
M&E Implementation	MU	Quality of Execution – DoF	U
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Overall Project Outcome (Objective)	U	Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	MU
Effectiveness of Outcome 1	MU	Financial resources	MU
Effectiveness of Outcome 2	U	Socio-economic	MU
Efficiency	U	Institutional framework & governance	MU
Relevance	Relevant	Environmental	MU
5. Impact	Rating		
Impact	Negligible		

NB: for Sustainability MU indicates Moderately Unlikely

Detailed ratings are tabulated below in **Exhibit 3**. A description of the grading scale is provided in **Annex 9**

Exhibit 3: Achievement Summary with TE Grading	
Project: Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola) UNDP PIMS ID: 4626; GEF Project ID: 4832	
Achievement Description & TE Rating	
Outcomes/ Results	
The project goal was to 'Maintain dry forests and their ecosystem goods & services in 13 Community Forests (CFs) covering 5,000 km ² (i.e. 0.5 million ha) of land, through the adoption of SLM and SFM'.	
Result - Overall Project Objective Achievement - Unsatisfactory	
Project Objective was 'Reduce pressure on forest resources by through policy and capacity building to improve practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry in the CF areas.'	
The grading at the project objective level depends on both the achievement of Outcomes 1 and 2 according to 'framework logic', and on the objective level indicators. There were two indicators attached to the objective level which were rated as: moderately satisfactory (1); and unsatisfactory (1). Outcome 1 and 2 were rated as moderately satisfactory, and unsatisfactory respectively.	
Justification: The project did not achieve its main environmental objectives and the project had significant shortcomings. Whilst Nafola gazetted over four million hectares of land as CF, it only managed this at the end of the project. The expectation was that this land would also be put under improved SLM in terms of improved rangeland management (better grazing control; improved quality of pasture with more palatable grass species; higher off-take of undesired livestock; localized rangeland monitoring; and controlled wood and fuelwood use from the CFs), and at least for 0.5m ha, within three CFs. These SLM actions were not implemented, and remain mostly uncovered in the Community Forest Management Plans (CFMPs). The project was not really understood by its Implementing Partner, the DoF.	
1/ Area of gazetted CFs, with legal entities to manage them [MS]	
The project was successful in achieving gazettelement of nine CFs. The target was 10. The most important result of gazettelement (and of the project), was the establishment of the Community Forest Management Committees (CFMCs) with CF constitutions and 5-Year CFMPs. The project supported 15 CFs, of which CFMPs were produced or updated for 13 out of these 15 CFs. The CFMPs were based on forest inventory surveys. For nine of the CFs, their CFMPs and	

¹ Evidence and verification of the findings was based on respondent interviews (usually at least 2-3 sources), cross-referenced against project documentation, field observation and desk study scientific or other published reports.

their 'constitutions' were forwarded as application dossiers for gazettelement, which was successful.

2/ Area under effective land use management with vegetative cover maintained [U]

There were four sub-indicators:

For indicator (a) which was 2.84 m ha under approved land use, Nafola was successful in achieving gazettelement of 4.08 million ha of land as CF. The first steps towards SLM / SFM were achieved through creating CFs, and importantly institutional structures for them, namely the CFMCs. The CFMCs were provided with the tools to begin SLM / SFM, in terms of creating for the CF, a constitution, and a management plan. The project ended at this point. For the 15 CFs that Nafola supported, the total area gazetted was 4,349,021 ha, of which nine were gazetted under Nafola covering an area of 4,077,847 ha. The 'plans' are the CFMPs of the CFs.

For indicator (b), which was to regenerate 0.5 m ha from 30 to 50% tree cover, Nafola was unsuccessful. Tree cover in the dry forest woodlands continued to decline in the CFs under Nafola, however the project supported forest inventories for 13 CFs. The expectation that Nafola could achieve this specific target, was extremely high. If Nafola had managed to gazette the 10 CFs in the first year and then work with all 15 on a full range of funded and supported direct land management interventions, then the woodland degradation might have been slowed down, but to expect a reversal, to increase tree cover by 20% would have been spectacular.

For indicator (c), which was to remove 10,000 ha of bush, Nafola was unsuccessful

For indicator (d), concerning the restoration of 50,000 ha of land to pasture with palatable grass species, Nafola was unsuccessful. The action was not started or achieved in any way, even though there were three outputs to support it (livestock grazing control; bush removal & re-seeding with grass; and rangeland monitoring). What might have been attempted was to set up a demonstration to monitor livestock numbers and grass species composition against no-grazing plots.

Effectiveness - Outcome 1 Achievement - Moderately Unsatisfactory

Outcome 1: Land use planning & policy hasten gazettelement of 10 CFs and mainstreaming of forest production

There were four indicators rated as: moderately satisfactory (1); moderately unsatisfactory (1); unsatisfactory (1) and highly unsatisfactory (1).

Justification: Outcome 1 only achieved only some of its main environmental objectives. The outcome had significant shortcomings. It achieved the required basic support of CFs towards gazettelement, but this expanded to take up most of the project time, at the expense of most other parts of the project. In particular under Outcome 1, the shortcomings included: a lack of integration of SLM into CFMPs as a demonstration, let alone their implementation; a lack of cross-sector collaboration, even within MAWF and between key directorates – the Directorate of Agriculture Production, Extension & Engineering Services (DAPEES) and the Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (DARD) in particular; and a lack of DoF institutional capacity built.

1/ Ten community forests legalised and their (land use) plans approved [MS]

The project supported 15 CFs, of which nine CFs were gazetted during the project. Four CFs were gazetted prior to the project, and two were surveyed and delineated by map, but were not gazetted. The nine CFs that were gazetted with approved plans covered an area of over 4m ha. The nine gazetted CFs were: Ehi-Rovipuka (Kunene), Otshiku-Tshiihilonde (Oshana), Omundaungilo (Ohangwena), African Wild Dog and Otjituuo (both Otjozondjupa), Otjombinde, Eiseb, Omuramba Ua Mbinda, and Epukiro (all Omaheke). The four CFs in Omaheke covered 2.73m ha out of the 4.1m ha gazetted. The two mapped were: Ongandjera (Omusati) and Onkumbula (Oshikoto). The four previously gazetted were Otjiu-West (Kunene), Uukolonkadhi (Omusati), Okongo (Ohangwena), and Oshaampula (Oshikoto).

The work which took over five years, involved consultation, constitution and CFMC establishment, inventory, CFMP preparation, and gazettelement, was extensive and shouldn't be under-estimated. At a central level, the latter final verification and gazettelement, involving DoF coordinating with MLR (approval) and MET (where conservancy boundaries coincided), was comparatively slow. The 5-year CFMPs included a summary of the inventory and a determination of the annual allowable cut (AAC). The mapping and boundary consultation was aligned with the communal land boards (CLBs). Standard Operating Procedures for CFs were developed, and the CF Toolbox was updated.

The project built two CF offices in Oshaampula CF and Otjiu-West CF, with planned completion in March 2020. Project laptops were bought in June 2019, but had not reached the CFMCs by December 2019.

2/ Forestry reflected in regional land use plans with three CF-based integrated (forest) resource management plans developed [U]

Forestry was mainstreamed in the Omaheke region land use plan (2017-27), which was produced by MLR, but without Nafola support. Omaheke is severely degraded due to large livestock over-stocking. This plan reflected land use

zoning for Omaheke and provided direction for four projects CFs. Concerning SLM, the plan recommended:

- (a) For the CF (Epuke) - Determine livestock 'carrying capacity'² locally and regularly, and broadcast the levels within the TA areas
- (b) For the CF – Conservancies (Otjombo, Eiseb & Omuramba) - support the registered entities in wildlife conservation, and eco-tourism, especially for the IUCN Red-list 'Endangered' species, such as African Wild Dog (*Lycaon pictus*); and stop considering waterless areas as under-utilized in terms of livestock farming
- (c) For both - support rangeland management in line with the national rangeland strategy; and support bush-thinning

Nafola, should have accessed this plan and based some of its interventions on these recommendations. The meaning of the 'integrated resource plans' was to integrate CF sustainable management requirements into the wider land use planning process, or for the wider process regarding SLM (land tenure, livestock management etc), to be incorporated into three enhanced CF plans. It is not important which way round the process is conducted, but rather that SLM actions become planned for, and part of the CFMP implementation. In this case, as three demonstration CFs.

As the Omaheke LUP had existed, at least in draft, for most of the Nafola time period, there was a clear opportunity to address the open savanna-woodland (rangeland) management issues, which were primarily land degradation due to over-stocking of cattle. However, Nafola didn't do this, but rather prepared standard forest management plans as part of the CF gazettement process, and then called these plans 'integrated resource plans,' when in fact they were forestry-only (inventory and AAC) plans. This was not only a DoF capacity issue, but one where cross-sectoral collaboration and fund-share were shunned by DoF.

Besides this, there were some cases, where the regional land offices were supporting map preparation for the CFs. An example was Okango CF (Ohangwena), which had a new map (October 2019) produced by the land office's land use planning & allocation section, which shows the CF and conservancy boundaries, plus all the Land Right Certificate (LRC) certificated land inside their boundaries. It also detailed all the land tenure application plots that have been mapped, but without the LRC issued to date. Such examples are very useful for the CFMCs, in order to assess present status, and report against any new illegal land conversion (agriculture or fenced for livestock) or settlement. This was a good example, but it was difficult to determine how many of the other CFs were benefitting from this process.

3/ Governance and forums connecting Natural Resources Management (NRM), SLM and SFM policy [HU]

The rationale for this intervention was that, despite various policies containing NRM, SLM and SFM, and including committees to work on cross-sectoral management, most actions were single sector and ineffective. This remained the same under Nafola. The most disappointing aspect, was DoF's failure to work with another MAWF directorate, namely DARD, even though, their offices were in the same building. DoF's work with DAPEES was also disappointingly limited.

The support towards the Omaheke Conservation Agriculture (CA) Forum was limited and weak. Despite some indications of a Northern CF Forum, no evidence of such could be found. There exists a National Rangeland Forum, but again, there was no evidence of Nafola working with them. However, Nafola did work with Constituency Development Committees (CDCs) in the seven regions. The remit of the CDCs is inter-sectoral. The CFMCs worked with CDCs and regional government.

Concerning policy, Nafola produced a forestry financing strategy (2019), listing 14 financing methods. It indicated Namibia's commitment to climate change via Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) from 2015-25, with a number of aims including restore 15m ha of grassland at a cost of US\$1.78 billion. It also confirmed the limited annual budget of DoF being 0.8 – 1.5% (~US\$14m / year) of the MAWF budget, of which 85% is used for operational costs, leaving only 15% (US\$2.1m / year) for capital projects. With a continued lack of investment in forestry, the 1.84 m ha of forest lost over the last 25 years (FAO, 2015) is set to continue.

There was a little evidence of forestry being mainstreamed into sectoral plans, however there were five main policies or plans identified as most relevant to SLM. (See Impact section – Policy change). The main issue is that the DoF, institutionally is out of date. It remains primarily established to manage forestry production receipts, and sits alongside other MAWF production departments, such as agriculture that are many times bigger. Forestry, especially in Namibia needs to be under NRM or SLM, and these days probably dissolved and created as a new unit under NRM within the MET. Only then will the subjects such as rangeland management or carbon neutrality be given the priority they deserve.

4/ DoF organisational capacity for CF management [MU]

The TE roughly estimated that Nafola provided ~80% of the technical support to gazette the nine CFs, with DoF central

² the number of animals an area can support without environmental degradation

and field staff contributing ~10% each. In support of this estimate, it was known that the operational and programme budget allocated to DoF was <1.5% of the MAWF budget. Added to this, the Nafola figures for MAWF / DoF co-financing amounted to only \$2.85m from a projected US\$15m to be provisioned (prodoc).

The DoF struggled to dedicate a central staff member to the CF programme, and only did so after the MTR with a senior forester then tasked to the work. There was little evidence of DoF record-keeping or any database of the CF programme, or CFMCs' legal dossiers or annual reports for example. For the UNDP capacity development scorecard, there was an increase in 11 percentage points for DoF and 20 for CFMCs, however the evidence of improved capacity at DoF level was scant. DoF capacity to facilitate CF gazettement was limited.

Effectiveness - Outcome 2 Achievement – Unsatisfactory

Outcome 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CFs.

There were seven indicators rated as: moderately satisfactory (2); unsatisfactory (2); and highly unsatisfactory (3).

Justification: In terms of effectiveness, there were major shortcomings in the achievement of Outcome 2. The outcome is not expected to achieve most of its environmental objectives. Interventions that failed included: Conservation Agriculture (CA); livestock management and rangeland monitoring; livestock off-take; bush thinning & grass seeding; and alternative energy for fuelwood use. Environmentally, the key issue was livestock over-grazing, but the counter-measures required were outside the skills of DoF, who failed to delegate responsibility or funds to a directorate better placed to achieve this, namely DARD. DoF also failed to delegate the CA intervention with funds to DAPEES. Concerning off-take, no actions were achieved during the project, however the livestock auction facility built in Tallismanus in Omaheke, may be successful in the future, but also needs the right directorate – Planning & Business Development (DPBD under MAWF) – to take the lead in legalising a suitable (cooperative-based) management approach. In fact, virtually the whole of Outcome 2 was outside the skill-set of DoF and needed its provisioned funds delegated to those who were better placed to achieve SLM results.

1/ Conservation Agriculture (CA) with increased productivity of climate-resilient crops covering 300,000 ha [HU]

Conservation Agriculture (CA) was the focus of this indicator, firstly in the provision of climate-resilient seed and secondly in adopting soil and water conservation tillage methods. The target was farmers in the NCAs. Nafola was expected to access seed from Omahenene Plant Breeding Station, and utilize the CA methods under the Dryland Crop Production Programme (DCPP) to increase crop productivity, and therefore reduce pressure on the CF natural resources. The objective was to introduce CA with pearl millet and sorghum as better drought-resistant crops into Omaheke and Otjozondjupa (as other projects were covering other regions), as these two regions were relying on maize, which due to drought, was failing over a number of years.

To support CA, the project bought three 95hp Kubota tractors (2016) to be used within three CFs and their communities (Omaheke - Otjombinde and Epukiro CFs - managed by DAPEES Gobabis office; and Ohangwena - Okango CF - managed by DAPEES Eenhana office). The project started supporting CA in 2016, but was unfortunately stopped in 2017 after one growing season, which was affected by drought. The tractors continued working under DAPEES.

There were no figures to verify any changes in crop selection (to pearl millet and sorghum), nor any increase in productivity, nor in the hectareage under improved CA measures. The TE did however verify that the management of the tractors and services to support CA was operating (by DAPEES) very well in the three project CFs, and their impact was beginning to be of some significance.

However, the DoF / PMU failed to develop any meaningful CA demonstration activities, either led by themselves or better led by DAPEES and / or DARD. Nothing happened for the first two years, then after a year of some very limited trials in Omaheke and Otjozondjupa in 2016, UNDP in 2017 called for all the CA activities to stop, based on limited statements in the MTR.

One of the issues was that DoF / PMU failed to have any clear agreement with DAPEES on their role and failed to work out how best for them to use the US\$405,000 (9% of the GEF funds), which had been provisioned for this activity. DAPEES with Nafola funds could have started in 2015 with CA exchange visits to other regions in the NCA, where FAO / GIZ were operating trials. They could have learnt how improved seed was being obtained and provided through the local extension service, and have replicated this in Omaheke and Otjozondjupa. In all, the GoN CA programme in these two project regions in the east, was let down by DoF / UNDP.

2/ Livestock management and rangeland monitoring [U]

The target was to improve the stock value of small-holder cattle herds, by selling off the older cattle, and keeping the 'Yearlings' as future breeding and meat stock. This would also allow the latter to have a better chance to reach a higher fat grade at sale. Neither DAPEES, DARD nor Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS) were engaged in any

way to support this intervention.

There were two outputs (2.2 and 2.7) designed to support this intervention with a provisioned budget of US\$543,000. They were not implemented. The purpose of Output 2.2 was to demonstrate localised rangeland monitoring in three regions. It was expected that the 'grassland monitoring tool' developed under the GEF-3 UNDP project 'Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (SLM)', would be used as a method to reduce over-grazing in three CFs under communal land tenure. The tool allows farmers and communities to seasonally reserve plots from grazing and rotate these. Nafola failed to even start this (apart from an unfocused baseline report in 2016), let alone collaborate with MET who implemented the GEF-3 project. It should have been understood that Nafola was primarily a SLM project, however the DoF failed to grasp any of the SLM aspects designed into Nafola, and doggedly stuck to 'forestry-only' activities.

The purpose of Output 2.7 was to produce and implement a more comprehensive rangeland monitoring system or model for the CFs. i.e. a system that would encompass grassland status, stocking density, fire risk, and bush encroachment. This was not done. One of the expectations was that technical support from the Namibia University of Science & Technology (NUST) would be sought to establish the system. They have such a model which could have been piloted over 4-5 years under the project.

Another clear option would have been to work with DARD (same ministry, same building as DoF), who also undertake extensive research on rangeland management and grazing capacities, and manage the Sandveld Research Station (Omaheke), which has a 20-year research programme in rotational grazing of the Caprivi-Sanga cattle breed. Technical support was not sought, and as a result, the capacity of DoF / PMU to implement the project effectively was limited again.

3/ Increased livestock off-take in Omaheke, Oshikoto, and Otjozondjupa [U]

The project did not achieve increased livestock off-take, but it did build a livestock auction facility at Tallimanus, Omaheke (Otjombinde CF area). The baseline off-take was ~6.5%, with Nafola reporting that the NCAs off-take rate was 9.5% (2012). In 2018, for Otjombinde, the cattle off-take rate was reported by DVS at 14%. These figures could not be verified, however the TE would suggest that off-take rates need to significantly increase, if sustainable grazing is to be attained, particularly in the face of variable rains with prolonged drought periods over a number of years in the region (as a result of climate change).

The livestock auction facility (a.k.a. kraal) was funded by donor and public money. At the time of the TE in December 2019, the auction facility was near completion and was undergoing 'snagging' finishing touches. It needs electricity (the line is <1 km away). The kraal which was constructed to EU standard, was due for handover in February 2020. Nafola produced a livestock marketing strategy which was aimed at promoting livestock off-take using the Tallimanus Auction Facility.

Overall, the auction facility desperately needs a 'management modality', which should be based on a 'cooperative model'. A facility under such a similar model, exists in Aminuis town in the south of Omaheke. The facility also needs a set of 'guiding principles.' The main reason for building it, was 'improved grassland management of the Otjombinde Community Forest (CF)', by aiding large livestock 'off-take' from the CF, and providing profit for the livestock farmers / community'.

The auction facility also needs a 'trustee management board' under MAWF, with the main 12-15 stakeholders represented. These are: MAWF (owner); Omaheke Regional Council; Omaheke Regional DAPEES Office; Omaheke Regional Forestry Office; Omaheke Regional Farmers Union (ORFU); Otjombinde / Tallimanus District Council; Otjombinde Constituency Councillor's Office (OCCO); Otjombinde CF & Conservancy Management Committee (CFCMC); Otjombinde Traditional Authority (OTA); Otjombinde Farmers Association (OTJOFA); Nguakondja Multipurpose Farmers' Cooperative (NMFC); and Tweripura Farmers Welfare Association (TFWA) [*these last 3 represent 3 TAs*].

It needs a manager and accountant to be employed. It needs two sub-contracts, one for 'facilities management' and one for 'auctioneering.' It needs a 'state financing plan to attain sustainability within five years. (It should be remembered here, that MAWF agreed to the significant Nafola investment for the facility, and that MAWF has a capital projects fund that includes livestock auction facilities). It needs a profit-share arrangement, based partly at least on a 'cooperative-model' of maximising benefits for the farmers and community. For this reason, the auction facility should not be operated solely on a profit-basis, nor controlled by a state or private-owned enterprise. It also needs a signboard to state that 'this Auction Facility was funded by GEF-UNDP Project Nafola and GoN, for the purpose of improved management of Otjombinde CF & Conservancy, and the benefit of the farmers and community'.

Concerning constructing the auction facility, one should note that this was the most contentious issue of the project. This was due to its purpose, cost, and viability. The project justification (i.e. the strategy) was only produced in 2019, after the facility was built. This assessment was too late and unclear regarding sustainability. For a GEF investment

of at least US\$554,530, this was not optimal. (Under Output 2.3 Improved livestock marketing the budget was \$380,000.)

Another issue was that the main state buyer of cattle (Meatco Ltd) (and possibly other commercial meat traders) have a purchase policy that penalises the sale of cattle below a pre-set slaughter weight - i.e. smaller-breed cattle and yearlings. The smaller-breed cattle are more suitable for SLM, especially in the northern Omaheke / Otjombe area. Fortunately, the new Livestock Sector Transformation Strategy (2019), includes removing penalties against small-frame and C-grade carcasses and promoting functionally efficient breeds.

4/ Fire management strategy in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa CFs [MS]

The project developed a national strategy for fire management, and a fire control plan for one CF. The project also added to the ability for Namibia to provide early-warning information on fire risk. However, there was little evidence of reduced incidence or severity of fire due to Nafola. Project training in fire control was only conducted once in 2017 and only for three CFs. The demonstration fire control plan was only finalised in 2019, and the national fire management strategy remained in draft, as of the end of project. Why three other fire control plans were not produced, was not clear. The DoF Remote Sensing Unit has collected fire report data since 2005, and maintains a 'live' fire risk map. Nafola purchased remote-sensed software to access satellite temperature data, so that the quality of the daily fire monitoring bulletin could be upgraded. But overall, the impact of the intervention was limited.

5/ Control of bush encroachment [HU]

The aim was to remove 10,000 ha of thicket that had encroached on grazing land in five CFs (Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde), and then re-seed the land with palatable grass species. Nafola failed to identify a viable approach for this. The real focus should have been on creating grass species regeneration plots – protected from livestock – as a seed source and demonstration. It should have been a grassland pilot demonstration activity managed by DARD. The prodoc explained 'one of the limiting factors to reseeded is inadequate supply of palatable rangeland grass seed. The project will train farmers and extension workers to obtain seed and begin seed multiplication.' There was US\$371,000 allocated for this output.

The project purchased a brushwood chipping machine, which African Wild Dog CFMC rented out for bush removal from private land. However, the area of bush removed 2016-18 was only 10 ha. The chipper reduces brushwood to woodchip, which when mixed with further animal feed, can produce a palatable fodder for livestock.

6/ Alternative energy sources and reduction in CF household fuelwood use [HU]

The target was to reduce fuelwood use from 90 to 70% use as a source of energy, mainly for cooking. This was ambitious to say the least, especially without any attempt by Nafola, to follow the prodoc design, which recommended a programme to access and increase the uptake of energy-saving stoves, and the provision of solar panels and cookers. The appropriate department or agency or NGO to deliver a stove and solar panel programme was never identified. Nafola did not support activities to reduce fuelwood use, however an income-generating activity (IGA) to support brick-making was introduced in three CFs. Overall, the impact was too small to be measurable.

7/ Income from CF forest resources and marketing of the products [MS]

Nafola reported incomes of ~US\$5,000 / year per CF, which was a doubling of income over six years. However, this volume of income is very small, bearing in mind the very large size of some of these CFs, and possibly with expenses to be taken out as well. Nafola supported a few IGAs: Brick-making equipment for three CFs - Uukolonkadhi, Ongandjera and Otshiku-Tshithilonde; a brushwood chipping machine for one CF - African Wild Dog; Workshop, wood-sawing machines and furniture-making equipment for two CFs - Okongo and Oshaampula; and 75 bee-hives with ~15 sets of equipment.

Efficiency

Efficiency Rating – Unsatisfactory

Nafola was not efficiently implemented, as it spent its funds on a much reduced number of outputs, that only concerned forestry, except for a one-off construction of a livestock auction facility, for which there was limited engagement on its profitability or management mode. All other outputs which would have meant working with partners were left out, apart from some nominal work with DAPEES for a limited period.

Relevance

Relevance Rating – Relevant

The project remained **relevant** in terms of trying to address land management and NRM issues, with the relevance being brought more sharply into focus due to climate change (drought patterns over the last nine years).

Implementation - Execution
<p>Project Implementation - Overall Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Project Implementation was assessed for the GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP) and the project Implementing Partner (DoF) according to five categories. These were: coordination & operational matters; partnership arrangements & stakeholder engagement; finance & co-finance; M&E systems; and adaptive management (work planning, reporting & communications). The project was supported by a DoF-led PMU who also acted as the secretariat to the PSC. The project started in August 2014 when the prodoc was signed.</p> <p>Coordination & Operational Management</p> <p><u>Coordination & Operational Management by the Implementing Agency (UNDP)</u></p> <p>The rating is Moderately Unsatisfactory</p> <p>At the project appraisal committee meeting (March 2014), the National Project Director (NPD) indicated that the PMU needed to be based in Windhoek for administrative purposes, but that there would be 13 field officers and seven regional officers fulltime in the field. The latter didn't materialise, although regional forestry staff were involved to a greater or lesser extent. Output 1.2 (Three CFs to formulate integrated forest resource management plans) continued to be misunderstood. The prodoc expectation was that the MLR would take the lead in preparing three land use plans that incorporated the management of three CFs (or <i>vice-versa</i>), with land tenure, livestock, agriculture and forestry etc. This was bearing in mind, much of the project design was centred on SLM actions, and this was the main activity to link SLM with forestry.</p> <p>Financial control - Under the UN Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) Framework, the project from start (August 2014) until September 2017 (i.e. 1st 3 years), was under National Implementation Modality (NIM) with direct cash transfers. Thereafter from October 2017 to December 2019 (the last 2 years), the project changed to a reimbursement method based on invoices, and with direct procurement of, and payments to, service providers. This was due to UNDP re-assessing the project's financial risk from low to moderate (and changing the cash transfer modality), which was due to the livestock auction facility. Whilst, the HACT Framework describes such a change as to have a minimal impact on implementation, in reality the impact of changing financial control was significant. The reason was that the project was at a stage when key investment decisions were being made, the IP was forced to change direction, resulting in a certain loss of interest and project morale.</p> <p>Management - There were indications, that insufficient UNDP staff time was given to Nafola. The MTR (August 2017) was used as a blunt instrument to control the project, having recommended UNDP to not pay for the kraal's rising costs. The MAWF letter to UNDP (September 2017), stated that the Nafola contribution to Tallismanus Kraal would remain at NAD6.3m with MAWF to contribute the added costs of NAD2.5m. Concerning CA activities, there was a clear lack of UNDP oversight regarding the lack of DoF delegation of responsibility to DAPEES or funding towards it. Activities only started in 2016, and only on a very small scale, then with a poor harvest due to drought, it was an easy target for the MTR in 2017 to recommended closure.</p> <p>In February 2018, the PM (of the PMU) resigned, but a new PM was not appointed until July 2018. This meant that nobody was running the project for six months, with decision-making affected. This could have been avoided (by UNDP) with the Regional implementation / M&E officer being given the role of 'Acting PM', until the actual appointment. This void appeared to be part of the continued 'fallout' from the MTR in August 2017, with UNDP and MAWF agreement, on the MTR recommendations, not achieved until December 2017. (i.e. the UNDP Management Response.) Thus, from the time of the MTR (August 2017), to the appointment of a new PM (July 2018), a whole year of activities were rather stifled. This can be taken as an example of very slow adaptive / risk management by UNDP.</p> <p><u>Coordination & Operational Management by the Executing Agency / Implementing Partner (MAWF / DoF)</u></p> <p>The rating is Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Project Steering Committee - The roles and purposes of the members of the PSC was never defined. The PSC was never formally established except as a members list in the prodoc, and then only by invitation to the 1st PSC meeting, which was held 10 months after the project start. MLR were listed as a member, but never appointed anyone or attended any meetings. The GEF Focal Point was also listed but didn't attend. Nacso, an NGO only attended three out of seven meetings, thus they were not representing the CFMCs effectively. In seven PSC meetings, UNDP attended with different staff on every occasion except once (6th and 7th meeting), thus their continuity in implementing the project could be construed as low. A concern regarding building an auction kraal was raised by UNDP during the 1st meeting (Q2, 2015), however when the PSC approved the kraal construction during the 2nd meeting (Q4, 2015), there was no comment by UNDP, nor later during 3rd meeting (Q3, 2016) when the kraal cost was revealed (US\$457,000 at the time).</p>

From the 6th PSC meeting (December 2017) until the 7th PSC meeting (January 2019), there was a gap of 13 months, when previous meetings had been organized more regularly. This was also part of the fall-out from the MTR, which also recommended that the PSC members be replaced. Moreover, it appeared that a PSC ToR was only produced as a result of the MTR, with its membership changed to no longer include the GEF Focal Point, MLR, or DVS.

The PSC was to be chaired by a senior MAWF representative. The position taken by the DoF Director, who was also the National Project Director. This meant a conflict of interest, and a natural bias towards forestry, and away from other parts of the project design, such as land use planning, rangeland / livestock grazing management, and dryland agriculture. The minutes of the PSC meetings indicated a lack of technical detail presented in managing a large project in comparison to the PSC mandate.

DoF / PMU - Partnership arrangements were insufficiently established between DoF and other key departments, namely DAPEES, DARD, and Directorate of Planning & Business Development (DPBD) – all within MAWF, and with MLR. Apart from working with DAPEES, in a limited way, DoF tried to implement the whole project by themselves. Within the project set-up (MAWF – DoF - PMU), MAWF didn't take the lead, with respect to ensuring adequate attention towards SLM, agriculture or livestock. There was a clear lack of interest or direction in these subject matters.

DoF (and the PMU and PSC) couldn't cope with managing funds effectively (due to the kraal costs) and lost financial control to UNDP after three years. Thereafter, payments for activities slowed down. Thus, the project had changed to UNDP-assisted NIM for the last two years. There was no mention in the PSC minutes of the change in financial control of Nafola by UNDP in October 2017. DoF under UNDP pressure at mid-term, assigned one staff member to coordinate CF activities. Project vehicles were successfully procured early on in the project (September 2014) through GoN procedures.

Institutional Mechanisms, Partnership Arrangements & Stakeholder Engagement

Institutional mechanisms are the backbone for delivering new policies and services.

Directorate of Forestry (DoF) - At present, the DoF lists inventories, maps and (timber) permits as its top three activities. The income generated from forestry is extremely low in comparison to agriculture and livestock, mainly because it lacks a productive capacity. i.e. its timber resources are meagre. At the least, it needs major institutional modernisation, and needs to look towards its ultimate purpose which is environmental management and revising its financing systems, towards climate change mitigation and carbon-generated funding. At a regional and constituency government level, DoF sit on the regional Coordination Development Committees (CDCs), however DoF staff at this level are often of insufficient civil service standing.

Directorate of Agriculture Production, Extension & Engineering Services (DAPEES) - DAPEES lists its top two activities as: agricultural extension, advisory & training services; and drought planning and response management. Nafola should have fully engaged DAPEES to implement the CA intervention, and drawn-in funds where possible to have expanded it.

Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (DARD, a.k.a. DRD) – DARD staff research livestock, grassland management, grazing and fodder management and regularly publish technical papers. However, the link between these papers, demonstrated on-farm research, and actual extension and uptake in the field is limited. Nafola had an opportunity to direct funds towards DARD to implement Output 2.2 (pasture management), 2.5 (bush control with grass seeding) and 2.7 (rangeland monitoring) towards such activities, but this was not achieved.

Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry (MAWF) - Development issues include procuring seed from South Africa or Zambia, as there is no seed multiplication within Namibia; the seed procured is often late, insufficient, or an inappropriate cultivar. Fertilizer availability is also an issue. The project solution was to introduce climate-resilient cropping practices under the umbrella of CA. This was to include dryland cultivation to enhance soil conservation and fertility. Instead of standard ploughing, minimal tillage was advocated through using ripper tines to break the plough-pan layer, release soils nutrients and create the planting lines. The biological aspect was then to support climate-resilient short duration crops / varieties, such as pearl millet and sorghum. These could also be intercropped with cow peas (and grams / beans / pigeon pea) for nutrition and as fodder / cover crops. However, the project only managed to support the physical side of CA, through delivering three tractors.

Ministry of Land Reform (MLR) - The CF process required the approval (of the boundary map) by the Communal Land Board (of the MLR) and the agreement of the Traditional Authority (TA). The official CF maps were also produced by the MLR, as only they had access to all private / other land plot boundaries within CF areas. These were important project links with MLR, however despite being requested to join the PSC, they failed to nominate a representative or attend any meetings.

Community Forestry Management Committees (CFMCs) - The capacity of the CFMCs varied between those gazetted some years ago, and those gazetted recently under Nafola, and accepting that some already gazetted as (wildlife)

conservancies also had greater skills in resource management and administering a registered entity. For example, Uukolonkadhi CFMC (gazetted in 2006), were in the process of hiring a technical person to monitor resource use within their CF and according to their new CFMP. By contrast, a number of the newly gazetted CFMCs said they didn't have a high understanding their CFMP, and that annual general meetings were dominated by discussions on income-sharing and not on resource management. A number of CFMCs were also coming to terms with how to 'manage' illegal settlement and illegal farming within their boundaries. This was because they were now positioned between needing to make formal cases through the legal system, and at times also being undermined by their local TA headmen who were parceling out such land.

Finance and spending

The breakdown of planned and actual expenditures by year is provided in **Annex 4**. Annual audits were undertaken 2016-18, with no significant issues reported. The statement of assets as of end-2018 indicated: four vehicles at US\$30,000 each located in Kunene, Ohangwena, Otjozondjupa and Omaheke; and two vehicles at \$43,000 and \$37,000 located in Windhoek. The project statement of assets (October 2019) indicated that: only two vehicles remained in the field in Ohangwena and Omaheke, with four now in Windhoek; three tractors at US\$52,000 each located in Omaheke (2) and Ohangwena; a brushwood chipping machine at \$40,000 located in Otjozondjupa; two sawmill and carpentry machines at \$51,000 located in Ohangwena and Oshikoto; three brick-making machines at \$26,000 located in Omusati and Oshana; with total assets at \$568,000. Of concern was the fact that the 15 Dell laptops procured (one for each CF) were missing from asset list, and only one had been delivered to Uukolonkadhi CF in Omusati. By the time of the TE, the asset handover planning had begun, but there wasn't a clear exit strategy.

As of 15 December 2019, the project spend on GEF funds was US\$3.49m out of a projected \$4.45m. Co-financing contributions, either as direct support or complementary funds, are not formally accounted for under GEF methods. As of 15 December 2019, the MAWF contribution was calculated at US\$2.8m, out of a projected 15m. The total project-spend (finance + co-finance) was calculated at US\$8.1m out of a projected 23.8m

Adaptive management (work planning, reporting & communications)

Work planning

The project inception workshop was held eight months after project start, which was somewhat late. The overall workplan and budget was informative as to how Nafola was expected to be implemented (prodoc p77).

Four annual workplans (2016-19) were assessed. They were presented in the format of UNDP accounting codes (as were the UNDP Combined Delivery Reports- CDRs), thus the TE was unable to match spending against the strategic framework and output spending plan, as per the (above) approved prodoc.

Reporting and Communications

Annual Reports (2016-18) were assessed. Annual report 2018 was only 20 pages. It consisted of the PIR undated to end-2018, progress against outputs to end-2018, conclusion and 2018 training table. It mentions that over-stocking of cattle is the biggest threat to SLM in Omaheke (where Tallismanus Auction Facility was constructed.) Only one PIR was presented to the TE, with its date difficult to determine, although stated as of July 2018. No critical risks were entered. The project held internal weekly meetings and kept a record of these.

Monitoring & Evaluation

M&E Systems – Design & Implementation

Overall quality of M&E – Moderately Unsatisfactory

The annual reports were partly based on the PIR format updated to end of year.

M&E at Design – Moderately Satisfactory

The standard M&E framework for these UNDP-GEF projects, is report-based, with PIRs for example, which unlike most annual reports, run from July to June each year.

M&E Implementation – Moderately Unsatisfactory

The main issue with the M&E, was a lack of any tracking (spreadsheet) system, indicating progress against outputs, indicators, or service contracts for example, thus monitoring project progress would have been difficult. An MTR was undertaken in 2017. It highlighted the low and unacceptable levels of implementation. It noted – 'the price escalation of the kraal poses a significant risk'.

Sustainability

Sustainability: According to the four GEF risk categories (financial, socio-economic, institutional & governance and environmental), present status, and towards the future is assessed. **Overall Rating: Moderately Unlikely**

Financial Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely

Forestry remains significantly underfunded in comparison to other MAWF directorates. The DoF gets ~1% (~US\$14m

/ year) only of the MAWF budget. The Nafola forestry long-term financing strategy (2019), included creating a forest conservation trust fund, linked to Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to stop climate change. However, the skills and will power inside DoF to achieve this are lacking. Within DoF, there isn't a dedicated budget to support CF development which is an issue.

Socio-Economic Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely

At present, the land management within CFs is communal, with everybody having a stake and access, and nobody taking responsibility – hence the degradation and over-grazing.

Institutional & Governance Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely

Concerning governance, Nafola's approach was to take the lead from DoF and work with regional forestry officials and directly with CFMCs, including establishing them. DoF was not open to engagement with other agencies (DARD, in particular regarding livestock and rangeland management). DoF needs modernizing, both in terms of its mandate, and its skill-set. It probably also needs to be realigned with MET, and focus on climate change and carbon neutrality.

Environmental Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely

The MTR cut CA after just one year of support, when for sustainability, a programme over a number of years is required, both to support cropping measures (crop selection and rotation, multi-cropping, short-duration varieties) and soil and water conservation measures (minimal tillage with ripper tines to reduce compaction and release soil nutrients). The NDP5 includes a target for half of the farmers to practice at least one CA measure.

CF is enshrined in the Forest Act and in the CF regulations. However, the CFMCs remain weak, and without regional bylaws on wood extraction and charcoal production being enforced, illegal extraction continues. What has changed is the awareness of CF regulations, which means that illegal activities now tend to be conducted at night.

Impact

Impact: According to the three GEF categories (Significant, Minimal or Negligible), present status and towards the future. The overall rating for impact is **Negligible**. NRM and SLM remained very weak.

Reduction in stress on ecological systems

The evidence is that land within CF boundaries continues to be degraded. The damage is mainly over-grazing by the residents of the CFs, although in some cases there is also illegal activity, as well as TA headmen providing unlicensed 'permission' for wood extraction, settlement, and grazing by outsiders. Once the open savanna-woodland is degraded, there are two highly significant impacts, namely: palatable grasses are replaced with ones much less so, with the methods to restore being difficult; and dense thicket bush species invade to replace the lost grazing land, leading to the grassland being even more expensive and difficult to restore to palatable species.

Regulatory & policy change

There were five main policy and regulatory changes:

- MAWF strategic plan (2018-22) included: CA measures and rangeland management (with US\$58m as operational budget)
- MAWF livestock sector strategy for the NCAs (2019) – with actions: to remove penalties against small-frame cattle; and promote rangeland management with efficient breeds, such as Caprivi-Sanga
- Agriculture policy (2015) – included implementation of the rangeland management strategy; strengthen rangeland / pasture science research and monitoring; and improve farmer access to better breeding materials
- MLR Omaheke land use plan (2017-27) – is a blueprint for SLM in the communal areas of Omaheke, where four of the newly gazetted CFs are located. It states 'stop trying to transfer livestock to water-deficient areas'
- CF regulations (2005), don't appear to have been updated, however the CF Toolbox was revised

Catalytic Effect

Theory of Change

A 'theory of change' pathway was prepared by the TE and is presented in the main report

Scaling-up and Replication

Nafola supported CFMCs to prepare proposals to access the wider donor-funded sector. This was facilitated by CF gazettement, under which the CFs / CFMCs became legal entities. This was successful in two instances.

Demonstration

As a demonstration for facilitating CF gazettement in communal areas, Nafola was successful. The CF gazettement process involves a number of key stages: consultation, boundary agreement, CFMC and constitution establishment, and a 5-year CFMP (with forest inventory and AAC approved).

New techniques / approaches

As part of indirect support to Nafola, the NGO - Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation (IRDNC) supported to five conservancies (and CFs), through a 'trust fund share agreement', to extract an aromatic oil from two tree species.

Conclusions

Nafola was designed as a technically-minded cross-sector project. It required extensive collaboration outside the sphere and skills of DoF. This was the case for seven out of the 11 outputs and in particular: MLR – land use plans for 3 CFs (Output 1.2); DAPEES – dryland conservation agriculture (Output 2.1); DARD - livestock management, de-bushing with pasture restoration, and rangeland monitoring (Outputs 2.2, 2.5 and 2.7); Directorate of Planning & Business Development (DPBD) – livestock auction facility operational model (Output 2.3); and an NGO to deliver an energy-saving woodstove programme (Output 2.6). This didn't happen. More should have been done to delegate responsibilities and activities to DAPEES and DARD in particular.

Forestry

The CF process has been effectively demonstrated, thus future CFs could be developed in a much shorter time period, subject to improvements in DoF capacity, and funds for the field requirements being available. As a result of Nafola, there are now 10-15 more CFs, in need of on-going capacity-building in SLM / SFM, and in need of institutional stability and support. The physical work (consultation, constitution, CFMC, inventory, CFMP) took about two years once the project got going, but it then took another two years of administrative work in Windhoek with DoF, MAWF and MLR involved. It would be useful for Nafola to document how the establishment of a CF entity could be streamlined. Nine CFs were gazetted with constitutions, CFMCs and CFMPs created. Individual CF rules and regulations were harmonised with CFMC – Conservancy Management Committees becoming single entities, but maintaining separate accounting.

The capacity of, and funding to DoF is very low. Training support is needed, especially in how to work across sectors with DAPEES, DARD and the Land Reform office. Regional and District Forest Offices also lack capacity and resources. District forest offices are often without electricity, with lines cut due to non-payment of bills. They also lack access to the internet on computers as they are without mobile wifi dongles. Decision-making is not devolved from central to regional level, with forestry not really involved in regional council decision-making. The offices usually only have one vehicle running.

The CFMCs have the ability to generate income, which over these mostly very large CF estates, should have a high potential, not least because many of them are also wildlife conservancies. The project was expected to support the CFs in implementation of their CFMPs and other CF capacity-building actions, however it only got to the stage of supporting CF designation and planning, but not implementation. DoF ability to absorb the maintenance costs and effectively use the six project vehicles post-Nafola is considered inadequate, thus their handover to six of the CFMCs would go some way to supporting this next crucial development stage.

Livestock

The operational model for Tallimanus Livestock Auction Facility needs to be 'cooperative'. It needs direct support from the DPBD to establish: a legal set-up; a 'Board of Trustees'; a set of Guiding Principles; facilities management, and auctioneering contracts; a facilities manager and an accountant; and a 5-year funding stream from MAWF. What it doesn't need is to be tendered into the private sector or be given to a party with vested interests, such as the regional farmers union.

Agriculture

Regarding CA, the DoF lacked interest, or the will to delegate and share project funds. UNDP were weak in overseeing DoF to implement the project according to its cross-sector needs. CA and dryland agriculture is still a new government programme. The project began CA 2016, but stopped in 2017 due to MTR. For whatever reason, the rationale in the MTR was weak, especially concerning closing down the CA aspects of the project.

Lessons Learned

Forestry

The DoF lack capacity (skills and funds) to train the CFMCs in implementing their CFMPs. The issue will arise, in four years' time in 2023, when a new forest inventory is required ahead a new CFMP, which needs to be updated every five years. At present the link between AAC, permits to harvest and the sustainability of CFMPs is tenuous and unproven. For these open woodland - savanna ecosystems, which at present are heavily degraded and continue to be so, having an AAC system may not be the most appropriate. Also, the AACs are effectively given to

the CFMCs to manage, but they lack the skills or experience to do so.

Another issue is that Traditional Authority headmen continue to 'allocate' land inside CF boundaries. Lastly, there is no grazing control within the CFs, and the land continues to be degraded – soil erosion with top soil being lost from livestock damage and wind, is resulting in a downward cycle towards unpalatable grass species and unwanted bush thicket takeover. CFMCs have a very weak knowledge of CFMPs, and the CFMPs themselves are extremely weak on zoning, any grazing control or rangeland management for example. The CF maps vary from showing the boundary only, to latest by the MLR, which also show land right certificated (LRC) land inside the boundaries and other mapped plots. Such new maps are a very useful tool to assess status and report against any new land conversion / settlement.

Livestock

The CFs encompass farming, and 'free-ranging' livestock, however the laws for communal lands prohibit fencing except for individuals with an LRC. This means block zoning and managing stock rotation, becomes difficult. Whether it can be achieved if presented within a CFMP for a gazetted CF, is uncertain. However, there needs to be a much better awareness (by livestock farmers) regarding the maintenance of grassland, and reduced stocking rates. The Tallismanus Auction Facility in the Otjombinde CF area could have a significant impact to support this, if managed with the CF in mind, and if specifically supported under Livestock Sector Transformation Strategy (2019) and the MAWF Strategic Plan (2018-22). Both of these strategies include (accredited) rangeland management and removing penalties for small-frame cattle. Added to this, there is possible technical support from the nearby Sandveld Research Station which has been researching a 'fodder-bank grazing system' since 2004 with indigenous (small-frame) Caprivi-Sanga cattle. Indeed, it was difficult to understand why Nafola did not work with DARD and Sandveld and at least have bought some demonstration Caprivi-Sanga cattle, which are much better suited to dryland conditions, than the larger Brahman breed. In Omaheke, the old private farm blocks could be areas for demonstrating rotational grazing (of smaller better-suited breeds.)

Agriculture

The CA physical methods (of soil and water conservation) were to use ripper tines to reduce compaction and release soil nutrients, as well as create planting lines. Then to disc cultivate. This is much better than traditional ploughing of the soil, but to note, the rippers should not be used every year, otherwise they will eventually damage the soil structure.

CA needs to have a stronger package for climate resilience. This could include: crop diversification (sorghum / millet), crop rotation, short-duration varieties; multi-and inter-cropping (e.g. green gram.) At present seed is late, and not always suited – this is where DAPEES need much more national level support - on getting climate-resilient crop varieties to the farmers. In the project area, farming systems are integrated (livestock - crop – forest), thus climate-smart approaches are needed, not just forest management in isolation.

Gender

The project should have been more proactive with respect to gender. The prodoc was vague concerning benefits to women. It didn't stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the CFMCs. Whilst a 50 / 50 gender balance was stipulated in the CF Toolbox, the TE figures indicated that an equal balance had not been achieved. A gender sensitivity training was only held in the project's last year and with only 12 participants (8 women), which was too little too late.

Recommendations

Exhibit 4: Key Recommendations Table (with responsible entity)

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directorate of Planning & Business Development (under MAWF) to establish a 'cooperative' management model for Tallismanus Livestock Auction Facility with: a legal set-up, a 'Board of Trustees³', a set of Guiding Principles', two contracts prepared for 'facilities management' and for 'auctioneering'; a facilities manager and an accountant; and to access funding from MAWF for five years. [DPBD / MAWF / UNDP] 2. The three tractors were designated for: Otjombinde and Epukiro CFs, and managed by DAPEES Gobabis office, Omaheke; and Okango CF, and managed by DAPEES Eenhana office, Ohangwena. To ensure |
|--|

³ MAWF (owner); Omaheke Regional Council; Omaheke Regional DAPEES Office; Omaheke Regional Forestry Office; Omaheke Regional Farmers Union (ORFU); Otjombinde / Tallismanus District Council; Otjombinde Constituency Councillor's Office (OCCO); Otjombinde CF & Conservancy Management Committee (OCFCMC); Otjombinde Traditional Authority (OTA); Otjombinde Farmers Association (OTJOFA); Nguakondja Multipurpose Farmers' Cooperative (NMFC); Tweripura Farmers Welfare Association (TFWA)

implementation of CA, these offices need to prioritize seed for climate-smart farmers (sorghum / millet with cow pea / green gram) together with their CA tractor services. [DAPEES in Gobabis and Eenhana]

3. The six project vehicles should be distributed to six of the nine gazetted CFMCs. The 13 quad bikes should be auctioned and the proceeds divided between these six CFMCs, for maintenance costs of the vehicles [MAWF / UNDP]
4. Laptops procured for the CFs need to be delivered [UNDP to verify]
5. Nafola to handover all CF project files to the DoF CF representative [Nafola / DoF]

Full report:

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The project

The UNDP-supported GEF-financed project was titled 'Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola) (PIMS 4626)'. The project was implemented in 15 community forests in seven regions in Kunene, Omusati, Oshana, Ohangwena, and Oshikoto, as well as in Otjozondjupa and Omaheke. The project was approved by the National Planning Commission in August 2014 and was due to end in December 2019. The 5-year (and 5-month) project was under National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) as the Executing Agency, and their Directorate of Forestry (DoF) as the designated Implementing Partner (IP). The project's main other partner / responsible party was: Directorate of Agricultural Production, Extension and Engineering Services (DAPEES). A Project Management Unit (PMU) was established and located within MAWF / DoF. UNDP and the PMU were supported by a Project Steering Committee (PSC).

1.2. Purpose of the evaluation and report structure

Purpose & Structure

This is an independent analysis of the project, known as the Terminal Evaluation (TE). The objective of the TE was to evaluate the achievement of the project at completion, as well as to assess its sustainability and impact. The report focuses on assessing outcomes and project management. The TE additionally considered accountability and transparency, and provided lessons-learned for future UNDP-GEF projects, in terms of design and implementation. This report is in six sections - introduction, description, findings, sustainability, impact and conclusions / recommendations. The UNDP-GEF rating scales are described in section 1.5. The findings (section 3) are additionally divided into strategy and design, implementation and management, and results.

1.3. Scope and Methodology

Approach

The approach and methodology of the evaluation followed UNDP guidelines⁴. The TE was an evidence-based assessment, which relied on cross-referencing four sources of information - stakeholder interviews, field observation, project documentation (**Annex 7**), and a brief review of relevant literature. The international consultant was the team leader and responsible for quality assurance, consolidation of the findings, and preparation of the TE report. The field mission took place from 2nd – 20th December 2019, according to the itinerary compiled in **Annex 11**. The agreed upon agenda included a UNDP briefing on 3rd December and a stakeholder workshop on 18th December. There were no distinct security issues which affected the TE. Usual precautions were undertaken, with a 4WD vehicle provided for the field travel.

Methods

The TE determined if the project's building blocks (technical, financial, management, legal) were put in place and then, if together these were catalysed sufficiently to make the project successful. The TE method was to utilise a 'multi-level mixed evaluation', which is useful when evaluating delivery of a new service or approach, being piloted by state institutions. The method is suitable for finding insights which are sensitive and informative. The rating scales are provided in **Annex 9**. Pro-forma questions on key themes such as those provided by the UNDP-GEF guideline were updated by the TE (**Annex 14**).

Main partners and Stakeholder feedback

The TE team interacted with the PMU Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office as well as with project-associated staff in DoF and DAPEES, local government staff in the seven regions, and Community Forestry Management Committees (CFMCs). The TE visited the project regions to interact with local administrators, technical staff and beneficiaries. Gaining a representative view from local stakeholders was limited by time. Additional telephone / email interviews with the stakeholders were arranged as necessary. **Annex 6** provides a list of people that the TE met and **Annex 10** is the mission schedule.

Ethics

The review was conducted in accordance with the UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators, and the reviewers signed

⁴ Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects (2012)

the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement form (**Annex 15**). In particular, the TE team ensures the anonymity and confidentiality of individuals who were interviewed and surveyed. In respect to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, results are presented in a manner that clearly respects stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Development Context

GEF-5 Focal Area – Land Degradation

- Objective 2 - Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in drylands, including sustaining livelihoods of forest dependent people: An enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector in drylands (2.1); Improved forest management in drylands (2.2); and Functionality and cover of dryland forest ecosystems maintained (2.3) [source PIF]
- Objective 3 - Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management (Outcome 3.1)⁵; and: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities (Outcome 3.2) [source Prodoc]

Sector-wide linkage with the International Community

- UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) ratified by Namibia May 1997
- UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), May 1995
- UNDAF (2013-17) - Pillar 3 - Natural resource management, Environmental sustainability; and Pillar 2 - Improving livelihoods and food security among the most vulnerable groups and reducing poverty
- UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, 2016)⁶ and their targets in particular Goal 12. SDG target 12.2 is 'by 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources'

Project linkage to National Planning

- MAWF Strategic Plan (2018-22) pp24 - Includes: Conservation Agriculture (CA) adopted by 43% of 30,000 farmers to practice: minimum tillage, crop rotation or organic soil cover (DAPEES, Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development - DARD); farmers trained in crops, livestock, rangeland management (DAPEES, Directorate of Veterinary Services - DVS, DARD; NAD843m as operational budget); Cooperatives as successful businesses (Directorate of Planning & Business Development - DPBD), with DAPEES and DARD)
- Livestock Sector Transformation Strategy for the Northern Communal Areas (MAWF, 2019, pp28) - Actions: reviewing meat classes to remove penalties against small-frame and C-grade carcasses; establishment of grazing areas and promoting accredited rangeland management; appropriate breeding and functionally efficient breeds
- Agriculture Policy (2015) pp44 – Includes Livestock Production Policy: implement the National Rangeland Management Policy & Strategy; strengthen the capacity for rangeland / pasture science research and rangeland management monitoring, in order to guide farmers; diversify breeding materials through the livestock research stations; increase the number of famers that benefit from breeding materials originating from breeding stations⁷
- National Rangeland Management Policy & Strategy (MAWF, 2012) - aims to address land degradation and increase rangeland productivity through improved management of rangelands. The plan was of relevance, since land degradation and bush encroachment, strongly affects rangelands in the Nafola regions
- Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture (CCA) Programme – to improve food security; to stabilise crop yields, while protecting natural resources, enabling farmers to cope with the negative effects of climate change / variability
- Regional Councils Act 22 (1992) - duties include the planning of regional development, including for natural resources, land utilisation and sensitivity of the natural environment. The RCs have a duty to compile a regional land use plan
- Traditional Authorities Act 25 (2000) - recognises TAs as legal entities. TAs must be fully involved in the planning of land use and development for their areas. They must equally be sensitised about sustainable resource management and how this must be implemented within their communities. Any protected landscape initiative within a communal land area must involve the TA
- Regional Planning & Development Policy (NPC 1997) - acknowledges trend of increasing degradation of pastures, rangelands and woodland and gives attention to soil, water and forest management as development tools. It promotes

⁵ Relates to GEF Outcome Indicators 3.1 Demonstration results in strengthening enabling environment between agriculture & forestry sectors; and Indicator 3.2 Area under effective land use management (500,000ha) with vegetative cover maintained or increased

⁶ Report of the Inter-Agency & Expert Group on SDG Indicators (E/CN.3/2016/2/Rev.1), Annex IV, Final list of proposed SDG indicators <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/11803Official-List-of-Proposed-SDG-Indicators.pdf>

⁷ The policy has no references to the forestry or fire-related issues, although considerable fires takes place on agricultural land and fire is used to burn land to increase grass growth for livestock

soil conservation and controlled grazing cycles, as important to agriculture

- Communal Land Reform Act 5 (2002) - provides for the creation of Communal Land Boards (CLBs) at regional level, with the function of exercising control over the allocation of customary land right certificates (LRCs)
- National Land Use Planning Policy (2002) - provides a framework for the implementation of regional integrated land use plans
- National Land Tenure Policy (2003) - covers all land tenure system in communal, commercial (freehold) and resettlement areas, and is intended to guide all land tenure rights
- Forestry Development Policy - aims to reconcile rural development with the conservation of biological diversity by empowering farmers and local communities to manage forest resources on a sustainable basis
- Forestry Act 12 (2001) - establishes community forests (CFs) as a devolved local governance system. Enables the registration of classified forests - state and regional forest reserves, and CFs.
- Community Forest Regulations (2005, pp58)
- Forestry & Environmental Authorisation Process for Bush Harvesting (2016, MAWF, MET) - as a significant increase in encroacher bush-harvesting is expected for the years to come, this document provides clear guidelines for the process according to existing legislation and best practices
- Cooperatives Act 23 (1996) - provides the legal means to organize cooperative businesses. The law mandated cooperative development under the auspices of the MAWF – relevant to Nafola's livestock auction management mode
- National Climate Change Strategy & Action Plan (2013-20) pp80 – Re. carbon – reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) - Promote CA practices to increase crop diversification and soil carbon storage
- 3rd National Action Programme (NAP3) to implement the UNCCD (2014-24)
- Community-Based Natural Resources Management Policy (CBNRM, 1995) - returned the rights to wildlife or 'game' to the conservancies
- Constitution Article 95 – founding of CBNRM - promotes sustainable natural resource use. 'The state shall actively promote and maintain the welfare of the people by adopting policies aimed at the maintenance of ecosystems and ecological processes'
- National Development Plan - NDP5 (2018-22) pp134, – climate and environment focus over five pages, including SLM – 'by achieving land degradation neutrality and optimum land productivity. The sustainable management of rangelands, restoration of bush-encroached land and the expansion of CA will be the main priority programmes under this strategy'⁸
- Vision 2030: (a) rehabilitation of forest & vegetation cover; (b) incentives for sustainable forest management, with diversified land use options; and (c) protecting natural woodlands and increasing their productivity as Forest Reserves
- National Renewable Energy Policy (2017) pp64

Linkage to donor-projects

- GEF Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (SLM) - focused on institutional capacity through local level coordination of integrated rangeland management to address root causes of land degradation and poverty (2008-12) – one of projects that Nafola was built up on
- KfW MAWF Community Forestry Namibia (CFN) - establishment of CF and related regulations in northern and north eastern Namibia (2004-16) – also guided the design of Nafola
- GCF Climate resilience agriculture in three of the vulnerable extreme northern crop-growing regions. (CRAVE) (2016-22) - to reduce food insecurity through adopting CA and climate-resilient agriculture, plus access to renewable energy
- MCA MAWF Community-based rangeland & livestock management - assist livestock farmers in the Northern Communal Areas (NCAs) to improve rangeland productivity using appropriate livestock management and production skills
- UNDP GEF - Scaling up resilience to climate variability & climate change in northern Namibia with special focus on women & children (SCORE) - to empower smallholders through adaptation measures, including climate-smart agriculture (2014-19)
- CBNRM Empower to Adapt – a grant facility for resilient CBNRM livelihoods for local climate change adaptation initiatives in registered conservancies and CFs
- Integrated Community Ecosystem Management - income generating through sustainable integrated ecosystem management with grants to communal conservancies (GEF / WB)

2.2. Problems that the Project Sought to Address

⁸ NDP3 - focused on building resilient rural communities revolving around the sustainable utilization of natural resources and land reform. It recognized the role of land use planning as a key to rural development.

Land degradation

The main drivers of deforestation and degradation are from a lack of food security. The threats are: over-grazing; over-exploitation of wood (for fuel and building); and land conversion (agriculture expansion). As a result of inappropriate land use, bush encroachment is also now a problem.

Cattle grazing and grassland ecology

Over-grazing causes the loss of palatable grass species (*Brachiaria*, *Digitaria* and *Eragrostis* spp.), changing to a dominance of unpalatable species⁹. Over-grazing of cattle¹⁰ also pushes out wildlife-browsing species, which keep a check on woody tree and bush growth.

Livestock management (in Omaheke)

During the 1990s farms were re-purchased by government and new communities re-settled (often with a number of families within a previous private farm block). Whilst the land was previously fenced to control and rotate cattle grazing¹¹ under a block system, this was lost under the new programme, with fences broken and uncontrolled over-grazing. From the 1960s to present, the rural and urban population has grown. The urban population, as they gain income, also often place cattle on the land, paying rental or fees to herders to keep their extra cattle on the communal land.

An issue with large livestock farming (on communal land) in northern Omaheke is that Yearlings are often sold-on to be fattened up before sale, meaning less profit for the farmers, and the sale of their future breeding stock. The large cattle the farmers do sell, when they need income, tend to be old and reach much lower prices.

Bush encroachment

The open woodland-savanna landscape is threatened by bush encroachment¹². Bush encroachment is the increase in coverage and density of woody vegetation at the expense of grasses and forbs, and trees¹³. It is due to over-grazing and reduced wildlife browsing in favour of cattle production.

The de-bushing activity assumed that once the heavily dense bush is removed, then the land will be restored to grazing land with suitable grass species. In reality, the bush stumps just regrow. If the stumps are removed mechanically at great expense, then the topsoil is damaged, but it also needs re-seeding with palatable grass species, for the rains to come and for livestock to be kept out until the grass has grown. This has only been possible within the private farming sector, and not to date within the communal land and CF areas.

Fire

Uncontrolled fires are widespread, often caused by farmers clearing fields for cultivation and grazing¹⁴. Hot late fires are common and destroy grazing and browsing resources, particularly in woodland areas¹⁵. Most damage is done during the dry winter months. The result is suppressed grass growth and enhanced bush encroachment, with the eventual loss of grazing land.

Land Conversion for Agriculture

Agriculture is limited by the high proportion of sandy soils, with a low capacity for water retention, and with nutrients limited to the thin topsoil (and humus) layer. Combined with the low rainfall (~600mm / year), this makes rain-fed crop production (millet, sorghum and maize) a low yield – high-risk enterprise. As nutrients and water are easily lost from the sandy soils, farmers tend to expand cultivation areas, which reduces grazing land and woodlands needed to maintain the ecosystem balance (temperature, water retention, dry season fodder etc).

⁹ *Eragrostis pallens*, *Sporobolus* spp., *Aristida* spp. and *Pogonarthria squarrosa* - PIF, p4. See also prodoc p10 for a list of palatable and unpalatable grass species by CF location

¹⁰ There are roughly 2 million cattle, half of which are in the northern communal areas (NCAs)

¹¹ Also known as the Mara grazing system, which included a fallow period, and as practiced at Sandveld Research Station

¹² Dominated by *Acacia mellifera* (Black thorn), *Dichrostachys cineria* (Sickle bush), *Terminalia sericea* (Silver terminalia), *Terminalia prunioides* (Purple-pod terminalia), *Acacia erubescens* (Blue thorn), *Acacia reficiens* (False umbrella thorn) & *Colophospermum mopane*

¹³ Bush encroachment is increasing in the communal areas, especially on loamy and clayey soils, and is common in the central and eastern parts of Otjozondjupa and Omaheke, where the density of plants is estimated to be 4,000 - 12,000 / ha

¹⁴ A 2005 study reported that bush fires destroy 3-7m ha of land per year, A recent GoN report on rangeland management indicated that by 2010, the carrying capacity of the rangelands had declined to 36% of values in 1959, and that bush encroachment leads to annual loss of income of NAD1.6 billion. These threats are compounded by the effect of climate change

¹⁵ Dry-season fires damage the grassland less, but do affect the grass seed-bank in the soil and do retard above ground part of trees

Population pressures and new settlement increase the problem.

Land Tenure

In the Northern Communal Areas (NCAs), the cultural norm is for TA leaders to allocate land for cultivation and grazing. With increasing population pressures, and inducements, more land is being parceled out, where traditionally communal grazing was undertaken.

2.3. Project Description and Strategy

Project Description

In Namibia, in the communal areas, small-holder farming systems are integrated with livestock and crops. And as such, forest management solutions alone can't meet the criteria for climate-smart approaches. This is in part due to the fact that community forests (CFs) encompass farming plots and 'free-ranging' livestock. Thus Nafola, was designed as a cross-sector project with land use planning (LUP) and sustainable land management (SLM) aspects.

The Nafola design was partly based on the GEF-3 'Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Integrated SLM', especially concerning rangeland management. CPP was said to influence NDP4 in terms of mainstreaming SLM into national development policies. The project was also partly based on the lessons being learnt from the KfW GoN Community Forest Programme (CFP), which indicated bottlenecks such as the difficulty in attaining gazettement status. Nafola also built on the CF toolbox, to the extent of updating it, based on its own experience.

The project goal was to maintain current dry forests and their ecosystem goods & services in 13 CFs covering 5,000 km² (i.e. 0.5 million ha) of land, through wide-scale adoption of SLM and sustainable forest management (SFM). The project objective was to reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the gazettement of CFs¹⁶, and increase their capacity for improved agriculture, livestock and forestry.

Project Location

The project location was the MAWF in Windhoek, and seven regions in the north within which the following CFs and other interventions were supported:

Region	Municipality /	Village	Community Forest Name	Status	Area (ha)	Delineated	Date
Kunene	Opuwo	Otjokavare	Ehi-Rovipuka	Gazetted	222,014	Yes	24-Oct-18
		Otjiu	Otjiu West	Gazetted	110,443	Yes	08-Mar-13
Omusati	Outapi	Onesi	Uukolonkadhi	Gazetted	84,925	Yes	14-Feb-06
			Ongandjera	Not gazetted	507,373	Yes	(i)
Oshana	Oshakati	Eengombe	Otshiku-Tshiithilonde	Gazetted	109,218	Yes	24-Oct-18
Ohangwena	Eenhana	Omundaungilo	Omundaungilo	Gazetted	22,256	Yes	24-Oct-18
	Okongo	Okongo	Okongo	Gazetted	75,000	Yes	14-Feb-06
Oshikoto	Onankali	Omahya	Oshaampula	Gazetted	807	Yes	08-Mar-13
		Onkumbula	Onkumbula	Not gazetted	56,103	Yes	(ii)
Otjozondjupa	Okakarara	Okondjatu	African Wild Dog	Gazetted	382,400	Yes	24-Oct-18
	Grootfontein	Ongongoro	Otjituuo	Gazetted	613,278	Yes	24-Oct-18
Omaheke	Gobabis	Talismanus	Otjombinde	Gazetted	591,100	Yes	24-Oct-18
		Eiseb Pos 10	Eiseb	Gazetted	662,500	Yes	24-Oct-18
		Okatumba gate	Omuramba Ua Mbinda	Gazetted	382,400	Yes	24-Oct-18
		Epukiro Pos 3	Epukiro	Gazetted	1,092,681	Yes	15-Feb-19
			Total		4,912,498		
			Gazetted total		4,349,021		
			Gazetted by Nafola		4,077,847		

Notes: Geo-coordinates as per government gazette; (i) Boundary dispute between two TAS; (ii) TA unwilling to sign as agriculture land within boundary

There were also nine other interventions in terms of infrastructure and equipment:

- Purchase of 3 tractors for Conservation Agriculture – managed by DAPEES for use at Otjombinde, Epukiro & Okango CFs
- Construction of a Livestock Auction Facility for Otjombinde CF and other neighbouring Omaheke CFs
- Construction of CF offices at Otjiu-West and Oshaampula
- Purchase of six 4WD vehicles for DoF and regional forest offices (RFOs)
- Three brick-making projects in Otshiku-Tshiithilonde, Ongandjera and Uukolonkadi CFs
- Purchase of a brushwood chipping machine for African Wild Dog CF

¹⁶ The prodoc described the CFs as 'hotspots.' This is not a technical term, thus the TE only refers to community forests (CFs)

- Two saw machines and carpentry equipment in Okongo and Oshaampula CFs
- Laptops and printers for each of the CFs
- Bee-hives and equipment for selected CFs

Project Area Map

See **Annex 11**

Project Timing & Milestones

The project timing was from August 2014 until December 2019. The project document does not mention milestones or benchmarks.

Comparative Advantage

UNDP was selected / expected to have a comparative advantage of capacity building, provision of technical support in the design and implementation of the project. UNDP also had an advantage working with government especially in strengthening institutional, policy and legislative mechanisms, in undertaking risk assessments, in mainstreaming forestry into development planning and harnessing best practices across the thematic area.

2.4. Implementation Arrangements

Project Management Structure

The project was steered by a Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the Directorate of Forestry (DoF) Director, who was also the Nafola Project Director. PSC members originally included UNDP, GEF Focal Point, MAWF (DoF, DAPEES, and Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development - DARD), Ministry of Land Reform (MLR), Ministry of Urban & Rural Development (MURD), Ministry of Mines & Energy (MME), Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET), and Nacso¹⁷. The project established a Project Implementation Unit (PMU) with a Project Manager, Accountant and M&E Officer. The PMU hired 13 Project Liaison Officers (for the 13 CFs).

2.5 Key Partners & Stakeholders

A description of stakeholders – those who are responsible for implementation of the project and those associated with the project – is provided as **Annex 8**.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Project Strategy

3.1.1 Project Design, Objective & Approach

The project goal was to ‘maintain dry forests and their ecosystem goods and services in 13 community forests (CFs) covering 500,000 ha of land, through the adoption of SLM, SFM, and other techniques. The objective was to: ‘reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the policy and capacity environment for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry in the CF areas.’ The project was designed with two main component outcomes: (1) Land use planning and policy hasten gazettement of 10 CFs, and mainstreaming of forest production; and (2) Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CFs

Within the two outcomes (components), the project set-out to achieve specific higher-level results:

Specific outcomes for Component 1

- 10 CFs gazetted, increasing area under land use plans from 182,615 to 2,840,153 ha
- Increase in compliance with land use plans from < 40% to > 60%
- Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and sector programs (local development, agriculture, environment, water, and tourism)
- Increase in capacity within ministries and CF management committees (CFMCs)

Specific outcomes for Component 2

- Crop productivity of pearl millet / sorghum from 400 to 600kg/ha in Omusati, Otjozondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena &

¹⁷ Namibia Association Community-based Natural Resources Management Support Organisation (an NGO)

<p>Omaheke (300,000 ha)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20% off-take of livestock (from 5%) in Omaheke, Oshikoto & Otjozondjupa - Increased type / quality of cattle in Omaheke, Oshikoto & Otjozondjupa (150,000 ha) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o An increase in 'Yearlings' (Weaned calves 1-2 years old) o A decrease in old cattle o 20% more cattle attaining Grade B at sale - 30% reduction in fire burned area in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene & Otjozondjupa (200,000ha) - 10% reduction in area covered by bush (100,000 reduced to 90,000 ha); 20% reduction in bush density in 5 CFs - 20% reduction in fuelwood use; 10% increase in alternative energy use - 25% increase in profit from sustainable use of forest resources by CFs

Source – adapted from the prodoc text on the project components (p41 & p48). Eleven CFs were originally planned for gazettement, with the number revised to 10.

The above targeted results, together with the project goal and objective, demonstrated that Nafola was to be focused on SLM, agriculture, and livestock, with forestry gazettement as the main channel to achieve this. Component 2 was directed towards large-scale agriculture and livestock interventions ahead of further forestry activities, such a fire control. The purpose of the bush control was to allow for grass re-seeding for livestock grazing. However, (as this report will describe) under the leadership of DoF and UNDP, the project polarized towards a 'forestry-only' project, and in the process somewhat lost sight of its major agriculture and livestock elements.

There were 11 outputs:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs 1.2 Three CFs supported to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans 1.3 Organisational Capacity for effective CF management 1.4 Support local governance and reflect forestry in national development policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Conservation Agriculture (CA) 2.2 Improved Livestock practices in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa CFs 2.3 Marketing of Forest and Livestock products 2.4 Fire management in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa CFs 2.5 Bush control in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde 2.6 Energy-saving & Alternative energy 2.7 System for monitoring Forest, Rangeland condition & Land productivity

3.1.2 Design Assumptions & Risks

Selected Assumptions and Risks from the results framework that proved to be correct / incorrect:

Assumption / Risk	TE Comment
Objective	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing pressure on forest resources will depend on (i) intensification of crop yields to prevent agriculture expansion into forest lands; (ii) successful reduction of over-stocking and over-grazing; iii) bush and fire control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (i) It was part of the project design to support dryland farming techniques, but the DoF lacked technical and political will to really support CA (under DAPEES) and was hit by the UNDP-driven MTR to curtail CA. Crop yields were not improved - (ii) It was part of the project design to support livestock rangeland management and grazing control. The basic approach to build an auction kraal was sound, but not supported by UNDP. Over-grazing was not controlled - (iii) Bush control was not undertaken. Such programmes are usually focused on private lands to the south, and not communal lands to the north; Fire control work was undertaken, although the overall long-term impact remains unknown
Outcome 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slow process of policy / legal enactment may cause delays in mainstreaming of forest into the productive sector - Complexity in sectoral coordination due to differing interests and wide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The slow process was mainly with DoF administrative capacity at national level, thus it was the end of the project before CF legal enactment, and no time left to support increase in CF productive forest capacities. Note, also that most CFs lack timber resources that could be extracted without further degrading the environment - Nafola PSC and UNDP lacked the political will to draw DAPEES and DARD into

<p>range of stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated land use management will become a national priority for the prevention of land degradation 	<p>the project and lacked interest in cross-sectoral forums.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated land use planning was not understood by DoF. However, the Omaheke land use plan (2017-27), produced by MLR (2017) was of a high standard, but not utilized – this was an opportunity lost
Outcome 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued degradation of the CFs accompanied by fencing, deforestation, over-grazing, extension of agriculture and population pressure - Climate change affects ecosystem resilience - Participation by women is limited by cultural norms - Local communities adopt the new techniques and there is sufficient uptake to reduce pressure on the forest - SLM / SFM technologies lead to better natural resource management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued degradation (from over-grazing and deforestation) proved correct. Fencing largely acts as a grazing control method. However, in Namibia, the meaning of 'fencing' is equated with private registered or unregistered (mainly livestock) farms being established within communal lands - Ecosystem damage is more acute when compounded with climate change. Climate change is not the cause of the damage. - Gender – project could have been more proactive – only 1 gender training at end of project - The expectation was that CA would cover 0.3m ha, grassland regeneration of 50,000 ha, bush clearance of 10,000 ha etc would reduce pressure on the forest, but these activities were not implemented. However, 3 tractors were bought and a livestock auction kraal built, could have a significant impact in the future, but the primary purpose of these two actions may be lost post-project. - SLM approaches were not attempted by Nafola, who in turn lacked any direction from MAWF or UNDP. SFM approaches were achieved on paper with gazettement, institutionally with CFMCs established, but not in terms of actual SFM practices which were rudimentary, small-scale, or limited (i.e. nominally setting Annual Allowable Cuts (AACs) within CFMPs, but not addressing grazing pressure)

The UNDP Atlas Risk & Management Response was not made available

3.1.3 Results Framework Indicators & Targets

Within the results framework (prodoc p65), at the objective level, there were two indicators. At Outcome 1 level, there were four indicators, including the UNDP capacity development scorecard. At Outcome 2 level, there were seven indicators. The indicators more or less mirrored the outputs, but on a higher level. However, many of the indicators contained sub-indicators (targets), which meant that the 13 indicators, actually morphed into a total of 27 indicators, which was far too many. In a number of cases, the indicators were not so 'SMART' (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic / Relative, Timebound). The main problem was that they were not easily measurable nor always directly related to the base of the output / intervention at hand, but related to a further stage of intervention thereafter and the future result of it. The table below provides a few examples:

Indicators or targets	Issue
Objective level	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2,840,153 ha under approved land use plans 	<p>The target of 2.84m ha is for area of CF (gazetted and under CFMPs), thus the wording 'land use plans' was inappropriate here</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 500,000 ha with woody cover in process of regeneration at an average >50% 	<p>Within the CFs, this was the area (see also project goal) to be put under improved SLM / SFM techniques – with bush control, grass-seeding, livestock rotation. Regeneration here means 'tree cover', not woody bush. Over-grazing with the invasion of woody 'bush' cover is the problem in many cases, not the solution</p>
Outcome 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 land use plans developed (1st indicator) - Output 1.1 was '10 communities assisted to legalize their CFs' 	<p>The use of the term 'land use plan' was not consistent in the prodoc which made understanding by UNDP / IP difficult. For the 1st Objective level and 1st Outcome 1 indicators, it just refers to the land gazetted as CFs with CFMPs. The IP took 'land use plan' to mean the forest inventories that were produced for the CFMPs. They called them 'integrated forest resource management plans'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans (LUPs) and regional programs of sectors (2nd indicator) - Output 1.2 was 'Three CFs to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans' 	<p>Nafola / DoF never understood or agreed to prepare land use plans, however two LUPs were produced / being developed by MLR, for Omaheke and Otjozondjupa, but these were not effectively utilized by Nafola</p> <p>Output 1.2 refers to the preparation of 3 'demonstration' land use plans that integrate SLM with agriculture, livestock and forestry with land tenure and management activities such as bush removal, stock rotation, grazing control etc. Nafola took this again to mean the forest inventories that were produced for the CFMPs.</p>

Outcome 2	
- Pearl millet / sorghum production increase to 400-600kg/ha	Nafola bought 3 tractors but kept no records of land planted with pearl millet or sorghum, nor promoted its planting as a drought-resistant (shorter-rotation) dryland crop suitable for CA.
- 20% of cattle upgrade to Grade B, fatness Grade 2 or 3 and decrease in oxen and increase in number of heifers	The expectation was that rangeland monitoring would lead to rotational grazing and changing the mix of cattle (less old / more young), resulting in increased livestock productivity. However, there are also too many livestock on the land <i>per se</i>
- Livestock off-take on 150,000 ha increased by 20%.	The project strategy to increase off-take via building an auction kraal was sound, but it took over 5 years to build, so there was no increased cattle off-take by end of project
- Reduction in fuelwood use by 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources	The prodoc indicated that a CSO / NGO was needed to drive this intervention, but the IP had no interest in such a programme, such as improved stoves

3.1.4 Gender Design

The prodoc mentioned the word gender 40 times, but was vague concerning actual benefits to women. These were mainly in relation to forest resources management, including harvesting and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). It didn't stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the CFMCs. To note, the project's gender rating was GEN-1, which indicated that the project was expected to only make a limited contribution to gender equality.

3.2. Project Implementation

3.2.1 IA and EA Coordination & Operational Management

UNDP were the GEF Implementing Agency (IA). The National Planning Commission (on behalf of GoN) together with the MAWF and UNDP signed the prodoc in August 2014. MAWF were the Executing Agency (EA), with DoF as the Implementing Partner (IP). The project was supported by a DoF-led Project Management Unit (PMU) who also acted as the secretariat to the PSC.

Coordination & Operational Management by Implementing Agency (UNDP)

LPAC Meeting

An LPAC meeting was held in March 2014. During the discussion on the location of the PMU, the National Project Director (NPD) indicated that it needed to be based in Windhoek for administrative purposes, but that there would be 13 field officers and seven regional officers fulltime in the field. The latter didn't really materialise, although regional forestry staff were involved to a greater or lesser extent.

Output 1.2 (Three CFs supported to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans) continued to be misunderstood. The prodoc expectation¹⁸ was that the MLR would take the lead in preparing three land use plans that incorporated the management of three CFs, with land tenure, livestock, agriculture and forestry etc. This was bearing in mind, much of the project design was centred on SLM actions, and this was the main activity to link SLM with forestry. This intervention was also meant to work with the involvement of the Communal Land Boards (CLBs) and the Traditional Authorities (TAs)¹⁹.

Financial control

Under a UN HACT Framework²⁰, from project start (August 2014) until September 2017 (i.e. 1st 3 years), the project was under NIM with direct cash transfers (funds advanced on a quarterly basis). Thereafter from October 2017 to December 2019 (the last 2 years), the project changed to a reimbursement method based on invoices, and to direct procurement and payments to service providers. This was due to UNDP re-assessing the project's financial risk from low to moderate (and changing the cash transfer modality), as a result of the livestock auction facility.

¹⁸ The second indicator for Outcome 1 and the description of Output 1.2 (prodoc p37)

¹⁹ Titling of the output with better wording would have helped. Instead Nafola went ahead and conducted some socio-economic surveys within the CFs, and conducted standard forestry inventories to determine standard 'ACCs' for timber. Nafola then titled their inventory survey reports as 'integrated forest resources management plans'. Thus, any discussion of agriculture and livestock was marginalised by the forestry establishment, i.e. the DoF.

²⁰ <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/harmonized-approach-cash-transfers-framework> (2014)

Whilst, the HACT Framework describes such a change as to have a minimal impact on implementation, in reality the impact of changing financial control was significant. The reason was that with certain activities being recommended for 'close down' by the MTR, UNDP would no longer pay such invoice items, plus at a stage where significant decisions / investments were being made (around mid-way through the project), the IP was basically forced to change direction, resulting in a certain loss of interest and project morale²¹.

Management

There were indications, that insufficient UNDP staff time was given to Nafola, especially in terms of technical direction and oversight. The MTR (August 2017) was used as a blunt instrument to control the project, having recommended UNDP to not pay for the kraal's rising costs²². The MAWF letter to UNDP (September 2017), stated that the Nafola contribution to Tallismanus Kraal would remain at NAD6.3m, with MAWF to contribute the added costs of NAD2.5m from its capital projects fund²³. Concerning CA activities, there was a severe lack of DoF delegation of responsibility to DAPEES or funding towards it. Activities only started in 2016, and only on a very small scale, then with a poor harvest due to drought, it was an easy target for the MTR in 2017 to recommended closure.

After the MTR, UNDP took financial control (October 2017) requiring quarterly plans and invoices for reimbursement, which slowed down activities. Also, procurement from 2017 was increasingly directed by Nafola towards UNDP, due to a new Namibia Procurement Act (2017). However, project vehicles were successfully procured early on in the project through GoN procurement methods.

In February 2018, the PM (of the PMU) resigned, but a new PM was not appointed until July 2018. This meant that nobody was running the project for six months, with decision-making affected. This could have been avoided (by UNDP) with the Regional implementation / M&E officer being given the role of 'Acting PM', until the actual appointment. This void appeared to be part of the continued 'fallout' from the MTR in August 2017, with UNDP and MAWF agreement, on the MTR recommendations, not achieved until December 2017. (i.e. the UNDP Management Response.)²⁴ Thus, from the time of the MTR (August 2017), to the appointment of a new PM (July 2018), a whole year of activities were rather stifled, which can be taken as an example of the very slow adaptive / risk management by UNDP.

Coordination & Operational Management by the Executing Agency / Implementing Partner (MAWF / DoF)

Project Steering Committee

PSC membership (prodoc) – UNDP GEF Focal Point, MAWF, MLR, MURD, MME, MET, and Nacso. Neither MLR nor MME appointed anyone to attend any meetings, and Nacso only attended three out of seven meetings, thus they were not representing the CFMCs effectively, if indeed that was their purpose on the PSC. The roles and purposes of the members of the PSC was never defined. The PSC was never formally established except as a list in the prodoc, and then only by invitation to the 1st PSC meeting, which was held 10 months after the project start.

In seven PSC meetings, UNDP attended with different staff on every occasion except once (6th and 7th meeting), thus their continuity in implementing the project could be construed as low. A concern regarding building an auction kraal was raised by UNDP during the 1st meeting (Q2, 2015), however when the PSC approved the kraal construction during the 2nd meeting (Q4, 2015), there was no comment by UNDP, nor later during 3rd meeting (Q3, 2016) when the kraal cost was revealed (US\$457,000 at the time).

From the 6th PSC meeting (December 2017) until the 7th PSC meeting (January 2019), there was a gap of 13 months, when previous meetings had been organised at ~two / year. This appeared to be part of the fall-out from the MTR, which also recommended that the PSC members be replaced. Moreover it appeared that a PSC ToR was only produced as a result of the MTR. Indeed its membership had changed and no longer included the GEF Focal Point²⁵, MLR, or Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS, MAWF). The PSC ToR also oddly stated that 'UNDP will advise the PSC in its deliberations and may vote in cases where a majority has not been met'.

²¹ In the TE Consultant's experience, such a sequence of events is not uncommon.

²² UNDP 'pressured' to undertake a 'spot check' to establish if there was financial impropriety, but in the end, just took financial control back.

²³ The CDR / audit records indicate that Nafola paid NAD7.61m to Atitati construction; and NAD0.44m to Agra for design. This was equivalent to NAD8.05m (US\$554,530), which is far higher than the NAD6.3m quoted in the MAWF letter of September 2017 to UNDP. Funds were re-allocated from Output 2.4 (Fire management), but costs were rising and appeared out of control.

²⁴ <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9046>

²⁵ GEF Focal Point was active in UNDP SCORE PSC meetings, but failed to be involved in UNDP Nafola, which appeared unbalanced.

The PSC was to be chaired by a senior MAWF representative, with the position taken by the DoF Director, who was also the National Project Director. This meant a conflict of interest, and a natural bias towards forestry, and away from other parts of the project design, such as land use planning, rangeland / livestock grazing management, and dryland agriculture. The minutes of the PSC meetings indicated a lack of technical detail presented in managing a large project in comparison to the PSC mandate. The attendance and detail on minutes of the PSC meetings (with TE comment) is presented in **Annex 5**.

DoF / PMU

Partnership arrangements were insufficiently established between DoF and other key directorates, namely DAPEES, DARD, and Directorate of Planning & Business Development (DPBD)²⁶ – all within MAWF, and with MLR. Apart from working with DAPEES, in a very small way, DoF attempted to implement the whole project by themselves. Within the project set-up (MAWF – DoF - PMU), MAWF didn't take the lead with respect to ensuring adequate attention towards SLM, agriculture or livestock. There appeared to be a lack of interest or direction in these subject matters²⁷. There was also no attempt to engage an NGO to deliver the energy-saving intervention, i.e. improved stoves.

DoF (and the PMU and PSC) couldn't cope with managing funds effectively (due to the kraal costs) and lost financial control to UNDP after three years²⁸. Thereafter, payments for activities slowed down. Thus, the project changed to UNDP-assisted NIM for the last two years. There was no mention in the PSC minutes of the change in financial control of Nafola by UNDP in October 2017. PSC meetings were quite bureaucratic, and in particular after the first PM left (and with the void before a new PM was appointed), the PSC lost sight technically of the project. DoF under project pressure at mid-term, re-assigned one staff member to coordinate CF activities. This person is now responsible for 42 CFs country-wide, but without any database currently set-up²⁹.

3.2.2 Institutional Mechanisms

Project-level partnership arrangements are briefly described in the previous section, whereas this section considers state institutional mechanisms and capacity, which are the backbone for delivering new policies and services. The section thereafter considers local partnerships.

Directorate of Forestry (DoF)

At present the DoF (website) lists inventories, maps and (timber) permits as its top three activities. The income generated from forestry is extremely low in comparison to agriculture and livestock, mainly because it lacks a productive capacity. i.e. its timber resources are meagre. Thus, the DoF might better be placed under MET again, where its environmental value would be better appreciated³⁰. Indeed, at least, it needs major institutional modernisation, and needs to look towards its ultimate purpose which is environmental management and revising its financing systems, which should tend towards climate mitigation and carbon-generated funding.

At a regional and constituency government level, DoF sit on the Regional Coordination Development Committees (CDCs), under MURD, however DoF staff at this level are often of insufficient civil service standing, and need central level agreement for decision-making. Forest harvesting 'block permits' are signed at RFO level.

Directorate of Agriculture Production, Extension and Engineering Services (DAPEES)

DAPEES lists its top two main activities as to: provide agricultural extension, advisory and training services, and to implement a drought planning and response management system. Nafola should have fully engaged DAPEES to implement the CA intervention, and drawn-in funds where possible to have expanded it.

Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (DARD, a.k.a DRD)

DARD is a directorate under MAWF. It aims to undertake well-balanced crop, livestock and natural resource research within the communal and commercial sectors, contributing to increased productivity and sustainable use of natural resources under arid, semi-arid and sub-humid conditions. The DARD remit is also to support indigenous

²⁶ And their Division of Co-operative Development & Regulation, who facilitate and register coops.

²⁷ As a comparison, under the UNDP SCORE project, the GoN added NAD7m for fodder-generating activities and was supported by the GEF Focal Point. Nafola wasn't in receipt of similar contributions, nor requested the GEF FP to attend PSC meetings. Politically, the GEF Focal Point is a Director within MET.

²⁸ Cheques were signed by the Nafola National Project Director [Director of DoF] and Project Manager from August 2014 – June 2017

²⁹ In contrast, under the CBNRM programme, MET has a 'services unit' staffed by seven personnel

³⁰ From 1995-2005, DoF was with MET, but moved to MAWF in 2005. MET maintained their CBNRM programme, which included wildlife conservancies

breeds, and provide registration for genetic breeding material (under Livestock Improvement Act, 1993)³¹.

DARD staff research livestock, grassland management, grazing and fodder management and regularly publish technical papers. However, the link between these papers and piloted or demonstrated research on-farm or in the field is extremely limited. Nafola had an opportunity to direct funds towards DARD to implement Output 2.2 (pasture management), 2.5 (bush control with grass seeding) and 2.7 (rangeland monitoring) towards such activities.

Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry (MAWF)

Agronomy issues include: seed needing to be procured from South Africa or Zambia, as there is no seed multiplication within Namibia; the seed procured is often late, insufficient, or an inappropriate cultivar, or at least not the most suitable. Fertilizer availability is also an issue. The project design solution was to introduce climate-resilience cropping practices under the title of Conservation Agriculture (CA). From the physical and chemical aspect, this was to include dryland cultivation methods to enhance soil conservation and fertility. Instead of standard ploughing, ripper tines were advocated to break any plough-pan layer and release soils nutrients along the ripper lines. The second and following action was to use cross-discs to cut-up the weeds (direct mulching) and provide a tilled soil layer for planting. The biological aspect was then to support climate-resilient - short duration crops/ varieties, such as pearl millet and sorghum. These could also be intercropped with cow peas (and possibly grams / beans and or pigeon pea – for nutrition and as fodder / cover crops³².

Ministry of Land Reform (MLR)

The CF process required the approval (of the boundary map) by the Communal Land Board (of the MLR) and the agreement of the Traditional Authority (TA). The official CF maps were also produced by the MLR, as only they had access to all private / other land plot boundaries within CF areas. These were important project links with MLR, however despite being requested to join the PSC, they failed to nominate a representative or attend any meetings.

Customary land right certificates (LRCs) can only be issued on an individual (e.g. private, business, lease land), and not on a group basis, so whilst CFs are mapped by the MLR, no LRC is issued and they are 'gazetted' (certificated) by MAWF. Thus, any individual with a LRC within a CF, holds the higher land right.

3.2.3 Local Partnership / Stakeholder Engagement

Community Forest Management Committees (CFMCs)

The capacity of the CFMCs varies between those gazetted some years ago, and those gazetted recently under Nafola, and accepting that some already gazetted as (wildlife) conservancies, also had greater skills in resource management and in administering a registered entity³³. For example, Uukolonkadhi CFMC (gazetted in 2006), were in the process of hiring a technical person to monitoring resource use within their CF, and according to their new community forest management plan (CFMP). (see **Annex 5** for some added selected field notes). By contrast, a number of the newly gazetted CFMCs said they had a low understanding their CFMP, and that annual general meetings were dominated by discussions on income-sharing and not on resource management. A number of CFMCs were also coming to terms with how to 'manage' illegal settlement and illegal farming within their boundaries. This was because they were now positioned between needing to make formal cases to a slow legal system, and at times also being undermined by their local TA headmen who were parcelling out such land.

Gender Analysis

A 50 / 50 gender balance was stipulated in the CF Toolbox. The composition of the 13 CFMCs was 73 women (48%) and 78 men (52%) (source PIR 2018). However, the TE evidence from three CFMCs was: Uukolonkadhi 13 men, 7 women; Oshaampula 10 men, 8 women; and for Ehi-Rovipuka, 5 men, 1 woman. These figures don't indicate quite such an equal balance. A breakdown of gender balance during training events is provided later (see section 3.3.3 Training).

³¹ www.mawf.gov.na/directorates

³² The farmers (in Omaheke) primarily plant 90-day maize, which when cobs don't form due to drought (which has been common in recent years), the stalk biomass is still useful for fodder, hence the farmer preference. Cowpea is also a key crop. Culturally they don't tend to plant sorghum or 65-day millet or intercrop for example. However due to land degradation and climate change, this was the purpose of the project intervention

³³ Those gazetted as conservancies have a management responsibility over wildlife, but when also gazetted as CFs, they increase their management responsibility to include all above ground natural resources as well. In fact, trying to manage wildlife without any control over their habitat would ultimately fail, hence the willingness to dual register as CFs and conservancies

The list of key stakeholders is described in **Annex 8**.

3.2.4 Finance & Co-finance

UNDP Financial management and Finance

The breakdown of planned and actual expenditures by year is provided in **Annex 4**.

Annual audits were undertaken 2016-18:

- 2018: no issues; spent US\$381,115; balance end-2018 was \$586,178; Statement of assets as of end-2018 – 4 vehicles at US\$30,000 each located in Kunene, Ohangwena, Otjozondjupa & Omaheke; 2 vehicles at \$43,000 and \$37,000 located in Windhoek
- 2017: no issues; \$634,518 spent. 2016: no issues; \$1,296,696 spent

Statement of Assets (October 2019)

- 4 vehicles at US\$30,000 each located in Ohangwena, Omaheke & Windhoek (2); 2 vehicles at \$43,000 and \$37,000 in Windhoek; 13 quad bikes @ \$5,000 each
- 3 Kubota tractors at US\$52,000 each at Omaheke (2) & Ohangwena
- Brushwood chipping machine at \$40,000 located in Otjozondjupa
- 2 sawmill machines + 2 carpentry machine at \$51,000 located in Ohangwena and Oshikoto
- 3 brick-making machines at \$26,000 total located in Omusati and Oshana
- Total assets \$568,000

The project was in the process of allocating its assets at the time of the TE. Of concern to the TE, was the fact that the 15 Dell laptops procured (one for each CF) were missing from asset list (either >\$1,000 or <\$1,000 list), and to the knowledge of the TE, only one had been delivered to Uukolonkadhi CF in Omusati. By the time of the TE, the asset handover planning had begun, but there wasn't a clear exit strategy in place.

Co-financing

Co-financing contributions, either as direct support funds (grant or in-kind) or as complementary funds (e.g. linking up with similar project in a neighbouring area), are not formally accounted for under GEF methods, with only the GEF and UNDP funds audited.

The DoF government budget contribution is under their CF programme, within their capital projects and operational budget. The KfW CF Programme (2013-16) was operating within the DoF and in Otjozondjupa. The GIZ Bush control & biomass utilization project (formerly GIZ Support to de-bushing) was operating in African Wild Dog CF. Oshaampula CF were awarded funds from the Environmental Investment Fund (GCF), with support from Nafola / Namibia Development Trust (NDT). African Wild Dog CF were awarded funds from the Regional Universities Agriculture Forum, for 'bush to feed' research, with support from Nafola.

Whilst the co-financing added an estimated US\$4.5m to the GEF US\$3.5m spent, it was not considered to have had a significant effect on project outcomes or sustainability. The contributions are recorded in **Annex 3**.

3.2.5 M&E Systems – Design & Implementation

The main issue with the M&E, was a lack of any tracking (spreadsheet) system, indicating progress against outputs, indicators, or inputs (service contracts for example), thus monitoring project progress would have been difficult. The standard M&E framework for these UNDP-GEF projects, is report-based, with PIRs, which unlike most annual reports, run from July to June each year.

Tracking Tools

The GEF Land Degradation Focal Area - Portfolio Monitoring and Assessment Tool (PMAT) was also undertaken, but only at project close, thus no comparison of change could be made from 'before-project' to present status.

Mid-term Review

An MTR was undertaken in June-August 2017 (pp31 + annexes), with the ratings given as: Objective – MS; Outcome 1 – MS; Outcome 2 – MU; UNDP / DoF Implementation – MU; Sustainability – ML. It highlighted the low and

unacceptable levels implementation. It noted – ‘the price escalation of the kraal poses a significant risk’³⁴. The CA activities were cut as a result of the MTR.

3.2.6 Adaptive Management (Work planning, Reporting & Communications)

Work planning

Inception Report (April 2015, pp31)

The project inception workshop was held eight months after project start. It contained some fair comments on difficult to measure / attain indicator targets.

Overall Workplan & Budget

The overall workplan budget was informative as to how Nafola was expected to be implemented (prodoc p77):

Output	Budget (US\$)	TE comment
1.1 Ten CFs gazetted	1,000,000	Achieved
1.2 Three CFs to formulate integrated forest resources management plans	550,000	The aim was put 3 CFs under improved SLM, agriculture, livestock and forestry actions covering 500,000 ha – not implemented
1.3 Strengthened Organisational Capacity for effective CF Management	230,000	The capacity of DoF to support CF remained very limited
1.4 Policies harmonised, to reflect forest value in national development programs	140,000	The aim was to use governance structures to create a cross-sector dialogue in order to implement SLM – not achieved

2.1 Conservation Agriculture piloted	405,000	The 3 tractors cost \$156,000 out of this. CA was only piloted for 1 year out of 5. The target was 300,000 ha – not implemented
2.2 Improved livestock practices in CFs in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa	243,000	Not implemented. The output was to monitor livestock carrying capacity and manage rotational grazing
2.3 Marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products	380,000	Nafola focused on building a livestock auction facility, which was an intervention better positioned in the value chain to get livestock out of the CFs in Omaheke
2.4 Fire management strategy in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa CFs	247,000	One CF fire control strategy + national guideline drafted
2.5 Bush control in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde	371,000	One brushwood chipper cost \$40,000 – 10 ha cleared out of a target of 10,000 ha to be cleared; and 50,000 ha to be returned to improved grassland – not achieved
2.6 Energy-saving and alternative energy	380,000	Not implemented
2.7 System for monitoring of forest / range condition and land productivity	300,000	Not implemented

Annual Workplan & Budgets (AWPBs)

Four AWPBs (workplans) 2016-19 were assessed. They were presented in the format of UNDP accounting codes³⁵ (as were the UNDP Combined Delivery Reports- CDRs), thus the TE was unable to match spending against the strategic framework and output spending plan, as per the approved prodoc (and table above).

Reporting

Annual Reports

Annual Reports from 2016-18 were assessed. Annual report (2018, pp20) - consists of: the PIR undated to end-2018; progress against outputs to end-2018; conclusion; training 2018 table. It mentions that over-stocking of cattle is the biggest threat to SLM in Omaheke (where Tallismanus Auction Facility was constructed). It is expected that through the auction kraal, livestock off-take will be increased from 10 to 20%. The report goes on to mention several GCF - Environmental Investment Fund (EIF) proposals having been prepared, however it appears that there

³⁴ The kraal was costed at NAD6.3m, however Nafola has already paid NAD8.05m (US\$0.55m), with at least another NAD3m required to finalise it. Out of the GEF grant of \$4.45m, the cost of the kraal was 15% of the budget. Further analysis and planning are needed to ensure that it will make a positive contribution towards achieving the project objective’

³⁵ Contractual services Companies (72100); Miscellaneous Expenses (74500); Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs (74200); Travel (71600); Local consultants (71300); Contractual Services Individuals (71400); Training workshops & conferences (75700); Equipment & furniture (72200); Professional services (74100); International consultants (71200)

wasn't one to work towards reduced stocking or the management mode, which would have been useful.

Proposals prepared

- Social Security Commission Development Fund (SSCDF) - Oshaampula CF – Climate-proof adaptation through rainwater harvesting - Construction of three Earth Dams (NAD1,655,000)
- SSCDF - Otjituuo CF - Bush Thinning and Value Addition Chains Employment Scheme - Our rangeland our responsibility (NAD2,795,085)
- SSCDF - Otjiu-West CF - Arts & Crafts Centre (NAD1,425,000)
- Support to several CFs (African Wild Dog, Oshaampula, Otji-West) to source funding from the GCF - EIF, in order to set up community projects and strengthen existing initiatives. Three proposals were submitted to EIF, with one from Oshaampula CF successful. The CF was awarded US\$340,000

The proposals provide an indication of capacity built in sourcing funds to make the CFs sustainable. However, the capacity within DoF at the central level to prepare detailed funding proposals such as under GCF directly is severely limited.

Project Implementation Reviews (UNDP PIRs)

Only one PIR was presented to the TE, with its date difficult to determine, although stated as of July 2018. No critical risks were entered.

Communications

The project held internal weekly meetings and kept a record of these.

3.3. Project Results

The TE assessed the three levels of the project results framework - Objective, Outcome and Output. This was guided by the indicators and targets set at each level. Project success is also built upon the achievement of the outputs, according to 'the framework's intervention logic³⁶.' UNDP / PMU were provided with two tables, within which they entered data:

- Progress towards Objective and Outcomes (Indicator-based) which is presented in **Annex 1**, and
- Progress towards Outputs which is described in **Annex 2**

According to UNDP-GEF TE guidance (**Annex 9**), these tables were rated and commented on. A detailed result-level analysis now follows of the Objective, Outcomes with their Indicators, and then of their corresponding Outputs.

3.3.1 Overall Result – Achievement of Objective and Outcome Indicators

The **project goal** was to 'Maintain dry forests and their ecosystem goods and services in 13 CFs covering 500,000 ha of land, through the adoption of SLM, SFM, and other techniques. The result was the certification of nine CFs, for the future adoption of SLM and SFM techniques.

Objective Level Indicator (Overall Result)

The project objective was to '**Reduce pressure on forest resources through policy and capacity building for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry in the CF areas**' (2 indicators)

The overall grading is **Unsatisfactory**

1/ Increased area of gazetted CFs, with legal management structures

(Baseline – 3 out of 13 CFs gazetted. Some established CFs but without any formal management authority; Target - 10 CFs successfully gazetted and under a systematic and integrated land-use management framework)

Result against Indicator and Analysis

The project supported 15 CFs, of which CFMPs were produced or updated for 13 out of these 15 CFs. The CFMPs were based on forest inventory surveys. For nine of the CFs, their CFMPs and their 'constitutions' were then

³⁶ The 'intervention logic' of the strategic results framework (i.e. the project's logical framework) works vertically – activities should lead to outputs, which should lead to the outcomes, which in turn should lead to the objective and goal; and horizontally – if the assumptions are correct and the inputs (funds and human resources) are delivered, then the activities, outputs, outcomes should be able to lead to the goal (see www.logframer.eu/content/what-logical-framework)

forwarded as application dossiers for gazette, which was successful³⁷.

The project was successful in achieving gazette of nine CFs. The most important result of gazette, was the establishment of the community forest management committees (CFMCs) with CF constitutions and 5-Year CFMPs.

2/ Area under effective land use management with vegetative cover maintained

Result against Indicators and Analysis

Baselines & Targets

a/ 162,815 ha (5.7%) managed in line with approved land use plans; Target - 2,840,153 ha under approved land use plans

For the 15 CFs that Nafola supported, the total area gazetted was 4,349,021 ha, of which nine were gazetted under Nafola covering an area of 4,077,847 ha. The 'plans' are the CFMPs of the CFs. For indicator (a), Nafola was successful in achieving gazette of 4.08 million ha of land as CF. The first steps towards SLM / SFM were achieved through creating CFs, and importantly institutional structures for them, namely the CFMCs. The CFMCs were provided with the tools to begin SLM / SFM, in terms of creating for the CF, a constitution, and a management plan. The project ended at this point.

b/ X hectares³⁸ and woody cover at 30%; Target - 500,000 ha with woody cover in process of regeneration at >50%

Tree cover continued to decline in the CFs under Nafola, however the project supported forest inventories for 13 CFs. For indicator (b), its meaning and purpose were poorly presented. In science, 'woody cover' means 'trees and shrubs', however, the prodoc designer surely meant 'tree cover' (i.e. in the dry forest woodlands) being increased (regenerating) from 30 to 50% cover over an area of 0.5 m ha. This is because the escalating problems in communal CF areas, is one where tree cover is declining, open grazing area (and its quality) is declining and dense woody tick is taking over.

The expectation that Nafola could achieve this specific target, was extremely high. If Nafola had managed to gazette the 10 CFs in the first year and then work with all 15 on a full range of funded and supported direct land management interventions, then the woodland-savanna degradation might have been slowed down, but to expect a reversal to increase tree cover by 20% would have been spectacular³⁹

c/ Bush densities at 2,500-8,000/ha; Target - Reduction in bush density by 20%, and 10% reduction in area covered by bush

Not achieved. For indicator (c), it is assumed that it is the same area as covered by the unpalatable (grass) species, i.e. 100,000 ha, thus the target was to remove 10,000 ha. The project managed 10 ha⁴⁰.

d/ Less desirable grasses dominate 100,000 ha of rangelands; Target - Desirable (palatable) perennial grasses dominant in 50% of degraded rangelands i.e. 50,000 ha

Not achieved. For indicator (d) concerning the restoration of 50,000 ha of pasture to palatable grass species, the corresponding Outcome indicator or Output was not clear. It could have been Output 2.2 - using pasture monitoring to reduce over-grazing; Output 2.5 - bush control, with pasture re-seeding; or Output 2.7 - rangeland monitoring. What is clear, is that this action was not started or achieved in any way. To note also, technically, once an area is degraded from over-grazing, its restoration can take many years, requiring significant scientific and management input. What might have been attempted was to set up a demonstration to monitor livestock numbers⁴¹ and grass species composition, against no-grazing plots.

3.3.2 Effectiveness – Achievement of Outcomes 1-2

Effectiveness – Outcome 1 at the Indicator and Output Level

Outcome 1: Land use planning and policy change hasten gazette of 10 CFs and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies (4 indicators, 4 outputs)

The overall grading is for Outcome 1 was **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. There were four indicators rated as: moderately satisfactory (1); moderately unsatisfactory (1); unsatisfactory (1) and highly unsatisfactory (1).

³⁷ See also the table in section 2.3 re. project location

³⁸ A baseline of how many hectares was never determined

³⁹ FAO as cited in the Nafola – Forestry Sector Long-term Financing Strategy (2019), Namibia lost 1.84 m ha of forest from 1990 - 2015

⁴⁰ Prodoc p43 re. grassland restoration

⁴¹ With a view to measuring carrying capacity

1/ Increase in compliance with land use plans as measured by % of area complying with approved uses⁴²

(Baseline - Only 5.7% of area under land use plans and compliance with land use plans currently <40 %; Target - 10 land use plans developed at > 60%)

Result against Indicator and Analysis

This is a repeat indicator. See objective level indicators which state that nine CFs were gazetted with approved management plans covering an area of over 4m ha. Note, Nafola referred to their forest inventory reports as 'integrated forest management plans' in order to fit with the project indicator requiring updated 'land use plans'. However, the inventories didn't really fulfil this role. This is because they focused on standing tree volume and AAC, without considering SLM (livestock, grassland management etc) or tenure for example.

Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs (Output 1.1)

Result

The project supported 15 CFs, of which nine CFs were gazetted during the project. Four CFs were gazetted prior to the project, and two were surveyed and delineated by map, but were not gazetted, due to lack of Traditional Authority (TA) agreement. (see table in project location section)

- The nine gazetted CFs were: Ehi-Rovipuka (Kunene); Otshiku-Tshiithilonde (Oshana); Omundaungilo (Ohangwena); African Wild Dog (Otjozondjupa); Otjituuo (Otjozondjupa); Otjombinde (Omaheke); Eiseb (Omaheke); Omuramba Ua Mbinda (Omaheke); Epukiro (Omaheke)
- Of note, the four CFs in Omaheke covered 2.73m ha out of the 4.1m ha gazetted under the project
- The two mapped were: Ongandjera (Omusati); Onkumbula (Oshikoto)
- The four previously gazetted were: Otjiu West (Kunene); Uukolonkadhi (Omusati); Okongo (Ohangwena); Oshaampula (Oshikoto)

Constitutions

The TE was provided with copies of nine CF constitutions: Uukolonkadhi (undated, pp9); Otshiku-Shilthilonde (2010, pp15); Okongo (2016, pp17); Omuramba (2017, pp24); Ongandjera (undated, pp12); Onkumbula (2016, pp15); Otjituuo (undated draft, pp18); Otjombinde (2017, pp23); Eiseb (2017, pp23)

Community Forestry Management Plans (CFMPs)

Nafola directly supported 10 CFs⁴³ in the production of CFMPs⁴⁴. These were: Ehi-Rovipuka (Kunene); Uukolonkadhi (Omusati); Otshiku-Shilthilonde (Oshana); Omundaungilo (Ohangwena); Oshaampula (Oshikoto); African Wild Dog (Otjozondjupa); Otjituuo (Otjozondjupa); Otjombinde (Omaheke); Eiseb (Omaheke); Epukiro (Omaheke)

Uukolonkadhi CFMP (Omusati): Reviewed as an example: 2017, pp23, unsigned, appears to be a draft; mentions: inventory in 2015 covering 213 plots; tree density at 9 trees / ha with 6.1 m³ / ha; AAC of 387 poles (25-50cm dbh)⁴⁵; no AAC of larger trees / timber; supporting stakeholders (CFMC, DoF, TA, Constituency Development Committee to liaise with the Regional Council, and NGOs such as the Namibia Development Trust; no rotational grazing control plan or zoning

Forest Inventories

In order to gazette a CF, a tree species / timber volume inventory is required. The TE was provided copies of six forest inventories: Ehi-Rovipuka (2016, pp20); Uukolonkadhi (2017, p19); Otshiku-Shilthilonde (2010, pp24); Okongo (2017, pp19); Oshaampula (2017, pp23); Otjituuo (2016, pp23)

Community Forestry Tool Box (2012), pp101 – was updated by Nafola.

It includes 10 steps, called milestones. Milestone 10 includes the documents required for gazetting: List of names and contact details of the CFMC, and list of names and ID numbers of at least 30 community members in whose

⁴² The terminology was imprecise here, when approved forest management plans were required for gazette under the indicator and output 1.1. The next indicator and Output 1.2 refers to preparing 3 demonstration land use plans that consider all SLM / NRM aspects, such as agriculture, livestock, and land tenure

⁴³ These are the 10 CFMPs that were provided to the TE as evidence. A further CF – Onkumbula has now had its dossier submitted to the Attorney General's Office for legal review

⁴⁴ In total, 13 out of 15-supported CFs now have CFMPs

⁴⁵ over 84,925 ha ~ only 4.5 poles / 1000 ha

behalf the application is made; Constitution; Benefit distribution plan; Boundary description and map; Integrated forest management plan; Use regulations / bylaws (all signed by CFMC Chairperson and TA); Letter of consent by the TA (signed by TA); Application for declaration of a CF (CF agreement to be signed by Minister of MAWF, CFMC and TA)

Other aspects of CF establishment

The project is supporting the construction of two CF offices - Oshaampula CF and Otjiu-West CF, with planned completion in March 2020. Project laptops and printers for the CFs were only procured in June 2019, with only 1-2 reaching the CFMCs by the time of the TE in December 2019.

Analysis

It has taken five years under Nafola to create and gazette the CFs. The work which involved consultation, constitution and CFMC establishment, inventory, CFMP, and gazettelement was extensive and should not be underestimated. At a central level, the latter final verification and gazettelement, involving DoF coordinating with MLR (approval) and MET (where conservancy boundaries coincided), was comparatively slow⁴⁶.

The 5-year CFMPs included a summary of the inventory and a determination of the Annual allowable cut (AAC). The mapping and boundary consultation was aligned with the regional communal land boards (CLBs). Standard Operating Procedures for CFs were developed, and the CF Toolbox was updated. The RFOs conduct annual audits of their CFs. For more information on the CFs and CFMCs - see section 3.2.3 – Local Partnership and **Annex 5**.

2/ Forestry reflected in regional land use plans and programmes (agriculture, water, development, environment)

(Baseline - No regional / national sector frameworks incorporate forestry; Target – Two frameworks incorporate forestry)

Result

Forestry was mainstreamed in two regional land use plans for Omaheke and Otjozondjupa. The MLR produced these two plans, without Nafola support. Omaheke is severely degraded due to large livestock over-stocking. One of the future strategies for CFs is to control grazing in gazetted areas through CF bylaws. The land use zoning for Omaheke reflects the four CFs. Similarly, the SEA⁴⁷ for Otjozondjupa (on which the LUP is based) indicates that the CF approach gives communities the authority to manage veld and pasture resources through appropriate local level management plans.

Analysis

For the Omaheke LUP (2017-27), which was a highly detailed piece of planning work, Nafola, should have accessed it and based some of its interventions on its recommendations. Concerning SLM, the plan recommended⁴⁸:

<p>Communal Cattle Farming [Zone 1A] – Land degradation (which includes Epukiro CF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop an improved standardized method to determine carrying capacity more locally and regularly - Develop a knowledge transfer method re. this carrying capacity in communal areas - Support bush thinning and value-addition projects in the context of CFs or group rights in communal areas. - Support rangeland management in accordance with the National Rangeland Management Policy and Strategy <p>Communal Cattle Farming & Conservation [Zone 1B] (which includes Otjombinde, Eiseb and Omuramba CFs which are also dual registered as Conservancies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the registration of entities or group rights for purposes other than livestock farming, e.g. CBNRM - Create awareness for CBNRM / wildlife conservation, particularly for IUCN Red-list species – e.g. Wild Dog - Support to CBNRM in terms of infrastructure, CF, wildlife conservation, trophy hunting and tourism - Provide training, financial and infrastructure support for Conservancy core areas
--

⁴⁶ Inventories were undertaken from 2015 onwards during winter seasons, mostly completed in 2016 and one - Ehi-Rovipuka, in 2017. Thus, the bottleneck was in finalising gazettelement through the DoF central office, which took another 2-3 years.

⁴⁷ Strategic Environmental Assessment – This was not seen by the TE, with the statement provided by the project

⁴⁸ It is also useful to understand the differing localised agro-climate conditions within the Omaheke region. To the north, there is slightly more rain, but the aquifer levels are too deep to bore, thus the suitability and tendency is towards cattle farming. To the south, it is drier, but the aquifer access is better (due in part to the Kalahari effect), with the tendency towards small livestock farming (sheep / goat). However small-holder farming with crops is also prevalent and an integral part of the farming system, which is at a subsistence level in many cases.

- Support rangeland management in accordance with the National Rangeland Management Strategy
- Stop considering waterless areas as under-utilized in terms of livestock farming⁴⁹
- Support bush thinning and value-addition projects in the context of CFs or group rights
- Investigate legality of land occupation & fences / Stop giving communal land rights in Eiseb Conservancy core area
- Investigate potential for small-scale water pipeline schemes, particularly for the San Community

Three CFs supported to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans (Output 1.2)

Result

This was not achieved by Nafola, however the Ministry of Land Reform (MLR – Land Use Planning & Allocation Division) produced two regional land use plans.

Nevertheless, there was ‘mapping’ collaboration in some cases, where the regional land offices were actively supporting map preparation for the CFs. For example, Okango CF (Ohangwena), had a new map (October 2019) produced by the MLR, which shows the CF and conservancy boundaries, plus all the LRC certificated land inside their boundaries. It also detailed all the land tenure application plots that have been mapped, but without certificate issued to date. Such examples, are very useful for the CFMCs to assess present status and report against any new land conversion / settlement⁵⁰. Alas, other CFs did not appear to possess such maps.

Analysis

The meaning under this output was originally to integrate CF sustainable management requirements into the wider landscape planning process (or *vice-versa*), however, Nafola didn't do this, but rather prepared standard forest management plans as part of the CF gazettelement process, and then called these plans ‘IFMPs’. (see Output 1.1)

3/ Number of national / regional forums supporting policy that incorporates NRM, SLM and SFM

(Baseline – One Ministerial Forum; Target – Two Forums - One each at National and Local level)

Result

Nafola worked with the Constituency Development Committees (CDCs) in all seven regions. The remit of the CDCs is inter-sectoral. The CFMCs worked with CDCs and regional government. Nafola also financially assisted the Omaheke farmers via an Omaheke CA Forum (managed by DAPEES) for a short period.

Analysis

The rationale for this indicator was that, despite various policies including NRM, SLM and SFM aspects, and containing various recommendations for committees to work on improving such types of resource management, most actions remain single sector and ineffective⁵¹. This remained true. The most disappointing aspect, was DoF's failure to work with another MAWF Directorate, namely DARD, even though, their offices were in the same building. The support towards the Omaheke CA Forum was limited and weak.

There is a Rangeland Forum managed through the De-bushing Advisory Service⁵², however despite Outputs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.7 directly relating to rangeland management, there was no evidence of Nafola working with this group. Under the National Rangeland Management Policy & Strategy, the Steering Committee (chaired by MAWF) is responsible for implementing and budgeting of the policy, but there was no link with Nafola. Reports indicated that the Northern Namibia CF Forum was working, however one comment was that it was not linked to central or regional government, i.e. its operational level was too low level to be strategic⁵³, but again, there was no evidence of Nafola working strategically in this way.

Policies harmonised, support local governance to reflect forestry in national programmes (Output 1.4)

Result

Long-term Financing Strategies for the Forestry Sector (2019, pp36)

⁴⁹ Relevant to Output 2.2

⁵⁰ Indeed, the CFMC had informed the land board of 12 illegal crop fields, and that the process to evict had begun as a result

⁵¹ The prodoc (p17) singled out here the CLBs. The PSC was also unable to get the MLR to attend or take an interest in Nafola, and the TE had to go to great lengths even to meet one staff member of a regional land office in the NCAs.

⁵² www.dasnamibia.org/events/event/22th-namibia-national-rangeland-forum/

⁵³ The TE tried to meet, and could not find evidence of their existence

Quotes FAO (2015) – From 1990 - 2015, hectares of forest lost was 73,720 ha / year, with a decrease from 8,762,000 to 6,919,000 ha – i.e. 1,843,000 ha lost over 25 years. The report provides a list of 14 financing methods. It indicates Namibia's commitment to climate change via Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) from 2015 (over 10 years), with a number of aims including restore 15m ha of grassland at a cost of US\$1.78 billion. It also confirms the limited annual budget of DoF being 0.8 – 1.5% (~US\$14m / year) of the MAWF budget. Of which 85% is used for operational costs, leaving 15% or (US\$2.1m / year) for capital projects⁵⁴. Its action plan, includes 'establish a forest conservation trust fund' using Nafola funds to make a proposal to GCF and to link the trust fund to the climate change NDCs.

Analysis

There was a little evidence of forestry being mainstreamed into national sectoral plans (see section 2.1 – Development Context), and the TE was unable to access any regional development plans, except for the Omaheke Land Use Plan. The main issue is that the DoF, institutionally is out of date. It remains primarily established to manage forestry production receipts, and sits alongside other MAWF production departments, such as agriculture that are many times bigger. Forestry, especially in Namibia needs to be under NRM or SLM, and these days probably dissolved and created as a new unit under NRM within the MET. Only then will the subjects such as climate change mitigation (carbon neutrality) and rangeland management be given the priority they need.

4/ Change in capacity scorecards for ministry technical staff and CFMCs

(Baseline - Technical institutions scored 65%; CF institutions scored 31%; Target - Capacity scorecard increases to 80% for technical institutions, 50% for CF institutions)

Result and Analysis

UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard

Entity / %	Baseline	Target	Result
MAWF / DoF	65	80	76
CFMCs	31	50	51

The prodoc mentions 'capacity scorecards' which refers to the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, which is undertaken to assess institutional development prior to project and at project end. The results indicate an improvement on the baseline for the CFMCs⁵⁵. However, the TE evidence of improved capacity at DoF level was scant.

Strengthened Organisational Capacity for effective CF Management (Output 1.3)

Result & Analysis

DoF capacity to facilitate CF gazettement was limited. The TE estimated that Nafola contributed to almost 95% financial support⁵⁶ for the project. The TE also estimated Nafola provided ~80% technical support to gazette the 10 CFs, with DoF central and field staff contributing 10% each. The prodoc co-financing by the GoN was provisioned to be US\$15m, however it was difficult to envisage how this could have been the case, with the figures being put at \$2.85m by end of project.

The DoF struggled to dedicate one central staff member to the CF programme fulltime, despite its running over a number of years, including prior to Nafola. Furthermore, under the MTR, the DoF was requested to allocate one such staff member to this work, in order to support and expedite the CF gazetting (and record keeping)⁵⁷. The TE could find no evidence of any CF database of such information, but rather only the *ad hoc* reports of Nafola⁵⁸. During the mission and across the seven regions, the TE identified a clear lack of DoF staff, and certainly at the skill-levels required. In defense of DoF, barriers to CF gazettement also included the UNDP - MAWF 'project' bureaucracy, and the relatively time-consuming forest survey methods⁵⁹, as well as needing additional time to

⁵⁴ Running the Tallimanus Livestock Auction Facility until profitable would probably take a sizable proportion of this alone, leaving questions of sustainability and appropriate development

⁵⁵ The CFs assessed were: Epukiro, Omundaungilo, Otshiku, Ehi-rovipuka, Otjituuo, Otjombinde, Omuramba ua Mbinda, Eiseb, African Wild Dog. Nafola also decided to assess four CFs in 2017 using the GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), which is usually reserved for protected areas.

⁵⁶ The DoF operational & programme budget amounts to <1.5% of that allocated to MAWF (Long-term financing strategies Report)

⁵⁷ After the MTR, one middle-management (senior forester) staff member was tasked to undertake CF work

⁵⁸ In comparison, under the CBNRM programme, MET has 7-8 dedicated staff for support services towards conservancies

⁵⁹ Required ~20 persons x 2 months to conduct one CF inventory survey

prepare the inventory report and CFMP. Moreover, under the KfW-funded CF programme, there had been little or no CF gazettement, whereas Nafola managed to get 9-10 CFs gazetted, albeit taking five years.

Effectiveness – Outcome 2 at the Indicator and Output Level

Outcome 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CFs (7 indicators, 7 outputs)

The overall grading for Outcome 2 was **Unsatisfactory**. There were seven indicators rated as: moderately satisfactory (2); unsatisfactory (2); and highly unsatisfactory (3).

1/ Increased productivity in agriculture crops (pearl millet / sorghum) in Omusati, Otjozondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena and Omaheke regions (300,000 ha)

(Baseline - Current production of 200-600kg/ha; Target - Production increase to 400-800kg/ha)

Background

Conservation Agriculture (CA) was the background to this indicator, firstly in understanding the need for improved climate-resilient seed and secondly for improved soil and water conservation tillage methods⁶⁰. The seed was to be provided by the Omahenene Plant Breeding Station.⁶¹ The target was farmers in the NCAs. The idea was that Nafola would obtain the seed from Omahenene, and utilize the CA methods under the Dryland Crop Production Programme (DCPP) to increase crop productivity, and therefore reduce pressure on the CF natural resources.

CA is embedded within the DCP, which although still at demonstration level includes a ploughing service; weeding work for community youth; and provides subsidized seed and fertilizer. It also often used walking cultivators for ploughing. The objective was to introduce CA with pearl millet and sorghum as better drought-tolerant (shorter rotation) crops into Omaheke and Otjozondjupa⁶². These two regions were relying on maize crops, which due to drought, were failing over a number of years.

Result against Indicator

To support CA, the project bought three Kubota tractors (2016) to be used within three CFs and their communities (Omaheke - Otjombinde CF⁶³ and Epukiro CF - managed by DAPEES Gobabis office; and Ohangwena - Okango CF - managed by DAPEES Eenhana office). The project started supporting CA in 2016, but was unfortunately stopped in 2017 after one growing season, which was affected by drought and pestilence⁶⁴. The tractors continued working under DAPEES.

Analysis

The TE was unable to obtain figures to verify any changes in crop productivity, the type of crop planted, or the hectareage covered by these three tractors. Whereas, the management of the tractors and services to support CA was operating (by DAPEES) very well in the three project CFs. If one considers that there are only three tractors for smallholders for the whole Omaheke region, with two bought by Nafola, then one can envisage the large impact⁶⁵.

Conservation Agriculture piloted (Output 2.1)

Result

In Otjombinde (2016/17), 29 farmers were trained in CA, with 10 demonstration plots established. The activity was poorly executed and largely failed as a demonstration, with poor yields for various reasons (drought, infestation, planting space). Nafola / DAPEES closed the activity thereafter. The demonstrations were with the

⁶⁰ In the 1990s MAWF launched a crop programme with pearl millet (omahangu) and sorghum as major crops, and with cowpea and groundnut as secondary. A system of seed production of improved varieties was put in place to ensure timely sustainable supply of good quality seed to communal farmers. Released varieties were Okashana 2, Kangara (pearl millet) and Macia (sorghum); while pre-released varieties were Nakare, Shindimba and Bira (cowpeas).

⁶¹ The TE spent some time trying to arrange a meeting at the Omahenene Station, but was unsuccessful

⁶² The Nafola project design rationale was that, with the UNDP SCORE and GIZ in the north, covering CA, then UNDP Nafola would cover the eastern regions in Omaheke and Otjozondjupa.

⁶³ Otjombinde constituency 5,889 km² in 5 administrative blocks with 120 villages (4,680 persons) with subsistence livestock farming at 76%

⁶⁴ UNDP supported the MTR in calling for a stop to CA activities. This was endorsed in the PSC in 2017, with the indicator and target discontinued

⁶⁵ The low number is thought to be due to Omaheke having sold / privatised their cultivation services

use of the ripper tines (as planting lines) for maize and cowpea⁶⁶. No pearl millet or sorghum was planted⁶⁷.

Analysis

In reality, the DoF / PMU failed to develop any meaningful CA activities, either led by themselves or better led by DAPEES and / or DARD. Nothing happened for the first two years, then after a year of some very limited trials in Omaheke and Otjozondjupa in 2016, the MTR in 2017 called for all the CA activities to stop. The DoF / PMU failed to have a clear agreement with DAPEES on their role and failed to work out how best for them to use the US\$405,000 (9% of the GEF funds)⁶⁸. DAPEES with Nafola funds could have started in 2015-16 with CA exchange visits to the NCAs under the GIZ / FAO project areas, and learned how improved seed was being obtained and provided through the local extension service. They could have then replicated this in Omaheke⁶⁹ and Otjozondjupa.

The project bought three tractors for these two regions and together with CA minimal tillage techniques, could have provided all the inputs as incentives for setting-up more and better demonstrations, than they managed. Thus, the GoN CA programme in the east, was let down by UNDP, based on quite superficial statements in the MTR.

2/ Increased quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa

(Baseline - 70% of cattle at Grade C, 60% with fatness grade 0 and 1, and 70% oxen; Target - Increased type / quality of cattle in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa (150,000 ha) via: increase in yearlings (< 2 years old, after weaning); a decrease in old cattle; and 20% more cattle attaining Grade B fatness at sale)

Result against Indicator

The project did not achieve this result. After the MTR, the PMU recommended that this indicator was to be discontinued.

Analysis

The target was to improve the stock value of smallholder cattle herds, by selling off the older cattle, and keeping the 'Yearlings' as future breeding and meat stock. This would also allow the latter to have a better chance to reach a higher fat grade at sale. Neither DAPEES, DARD nor DVS were engaged in any way to support this intervention.

Improved livestock practices in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa (Output 2.2)

Result & Analysis

The purpose of this activity was to conduct localised rangeland monitoring. It was expected that the 'rangeland monitoring tool' developed under the GEF-3 UNDP project 'Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Integrated Sustainable Land Management'⁷⁰ would be used as a demonstration to reduce over-grazing in three CFs under communal land tenure. The tool allows monitoring down to farmer level and allows communities to seasonally reserve plots from grazing and rotate these. Farmers then monitor grassland condition, classify it and record the rainfall data. Nafola failed to even start this, in any shape or form, let alone collaborate with MET who implemented the GEF-3 project. Another avenue would have been to consult the Rangeland Management Manual (2008)⁷¹.

System for monitoring of forest and range condition and land productivity (Output 2.7)

Result

Development of the National Forest Account (Inception Report, April 2019, pp16)

Nafola produced a ToR for a consultant to prepare a report on the forest account (economic valuation of forest

⁶⁶ As the focus of CA was limited soil disturbance with short duration drought-resistant crops and varieties to be planted, then the farmer priority lists should have reflected this – i.e. pearl millet / sorghum planters in Omaheke in particular.

⁶⁷ Source - Lessons learned from Nafola support to the CA Pilot in Otjombinde (2018, pp15)

⁶⁸ For GEF cross-sector designed projects under UNDP NIM, the lack of sharing implementation responsibility across sectors is common, due to lack of written agreement at formulation, and a vested interest wishing to steer the funds only towards the designated leading office (Implementing Partner)

⁶⁹ In Omaheke, the land is arid to semi-arid, and the small-holders are traditionally livestock - maize / cowpea farmers

⁷⁰ <https://www.thegef.org/project/cpp-namibia-country-pilot-partnership-integrated-sustainable-land-management-phase-1> - This was a SLM project, that Nafola was based upon, however the DoF failed to grasp any of the SLM aspects designed into Nafola, and doggedly stuck to 'forestry-only' activities

⁷¹ ISBN 978-99916-848-0-2 Helmut Stehn, Joint Presidency Committee (NAU & NNFU)

ecosystem goods and services), and a policy brief. The Inception report was completed. Proposed activities included: national land and carbon inventory, geo-referenced database, identification and valuation of NTFPs and ecosystem services.

Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Report (2018, pp49)

The DoF Remote Sensing Unit, with the support of MET and GIZ, is producing an on-going Land Degradation Neutrality Report⁷² (see **Annex 5**). It includes data on land cover (FAO land classification system), bush encroachment, and soil carbon. It has been completed for Oshakati and Kunene. Nafola part-funded this work, with one software licence.

Analysis

The purpose of Output 2.7 was to produce and implement a more comprehensive rangeland monitoring system or model for the CFs. i.e. a system that would encompass grassland status, livestock numbers, fire risk, and bush encroachment⁷³. This was not done. One of the expectations was that technical support from the Namibia University of Science & Technology would be sought to establish a rangeland monitoring system. They have for example a model for rangeland management regarding rainfall, fire, grassland stocking densities, and bush management⁷⁴, which could have been piloted over 4-5 years under the project.

Another clear option would have been to work with DARD (same ministry, same building as DoF), who also undertake extensive research on rangeland management and grazing capacities, and manage the Sandveld Research Station (Omaheke), which has a long-term research programme in rotational grazing of the Caprivi-Sanga cattle breed. Technical support was not sought, and as a result the capacity of DoF / PMU to implement the project effectively was limited again.

Why the project was allowed to begin developing a 'national forest account' which was outside the project brief, and be able to start it right at the end of the project was unclear. No report of the actual account was delivered. The link between the LDN activity (and again at the end of the project and otherwise supported by GIZ) and the Nafola project design was also tenuous⁷⁵.

Outputs 2.2 and 2.7 were budgeted at US\$243,000 and \$300,000 respectively, but not implemented at all.

3/ Increased off-take of livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa

(Baseline – Current livestock off-take at 5-8%; Target - Off-take increased to 20%)

Result

Nafola reported that the NCAs off-take rate was 9.5% (2012), whereas commercial off-takes are often above 20% (Agra, 2012). In 2018, for Otjombinde, the cattle off-take rate reported by DVS at 14% (4854/41,509), although this was not a result of the auction kraal or any other Nafola intervention. Thus, the project did not achieve this result, but it did build a livestock auction facility at Tallimanus, Omaheke (Otjombinde CF area).

Analysis

This is quite a change from the project baseline at 5-8% off-take. Fourteen percent (14%) also appears high in comparison to other figures of 9.5%⁷⁶ and 11%⁷⁷ for NCAs. However, the TE would suggest that off-take rates still need to significantly increase, if sustainable grazing is to be attained, particularly in the face of variable rains with prolonged drought period over a number of years in the region (as a result of climate change).

Improved marketing of livestock and forest products (Output 2.3) – Part A - Livestock

⁷² The LDN concept (endorsed 12th Session CoP UNCCD, 2015). LDN was defined as the 'state whereby the amount & quality of land resources to support ecosystem functions & services, and enhance food security remain stable or increase within a temporal & spatial scale'. The UNCCD uses 3 indicators for land degradation: Land cover/use change; Land productivity change per land cover class; Soil organic carbon (SOC) change. Bush encroachment was added as a 4th LDN indicator in Namibia.

⁷³ Whereas Output 2.2 concerning farmer-led monitoring of livestock numbers with a view to better rangeland management

⁷⁴ Encroachment by *Acacia mellifera* (Blackthorn)

⁷⁵ Except to say, Under Output 2.7, the prodco design assumed that the rangeland monitoring system to be developed would 'somehow' also be compatible with the UNCCD (LDN) indicators. The project output was to implement a working system for CFs, whereas the LDN reports are presently for UN reporting only.

⁷⁶ Source – Marketing strategy, p24 - Cattle off-take rate = Livestock sold divided by total livestock x 100.

⁷⁷ Community Based Rangeland & Livestock Marketing project baseline (2012) - Innovation for Poverty Action, as cited in 'Can Livestock Cooperatives Improve Cattle Marketing?', L. Amunyela, T Moyo, NUST, Windhoek

This output is divided between livestock marketing (Part A) and forest income-generating activities (Part B), which is later.

Result

Omaheke Tallismanus Livestock Auction Facility

The auction facility (a.k.a. kraal) was funded by public and donor money. At the time of the TE in December 2019, the auction kraal was near completion and was undergoing 'snagging' finishing touches. It needs electricity (the line is <1 km away). The kraal was constructed to EU standard, with an EIA report.

Livestock Marketing Strategy – Auction Kraal Tallimanus (2019, pp80)

The strategy was aimed at promoting livestock off-take using the Tallimanus Auction Facility. The report provided some background. It suggests that for the first five years, the auction facility should focus on the sale of Yearlings (as the land is so degraded, it is too difficult to get the cattle up to standard 'slaughter weight'), during which time MAWF should conduct a feasibility study for a supporting feedlot (although the auction facility catchment is spread over hundreds of square kilometres), and identify a funding mechanism for the auction facility (public or private, with no further detail given). After five years, MAWF should consider the merits of an abattoir.

Analysis

Overall, the Auction Facility desperately needs a 'management model', which should probably be based on a 'cooperative model'⁷⁸. A similar facility under such a model, exists to the south of the Omaheke region in Aminuis. The facility also needs a set of 'guiding principles.' The main reason for building it, was 'improved grassland management of the Otjombinde Community Forest (CF)', by aiding large livestock 'off-take' from the CF, and providing profit for the livestock farmers / community. The auction kraal also needs a 'trustee management board' under MAWF, with the main 12-15 stakeholders represented. These are: MAWF (owner); Omaheke Regional Council; Omaheke Regional DAPEES Office; Omaheke Regional Forestry Office; Omaheke Regional Farmers Union (ORFU); Otjombinde / Tallismanus District Council; Otjombinde Constituency Councillor's Office (OCCO); Otjombinde CF & Conservancy Management Committee (OCFCMC); Otjombinde Traditional Authority (OTA); Otjombinde Farmers Association (OTJOFA); Nguakondja Multipurpose Farmers' Cooperative (NMFC); Tweripura Farmers Welfare Association (TFWA)⁷⁹.

It needs a manager and accountant to be employed. It needs two sub-contracts, one for 'facilities management' and one for 'auctioneering.' It needs a 'state financing plan to attain sustainability within five years.'⁸⁰ It needs a profit-share arrangement, based partly at least on a 'cooperative-model' of maximising benefits for the farmers and community. For this reason, the auction kraal should not be operated solely on a profit-basis, nor controlled by a state or private-owned enterprise. It also needs a signboard to state that 'the Auction Facility was funded by GEF-UNDP Project Nafola and GoN, for the purpose of improved management of Otjombinde CF & Conservancy, and the benefit of the farmers and community'.

Concerning constructing the livestock auction facility, one should note that this was the most contentious issue of the project. This was due to its purpose, cost, and viability⁸¹. The project justification (i.e. the strategy) was only produced in 2019, after the facility was built. The TE found this assessment too little, too late and unclear regarding sustainability. For a GEF investment of at least US\$554,530, this was not optimal. Under Output 2.3 Improved livestock marketing the budget was \$380,000.

Another issue was that the main state buyer of cattle (Meatco Ltd) (and possibly other commercial meat traders) have a purchase policy that penalises the sale of cattle below their 'pre-set slaughter weight'⁸² - i.e. smaller-breed

⁷⁸ One should remember the differing vested interests of two models: Under 'cooperatives', the members get to benefit, whereas under 'unions or associations' (as umbrella groups), it is the shareholders that benefit, with the latter being much closer to the big buyers and marketeers.

⁷⁹ To note, the latter three entities each represent a differing TA

⁸⁰ MAWF agreed to the Nafola investment, and has a capital projects facility that includes Livestock Auction Facilities

⁸¹ Ten-twenty years ago, the GoN tended to construct livestock auctions, and tendered for their private running, however in 2015, the government stopped building these kraals as many were not profitable. Some were taken over by regional farmers unions and some were designated as cooperatives (under MAWF) to manage. Since, then the most beneficial model for land productivity has not been determined.

⁸² They pay a lower rate per kg for such smaller breeds, or younger cattle. Concerning sale, the destination of communal cattle was: 57% for eating; 31% for on-sale; and 12% for gifts (2015, NSA). As over half the cattle sold are direct for slaughter, their price / kg becomes all the more important.

cattle and yearlings. The smaller-breed cattle are more suitable for SLM, especially in the northern Omaheke / Ojombinde area. Also, fortunately the Livestock Sector Transformation Strategy (2019), includes removing penalties against small-frame and C-grade carcasses, and promoting functionally efficient breeds.

4/ Improved fire management reduces area burned and severity of fires (Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa - 200,000 ha)

(Baseline – 15,405 ha burned with 4 CFs suffering severe fires; Target – 30% reduction in area burned, and 2 CFs reduced to mild fire severity)

Result and Analysis

There was little evidence of reduced incidence or severity of fire due to Nafola. Project training in fire control was only conducted once in 2017, for only three CFs. A demonstration fire control plan was only finalised in 2019 for one CF. The national fire management strategy remained in draft as of the end of project. Thus, the overall scale of the intervention appeared limited.

Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa CFs (Output 2.4)

Result

The project developed two outputs, a national strategy and fire control plan for one CF. The project also added to the ability for Namibia to provide early-warning information on fire risk.

National Forest & Veld Fire Management Strategy (2020-24)⁸³, produced 2018 but remained in draft, pp30

- Extends the definition of forest management areas to include the sustainable management of the veld
- Moves away the focus from wild fire suppression towards prevention and integrated fire management
- Identifies planning mechanisms for fire control and provides the National Fire Forum with a legal mandate
- Addresses the issue of creating sustainable incentives for carrying out fire management measures
- Addresses the use of fire as a management tool e.g. to control bush encroachment and fuel load

The project developed a Forest Fire Control Plan for Ehi-Rovipuka CF (Kunene, 2019, pp30). Fire-fighting training was also undertaken in Otjituuo, Ehi-Rovipuka and Uukolonkadhi (October 2018) with 61 participants.

The DoF Remote Sensing Unit has collected fire report data since 2005, and maintains a 'live' fire risk map. Nafola purchased remote-sensed software to access satellite temperature data, so that the quality of the daily fire monitoring bulletin could be upgraded.

Analysis

The fire management strategy was a fair effort, but by the end of the project had not been approved by GoN. The Kunene fire control plan, was produced as a model for other CFs, but very late into the project. Why three other fire control plans were not produced was not clear. The software to support Namibia's early-warning systems was useful.

5/ Reduction in bush encroachment in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde

(Baseline – Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha; Target - Reduction in bush densities by 20% and a 10% reduction in area of 100,000 ha covered by bush for these 5 CFs)

Result and Analysis

Not achieved. The targets were not based on a viable approach, or measure of sustainability. In fact, bush removal within communal lands is largely restricted.

Bush control in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo & Otjku-Tjithilonde (Output 2.5)

The Nafola bush control activity was aimed at private land, and not communal and / or CF land. There was US\$371,000 allocated for this output. The project purchased a brushwood chipping machine. African Wild Dog CFMC rent out this 'bush to fodder' brushwood chipper for use on private land for income generation⁸⁴. However,

⁸³ Previously, there was a Forest & Veld Fire policy which was expected to be approved by Cabinet in 2007

⁸⁴ Low profit so far due to teething problems to fix some parts and get it running effectively. – Took 2 years on a steep learning curve – now doing well – private farmers rent the service (machine + two workers) – at a rate per ha.

the area of bush removed from African Wild Dog CF from 2016-18 was only 10 ha.⁸⁵ The chipper reduces bushwood to chips, which when mixed with further animal feed, can produce a palatable fodder for livestock.

Thus Output 2.5 was poorly understood, and should have been re-titled 'grassland management', with a real focus creating particular grass species regeneration plots – protected from livestock – as a seed source and demonstration. It should have been a grassland pilot demonstration activity managed by DARD⁸⁶.

6/ Increase in utilisation of alternative energy sources and reduction in CF wood consumption for energy in the households in the CFs

(Baseline – Current number of households: fuelwood (89.2%), electricity (7%), Gas (1.3%), Animal dung (0.8%), Paraffin (0.4%), Solar (0.3%); Target – 20% reduction in use of fuelwood, and increase in use of alternative energy sources)

Result

Nafola did not support activities to reduce fuelwood use, however one income-generating activity (IGA) to support brick-making was introduced.⁸⁷ (see later section Output 2.3 – Part B)

Analysis

Very small impact. The target was to reduce fuelwood use from ~90 to 70% use as a source of energy, mainly for cooking. This was an ambitious to say the least, especially without any attempt to follow the prodoc design, which recommended a programme to access and increase the uptake of energy-saving stoves, and the provision of solar panels and cookers. The appropriate directorate or agency or NGO to deliver a stove and solar panel programme was never identified.

Energy saving and alternative energy program implemented (Output 2.6)

Result & Analysis

See next section under IGAs, regarding brick-making.

7/ Increase in income from sustainable use of forest resources in CFs, in line with land use plans

(Baseline – PPG - annual income of N\$ 37,500 per CF (N\$ 487,500 for 13 CFs); Target - 25% increase in incomes)

Result and Analysis

The last reported figures were for the Nafola CFs was ~US\$5,000 p. a. per CF (NAD72,000), which is a doubling of income over six years. The volume of income appears very small, bearing in mind the very large size of some of these CFs, and with expenses to be taken out as well. The sustainability of these income sources was not assessed.

Improved marketing of forest and livestock products (Output 2.3) – Part B – Forest

This output is divided between livestock marketing (Part A) and other (forest) income-generating activities (Part B) – This is Part B

Result

Income-Generating Activities and Forest Product Development

Nafola supported a number of income-generating activities, however they were not clearly, nor concisely reported by the project, hence the detail here is limited:

- Brick-making equipment for three CFs - Uukolonkadhi, Ongandjera and Otshiku-Tshithilonde
- Brushwood chipping machine for one CF - African Wild Dog (see also Output 2.5)
- Workshop, wood-sawing machines and furniture-making equipment for two CFs - Okongo and Oshaampula

⁸⁵ Annual Report 2018 states - Two sites bush encroached covering 30 ha were cleared in 2017, for testing grass spp. composition in April 2019. The TE quotes the report – 'Area thinned through the bush to feed pilot project in African Wild Dog Conservancy & CF' (2019), which states the total area thinned at 9.8 ha.

⁸⁶ Prodoc p43 – 'Bush clearing will be accompanied by grass reseeding, to support the grass seed bank. Perennial grasses have good self-seeding ability and with proper management they can establish and spread quickly to give good cover. The most productive grasses in the semi-arid rangelands are *Cenchrus ciliaris*, *Chloris roxburghiana*, *Entropogon macrostachyus*, *Eragrostis superba*. They are easy to establish, drought-tolerant and perpetuate. One of the limiting factors to reseeding is inadequate supply of seed of high-yielding rangeland species. The project will therefore assist farmers to obtain such seed. It will train farmers, and extension workers to implement seed multiplication. Keen farmers will be encouraged to grow grass seed and/or for sale - this will contribute to improving livelihoods, providing a financial incentive to range rehabilitation.'

⁸⁷ The use of bricks was mentioned in the prodoc.

- 75 bee-hives and ~15 sets of equipment

Analysis

The prodoc design included a PPG Market Assessment of the 13 CFs (2013, pp91) which described the integrated farming systems with livestock, crops and forest resource use. However, the project options for income-generation tended to focus on forest resources – wood, and NTFPs, and not on sustainable management of the CFs, nor how to better manage and profit from livestock farming, which was the mainstay of most CF members.

3.3.3 Training and Awareness

Training

The training record provided by the PMU was incomplete. It recorded 304 participants trained, of which 95 were women, however numbers were missing from some of the events. (see **Annex 5**). The CFMCs received CFMC training on their roles and enhancing awareness post-gazettement. These occurred very late in the project in the last two years in 2018 and 2019. A number of the CFs also received fire control training, again very late into the project in 2018. A gender sensitivity training was held in the last year of the project, with only 12 participants (8 women) covering four days.

No trainings were recording in 2014 and only four training events in 2015-16, two of which concerned CA, one on PRA / socio-economic survey methods, and one at African Wild Dog CF on the use of the 'bush to fodder' chipping machine.

A number of other trainings may have occurred under the first PM, however no further records were provided by the PMU. No trainings were recorded in 2017, which was an indication of the project being dis-jointed at the time, due to the MTR recommendations and the change in UNDP financial control towards a re-imburement method.

Awareness & Knowledge Products

A number of 'knowledge products' are available on the MAWF - DoF - Nafola webpage:⁸⁸ CF Legal declaration – Nafola project – best practices & lessons learned (2018, pp30); Ehi-Rovipuka CF (Kunene) – Fire management plan (2019, pp28); Fire prevention leaflet; Bee-keeping leaflet and booklet (pp8); Forest sector long-term financing (2019, pp32); Otjituuo CF – Resource use & socio-economic profile (2018, pp30); Bush to fodder at African Wild Dog CF (2018, pp22); CF Capacity building & Institutions (2018, pp26); CF Management effectiveness (218, pp18); CA Lessons learned (2018, pp18); Nafola booklet (pp17); Tree species of the year poster⁸⁹

The most important knowledge product, namely the 'CF Toolbox' is missing from this webpage.

3.3.4 Efficiency, Relevance and Ownership

Efficiency was graded as **Unsatisfactory**. Nafola was not efficiently implemented, as it spent its funds on a much reduced number of outputs, that directly concerned forestry only. All other outputs which would have meant working with partners, were left out, apart from some nominal work with DAPEES for a limited period. The only work conducted outside forestry was the construction of a livestock auction facility, for which there was very limited engagement on its purpose, achieving profitability and its management mode. The project remained **relevant** in terms of trying to address land management and NRM issues, with the relevance being brought more sharply into focus due to continued land degradation and climate change (drought patterns over the last nine years). Project ownership by DoF was very low. They struggled to build any capacity in CF or attract increased GoN funds to support the programme during the project or thereafter.

4. SUSTAINABILITY

The overall rating is that sustainability is **Moderately Unlikely**

4.1. Financial Risks to Sustainability

The rating is 'Financial Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely.' Forestry remains significantly underfunded in comparison to other MAWF directorates. The DoF gets ~1% (~US\$14m / year) only of the MAWF budget.⁹⁰ The long-term financing strategy action plan (2019), included using Nafola funds, to prepare a GCF proposal, 'to create

⁸⁸ www.forestry.gov.na/nafola-downloads

⁸⁹ Nafola also supported National Tree Day – E.g. Kunene 500 people attended the function

⁹⁰ Long-term financing mechanism for forest sector (p24, Nafola, MAWF, 2019)

a forest conservation trust fund' and to link it to the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to stop climate change⁹¹. However, DoF lack the skills to prepare detailed proposals or manage such a fund. Nafola began supporting a nation forest inventory, known as a 'forest account', although where this was heading was unclear.

Within DoF, there isn't a dedicated budget to support CF development, only one staff member and limited on-going donor support from KfW (see **Annex 5**). Income from timber permits (which is now indexed) is low. The CFMCs themselves are also in many cases experiencing bans on wood harvesting, as they are dual registered as (biodiversity / wildlife) conservancies under MET.

4.2 Socio-economic Risks to Sustainability

The rating is 'Socio-economic Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely.' At present, the land management within CFs is communal, with everybody having a stake and access, and nobody taking responsibility – hence the degradation and over-grazing⁹².

4.3. Institutional & Governance Risks to Sustainability

The rating is 'Institutional & Governance Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely.' Concerning governance, Nafola's approach was to take the lead from DoF and work with RFOs, local forest offices and directly with CFMCs, including establishing them. DoF was not open to engagement with other agencies (DARD, in particular regarding rangeland management). DoF needs modernising, both in terms of its mandate, and its skill-set. It probably also needs to be realigned with MET, and focus on climate change mitigation.

4.3. Environmental Risks to Sustainability

The rating is 'Environmental Sustainability is Moderately Unlikely.' The MTR cut the CA pilot (Output 2.1), after just one year of support, when (for sustainability) a programme over many years is required to support climate-resilient cropping measures (crop selection and rotation, multi-cropping, short-duration varieties) and soil and water conservation measures (ripper tines to reduce compaction and release soil nutrients, and then tillage using discs to cut up weeds and make the soil suitable for planting). The NDP5 includes a target for half of the farmers to practice at least one CA measure.

One of the impacts of over-grazing, is the invasion in the dry season of poisonous plants. Once, other palatable plants have been eaten, the livestock then eat certain remaining plants, which leads to toxicity problems.

Community Forestry is enshrined in the Forest Act and in the CF regulations. Added to this, the CFs have their own regulations on resource use. However, the CFMCs remain weak, and without regional bylaws on wood extraction and charcoal production being present and / or enforced, illegal extraction continues. What has changed is the awareness of CF regulations, which means that illegal activities now tend to be conducted at night.

5. IMPACT & CATALYTIC EFFECT

5.1. Impact

The overall rating for impact is **Negligible**. SLM remains very weak.

Reduction in stress on ecological systems

The evidence is that land within CF boundaries continues to be degraded by people⁹³. The damage is mainly over-grazing by the residents of the CFs, although in some cases there is also illegal activity, as well as TA headmen providing unlicensed 'permission' for wood extraction, settlement, and grazing by outsiders. Once the open savanna-woodland is degraded, there are two very significant impacts, namely: palatable grasses are replaced with ones much less so, and the requirements to restore to the original grass species mix are difficult and can take many years; and bush encroachment replaces the lost grazing land, leading to it being even more expensive and difficult to restore to grassland with palatable species (and useful open woodland trees).

⁹¹ Since 2012, MET has been in the process of establishing a community conservation fund (under CBNRM), to receive endowment and donor funds, and provides grants

⁹² Read: Tragedy of the Commons by Hardin, G. (1968) - <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/sci/162/3859/1243.full.pdf>

⁹³ Evidence – field observation, interviews in field, and project and other reports

Regulatory & policy changes at national and local levels

There were five main policy and regulatory changes that occurred during the project, or its formulation:

- MAWF strategic plan (2018-22) includes actions such as: CA measures (minimum tillage, crop rotation or organic soil cover) adopted by 43% of 30,000 farmers; farmers trained in crops, livestock, and rangeland management (with US\$58m as operational budget); and cooperatives supported
- MAWF livestock sector strategy for the NCAs (2019): Actions: to remove penalties against small-frame cattle carcasses; promote accredited rangeland management; and promote functionally efficient breeds⁹⁴
- Agriculture policy (2015) – Implement the national rangeland management policy & strategy; strengthen the capacity for rangeland / pasture science research and rangeland monitoring; and increase the number of famers that benefit from quality breeding materials originating from breeding stations
- Omaheke land use plan (2017-27) – Published in 2017 by MLR, it provides a blueprint for SLM in the communal areas of Omaheke where four of the newly gazetted CFs are located. It states ‘stop trying to locate livestock to water-deficient areas’
- The CF regulations (2005), don't appear to have been updated, however the CF Toolbox (originally produced with German funds), was slightly revised under Nafola. (see also section 2.1 – Development Context)

5.2. Catalytic Effect

Theory of Change

‘Theory of change’ (ToC) was not described as such within the prodoc, thus the TE has re-constructed one with a pathway discussion from basic problem through to intervention and on to outcome and then impact⁹⁵. The comparison then is ‘has or hasn't the project / national partner achieved this desired change?’⁹⁶ ToC should also consider ‘change in behaviours’. As is more common, the prodoc does describe threats, root causes, and solutions to barriers. It also describes risks and assumptions, as well as having a logframe with its inherent logic flow from output to outcome to achieving its overall objective.

Parameter	Pathway
Concept	To stabilise the management of ecosystem goods and services in 13 Community Forests (CFs) (2.8m ha of land) and to further support SLM (0.5m ha of land). By legally gazettement these CFs, to facilitate improved agriculture, livestock and forestry management
Root causes & threats	Land degradation from over-grazing of large livestock and expanding subsistence agriculture. Over-exploitation of forest resources due to poverty. Cultural norms in keeping cattle for times of hardship. Drought, changing weather patterns
Solution (Input to Output)	Off-take of cattle. Improved communal rangeland management (through the CFs being established). Conservation Agriculture
Outcome required	New institutional mechanisms (i.e. CF Management Committees with CF Constitutions), with management tools (CF Management Plans). Increased capacity in government, political willpower, and change in behaviours
Result	Institutional and legal system in place, but technical (and financial) capacity of government to support agriculture, livestock and forest management is very low. Behaviours not sufficiently changed in favour of sustainable grassland (rangeland) management, as being paramount to reversing the accelerating land degradation.
Impact	The establishment of new CFs in the northern communal areas is the first step, with future projects now needed to improve cross-sectoral natural resource management, with the primary focus on local grassland condition monitoring with livestock zonal grazing control. A secondary focus would be on climate-smart agriculture.

Scaling-up and Replication

Nafola supported CFMCs to prepare proposals for funding, not just from Nafola, but to also learn to access the wider donor-funded sector. This was facilitated by CF gazettement, under which the CFs / CFMCs became legal

⁹⁴ Meaning for example the indigenous small-frame Caprivi-Sanga cattle breed, as it is more suitable to the dryland savanna

⁹⁵ Guidelines for GEF Agencies in conducting Terminal Evaluations for Full-sized Projects (2017) require a Theory of Change discussion

⁹⁶ Theory of Change is a similar development tool to ‘Logical Framework Analysis’ where underlying problems (root causes and threats) and solutions (change in behaviours) are directly responded to through the logical framework itself – i.e. the implementation of the project design, to ultimately achieve the goal and development objective, which in turn should lead to the desired impact.

entities (with an entity bank account), and thus were able to apply for and receive funds. This was successful in two instances: Oshaampula CF were awarded funds from the Environmental Investment Fund (GCF); and African Wild Dog CF were awarded funds from the Regional Universities Agriculture Forum Fund.

Demonstration

As a demonstration for facilitating CF gazettement in communal areas, Nafola was successful. The CF gazettement process involves a number of key stages: consultation, boundary agreement, CFMC and constitution establishment, and a 5-year CFMP (with forest inventory and AAC approved).

Production of new technologies / approaches

As part of indirect support to Nafola, the NGO - Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation (IRDNC) have been working with CFs in Kunene. The IGA involves the production of aromatic citral oils (for cosmetics) from Mopane and *Commiphora Wildii* tree species. IRDNC has developed this support to five conservancies (and CFs), through a 'trust fund share agreement'.

6. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

Nafola was designed as a technically-minded cross-sector project. It required extensive collaboration outside the sphere and skills of DoF. This was the case for seven out of the 11 outputs and in particular: MLR – land use plans for 3 CFs (Output 1.2); DAPEES – dryland conservation agriculture (Output 2.1); DARD - livestock management, debushing with pasture restoration, and rangeland monitoring (Outputs 2.2, 2.5 and 2.7); Directorate of Planning & Business Development (DPBD) – livestock auction facility operational model (Output 2.3); and an NGO to deliver an energy-saving woodstove programme (Output 2.6). This didn't happen. Much more should have been done to delegate responsibilities and activities to DAPEES and DARD in particular.

The MTR was responsible for reducing the 13 CF Liaison Officers down to seven. It was not appreciated by the MTR and UNDP, that these 'staff' would otherwise have needed to be hired as consultants. By the end of the project, their number was reduced to just three. The 13 hired officers had a range of experience from recent graduate upwards, with most learning an extended range of new skills on-the-job from CF boundary consultation and CF forest inventory, through to CFMP preparation and CF constitution establishment. Their value to the project was high, even if their 'contractual' positioning was argued about by UNDP.

There is an opportunity for climate-smart approaches to be demonstrated at the local level (as well at the landscape level), under a new UNDP project 'Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods & Environmental Governance.'

Forestry

The CF process has been effectively demonstrated, thus future CFs could be developed in a much shorter time period, subject to improvements in DoF capacity, and funds for the field requirements being available. As a result of Nafola, there are now 10-15 more CFs, in need of capacity-building in SLM / SFM, and in need of institutional stability and support. The physical work (consultation, constitution, CFMC, inventory, CFMP) took about two years once the project got going, but it then took another two years of administrative work in Windhoek (with DoF, MAWF and MLR involved.) It would be useful for Nafola to document how the establishment of a CF entity could be streamlined. Nine CFs were gazetted with constitutions, CFMCs and CFMPs created. Individual CF rules and regulations were harmonised with CFMC – conservancy management committees becoming single entities, but maintaining separate accounting. The project planned to build two CF offices for Otjituuo-West and Oshaampula CFs, but these remain under construction at the time of the TE in December 2019. Again, the timing appeared very late⁹⁷. The CF laptops had only been delivered to one CFMC, but they also require mobile wifi dongle connections for internet connectivity.

The capacity of, and funding to DoF is very low. DoF ability to absorb the maintenance costs and effectively use the six project vehicles post-Nafola is considered inadequate. Training support is needed, especially in how to work across sectors with DAPEES, DARD and the Land Reform office. Regional and District Forest Offices also lack capacity and resources. District forest offices (DFOs) are often without electricity, with lines cut due to non-

⁹⁷ The first procurement of contractors under a GoN tender, failed with issues on the 'bill of quantities and on lack of supervision contracts, so it was started again under UNDP in June 2019.

payment of bills. They also lack access to the internet on computers as they are without mobile wifi dongles. Decision-making is not devolved from central to regional level. Forestry not really involved in Regional Council decision-making. Forest technician grade are sometimes the highest level to run their offices. They usually only have one vehicle running.

The CFMCs vary in strength / experience, from being highly organised in Uukolonkadhi CF to 'just starting out' in Otjombinde CF. Many of the CFMCs are being undermined by the slow national response to illegal settlement. The CFMCs have the ability to generate income, which over these mostly very large CF estates, should have a high potential, not least because many of them are also wildlife conservancies⁹⁸. The project was expected to support the CFs in implementation of their CFMPs and other CF capacity-building actions, however it only got to the stage of supporting CF designation and planning, but not implementation. The handover of the project vehicles to six of the CFMCs would go some way to supporting this next crucial development stage.

Livestock

As mentioned in detail⁹⁹, the operational model for Tallimanus Livestock Auction Facility needs to be 'cooperative'. It needs direct support from the Directorate of Planning & Business Development (MAWF) to establish: a legal set-up, a 'Board of Trustees', a set of Guiding Principles', separate facilities management and auctioneering contracts; a facilities manager and an accountant; and a 5-year funding stream from MAWF. What it doesn't need is to be tendered into the private sector, nor be given to a party with vested interests, such as the regional farmers union.

Agriculture

Regarding CA, the DoF lacked interest, or the will to delegate and share project funds. UNDP were weak in directing DoF to implement the project according to its design and cross-sector needs. CA and dryland agriculture is still a new government programme. The project began CA in 2016, but stopped in 2017 due to the MTR. For whatever reason, the rationale in the MTR was weak, especially concerning closing down the CA aspects of the project.

6.2. Lessons Learned

Forestry

The DoF lack capacity (skills and funds) to train the CFMCs in implementing their CFMPs. The issue will arise, in four years' time in 2023, when a new forest inventory is required ahead a new CFMP, which need to be updated every five years. At present the link between AAC, permits to harvest and the sustainability of CFMPs is tenuous and unproven. Again, an extensive monitoring and research exercise will be required in 4-5 years' time to assess this. The 5-Year CFMPs include Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) figures for timber and poles. However, for these open woodland - savanna ecosystems, which at present are heavily degraded and continue to be so, having an AAC system may not be the most appropriate to begin with. The reasons are that AAC is very theoretical, and based on a positive forest productivity, but in this case, they are being degraded, so the productivity would be questionable. Also, the AACs are effectively given to the CFMCs to manage, but they lack the skills or experience to do so.

Another issue is that Traditional Authority headmen continue to 'allocate' land inside CF boundaries. Lastly, there is no grazing control within the CFs, and the land continues to be degraded – soil erosion with top soil being lost from livestock damage and wind, is resulting in a downward cycle towards unpalatable grass species and unwanted bush thicket takeover. CFMCs have a very weak knowledge of CFMPs, and the CFMPs themselves are extremely weak on zoning, any grazing control¹⁰⁰ or rangeland management for example.

Customary Land Right Certificate (LRC) can only be issued for an individual (private, business or land lease) and not on a 'group entity' basis. Thus, the CFMCs can't apply for a LRC for their CF land, despite their legal gazettement (by MAWF and MET) as CFs and / or conservancies. So, whilst CFs are gazetted, and then mapped by the Land Reform office, no LRC is issued, so any individual with a LRC within a CF, holds the higher title. The CF maps vary from showing the boundary only, to latest by the MLR such as for Okongo CF (October 2019), which shows: the conservancy and CF boundaries; LRC land inside the boundaries; and mapped plots without LRC issued yet. Such new maps are a very useful tool to assess status and report against any new land conversion /

⁹⁸ In most cases now the CFs and conservancies are dual gazetted (covering the same areas) with amalgamated management committees, usually known as 'community forest & conservancy management committees'

⁹⁹ Section 3.3.2 Effectiveness – Achievement of Outcomes 1-2 – Output 2.3 – Marketing of Livestock

¹⁰⁰ Whilst engaging with the CFMCs, the TE recommended in many cases that they set up CFMC forest management sub-committees to identify actions

settlement.

Livestock

The CFs encompass farming, and 'free-ranging' livestock, however the laws for communal lands prohibit fencing except for individuals with an LRC. This means block zoning and managing stock rotation, becomes difficult. Whether it can be achieved if presented in a CFMP for a gazetted CF, appears unknown. However, there needs to be a much better awareness (by livestock farmers) regarding the maintenance of grassland, and reduced stocking rates. The Tallismanus Auction Facility in the Otjombinde CF area could have a significant impact to support this, if managed with the CF in mind, and if specifically supported under Livestock Sector Transformation Strategy (2019) and the MAWF Strategic Plan (2018-22). Both of these strategies include (accredited) rangeland management and removing penalties for small-frame cattle. Added to this, there is possible technical support from the nearby Sandveld Research Station which has been researching a 'fodder bank grazing system' since 2004 with indigenous (small-frame) Caprivi-Sanga cattle¹⁰¹. Indeed, it was difficult to understand why Nafola did not work with DARD and Sandveld and at least have bought some demonstration Caprivi-Sanga cattle, which are much better suited to dryland conditions, than the larger Brahman breed. In Omaheke, the old private farm blocks could be areas for demonstrating rotational grazing (of smaller better-suited breeds.)

Agriculture

The CA physical methods (of soil and water conservation) were to use ripper tines to reduce compaction and release soil nutrients, as well as create planting lines. Then to disc cultivate. This is much better than traditional ploughing of the soil, but to note, the rippers should not be used every year, otherwise they will eventually damage the soil structure.

CA needs to have a stronger package for climate resilience. This could include: crop diversification (sorghum / millet), crop rotation, short-duration varieties; multi-and inter-cropping (e.g. green gram.)¹⁰² At present seed is late, and not always suited – this is where DAPEES need much more national level support - on getting climate-resilient crop varieties to the farmers. In the project area, farming systems are integrated (livestock - crop – forest), thus climate-smart approaches are needed, not just forest management in isolation.

Gender

The project should have been more proactive with respect to gender. The prodoc was vague concerning benefits to women. It didn't stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the CFMCs. Whilst a 50 / 50 gender balance was stipulated in the CF Toolbox, the TE figures indicated that an equal balance had not been achieved. A gender sensitivity training was only held in the project's last year and with only 12 participants (8 women), which was too little too late.

6.3. Recommendations

The recommendations are listed with the responsible party identified in brackets.

1. Directorate of Planning & Business Development (under MAWF) to establish a 'cooperative' management model for Tallismanus Livestock Auction Facility with: a legal set-up, a 'Board of Trustees'¹⁰³, a set of Guiding Principles', two contracts prepared for 'facilities management' and for 'auctioneering'; a facilities manager and an accountant; and to access funding from MAWF for five years. [MAWF / UNDP]
2. The three tractors were designated for: Otjombinde and Epukiro CFs, and managed by DAPEES Gobabis office in Omaheke; and Okango CF, and managed by DAPEES Eenhana office in Ohangwena. To ensure implementation of CA, these offices need to prioritize seed for climate-smart farmers (sorghum / millet with cow pea / green gram) together with their CA tractor services. [DAPEES in Gobabis and Eenhana]
3. The six Nafola vehicles should be distributed to six of the nine gazetted CFMCs. The 13 quad bikes should

¹⁰¹ The station is managed by DARD, sub-division Pasture Science (see also Agricola, 2013, #23, ISSN 1015-2334, p25-32). The fodder bank system makes provision for a 1/3 of the farm that is grazed during a growing season, then receives a 16-month rest. This allows the palatable grass seed bank to regenerate, grow and be pollinated. The main findings based on research 2004-12, were that grass fodder production is not strongly correlated with rainfall, and that there is an improvement of fodder production under this system.

¹⁰² new cash cow in Kenya's drylands! - www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-01/06/c_136876675.htm

¹⁰³ MAWF (owner); Omaheke Regional Council; Omaheke Regional DAPEES Office; Omaheke Regional Forestry Office; Omaheke Regional Farmers Union (ORFU); Otjombinde / Tallismanus District Council; Otjombinde Constituency Councillor's Office (OCCO); Otjombinde CF & Conservancy Management Committee (CFCMC); Otjombinde Traditional Authority (OTA); Otjombinde Farmers Association (OTJOFA); Nguakondja Multipurpose Farmers Cooperative (NMFC); Tweripura Farmers Welfare Association (TFWA)

be auctioned and the proceeds divided between these six CFMCs, who are provided with a project vehicle, for their maintenance costs [MAWF / UNDP]

4. Laptops (with wifi dongles) procured for the CFs need to be delivered [UNDP to verify]
5. Nafola to handover all CF project files to DoF CF representative [Nafola / DoF]

7. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Delivery of Project Objective and Outcomes against Performance Indicators

Assessment Key:

Green: Completed / Achieved

Yellow: On target to be completed / achieved

Red: Not on target to be completed / achieved

Extracted from project document (IP indicate if there have been approved changes)			IP to fill out this column with detail text on achievement	TE team	TE team fills out
Indicator	Baseline	Project target	2019 End term Level & Assessment	Rating	Justification for Rating
Objective: Reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the policy and capacity environment for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry in the community forest areas					
Increased area of gazetted community forests within the CF hotspots in northern Namibia with legal management structures	3 out of 13 CFs gazetted. Some identified/ established communal forests but without any systematic management regime or formalised authority.	10 CFs successfully gazetted and under a systematic and integrated land-use management framework	9 out of 10 CFs have been officially registered in Government Gazette successfully.	MS	The project was successful in achieving gazettement of nine CFs. The most important result of gazettement, was the establishment of the CFMCs with CF constitutions and 5-Year CFMPs.
Increase in area under effective land use management with vegetative cover maintained or increased as measured by % area being managed under approved land use plans; % change in woody cover for degraded areas, reduction in plant density in bush encroached areas and increase in desirable grass species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 162,815ha out of 2,840,153ha (5.7%) being managed in line with approved land use plans; X hectares woody cover average 30%; Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha, decreaser grasses dominate over 100,000 ha of rangelands (all 3 will be fine-tuned for each community forest as part of participatory monitoring) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2,840,153ha under approved land use plans; 500,000ha with woody cover in process of regeneration at an average >50%; Reduction in bush densities by 20% and reduction in area covered by bush 10% Desirable perennial grasses 	<p>13 out of 15 CFs have updated land use plans (Integrated Forest Management Plans). 14 CFs covering an area of 4,383,644 ha.</p> <p>Three bush encroached sites have been thinned between 2016 and 2018, with a total area 12 ha cleared. Bush based animal fodder is very crucial for Namibia in time of drought and fodder shortage. The NAFOLA Project in partnership with GIZ conducted bush based feeding trails in three different areas, including the African Wild Dog (NAFOLA hotspot.). The trials have proven that there is huge potential for bush based animal feed for farmers in Namibia. Some improvements in livestock conditions were observed from the trails. Results from the feeding trials inspired NAFOLA and GIZ to develop a manual which outlines the huge potential for bush based animal fodder value chain in Namibia, for both commercial and communal based organizations. Fodder value chain in Namibia can be a successful measure to combat bush encroachment and consequently improve rangeland in Namibia. The research trials have also motivated other communal and commercial land users to consider replicating the value chain from encroacher bushes mechanism. The NAFOLA project continues to render technical support African Wild Dog community in the production of bush based animal fodder.</p>	U	<p>For indicator (a), Nafola was successful in achieving gazettement of 4.08 million ha of land as CF. The first steps towards SLM / SFM were achieved through creating CFs, and importantly institutional structures for them, namely the CFMCs. The CFMCs were provided with the tools to begin SLM / SFM, in terms of creating for the CF, a constitution, and a management plan. The project ended at this point.</p> <p>For indicator (b), its meaning and purpose were poorly presented. In science, 'woody cover' means 'trees and shrubs', however, the</p>

		dominant in 50% of degraded rangelands	<p>Grass species present on thinned area are <i>Aristida rhinochloa</i> (Low grazing value and occurs in deteriorated veld), <i>Aristida stipitata</i> subsp. <i>stipitata</i> (Low grazing value and occurs in deteriorated veld), <i>Aristida stipitata</i> subsp. <i>spicata</i> (Low grazing value and occurs in deteriorated veld), <i>Stipograsis uniplumis</i> (Average grazing value and veld in transition phase), <i>Eragrostis nindensis</i> (Average grazing value and veld in transition phase) and <i>Eragrostis scopelophila</i> (Endemic species, Average grazing value and veld in transition phase).</p> <p>No conclusive remarks can be made at this point in time on the status of rangelands in terms of grass species composition and rangeland health status due to short period under which the research was conducted.</p>		<p>prodoc designer surely meant 'tree cover' being increased (regenerating) from 30 to 50% cover over an area of 0.5 m ha. This is because the escalating problems in communal CF areas, is one where tree cover is declining, open grazing area (and its quality) is declining and dense ticket is taking over.</p> <p>For indicator (c), it is assumed that it is the same area as covered by the unpalatable (grass) species, i.e. 100,000 ha, thus the target was to remove 10,000 ha. The project managed 10 ha.</p> <p>For indicator (d) concerning the restoration of 50,000 ha of pasture to palatable grass species, the corresponding Output was not clear. It could have been Output 2.2 – using pasture monitoring to reduce over-grazing; Output 2.5 bush control which then needs pasture re-seeding; or Output 2.7 – rangeland monitoring. What is clear, is that this action was not started or achieved in any way.</p>
Outcome 1: Land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of 11 community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies					
Increase in compliance with land use plans as measured by % of area complying with approved uses	Only 5.7% of area under land use plans and compliance with land use plans currently <40 %	10 comprehensive land use plans developed and compliance in all > 60%	<p>10 comprehensive land use plans developed and being implemented in all 10 CFs. CFs' compliance to IFMPs is at 52%, based on CFs Management Effectiveness Assessment (MEA) done for four gazetted CFs.</p> <p>The NAFOLA project has conducted several Capacity Building and Institutional Development training in newly gazetted Community Forests. Institutional capacity building initiatives were aimed at enhancing change in</p>	MS	This is a repeat indicator. See objective level indicators which state that nine CFs were gazetted with approved management plans covering an area of over 4m ha.

			<p>individual behaviours and ultimately to the more efficient and effective operation of institutions and organisations within CFs in the long run.</p> <p>The institutional capacity building training for CFs comprised two parts:</p> <p>a) Forest Management Body training, which covered the roles and responsibilities of each member of the FMB, financial management, forest law enforcement & the forest permit system; and</p> <p>b) Fire management training, which covered regional fire regimes, causes of wildfires, fire suppression tactics, types of firefighting equipment, fire prevention measures, the establishment and structures of firefighting units, and the use of fire as a forest management tool in fire-prone areas.</p>		<p>Note, Nafola referred to their forest inventory reports as 'integrated forest management plans' in order to fit with the project indicator requiring updated 'land use plans'.</p>
<p>Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and regional programs of sectors such as agriculture, water, local development, environment and tourism.</p>	<p>No regional and national level production sector frameworks incorporating forestry issues</p>	<p>2 (Agriculture and energy sectors) incorporate forestry considerations</p>	<p>2 - end of project target fully achieved already as reported in 2017 .</p> <p>Two sector considers forestry issues. The National Agricultural Policy of 2015), Updated Energy Policy of 2017. Forest issues mainstreamed in Regional Land Use Plans for Okavango East, Omaheke and Otjozondjupa Region. It is understood that sound land use planning processes are one key element to attaining sustainable land management. Empowering local natural resource users to take informed land and resource management decisions, track and monitor their resources and lay the foundation for adaptive management is understood to be key to livelihood security and development in Namibia's rural areas.</p> <p>Forest sector issues are also mainstreamed into National Development Plan 5, under environmental sustainability, programme 1 SLM with two projects one to conserve land through conservation agriculture, debushing, and restoration of degraded lands and habitats, the other on strengthening governance mechanisms over natural resources on CBNRM mechanism and benefits accruing thereafter.</p>	<p>U</p>	<p>Forestry was mainstreamed in two regional land use plans for Omaheke and Otjozondjupa. The MLR produced these two plans, without Nafola support.</p> <p>For the Omaheke LUP (2017-27), which was a highly detailed piece of planning work, Nafola, should have accessed it and based some of its interventions on its recommendations.</p> <p>However the output attached to this indicator was for 3 CFs to undergo improved integrated planning (with rangeland management, grazing control etc) – this did not happen</p>
<p>Number of national, local and regional dialogue forums actively supporting implementation of policy recommendations of the CPP in local SFM and SLM processes</p>	<p>1 (Ministerial Forum)</p>	<p>2 (One at Local and one at National level)</p>	<p>2 - end of project target is achieved already as reported in 2017.</p> <p>Constituency Development Committees in all 7 regions under which the project is falling are operating. This inter-local governance structures discuss forest matters that overlap with wildlife management and small scale farming</p>	<p>HU</p>	<p>This remained true. The most disappointing aspect, was DoF's failure to work with another MAWF Directorate, namely DARD, even though, their offices were in the same building. The support towards the Omaheke CA Forum was limited and weak.</p>

<p>Change in capacity score cards of technical staff of ministries, CF management committees/ Boards and community members</p>	<p>Technical institutions scored an average of 64.9; CF institutions an average of 30.9; community members capacity assessment during inception</p>	<p>Capacity score card increases to average of 80% for technical institutions, >50% for CF institutions and community members</p>	<p>Technical Institutions: Capacity score for (MAWF/DoF) is at 76%, based on Capacity Scorecard Assessment conducted for DoF on 24 June 2019,. This shows that there have been improvements in the capacities at individual and organizational level. With improved capacities, individuals, organizations, institutions and societies have developed abilities to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve common development goals. This include improvement in capacities for engagement with stakeholders; capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge, capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development; Capacities for management and implementation; Capacities to monitor and evaluate</p> <p>Although this is 4% lower than the intended end of project target; this reflects a 6.21% increase from the Capacity Score assessment conducted in 2016 (70.21%), and about an 11% increase from the baseline (64.9%).</p> <p><u>CF Institutions:</u> Capacity scorecard for CF institutions currently stands at 51%, based on Capacity scorecard assessment done for 9 CFs in May 2019. Local communities require access and exposure to different issues/factors if they are to implement effective and sustainable forest management. Essential aspects of community development related to CFs include: technical, managerial and organizational skills, such as the capacity to formulate, implement and evaluate policies; research and development for SFM; forest-related education as a means of raising awareness, networking, and communication and information exchange are all essential part of capacity development for local communities</p> <p>This is an increase of 20% from the baseline. (End of project target achieved), While the project attained the end target, communities have experienced challenges such as droughts during the period of the project implementation which impacts on the abilities to uptake the required forest technical management).</p>	<p>MU</p>	<p>The prodoc mentions 'capacity scorecards' which refers to the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, which is undertaken to assess institutional development prior to project and at project end. The results indicate an improvement on the baseline. However, the TE evidence of improved capacity at DoF level was scant.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots</p>					
<p>Increase in agricultural productivity of main crops (pearl millet and sorghum) in Omusati, Otjozondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena and Omaheke</p>	<p>Current production of 200-600kg/ha</p>	<p>Production increase to 400-800kg/ha</p>	<p>The MTR recommended that the project should cease supporting Conservation Agriculture (CA) activities. MTR strongly recommended that CA support in Omaheke by NAFOLA be realigned due to several reasons as stated in the report, including CA activities in Omaheke not being in line with the Strategic Environmental Assessment done for the Omaheke Land Use Plan and since the application or replication of CA has been done in other parts providing already valuable lessons for expansion.</p>	<p>HU</p>	<p>The TE was unable to obtain figures to verify any changes in crop productivity, the type of crop planted, or the hectareage covered by these three tractors. Whereas, the management of the tractors and services to support CA was operating (by DAPEES) very well in the three</p>

Terminal Evaluation Report - Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola)

regions covering 300,000ha			After tabling this at the PSC meeting held 07 December 2017, this indicator and associated targets were discontinued.		project CFs. If one considers that there are only three (DAPEES) tractors for smallholders for the whole Omaheke region, with two bought by Nafola, then one can envisage the large impact
Increased health, quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa regions covering 150,000ha	70% of cattle at Grade C, 60% with fatness grade 0 and 1 and 70% oxen	20% of cattle upgrade to Grade B, fatness Grade 2 or 3 and decrease in oxen and increase in # of heifers	N/A. This indicator was recommended to be discontinued after the revision of the monitoring and evaluation framework based on the recommendation of the Mid-Term Report in 2017	U	The target was to improve the stock value of smallholder cattle herds, by selling off the older cattle, and keeping the 'Yearlings' as future breeding and meat stock. This would also allow the latter to have a better chance to reach a higher fat grade at sale. Neither DAPEES, DARD nor DVS were engaged in any way to support this intervention.
Increased off-take of livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa	Current livestock off-take at 5-8%.	Off-take increased to 20%.	Per recommendations of the MTR, this indicator was amended to read as: "% change of offtake in livestock in Omaheke region." An assessment done between October 2018 - March 2019 by the NAFOLA Project has established that the current livestock offtake based on data for 2018 is at 14.06%. The study further established that generally, livestock offtake in communal areas occurs more through consumption than it does through sales. According to Namibia Statistic Agency (2015), the distribution of livestock offtake rates in communal areas of Namibia was 57% through consumption, 30.7 % through sales and 12.1% through give away/gifts. This finding could partly explain the low livestock offtake rate (through sales) that has been observed in Otjombinde during the field survey. Furthermore, the project made an investment in the construction of a marketing facility in Tallismanus, as a means to increase livestock off-take. Over-stocking is the biggest threat to sustainable land management in the Omaheke region (where Tallismanus is situated). It is expected that through the marketing facility livestock off-take will be increased from 10% to 20%.	U	This is quite a change from the project baseline at 5-8% off-take. Fourteen percent (14%) also appears high in comparison to an average of 9.5% for NCAs. However, the TE would suggest that off-take rates still need to significantly increase, if sustainable grazing is to be attained, particularly in the face of variable rains with prolonged drought period over a number of years in the region (as a result of climate change).
Increased utilisation of fire management practices reduces total areas burned	15,405.3ha burned with 4 CFs suffering severe fires	Reduction in area burned by at least 30% and at least	Per MTR, this indicator was revised to read: The indicator was revised during the updating of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework for NAFOLA Project conducted by an external consultant. Number of Fire mgt practices and decisions made in targeted CFs; Baseline: 0	MS	Project training in fire control was only conducted once in 2017 for only three CFs. A demonstration fire control plan

<p>and severity of fires in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa regions (200,000ha)</p>		<p>2CFs reduced to mild fire severity</p>	<p>End of Project Target: 4 - Trainings on fire fighting in Otjituuo, Ehrovipuka and Uukolonkadhi was undertaken in October 2018 with a total of 61 people trained in the three selected CFs, Pre-training assessments and post-training evaluation results showed that there were significant improvements in the understanding and detailed knowledge on fire management related issues and increased confidence among community members to actively participate in fire management. Fire management plan for Ehrovipuka CF has been developed as a model for other CFs. The National Forest and Veld Fire Management Policy and Strategy document has been finalised and submitted to MAWF for endorsement</p>		<p>was only finalised in 2019 for one CF. The national fire management strategy remained in draft as of the end of project. Thus, the overall scale of the intervention appeared limited.</p>
<p>Reduction in bush encroachment in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde</p>	<p>Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha. Baseline surveys to determine area covered by bush conducted at Inception</p>	<p>Reduction in bush densities by 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by 10%</p>	<p>Per MTR this indicator was revised to two: The indicator was revised during the updating of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework for NAFOLA project conducted by an external consultant. 1. Ha of land cleared and thinned in African Wild Dog CF Baseline (2017): 12ha cleared and thinned. Project end of Target (2018): 12 ha cleared and thinned. Target achieved in the previous reporting period. 2. Financial returns (income) from sales of animal feeds from harvested encroacher bush Baseline (2018): TBD / End of Project Target (2019): 20% increase from baseline - The financial returns increased up to 72% in comparisons to the previous reporting period. Target Achieved.</p>	<p>HU</p>	<p>The targets were not based on a viable approach, or measure of sustainability.</p>
<p>Increase in utilisation of alternative energy sources and reduction in CF wood consumption for energy in the households in the CFs</p>	<p>Current number of households: wood fuel (89.2%), electricity (7%), Gas (1.3%), Animal dung (0.8%), Paraffin (0.4%), Solar (0.3%)</p>	<p>Reduction in use of wood fuel by 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources</p>	<p>The report on alternative energy sources for Otshikutshithilonde CF has been completed and approved in November 2018. The number of household adopting new construction materials (clay bricks) as opposed to woody materials based on the assessment undertaken by the project were 85 in Otshikutshithilonde CF of which 48% (n=41) were using corrugated iron sheets, 27% (n=23) using bricks, 13% (n=11) using Millet stalks and others (treated poles, palm leaves, mesh wire) were at 12% (n=10). This data is based on a study done in September 2018. The NAFOLA Project supported several community brick making projects as a mechanism to reduce the reliance of local communities on woody materials for construction. Therefore, the Project saw the need to conduct an assessment to assess the level of wood consumption and the use of bricks,</p>	<p>HU</p>	<p>No reduction in fuelwood use Or alternative energy creation</p>

Terminal Evaluation Report - Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola)

			and determine the impacts of the brick making projects on reducing wood consumption by local communities. Baseline: 0 End of Project Target: 10 households.		
Increase in financial returns from sustainable economic exploitation of forest resources in all hotspots, in line with land use plans	Data is incomplete but PPG assessment reported an annual total of N\$ 487,500 (average of N\$ 37,500 for 13 CFs)	Increased ability to capture data on incomes per CF; at least 25% increase in total incomes earned	<p>During this reporting period the 14 CF (one CF was split into 3) CFs recorded a decrease of -53% (NAD N\$ 1,007,036.20 in comparison to the previous reporting period that recorded N\$ 2,130,021.31 for the (Annual DoF administrative data -CF annual income reports). These dataset is captured to document the revenue generated by CFs at a certain period.</p> <p>In comparison to data from PPG assessment there is an increment of 107% in financial returns from the sustainable economic exploitation of forest resource. (At PPG Assessment N\$ 487,500.00 while at 2019 N\$ 1,007.036.20). The gazettement of CFs allows communities to generate income from forest resources while at the same time advancing the sustainable management of their forests.</p> <p>Target is achieved and the project has supported the CFs with technical capacity to manage their forest resources at the same time providing incentives to generate income. This has been done through the provisioning of infrastructure and equipment</p>	MS	The last reported figures were for the Nafola CF was ~US\$5,000 p. a. per CF (NAD72,000), which is a doubling of income over six years.

Annex 2: Delivery of Outputs

Comment here may be limited to stating 'on target', 'partially on target' or 'not on target'. Details are reported under section 3 'Findings'

Outputs	Achievements Reported by IP	TE Comment
Project Objective:		
Outcome 1:		
1.1 Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs	9 out of 11 CFs have been officially registered in Government Gazette successfully. The total area of land brought under gazette through these 9 CFs is 4,383,644 ha	Achieved
1.2 Three CFs supported to formulate & implement integrated forest resources management plans:	Eleven localized integrated forest management plans have under implementation. Dossier for the remaining one (1) CF (Onkumbula) is finalized and submitted for legal review at Attorney General's Office.	The aim was put 3 CFs under improved SLM, agriculture, livestock and forestry actions covering 500,000 ha
1.3 Strengthening Organisational Capacity for effective Community Forest Management	<p>The NAFOLA project has conducted several Capacity Building and Institutional Development training in newly gazetted Community Forests. Institutional capacity building initiatives were aimed at enhancing change in individual behaviours and ultimately to the more efficient and effective operation of institutions and organisations within Community Forests (CFs) in the long run.</p> <p>The institutional capacity building training for CFs comprised two parts:</p> <p>a) Forest Management Body training, which covered the roles and responsibilities of each member of the Forest Management Body (FMB), financial management, forest law enforcement and the forest permit system; and</p> <p>b) Fire management training, which covered regional fire regimes, causes of wildfires, fire suppression tactics, types of firefighting equipment, fire prevention measures, the establishment and structures of firefighting units, and the use of fire as a forest management tool in fire-prone areas.</p> <p>Report on management effectiveness of CFs developed and available; CFs' compliance to IFMPs is at 52 %, based on CFs Management Effectiveness Assessment (MEA) done for four gazetted CFs.</p> <p>The commission of the construction of offices for two community forest for Oshaamula CF and Otjiwest CF has been commissioned and is scheduled to be completed in March 2020.</p>	The capacity of DoF to support CF remained very limited
1.4 Policies harmonised, support local governance and reflect value of forests in national development programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest issues are mainstreamed in the draft Regional Integrated Land Use Plans (RILUP) for Omaheke and Otjozondjupa regions. Omaheke region is one of the severely land degraded areas of Namibia, due to overstocking. According to the Strategic Environmental Assessment which guides the RILUP, community forestry offers great potential to improve management of grazing areas. One of the strategies in community forestry is to control grazing in gazetted areas through the CFs bi-laws. The land use zonation for Omaheke reflects the four proposed CFs. Similarly, the SEA for Otjozondjupa indicates that the community forestry approach grants communities authority to manage veld and pasture resources through appropriate local level management plans. The SEA further makes reference to the NAFOLA pilot on bush-thinning as a best practice to manage degraded lands. 	The output aim was to use national and local governance structures to create a cross-sectoral dialogue in order to implement SLM / SFM. Nafola produced a forestry financing strategy.

Outputs	Achievements Reported by IP	TE Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary work on the forest account has been completed. Proposed activities for the completion of the forest account includes: national land and Carbon Inventory, Geo-Referenced Database, Identification and Quantification & Valuation of non-timber forest products and ecosystem services. The integrated national fire management policy strategies has been submitted to MAWF Management for approval. Lessons learned report on harmonisation of community forest and conservancies has been completed. 	
Outcome 2:		
2.1 Conservation agriculture piloted	The Mid-Term Review recommended that the project should cease supporting Conservation Agriculture (CA) activities. MTR strongly recommended that CA support in Omaheke by NAFOLA be realigned due to several reasons as stated in the report, including CA activities in Omaheke not being in line with the Strategic Environmental Assessment done for the Omaheke Land Use Plan and since the application or replication of CA has been done in other parts providing already valuable lessons for expansion. After tabling this at the PSC meeting held 07 December 2017, this output and associated targets were discontinued	CA was only piloted for 1 year out of 5. The 3 tractors cost \$156,000.
2.2 Improved livestock practices piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa hotspots	Under output 2.2, the Livestock Marketing Strategy is aimed at promoting livestock offtake once the livestock marketing facility has been completed by MAWF. This strategy has been finalized, validated and approved by MAWF.	Not implemented. The output was to monitor livestock and manage rotational grazing
2.3 Improved marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products piloted	<p>There is an evidence of increased abilities to capture data on incomes per 13 CF. During this reporting period the 14 CF (one CF was split into 3) CFs recorded a decrease of -53% (NAD N\$ 1,007,036.20 in comparison to the previous reporting period that recorded N\$ 2,130,021.31 for the (Annual DoF administrative data -CF annual income reports). These dataset is captured to document the revenue generated by CFs at a certain period.</p> <p>In comparison to data from PPG assessment there is an increment of 107% in financial returns from the sustainable economic exploitation of forest resource. (At PPG Assessment N\$ 487,500.00 while at 2019 N\$ 1,007.036.20). The gazettement of CFs allows communities to generate income from forest resources while at the same time advancing the sustainable management of their forests.</p>	The prodoc mentioned 'value addition' via the construction of an abattoir – this was not appropriate, thus Nafola focused on an auction facility – which was an intervention better positioned in the value chain to get livestock out of the CFs in Omaheke. But the project 'allowed' the facility to cost more than the budget
2.4 Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjozondjupa hotspots	Output 2.4 deals with Fire Management Strategies piloted in CFs. During this reporting period, extensive work was done to support fire management at community forest through the provision of firefighting equipment and training in three fire-prone community forests. In addition, to supplement the forest management plans, fire management plans were developed and are being implemented to support fire management at the three community forests. A fire management plan for Ehirovipuka CF has been edited and published to be used as a standard for developing local fire management plans for community forests.	One CF fire control strategy + national guideline drafted
2.5 Bush control program is piloted in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera,	Output 2.5 deals with bush control program at selected sites. Documentation of area cleared and the grass species composition at cleared and uncleared sites was done to better understand the impact of the bush control programme on the health status of the	One brushwood chipping machine bought for \$40,000 – 10 ha cleared out of a target of

Outputs	Achievements Reported by IP	TE Comment
Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance	rangeland. This documentation is important to understand succession processes within the plant community and its relations to other dynamics within a particular setting.	10,000 ha - to be cleared and 50,000 ha to undergo grass seed planted and returned to grazing land
2.6 Energy saving and alternative energy program implemented	<p>The report on alternative energy sources for Otshikutshithilonde CF has been completed and approved in November 2018.</p> <p>The number of household adopting new construction materials (clay bricks) as opposed to woody materials based on the assessment undertaken by the project were 85 in Otshikutshithilonde CF of which 48% (n=41) were using corrugated iron sheets, 27% (n=23) using bricks, 13% (n=11) using Millet stalks and others (treated poles, palm leaves, mesh wire) were at 12% (n=10). This data is based on a study done in September 2018.</p> <p>The NAFOLA Project supported several community brick making projects as a mechanism to reduce the reliance of local communities on woody materials for construction. Therefore, the Project saw the need to conduct an assessment to assess the level of wood consumption and the use of bricks, and determine the impacts of the brick making projects on reducing wood consumption by local communities.</p> <p>Baseline: 0. End of Project Target: 10 households.</p>	Not implemented
2.7 System for monitoring of forest and range condition and land productivity		Not implemented

Annex 3: Co-financing Table

Sources of Cofinancing ¹	Name of Co-financer	Description of Co-financing	Type of Cofinancing ²	Confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Contributed by MTR stage (USD)	Expected by Project Closure (USD)	New Investment or Recurrent Expenditure (N/R)	% of Expected Amount USD
GEF / Partner Agencies	GFF	Nafola project award	Grant	4,446,000	2,637,866	3,489,717	R	78
	UNDP	Country funds	Grant / In-kind	500,000	0	498,033	N	100
	KfW ⁴	Community Forestry Programme in the same regions as Nafola	Grant	3,900,000	0	500,000	N	13
UNDP & Partner Sub-Total				8,846,000	2,637,866	4,487,750		51
Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	Seven regions of Nafola + National level	In-kind	15,000,000	0	2,805,810	R	19
Other	GIZ	Bush to Fodder (African Wild Dog CF / Conservancy)	Grant	0	0	200,000	N	
	Regional Universities Forum	UNAM with Nafola's engagement was awarded a grant for African Wild Dog Bush feed project	Grant	0	0	300,000	N	
	Environmental Investment Fund (GCF)	Nafola Proposal for Oshaampula CF awarded (Implemented by the CF, with Nafola technical support)	Grant	0	0	339,144	N	
Government / Other Sub-Total				15,000,000	0	3,644,954		
Total				23,846,000	2,637,866	8,132,704		

1/ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agencies, Foundation, GEF Partner Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

2/ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other

3/ Excludes PPG

4/ KfW Co-financing letter €3.5m; An indicative figure is entered by the TE covering national and Otjozondjupa regional contributions (see **Annex 5** for details)

5/ The GEF contribution at 'project close' is from 15/12/2019

6/ The MAWF figure was provided by Nafola

Annex 4: Planned Budget and Expenditures at End-term

Outcome (US\$)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Indicative Breakdown of Project Budget in Project Document:							
Outcome 1	86,000	349,500	457,000	536,000	390,000	101,500	1,920,000
Outcome 2	108,000	342,000	619,500	704,000	345,500	207,000	2,326,000
Project Management	19,000	51,500	71,000	36,500	11,000	11,000	200,000
Total	213,000	743,000	1,147,500	1,276,500	746,500	319,500	4,446,000
Outcome	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Annual Work Plan Budgets and Actual Expenditures Incurred through End term:							
Outcome 1:							
Annual Work Plan	17,754	612,650	786,372	433,395	190,156	523,717	2,564,045
Disbursed	65,664	399,476	440,109	259,432	203,782	442,102	1,810,565
Balance (AWP-Disbursed)	-47,910	213,174	346,262	173,964	-13,626	81,615	753,479
Outcome 2:							
Annual Work Plan	173,908	638,650	440,278	293,097	240,597	357,526	2,144,056
Disbursed	102,289	507,753	834,967	363,178	173,810	229,269	2,211,265
Balance (AWP-Disbursed)	71,619	130,897	-394,688	-70,081	66,787	128,257	-67,210
Project Management:							
Annual Work Plan	2,250	93,565	67,453	16,430	14,448	21,000	215,146
Disbursed	2,075	90,084	21,621	11,908	13,569	12,894	152,151
Balance (AWP-Disbursed)	175	3,481	45,832	4,521	879	8,106	62,994
Grand Totals:							
Annual Work Plan	193,912	1,344,865	1,294,103	742,922	445,201	902,244	4,021,003
Total Disbursed	170,028	997,313	1,296,697	634,518	391,162	684,265	3,489,717
Balance (AWP-Disbursed)	23,884	347,552	-2,594	108,404	54,039	217,979	531,286

End term – through to 15/12/2019

Annex 5: Brief review of Sectoral plans, Technical reports, Training materials, Misc.

Contents

- PBs Attendance
- History of PSC key decisions
- Field notes
- Training Events
- Cofinancing – Extra
- Other - Land Degradation Neutrality information

PSC Attendance

PSC membership (prodoc) - GEF Focal Point, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry; the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement; the Ministry of Urban and Rural Development; the Ministry of Mines and Energy; the Ministry of Environment and Tourism; the UNDP; and the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (Nacso).

Q2, 2015 – UNDP x 3, Nafola x 3, DoF, DAPEES, MURD, NACSO, KfW. Non-attendance – DoF, Directorate of Agriculture Research & Development (DARD), MET. Two ministries had not nominated representatives – Ministry of Land Reform (MLR) and Ministry of Mines & Energy (MME)
Q4,2015 – UNDP x 2, Nafola x 3, DoF x 2, DAPEES, MURD, DARD, KfW / Community Forestry Namibia (CFN). Absent – NACSO, GIZ biodiversity project
Q3, 2016 - UNDP, Nafola x3, DoF x 2, MURD, DARD, DAPEES, KfW/CFN. Absent – NACSO, MET, GIZ biodiversity
Q4, 2016 – UNDP x 2, Nafola x 3, DoF x 2, DAPEES, DARD, MURD. Absent – NACSO, MET
Q3, 2017 – UNDP, Nafola x 3, DoF x 3, DAPEES, DARD, MURD, NACSO. Absent MET
Q4, 2017 – UNDP x 2, Nafola x 3, DoF x 3, DAPEES, DARD, MURD, NACSO. Absent MET
Q1, 2019 – UNDP x 5, Nafola x 3, DoF x 2, DAPEES, MURD, unknown. Absent – NACSO, MET

History of selected key points / decisions by the PSC

Date	Key Points	TE Comment
Q2 2015 (1 st meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13 CFs covering 0.5m ha of dryland forest – 4 gazetted, 9 to undergo gazettement - Budget US\$4.5m - Organizational structure headed by PSC with a PMU reporting to them - UNDP Rep – asked how NAFOLA's approach to livestock offtake differed in comparison to the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and the Country Pilot Partnership Integrated Sustainable Land Management Programme (CPP ISLM), particularly in regards to areas where past strategies proved unsuccessful. - PM responded – Nafola would conduct a study of lessons from these projects 1st and then support infrastructure development. - PM stated that Nafola had not yet committed funds to Auction Kraals - GEF RTA – say GoN should pay for Kraals and Nafola support their use - Community forestry in Namibia Project – said CFs are better harmonized with conservancies, and not integrated into each other. - 13 Liaison Officers to embed in Regional Forest offices under Regional Chief Forestry Officers - Nafola bought 4 vehicles + GoN 3 + quad bike - Issues concerning the appropriateness of certain indicators raised - 16% disbursement rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issue of the Auction Kraal is already there during the first PSC meeting
Q4, 2015 (2 nd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PSC agreed that construction of auction kraal(s) would be more appropriate in the selected rural communal areas to increase off-take of livestock (instead of construction of abattoirs as indicated in the prodoc. The PSC therefore gave the project a go-ahead with construction of the Talismanus auction kraal. - UNDP enquired on the time it takes for a CF to be gazetted once all the documents have been submitted. It was reported that the process typically takes about three months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 months for administrative processing of CF – in reality it took ~2 years - PSC recommended that Nafola work with DARD on pasture management — next PSC says Nafola was working with DARD on this?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress with gazetting Epukiro CF is slow. Challenges include the large area, fencing off for livestock management, uncertainties with powers of TAs (there are many TAs, some whom are not recognised by the government) and potential conflicting land uses/management. The PSC advised the PMU to revisit the current approach and make a proposal to the National Project Director on how to fast-track the gazetting process - The Project Management team should liaise with the Directorate of Agriculture Research and Development (DARD) on pasture management. At the same time, the project should be careful so that it does not lose its visibility where enters into partnerships. - Suggested that Conservation Agriculture (CA) demonstration projects should be set up as soon as possible before the rains. Similarly, the project should work out incentives for farmers who are engaged in CA. - PSC cautioned on working with 'de-bushing project' – as objectives different to Nafola - UNDP said project management fees should not exceed 5% of project budget. The PSC deliberated on the cost for 16 staff members which surely exceeds 5% of the project budget. It was clarified that all the project staff are directly implementing activities under Components one and two. Hence, their salaries can be recovered from the outputs that they implement. - Nafola urged to focus on off-take, and work with other project on rangeland management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confusion over the role of the 13 Liaison officers – without whom there would be no CFs gazetted + they were in the project organogram - If rangeland management was in the project design, then any synergies surely would have been already listed then.
Q3, 2016 (3 rd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nafola joined the PSC of the Nat. Action Plan for Land Degradation, Drought & Desertification (LDDD) - Two CF dossiers for gazettelement submitted; 7 in progress - Policy harmonization – meeting with MLR on land use planning held; CF issues with land law / land use planning sent to AG - Auction Kraal – Talismanus (NAD 6.5m ~ US\$457,000) - 3 tractors bought for CA (NAD 2.1m ~ US\$148,000) - 2 brick-making projects in Uukolonkhadi and Ongandjera CFs - Bush to fodder chipping machine bought for AWD CF to rent out to make income and reduce bush encroachment on private land (not in the CF) - 2 CF offices to be constructed in Aug 2016 – Oshaampula and Otjiu-West CFs - Carpentry workshop to be completed July 2016 in Okongo CF + 2 sawmill machines – Okongo and Onkumbula - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nafola supported the Focal Point to prepare the national report to the UNFCCC - Nafola – has been quite active in starting the supportive interventions - Cost Kraal mentioned - Plan to complete construction of Livestock Auction by end of 2016 – in fact it was still undergoing final snagging in December 2019 (as seen during the TE mission) – thus it took 3 years longer than expected. - TE to note volume of timber in these two CFs vs wisdom to buy sawing machines? – now a moratorium on harvesting in Okongo CF at least
Q4, 2016 (4 th)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor delays in kraal construction due to cash flow - NAFOLA is supporting MAWF with the development of an integrated fire management policy and strategy - CA – 1st demo plots with DAPEES in Omaheke to begin this cropping season - Nafola recommended to work with DARD – on grass seeding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CA – 2 years + to start CA - Pasture management / grass seeding – should have been a higher priority
Q3, 2017 (5 th)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nafola support to MAWF Integrated Fire Management Policy - Nafola to consult DARD on grass seeding – which was previously supported by CPP – ISLM project - 6 CF dossiers now submitted to DoF, but process slow – DoF was urged to appoint a technical person to support the process, especially in liaison with the AG's office and the MLR - CF SOPs developed (with KfW CFN project) for DoF to monitor compliance of CFs (under the Forest Act, amended 2005, and Forest Regulations 2015. - National Arbour Day support - CA – 17 plots supported in Omaheke, but work in Ohangwena delayed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nafola didn't engage any active grass seeding work, although said it did support further applications for funding under GEF small Grants Programme – opportunity / direction lost by Nafola - Lack of gazettelement was unnecessarily taken to be an obstacle to further CF activities - PSC displeased with MTR

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Auction Kraal construction halted due to UNDP MTR report. - MTR – Management Response – PSC request to agree this with UNDP before endorsing it - The PSC noted the two indicators for the Kraal - a) increased off-take of livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa from 5% to 20% and b) increased health, quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa regions covering 150,000ha. - PSC / PMU requests a consultant to achieve help these targets – ToR required for PSC approval - Project Risk log developed in Dec 2016. No new risks in 2017 - Added income generation activities: Ehi-Rovipuka – Devil's claw; Oshampula – Ximenia spp – cosmetic oil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk log (not provided)– doesn't mention the kraal -
Q4, 2017 (6 th)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PSC was dominated by the recommendations of the MTR and the Kraal - E.g 1. MTR recommendation - Replace the PSC as they have not taken on their oversight responsibilities; include CF representatives in PSC as they are indicated in the prodoc as Responsible Parties. The PSC agreed to the (UNDP) management response that the current PSC will be maintained and its capacity strengthened. - E.g. 2 - At MTR, NAFOLA is prioritizing its interventions and the PSC has taken a resolution to focus project resources on sustainable forestry interventions. As a result NAFOLA will not be engaged in active CA activities. - E.g 3 - Workplan - Support farmers associations/ cooperatives in Otjombinde to develop a marketing strategy to operationalise the auction kraal. Response - the PSC discouraged the project from developing new strategies; instead it should liaise with DVS / DAPEES to strengthen existing strategies to increase livestock off-take. With the Action - The PMU needs to determine if there is a marketing strategy for Omaheke Region/Otjombinde constituency before it attempts to develop a new strategy. B) If a strategy is in existence, the project should attempt to identify gaps and strategies to fill the gaps, in close liaison with DVS and DAPEES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CA support stopped despite its integral importance in the project design. TE considered this move as short-sighted - The Kraal was effectively built by now – or at least the money contractually spent, thus the PMU wishing to establish a management method for it was sound. The PSC / UNDP didn't seem to understand
Q1, 2019 (7 th)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 CFs gazette; CF toolbox updated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kraal not mentioned

Field notes

Kunene - At present the TA headman (and deputy) have a stamp to requests timber harvesting permits from the RFO. The CFMCs are generally quite weak, and lack ownership of their CFMPs, or the knowledge needed for SLM / SFM, or indeed the power to stop TS chiefs, not only applying directly to the RFOs, but also informally 'allocating land' to new settlers and expanded family community members. The RFOs in turn lack the capacity to monitor such changing land use.

In some cases, the CFMC has been devolved the power to issue timber permits (e.g. Ehi-Rovipuka)

DoF Capacity

Kunene RFO - DoF – 3 rangers only for all of Kunene – 1 pick-up vehicle – used by DFO. DFO needs better monitoring of forest resources to set AAC for poles.

Ohangwena RFO Forest office

Capacity – there are 18 staff at the RFO, with an added 28 staff (mainly demobilised soldiers) spread across five stations. Only one vehicle running, out of a possible seven.

Ohangwena – DAPEES – tractor for Okango CF

Tractor (Kubota) – DAPEES manage out of Ohangwena RAO – 100 km away in Eenhana - Tractor arrived in 2015, but only used in Okongo area from 2018 (broke, as was not serviced, now fixed – DAPEES have funds to maintain.¹) CA techniques are being introduced – ripper & discs – why so late again?? Lack of agreement between DoF and DAPEES. CF chairlady doesn't know how to get permission to use tractor

Village farmer has to register with DAPEES sub-office (or via the TA village head) – 17 villages each has ~40 farming households – but tractor can only manage 10 farmers / village – not all register yet– so big impact -but without project follow-up on CA –

¹ Ohangwena DAPEES have 30 tractors in fleet, which compares with 3 in Omaheke DAPEES.

lost opportunity – farmer pays 50% of costs (driver / fuel)

To use tractor by CF – need method (as in agri DAPEES sub-office) – request by forest office to agri office – suggested method as need driver. Disc, ripper tines (2-3), ripper + wings

CA demonstrations by project – 1 failed as farmer not so enthusiastic, 1 good with field days – ½ ha compared conventional vs CA agri methods – 2 project liaison officers helped for 2 seasons (then MTR) After demos – project support mainly for training / field days.

CA types (Dryland crop production programme (DCPP) types ripping, crop rotation, mulching – latter difficult. Lead farmers spread across the constituencies. Pearl millet productivity – not clear improvement as drought for last 9 (?) years

CA forum working OK last 1-2 years – Nafola support?

Ohangwena Okango CF

CFMC

CFMC - Each village has rep. on CFMC (cattle posts attached to villages). Have Okong CF bylaws; conduct patrols – if find illegal settlement / activity – return to discuss with CFMC, not approach. AGM + meeting every month – TA also 3 times /year have meeting

Have bank a/c – share after expenses - 35% community; 40% MC; 15% TA; 10% community development fund. Local village provide some voluntary work, but not much, hence the limited share, but they do report illegal activity – new settlement.

No office equipment – to come laptop and printer, desk and chair (Nafola should provide wifi dongles to facilitate internet connection) – for remaining funds)

CFMP – Based on inventory / Little knowledge of CFMP (chair of Okongo CFMC) / Question of grazing control – not understood – answer – it depends on the livestock!, but accepted they can degrade land

Illegal settlements – if one comes, more follow - Himba people from Kunene inside CF and on boundary due to drought in Kunene – CF notified government, but referred to constituency councillor who said they can stay until drought is over. Challenge of headmen / TA – don't say no to new settlement e.g. will take NAD 15,000 to allow new homestead

CF Map -see photos – produced by Min. of Land Reform (Oct 2019) – shows conservancies, CF + certificated land inside their boundaries, and mapped plots without certificate issued. – very good to assess status and report against any new land conversion / settlement. Have 12 illegal crop fields – land board informed – in process to evict.

CF Income and Utilisation

- Okango conserve. – little income at present
- Fuelwood sale allowed to Oskakati / Have received chainsaw-felling and processing training
- Planing machine for furniture making – but prohibition on wood cutting by MET - Timber cutting now prohibited (by MET) so furniture workshop idle, except for furniture repairs
- being provided for 2 eland and 2 kudu – licence to sell for bidding hunter - CFMC doesn't know about their MET allocation of 2 eland & 2 kudus for hunting auction. – district forest officer knows about this though. (Wildlife fenced into a small core area where there is water)
- Horticulture garden – tomatoes rotting from bottom (blossom-end rot) - Have drip irrigation
- CF supported school, vulnerable people, boreholes

Ohangwena Omundaunglio CF (Since March 2016)

The AAC permits are set by the CFMC according to the CFMP, however the TA Headmen still give permission to cut wood. The RFO has been informed, although they have shifted the responsibility to the constituency councillor. The CFMC does include a TA representative, although there are 9 headmen covering nine villages.

Get 3-4 calls months regarding illegal cutting of poles at Omundaunglio CF. The RFO responds An added problem is that for a payment, TA headman, allows outsiders to 'cut' new agriculture land, then the newcomers quickly put up illegal fencing and claim customary use. The CF has a patrolling system, with previously ~10 reports a month for illegal activity, now reduced to three.

Otjozondjupa RFO – Covers three regions including Kunene.

with charcoal production – on communal land – difficult to control

Farmers using cow dung for burning – losing nutrients needed for the grazing areas.

Otjonzondjupa African Wild Dog CF

Issues - 5-20 ha TA / headman can / is giving away land inside Cons / CF

7 guards for 7 blocks. Have boundary pillars and signboards – to say AWD

Otjituuo CF (pro Otituwa) - Illegal fencing for agriculture – DoF brought lawyer from Windhoek – 4 months ago – farmer could appeal – no instructions for forest officeto remove

Omaheke - Tallismanus District Forest Office (DFO) - done

DFO – Limited capacity without internet for the computer, and one broken vehicle without funds to repair.

DFO (Tallismanus representing Otjombinde CF) has not forwarded the timber harvest permit books, as the CF / TA: need to obtain block permit from DoF Windhoek beforehand; send a request letter from the TA to the DFO; and the CFMC receive more training.

In virtually all cases, the CFMCs have amalgamated with Conservancy MCs in cases where they both exist. However, CF AGMs are being dominated by TA leaders wanted to know their share of income, compensation for wildlife damage (in the case of dual CF / conservancies, which many of the Nafola CFs were). Process is for the CF to send minutes of the AGM to their RFO.

Project has provided apiculture training and provided bee hives, although not all CFs in the activity have had the bee-hives delivered yet (e.g. Otjombinde CF)

Registration for tractor services with the local DAPEES district office is working well, with 40 registered so far out of 290 farmers cropping (in Otjombinde CF), at the time of the TE in December 2019.

A point to remember, is that there is no need to rip the soil every year (and in fact will damage the soil structure making it more prone to fast filtration and soil erosion). The other tractor is servicing the Epukiru CF. Seed is being provided, but not always the best type or variety.

Omaheke RFO (Gobabis)

Capacity – the region has 30 staff, of which 15-20 are in the field. They have one working vehicle out of a possible three. They have five outside stations, all without electricity or internet

CF report to forest technician (which is the highest position for the region!)

MAWF general sevices in office – IT support to DAPEES as well -should train the CFs in laptop use.

Permit – see phone picture – harvest, transport, marketing, + charcoal bricket production

Omaheke Otjombinde CF / Conser

DAPEES need sorghum / millet – but farmers want maize as even if no cobs – fodder good for livestock. – they need to diversify crops / timing etc -virtually all rainfed.

Demara sheep – local breed + fat bottom

Omaheke CF Epukiru CF and Conservancy (met in orther region)

Have stopped outsider grazing under CF mandate – case pending in Windhoek

Protect trees on communal (CF / Conserv) and de-bush on private land

Future – manage tree cutting; devil's claw development, stop copper and sand mining – or tax

Have CFMP & forest resurce monitor to support implementation of management plan

Basically, the whole district has been gazetted as a CF – 10,927 km²

Training Events

Terminal Evaluation Report - Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola)

Region	Community Forest	Training Title	Content focus	Men	Women	Total	No. of Days	Location	Date
Local Level									
Otjozondjupa	African Wild Dog	Forest Management Body Training	Roles and responsibilities, law enforcement and permit system, financial management and skills development.	7	6	13	3	Okondjatu	20-21 & 28 August 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests on what is expected from them, presentation of Community Forest annual work plan by Forest Management Body representatives and assessment of Community Forest Management Body capacity.	10	3	13	1		10-May-19
		Bush to feed Training	Training on the use of Bos tot Kos machine and fodder production.				2		18-19 July 2016
Otjituuo		Forest Management Body Training	Roles and responsibilities, law enforcement and permit system, financial management and skills development .	10	7	17	3	Ongongoro	22-24 August 2018
		Basic Fire Management Training	Fire prevention measures, Firefighting equipment, fire suppression tactics, types of fire, causes of wild fires, fire regimes for the region.	16	10	26		Okatjoru	4-6 September 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc				1	Ongongoro	17 May 2019
Omaheke	Otjombinde	Forest Management Body Training	Financial management; Law enforcement and permit system.				2	Talismanus	13 August 2018; 24 September 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc	10	5	15	1		06 May 2019
	Epukiro	Forest Management Body Training	Roles and responsibilities, law enforcement and permit system, financial management.				3	Post 3	16 August 2018; 27-28 September 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc	10	3	13	1		07 May 2019
	Omuramba Ua Mbinda	Forest Management Body Training	Financial management, law enforcement and permit system				2	Okatumba gate	14 August 2018; 26 September 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc	11	3	14	1		08 May 2019
Eiseb	Post gazettement awareness Training	as above	13	2	15	1	Post 10	09 May 2019	
Omusati	Uukolonkadhi	Basic Fire Management	Fire prevention measures, Firefighting equipment, fire suppression tactics, types of fire, causes of wild fires, fire regimes for the region.	15	4	19	3	Onesi	14-16 August 2018
Ohangwena	Omundaungilo	Forest Management Body Training	Roles and responsibilities, law enforcement and permit system, financial management and skills development.	5	3	8	3		28-30 August 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc				1	Omundaungilo	15 May 2019
Oshana	Otshiku-Tshiithlonde	Forest Management Body Training	Law enforcement and permit system.	4	5	9	1	Engombe	21 August 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc						14 May 2019
Kunene	Ehi-Rovipuka	Forest Management Body Training	Law enforcement and permit system.	10	2	12	4	Otjokavare	18 September 2018
		Basic Fire Management Training	Fire prevention measures, Firefighting equipment, fire suppression tactics, types of fire, causes of wild fires, fire regimes for the region.	14	3	17	3		7-9 August 2018
		Post gazettement awareness Training	Awareness creation among newly gazetted Community Forests etc						13 May 2019
	Otju-West	Forest Management Body Training	Financial management, law enforcement and permit system.	13	5	18	1	Otju	31 August 2018
Oshikoto	Onkumbula	Forest Management Body Training	Roles and responsibilities, law enforcement and permit system, financial management and skills development.	9	7	16	3	Onkumbula	28-30 August 2018
National Level									
Otjozondjupa		Socio-economic research training	Learning and discussing the current trends and providing in-depth understanding and exposure in the field of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), sharing of case studies, best practices and peer learning.					Okahandja	01 May 2016
Khomas		Long term financing mechanisms for the forest sector workshop	Identify existing and prospective sustainable financing mechanisms in order to fund critical support services provided to community forest streamlined within the realm of CBNRM approach; Analyse the potential of these financing mechanisms and recommend priorities for developing pilot sustainable financing mechanisms.				1	Windhoek	03 July 2019
Otjozondjupa		Gender Sensitive Training for MAWF	Equip trainers (DoF) with key information and tools on gender-sensitivity; Enable trainers (DoF) to develop and facilitate participatory trainings and workshops in a gender-sensitive manner; Train trainers on gender-sensitivity in CBNRM.	3	8	12	4	Otjiwarongo	12-15 February 2019
Khomas		Training Workshop on Development of the National Forest Accounts and Data Collection	Present the preliminary framework as the knowledge basis, which will support the staff members during the exercises on selection and development of the national forest accounts for Namibia, and elaborate further practical recommendations and implementation plan of the Namibian forest accounts framework together with the relevant stakeholders and institutions.				2	Windhoek	13-14 August 2019
Khomas		Monitoring and Evaluation training							
Omaheke		Conservation Agriculture	CA	26	10	36	5	Post 3	7-11 November 2015
			Discuss and develop a workplan for Conservation Agriculture activities to be implemented in the region.	22	9	31	2	East gate lodge	24-25 November
Total (incomplete record)				208	95	304			

Co-financing Extra information

KfW co-financing

The CFN-II (Community Forestry Programme in Namibia) was financed by the Federal Republic of Germany through the German Development Bank (KfW) with co-financing by the Republic of Namibia. CFN-II was embedded in the DoF's long-standing Community Forestry Programme. Following a pilot phase from 1999 to 2003, Phase I of the project ran from 2004 to 2011 (2 Mio. Euro). As the previous project phases, the second phase CFN-II targeted the north-eastern part of Namibia, comprising Kavango West, Kavango East, Zambezi and the Tsumkwe District of Otjozondjupa Region:

This project phase ran from 2013 to 2016 (3,5 Mio. Euro) and was implemented by the Directorate of Forestry (DoF) of the Namibian Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) with technical assistance from GOPA Consultants and the Namibia Development Trust (NDT). The objective of the CFN-II project was twofold: To enable rural communities to acquire the rights, capacity and resource information for managing their forests and pasture in a sustainable manner and in collaboration with relevant authorities and stakeholders. To enable residents of community forests to benefit economically from the sustainable use of their forestry and pasture resources.

To achieve the project objectives, the following project result areas were formulated, from which the project activities and indicators were derived:

- Result 1: Community Forests are established and managed effectively and sustainably within the Project area.
- Result 2: DoF is strengthened to effectively monitor and support Community Forests.
- Result 3: Community Forests are integrated with Communal Conservancies as well as relevant national and trans-national natural resource management initiatives.
- Result 4: The capacity of Community Forests and their residents to benefit economically from the sustainable use of their forestry and pasture resources is improved.
- Result 5: The project implementation unit is established, operational and effectively managed.

While all the "soft components" (support to integrated approaches to community training, management planning, natural resource monitoring, income generation, etc.) were concluded in 2016, the completion of CF infrastructure is still outstanding in 2020: Infrastructure, like CF offices, craft centers and store rooms, are being constructed in the following CFs: Zambezi region: Sikanjabuka, Lubuta, Sachona, Kwando Kavango East& West: Ncumcara, Katope, Likwaterera, Otjozondjupa: Nyae-Nyae, Ondjou

GIZ Bush Control and Biomass Utilisation Project

(formerly GIZ Support to De-bushing). We intensively cooperated with NAFOLA at the African Wild Dog CF on bush-based animal feed production. While NAFOLA financed equipment and community mobilisation, GIZ brought in technical expertise and consumables for fodder production trials. The results are documented as attached.

Other

Land Degradation Neutrality Pilot Project (2018, pp49) - The outputs are to be:

- Establishment of locally applicable LDN assessment methodologies based on the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) recommendations
- Production of training material for technical training course on the LDN assessment methodology
- Training of MET staff and local experts from the University of Namibia (UNAM), the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) and other institutions in LDN assessments
- Carrying out of LDN assessments in the Otjozondjupa and Omusati regions to create an information basis for land use plans, research and other actions related to land management
- Inclusion of the sustainable land management (SLM) recommendations for Otjozondjupa in the regional land use plan (IRLUP), based on the LDN assessment
- Provision of LDN assessment and SLM recommendations to the Ministry of Land Reform (MLR) and the Omusati Regional Council for inclusion in the IRLUP
- Facilitation of inter-ministerial meetings of the national Sustainable Land Management Committee (SLMC) in charge of the national LDN process
- Contribution to international knowledge exchange on best practices for LDN assessment
- Provisioning of guidance about the future of LDN in Namibia to the MET/UNDP project - the Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for Enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to Eradicate Poverty (2018-23) (NILALEG)
 - Advising UNAM / NUST to improve the use of their techniques to enable the local analysis of LDN indicators

Annex 6: List of Persons Interviewed

Name	M/F	Organisation	Contact
Naemi Shaninga	F	NAFOLA	+264 811 489 611
Hivangere Hoveka	F	NAFOLA	+264 813 171 196
Herman Frans	M	NAFOLA	+264 815 645 895
Shivute D	M	NAFOLA	+264 814 989 735
Raili Hasheela	F	UNDP	+264 811 242 844
Paulus Shikongo	M	DoF GIS/Remote sensing	+264 812 368 246
Joseph Hailwa	M	NAFOLA National Director	+264 811 286 390
Mildred Kambinda	F	Director DAPEES	+264 61 2087785
Maxi Louis	F	Director NACSO	+264 61237036
Meundju Muzuma	M	Chair Ehi-Rovipuka CF	+264 812 970 311
Nakangobe Tadeus	M	Forester Otjozondjupa	+264 813 38 0466
Kajjazermisiua Muzuma	M	Ehi Rovipuka CF	+264 812 558 622
Sidney Gaeseb	M	DAPEES Otjozondjupa	+264 813 358 816
Helena Modestus	F	DoF Technician, Opuwo	+264 183 912 300
Michael Heita	M	DoF Forest Ranger, Opuwo	+264 812 918 618
Steve Kasaona	M	CBNRM Ranger, Opuwo	+264 818 900 077
Ueriira Tjiveze	F	IRDNC, Opuwo	+264 812 238 098
Gerry Nekongo	M	DD MLR, Kunene Region	+264 811 416 202
Wilhelmina Kautewa	F	DoF Outapi	+264 812 619 389
Ipinge Nestory	M	Chair - Oukolonkadhi CF	+264 813 797 528
Christofina Kambala	F	DoF Technician, Eenhana	+264 812 687 937
Hamutenya Vilho K	M	Forest Ranger, Eenhana	+264 814 675 203
Immanuel Kapofi	M	Ohangwena Warder CBNRM	+264 812 560 756
Ndilimeke Josua	F	Ohangwena Chief DAPEES	+264 811 440 033
Aina Shanika	F	DAPEES Scientific Officer	-
Immanuel Eelu	M	DAPEES Chief Technician	-
Martha Kapembe	F	Chairperson Okongo CF	+264 813 600 570
Martha Shilongo	F	Secretary Okongo CF	+264 813 750 376
Abel Uushona	M	DoF Okongo Technician	-
John Kandimune	M	Africa Wild Dog CF Member	+264 810 326 864
Matheus Backham	M	Chair - Africa Wild Dog CF	-
Vejee Veii	M	Sandveld Research Station	+264 814 523 866
Melba Tjitemisa	M	DAPEES Tallismanus	-
Eunike Sheepo	F	Dof Technician Tallismanus	+264 816 150 120
Job Kaurivi	M	Crop Farmers Association	+264 812 279 404
Benita Kamboualo	F	Chair - CF & Conservancy	+264 813 024 604
Katjana Kaurivi	M	CLLr Constituency	+264 811 657 779
Jorry Z. U .Kaurivi	M	DD DAPPES Omaheke	-
Merani Beukes	F	DoF Gobabis Office	062-562 782
F Kayofa	M	DD – Forestry	+264 811 599 013
Teophilus Nghitila	M	GEF Focal Person	+264811247793
Abraham Katjiukua	M	MAWF - Livestock	+264 811 407 781
Linda Fillemon	F	Horticulture Assistant NAB	+264 61-379 514
Rosa-Stella Mbulu	F	Biodiversity & Climate Change	+264 811500854
Mate Isaskar	M	MAWF RD Director	+264 811223607
Jonas Nghishiidi	M	NAFOLA Manager	+264 812 910 884
Martha Naanda	F	UNDP	+264 612046201
Armstrong Alexi	M	UNDP DRR	-
Phero Kgomotso	F	RTA	-

Annex 7: List of Documents Reviewed

Implementation Data (mainly from the EA/IP)

1. IP's M&E Data management system / spreadsheets – tabulated to at least each output level
2. Minutes of Project Board Meetings – full sequence of annual, quarterly, ad hoc
3. Minutes of Technical Steering Committee meetings
4. List of consultancies / sub-contracts for services and their reports / outputs, including baseline / endline survey reports
5. All outputs – e.g. guidelines produced by the project
6. Stakeholder list – by activity & location
7. IP's Annual Reports and Final Report
8. Progress reports of the IP, Responsible Parties / implementation task teams
9. Project training data - Table of all project trainings with participant numbers disaggregated by gender
10. Output and Results (by Indicator) – two tables to be provided by the TE
11. Project location / activity maps
12. Other Local Committees - Minutes of Meetings
13. Mainstreaming documents – e.g. legislation produced under the project
14. Other materials - Training materials (PPTs etc.), Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) survey reports – if used, News & Awareness materials, Project workshop PPTs, including if presented at regional workshops (list of materials + materials to be provided)
15. Project Inception Report
16. Tracking Tools – At CEO endorsement, midterm and end-term need to be prepared before TE visit and verified during the mission
17. Implementation Data (mainly from the IA - UNDP)
18. Annual Workplans (digital copy + signature pages)
19. Atlas Risk Register (word format to be provided)
20. Logframe revision if undertaken with approval letter
21. Financial expenditures and co-financing - itemized according to two table to be provided by TE team
22. Audit reports
23. Monitoring mission reports by UNDP, RTA, PMU / project manager, RTA etc
24. UNDP Annual Reports (PIRs / APRs)

Preparation / Pre-implementation (from the IA – UNDP)

25. UNDP Project Document, but require signed cover page, signed co-financing letters & Annexes
26. Implementing/Executing partner (EA/IP) arrangements / contract (e.g. HACT agreement between UNDP and the IP; Project Cooperation Agreement; MoUs)
27. UNDP (Local) Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes
28. MTR Report and UNDP Management Response (if not on the UNDP ERC webpage)
29. Project Identification Form (PIF), PPG, GEFSEC Review, STAP Review, CEO Endorsement Request (usually on the GEF projects webpage)
30. UNDP Initiation Plan
31. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP); and UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

National / Programming documents

32. List of relevant national planning and policy documents (National Expert to compile list and provide)

Annex 8: Stakeholder List

Stakeholder	TE Interest
Government	
PMU (as NIM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager, M&E officer, Finance Officer (GEF-required tables)
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Conservation Agriculture Strategy & Action Plan – status, local funding, sustainability Coordinates the CA strategy
Directorate of Forestry (DoF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstreaming of CF programs, policies Local forest governance / Legal entity status of CFs (under which laws?) If CFs difficult to gazette – why were they put in prodoc as agreed by government System for monitoring of forest, range condition, conservancies, CF etc / Conservancy vs CF
Directorate of Agriculture Research Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project inputs
DAPEES (MAWF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads Conservation Agriculture
Directorate of Parks & Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservancies
GEF Focal Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nafola in context of other GEF projects
Land Use Planning (LUP) Departments (in 3-4 regions) Inc. visit department that made the Omaheke ILUP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets - LUPs covering 2,840,153ha (from 182,615 ha ~ 90% increase) LUP compliance increase from 40 to 60% Visit 3 to gain rep. view of how LUP was / wasn't implemented – how / why – when it was a key part of approved prodoc Omaheke LUP indicates it is of low agriculture potential with marginal rainfed agriculture. No groundwater
Communal Land Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customary land / livestock vs CF management
Kunene, Oshikoto, Otjozondjupa, Omaheke, Department of Livestock Offices / DAPEES (in these 4 regions) Regional MEATCO Offices (1-2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target - Improved livestock practices Assessment of livestock 'off-take' from 5 to 20% Increased health, quality and type of livestock on 150,000ha of land (with 20% of cattle upgraded to Grade B with Fatness Grade 2 or 3; Decrease in oxen and increase in number of heifers System for monitoring of livestock rangeland condition (Carrying Capacities) Improved marketing of livestock products Rangeland management was assessed in 4 regions in 4 CFs (Ehrovipuka, Oshaampula, African Wilddog & Otjombinde) Annual Monitoring & strategy DAPEES staff trained on livestock health /productivity A pilot at Okandjatu (African Wild Dog Conservancy and CF) – making animal feed from invader bush and testing it on livestock
Sandveld Research Station, Omaheke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Veld management / stocking rates
Omaheke - Otjimbinde CF - Tallismanus Livestock Auction Kraal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High investment not in Prodocol approved by UNDP Status – has it reduced livestock pressure
Fire control department – piloted in Kunene, Oshikoto, Otjozondjupa, Omaheke regions – visit 2 in north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire management strategy is piloted in the 4 regional hotspots Fire control (200,000ha) – 30% of area reduced to mild burning; with 20% reduction in bush density; [Note fire control budget went to Kraal]
Bush control program - Ohangwena (Omundaungilo, Okongo); Omusati (Ongandjera) Oshana (Otjku-Tjithilonde); and Otjozondjupa (Otjituuo) – visit 3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 10% reduction in bush coverage in these 5 hotspots; A financial incentive for controlled bush clearance
Local Forest Offices – meet in all regions that TE mission visits Local government statistic office? Charcoal & Fuelwood traders in small towns –	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target - 20% reduction in fuelwood use; with 10% increase in alternative energy 25% increase in sustainable income from forest resources in hotspots, in line with land use plans Integrated Forest Resources Management plans formulated and implemented in

Annex 9: Rating Scales

The following UNDP-GEF grading scales were applied in the evaluation

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Definition
Effectiveness - Objective	- The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
Effectiveness - Outcomes	- Results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time. - The extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded. <p>(Retrospectively, relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.)</p>
Efficiency	- The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion - Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. - Longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects.

Rating Scale for Outcomes (Overall, Effectiveness & Efficiency)

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of effectiveness (outcomes), or efficiency. The project is expected or has achieved its global environmental objectives. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.
Satisfactory (S)	There were only minor shortcomings The project is expected or has achieved most of its global environmental objectives.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were moderate shortcomings The project is expected or has achieved most of its relevant objectives but with moderate / significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. The project isn't going to achieve some of its key global environmental objectives
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project had significant shortcomings The project is expected to achieve its global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of effectiveness, or efficiency The project is not expected to achieve most of its global environment objectives
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project had severe shortcomings The project has failed to achieve any of its major environment objectives

Or Not Applicable (N/A); Unable to Assess (U/A)

Note

Overall Outcome: Achievement of the project objective will be rated HS to U.

Effectiveness: Each of the project's three outcomes will be rated HS to U. The colour coding of the individual indicator targets in **Annex 1** will partially help determine the grade. Each of the outcome indicators will also each be given a grade (in the justification column), however the final rating for each of the three outcomes will be due to appropriate weighting in terms of attaining project objectives. This means that professional judgement of the TE team will also be a key consideration.

Efficiency: An overall rating for cost-effectiveness will be provided

Rating Scale for Outcome (Relevance)

Relevant (R)	Not relevant (NR)
--------------	-------------------

Rating Scale for Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA) Execution

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The agency had no shortcomings in the achievement of their objectives in terms of quality of implementation or execution. Implementation of all five given management categories – IA or EA coordination & operational matters, partnership arrangements & stakeholder engagement, finance & co-finance, M&E systems, and adaptive management (work planning, reporting & communications, including update to project design) – has led to an efficient and effective project implementation. The agency can be presented as providing 'good practice'
Satisfactory (S)	The agency had only minor shortcomings in terms of the quality of implementation or execution. Implementation of most of the five management categories has led to an efficient and effective project implementation
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The agency had moderate shortcomings Implementation of some of the five management categories has led to a moderately efficient and effective project implementation
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The agency had significant shortcomings Implementation of some of the five management categories has not led to efficient and effective project implementation
Unsatisfactory (U)	There agency had major shortcomings in the quality of implementation or execution Implementation of most of the five management categories had not led to efficient and effective project implementation
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The agency had severe shortcomings with poor management leading to inefficient and ineffective project implementation

Rating Scale for Monitoring & Evaluation

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The M&E system – its design and implementation had no shortcomings in the support of achieving project objectives. The M&E system was highly effective and efficient and supported the achievement of major global environmental benefits. The M&E system and its implementation can be presented as 'good practice'.
Satisfactory (S)	The M&E system – its design and implementation had minor shortcomings in the support of achieving project objectives. The M&E system was effective and efficient and supported the achievement of most of the major global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The M&E system – its design and implementation had moderate shortcomings in the support of achieving project objectives. The M&E system supported the achievement of most of the major relevant objectives, but had significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The M&E system – its design and implementation had major shortcomings in the support of achieving project objectives. The M&E system supported the achievement of most of the major environmental objectives, but with modest relevance
Unsatisfactory (U)	The M&E system – its design and implementation had major shortcomings and did not support the achievement of most project objectives. The M&E system was not effective or efficient
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The M&E system failed in its design and implementation in terms of being effective, efficient or supporting project environmental objectives or benefits.

Rating Scale for Sustainability

Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability with key Outcomes achieved by the project closure and 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)	Significant risk that key Outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project Outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

According to UNDP-GEF evaluation guidelines, all risk dimensions of sustainability are critical: i.e., the overall rating for sustainability is not higher than the lowest-rated dimension.

Ratings should take into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

Risk definitions:

- a) Whether financial resources will be available to continue activities resulting in continued benefits
- b) Whether sufficient public stakeholder awareness and support is present for the continuation of activities providing benefit
- c) Whether required systems for accountability / transparency & technical know-how are in place
- d) Whether environmental risks are present that can undermine the future flow of the project benefits.

Rating Scale for Impact

Significant (S)	Minimal (M)	Negligible (N)
------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

Project Impact is rated as Significant; Minimal or Negligible, but also the positive or negative aspect of the impact will be stated.

Concerning impact, the TE will consider the extent of

- a) Verifiable improvement in ecological status; and/or
- b) Verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems
- c) Regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels

Process indicators will be specified to demonstrate achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement.

Part of the impact assessment, will concern catalytic effect. The TE will consider if the project exhibited

- a) Scaling up (to regional and national levels)
- b) Replication (outside of the project),
- c) Demonstration, and/or
- d) Production of a public good, such as new technologies /approaches)

Annex 10: Mission Itinerary

Day/Date	Time	Activity	Notes	Participates / Contact
Sun 1st Dec		Int'l Expert Depart from UK		
Mon 2nd Dec		In't Expert Arrival		timosobey@gmail.com
Tues 3rd Dec	AM	Inception Briefing by UNDP and the IP		
	PM	PMU Meetings - M&E, documentation check		
Wed 4th Dec		National level meetings		
	AM	MAWF; DoF; DAPEES - Conservation Agriculture		sustainable financing
	PM	NACSO / IRDNC		
		Hotel Windhoek		
Thur 5th Dec	AM	Travel to Field - Kunene (8 hours)		
	PM	CF - Ehirovipuka enroute to Opuwo		
		Overnight in Opuwo	Hotel	
Fri 6th Dec		Kunene - Opuwo		
	AM	Directorate of Forestry staff - Opuwo;	CF issues - Chief Forest Technician	Michael Aimana Cell +26481 2556701
	AM	Meeting with Directorate of CBNRM (MET)	Working on Conservancy issues	Rauna Gerhard (Warden), Cell +264812083913
	PM	Meeting with IRDNC	CF supported by the NAFOLA	
	PM	Meeting with Kunene Land Reform Office		
		Overnight in Opuwo	Hotel	
Saturday 7th Dec		Omusati		
	AM	Travel from Kunene to Omusati		
	AM	Uukolonkadhi CF members (Brickmaking Project)	Working on CF issues	Ms Kautiwa (Forest Technician), +264812164252
	PM	Omahenene Research Station	[unable to meet at weekend]	0818265744 Ms. Mundjele
	PM	Directorate of Forestry staff - Onesi	CF supported by the NAFOLA	Mr Nestory Ipinge (Chair of CF) +264813797528
	PM	Meeting with the Acting Chief Forester (Outapi)	Oversee forestry in Omusati and Oshana	Ms Felicia Haiduwa, Cell +264812591747
	PM	Overnight in Outapi	Hotel	
Sun 8th Dec		Travel / rest / Oshakati	Hotel	
Mon 9th Dec	AM	Namibia Development Trust - Meeting in Oshakati	CF- Uukolonkadhi, Otshiku, Okongo CF	Mr Teo Ntinda, Cell +264813363126
	AM	Travel from Oshana to Ohangwena,	Oshakati to Eenhana	
	PM	Ohangwena DoF		Elikana Popyeninawa, Cell +264812592883
	PM	Ohangwena DAPEES		
	PM	Overnight in Eenhana (Ohangwena)	Hotel	
Tues 10th Dec Public Holiday		Ohangwena		
	AM	CF - Okongo	CF members on project support	Ms Martha Kapembe, Cell +264813600570
	PM	Travel from Ohangwena to Tsumeb		
	PM	Overnight in Tsumeb or Grootfontain	Hotel	

Terminal Evaluation Report - Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (Nafola)

Wed 11th Dec		Otjozondjupa		
	AM	Travel		
	AM	African Wild Dog CF -	Bush to Feed program	Mr Kandinda (Chairperson), +264812615539
	PM	Sandveld Research Station		062568014 office
		Gobabis	Hotel	
Thur 12th Dec		Omaheke		
		Travel to Otjombinde	CF	
		Conservation Agriculture	Demonstration Plots	
	AM	Talimamus Kraal	Livestock Marketing	Dr Kaurivi, Cell +264811700128
	PM	Otjombinde Constituency Councillor		Chairperson
	PM	Overnight in Otjombinde	Hotel	
Friday 13th Dec		Omaheke - Drive to Gobabis		
	AM	DAPEES (Gobabis)	Livestock Marketing	Dr Kaurivi, Cell +264811700128
	PM	Directorate of Forestry staff - Gobabis	Working on CF issues	
	PM	Meeting with ORFU	Omaheke Region Farmers Union	Chairperson
		Gobabis	hotel	
Sat 14th		Return		
		Windhoek	hotel	
Sun 15th		Rest / Windhoek		
Mon 16th	AM	MAWF – Directorate of R&D MAWF – Directorate of Forestry – CF Representative		
	AM	Namibia Agronomy Board		
	AM	GEF Operational Focal Point		
	PM	UNDP Programme / Unit Manager		
	PM	UNDP RTA Phemo Kgomotso		
Tues 17th Dec	AM	Project Manager Eval Questions		
	PM	Seminar Preparation		
Wed 18th Dec	AM	TE Team Briefing (Draft Findings) - Seminar		
	PM	TE Team time		
Thur 19th Dec	AM	UNDP - Wrap-up with UNDP CO / Deputy RR		
	PM	TE Team time		
Fri 20th Dec	AM	Intl Expert Departure		
Sat 21st Dec		Arrival back in UK		

This mission was completed as written, but with minor changes

Annex 12: Indicative TE Evaluation Matrix

This questionnaire was used as a general aid during the field visit with the results described in section 3. (Note there is no further information to be presented in the blank boxes.)

Evaluation Question	Response / Finding	Conclusion/ Recommend
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF FA, 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		
Findings discussion – 3 areas - Project formulation, project implementation, and project results.		
Project Strategy		
Project Design:		
To what extent is the project in line with national and local priorities?		
To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area?		
Have synergies with other projects and initiatives been incorporated in the design?		
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?		
Decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?		
Have issues materialized due to incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document?		
Results Framework:		
Are the project objective / outcomes clear, practicable, & feasible within its time frame?		
Were the project's logframe indicators and targets appropriate? How "SMART" were the midterm and end-of-project targets (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound)? Any amendments?		
Progress towards Results		
Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:		
Review the logframe indicators against delivery at end-of-project targets using the Results Matrix (see Annex).		
Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline, MTR and End.		
Which barriers hindered achievement of the project objective		
PROJECT FORMULATION		
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?		
Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?		
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?		
Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?		
Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?		
Were the project assumptions and risks articulated in the PIF and project document?		
Whether the planned outcomes were SMART		
ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS		
As per logframe - Logical and robust, and have helped to determine activities and planned outputs.		
Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings.		
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management		
GEF Partner Agency / Implementing Entity – UNDP		
Has there been an appropriate focus on results?		
Has the UNDP support to the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and Project Team been adequate?		
Has the quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner and Project Team been adequate?		
How has the responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any) been?		
Has overall risk management been proactive, participatory, and effective?		
Are there salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays? And, how have they affected project outcomes and sustainability?		
Candor and realism in annual reporting		
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner Execution		
Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the Project was designed?		
Were partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to Project approval?		
Were counterpart resources, enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at Project entry?		
Have management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement been adequate?		

Has there been adequate mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure?		
Whether there was an appropriate focus on results and timeliness? Quality of risk management? Candor and realism in reporting?		
Government ownership (when NEX) or level of support if 'in cooperation with' the IP.		
Work Planning / PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION		
Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region, including the formation of a Project Board. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project implementation.		
Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.		
Has the project experienced delays in start-up and/or implementation? What were the causes of the delays? And, have the issues been resolved?		
Were work-planning processes results-based?		
Did the project team use the results framework/ logframe as an M&E and a management tool?		
Were there any changes to the logframe since project start, and have these changes been documented and approved by the project board?		
FINANCE & CO-FINANCE		
<u>Prodoc</u> Did the prodoc identify potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing? Prodoc include strong financial controls that allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget, allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of project deliverables Did the prodoc demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits.		
Sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources. The reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing. The extent to which project components supported by external funders were integrated into the overall project. Effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of co-financing. Evidence of additional, leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project. (Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector)		
<u>Cost-effective factors</u> Compliance with the incremental cost criteria and securing co-funding and associated funding. Project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned. The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)?		
<u>Standard Finance questions</u> (see MTR) Have strong financial controls been established allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and the payment of satisfactory project deliverables? Are there variances between planned and actual expenditures? If yes, what are the reasons behind these variances? Has the project demonstrated due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits? Have there been any changes made to the fund allocations as a result of budget revisions? Assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. Has pledged cofinancing materialized? If not, what are the reasons behind the cofinancing not materializing or falling short of targets?		
Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems		
The quality of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan's design and implementation: An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, MTR, TE, and adequate funding for M&E activities.		
M&E plan at project start up, considering whether baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities are well articulated. Is the M&E plan appreciated? Is it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?		
Were sufficient resources allocated effectively to M&E?		
Were there changes to project implementation / M&E as a result of the MTR recommendations?		
Are the M&E systems appropriate to the project's specific context? - effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance		
Do the monitoring tools provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?		
To what extent has the Project Team been using inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems?		
To what extent have follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management measures, been taken in response to the PIRs? Check to see whether APR/PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with the MTR and TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?		
Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports		
The value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff		
The extent to which development objectives are built into monitoring systems: How are perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed?		

How are relevant groups' (including women, indigenous peoples, children, elderly, disabled, and poor) involvement with the project and the impact on them monitored?		
Has there been adequate mitigation and management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Environmental and Social screening procedure?		
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT		
Are the interactions as per the prodoc? Stakeholder interactions include information dissemination, consultation, and active participation in the project.		
Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?		
Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?		
Participation and public awareness: How has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?		
Are there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities? Is there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?		
Reporting:		
How have adaptive management changes been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board?		
How well have the Project Team and partners undertaken and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs?), and suggest trainings etc. if needed?		
How have PIRs been shared with the Project Board and other key stakeholders?		
How have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners, and incorporated into project implementation?		
Communication:		
Internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and long-term investment in the sustainability of project results?		
External project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)		
Are there possibilities for expansion of educational or awareness aspects of the project to solidify a communications program, with mention of proper funding for education and awareness activities? What aspects of the project might yield excellent communications material, if applicable?		
ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT		
Changes in the environmental and development objectives of the project during implementation, why these changes were made and what was the approval process. Causes for adaptive management: a) original objectives were not sufficiently articulated; b) exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; c) project was restructured because original objectives were overambitious; d) project was restructured because of a lack of progress;		
How these changes were instigated and how these changes affected project results: - Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the MTR? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications. - If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? - Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?		
PROJECT RESULTS		
A 'result' is defined as a describable or measurable development change resulting from a cause-and-effect relationship. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects. Assess the results based management (RBM) chain, from inputs to activities, to outputs, outcomes and impacts.		
Assess the project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools		
BROADER ASPECTS OF PROJECT OUTCOMES		
Country Ownership		
Project concept had its origin within the national sectoral and development plans?		
Have Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans? Has the government enacted legislation and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?		
Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) were actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation, part of steering committee?		
Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?		
The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project?		
Mainstreaming (Broader Development and Gender)		
Whether broader development and gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?		
In what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of environmental impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how.		
Did the MTR recommend improvements to the logframe with SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits? - Were these taken up?		

1. Whether it is possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/ job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).		
2. If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP).		
3. Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters.		
The mainstreaming assessment should take note of the points of convergence between UNDP environment-related and other development programming.		
Sustainability		
Risk Management		
Are the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module the most important? And, are the risk ratings applied appropriate and up to date? If not, explain why.		
Financial Risks to Sustainability (of the project outcomes)		
What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends? (This might include funding through government - in the form of direct subsidies, or tax incentives, it may involve support from other donors, and also the private sector. The analysis could also point to macroeconomic factors.)		
What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?		
What additional factors are needed to create an enabling environment for continued financing?		
Has there been the establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (i.e. from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives)?		
Socio-Economic Risks to Sustainability:		
Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?		
What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?		
Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?		
Is there sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?		
Have lessons learned been documented by the Project Team on a continual basis?		
Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?		
Institutional Framework and Governance Risks to Sustainability:		
Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize project benefits?		
Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?		
How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?		
How has the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?		
Has the project achieved stakeholders' (including government stakeholders') consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?		
Does the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership)? Can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning?		
Environmental Risks to Sustainability:		
Are there environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders? E.g. climate change risk to biodiversity		
Impact - Progress towards the achievement of impacts		
Verifiable improvements in ecological status (or via process indicators to show it is likely in the future)?		
Verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems (via process indicators)?		
E.g. as a result of the project, there have been regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels? (Use tracking tools and indications from baseline to target)		
Identify the mechanisms at work (i.e. the causal links to project outputs and outcomes);		
Assess the extent to which changes are taking place at scales commensurate to natural system boundaries; and		
Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts.		
On the basis of the outcome and sustainability analyses, identify key missing elements as that are likely to obstruct further progress.		
Theory of Change – Identify project intended impacts – verify logic – analyse project outcome to impact pathway		
Based on the theory of change (building blocks, catalysts etc), has the progress towards impact has been significant, minimal or negligible.		
Catalytic role		
Scaling up - Approaches developed through the project are taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required		
Replication - Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the project, nationally or internationally		
Demonstration - Steps have been taken to catalyze the public good, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training		
Producing a public good –		
(a) The lowest level of catalytic result, including for instance development of new technologies and approaches.		
(b) No significant actions were taken to build on this achievement, so the catalytic effect is left to 'market forces'		

Annex 13: Signed UNDP Code of Conduct 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	
Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System	
Name of Consultants: Victory Mufita, Richard Sobey	
We confirm that we have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.	
Signed on December 3 rd 2019	Signed 30 th November 2019
 Victory Mufita National Consultant / Team Specialist	 Richard Sobey International Consultant, Team Leader

Annex 14: Signed TE Final Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:

Annex 15: Terms of Reference

To be presented on the UNDP ERC webpage - <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/units/130>