

Review of draft MTR: Comment log

#	Location in Report	Comment	Response from evaluators
1	Front page, rh top cell of table	Please specify NIM, with execution-support	Amended
2	Pg. 3, 2 nd last paragraph	Please add: Which is known commonly as the Global Wildlife Programme – GWP, and is led by the World Bank.	Text added. Note there is also a footnote on GWP
3	p. 4, paragraph below Table 1, last line:	Please check with the PMU if the vaDoma self-identify as indigenous peoples and, if they do, please mention this here.	Yes they do (PIR, 2021) text added.
4	p. 15, Table 7, Indicators 8 and 9:	These are rated S, but are coloured orange, which in all other cases indicates MS. Can you either explain why this is the case or correct if this is an error.	Rating made consistent
5	p. 15, Table 7, Indicator 10	Similarly, Indicator 10 is rated MS, but is colour-coded red. Please rectify, one way or the other.	Rating amended
6	p. 18, Indicator 6	Do you think that the results observed may be due to use of number of seizures as a measure of improved law enforcement effectiveness? For example, fewer seizures could be because there are fewer incidents so perhaps the important thing is to correlate seizures with number of incidents/animals poached etc	As explained in the report the number of seizures and arrests may not consistently correlate with the effectiveness of law enforcement. Improved law enforcement may well be reflected in increases in seizures at least initially, but then fall as perpetrators move to less well enforced areas. The clearest measure of law enforcement is probably the number of animals, but also important to track seizures / arrest, along with % of successful as this act as deterrent
7	p. 26, Indicator 1	(i) Did the project mention that resources will be invested in developing a tissue culture facility to increase seedling production? The PMU can provide information. (ii) Is it possible that the project could also look at using Bindura bamboo – which is indigenous, fast-growing and a quickly-replenished source of firewood and building materials; since the bamboo is clump-forming and has a shallow fibrous root system, it has excellent soil holding properties which helps address erosion in degraded lands (and may be more effective in terms of restoring ecosystem function than planting only fruit	(i) Not mentioned – but text added on this (ii) Added footnote on this

		trees would be). There are also many options for setting up secondary businesses – furniture making, biochar etc	
8	p. 30, Box on Small Grants, first paragraph	Reference is made to UNDP having preference to build a new barn rather than upgrade existing ones. Were you able to establish the reasons for this – it is because that is what stands in the Prodoc and that the new barn would be of a more energy efficient type that would reduce fuelwood use, or were there other reasons?	I have removed this text as I am not sure of the reason. I think it may be linked to the intention to use the barn all year round, rather than for just tobacco curing
9	p. 37 and elsewhere	Reference is made to the PSC and a JSC – I am not sure if I missed it somewhere, but how do these bodies differ?	They are the same. PSC now used consistently throughout
10	p. 40, second last paragraph	Can you provide more clarification with regard to expenditures related to UNDP staff costs. No UNDP staff costs should be charged to the project grant. However, since there is an approved LOA for UNDP to provide execution-support services, UNDP can recover the costs of staff time (not salaries) and other costs associated with performing these services from the DPC budget line. The costs of technical oversight, M&E support etc should all be costed against the GEF Agency Fee, NOT the project grant.	I was seeking clarification myself on this and some other aspects of the financials. I have amended text to reflect comment
11	p. 45, Notes under the Table	For your information: Reference is made to UNDP procedures not allowing for direct transfers to NGOs/RPs. This is only the case if the HACT assessment of the RP showed Significant or High Risks.	Noted. Text revised
12	p. 48, box on Challenges with DSA payments	Bullet 2 states that Mobile Money transactions were banned due to illegal transactions. Please can you make it clear who banned these transactions (was it the government?) and if the illegal transactions were associated with this project, or if they were taking place generally in the country, and hence the government banned this.	Clarifications made
13	p. 48, Procurement, para. 2	Reference is made to UNDP doing a lot of the procurement on behalf of the IP – please can you add, for accuracy, that this is consistent with the approved LOA between the IP and UNDP in respect of execution services to be performed by UNDP – this is very important for us from a policy compliance perspective	Text amended
14	p. 48, last paragraph	Fuel availability – please could you state that the lack of availability of fuel is due to external conditions prevailing in Zimbabwe (not necessarily bad planning on behalf of the	Text added

		project), in which fuel is in short supply and not readily available. This will help explain the operating difficulties the project faces and the reason why the project has had to take decisions it has to resolve this problem.	
15	p. 49, 2 nd para	Delays due to imports from China: Was it possible to establish if some of this equipment could be purchased from South Africa, where supply chain issues and delivery delays may not be as severe?	Not established through MTR
16	p. 51: Communications	It is not evident anywhere in the report that the project has been very active participants in and contributors to knowledge exchanges convened through the Global Wildlife Programme including annual GWP conferences and quarterly regional coordination calls. The project has also been featured in two Exposure stories published on the internet. One of the project RPs (Charles Jonga from CAMPFIRE) led a discussion panel at the 2020 GWP conference and the Project Manager has presented examples and lessons learnt during several of the regional coordination calls and in specific training sessions convened by GWP. It is a pity if this is not reflected.	Text added
17	p. 58, Ratings Table, Implementation and Adaptive Management	It seems there is indecision as to the rating to award: For an MU rating, SOME of the 7 components assessed under this category should be deemed not to be contributing to efficient or effective implementation, with most needing remedial action. For a U rating, MOST of the 7 criteria assessed under this category should be deemed not to be contributing to effective and efficient implementation.	Overall rating of MU given, although some elements such as disbursements considered to be unsatisfactory
18	p. 59: Recommendation 2: Annual Plans	For you to consider: Please note that the project is required to use this format since it is a pre-set template. HOWEVER, the Excel spreadsheet you propose could be set up IN ADDITION to using the pre-set template (which basically serves as a summary) to ensure the finer-grained planning and monitoring which clearly is required	Noted and text amended
19	p. 59: Recommendation 2: Acceleration Plan	FYI – the 2021 PIR includes recommendations for accelerating delivery – it would be useful if these could be considered during the development of the proposed acceleration plan. It also includes Action Plans for each outcome that is off-track	Noted

		and it would be useful if these could be incorporated into the acceleration plan you propose here.	
20	p.60, Recommendation 4: reconfirming cofinance	For information: It is now compulsory to report on realized cofinancing in the annual PIR	Noted. Co-financing realised is noted in PIR, but this is different to the information i received from the PMU
21	p. 60, Recommendation 5: Expedite procurement of boats	Please could you clarify as it is not clear to me if the recommendation is to implement a special unit for river patrols/surveillance, or, if this is already a plan under development – this may be because the wording in the recommendation is a little telegraphic.	Sorry – text mistakenly left in note form – I have amended.
22	p. 60, Recommendation 6, involvement of senior management	Can you elaborate a little on this recommendation please to provide clearer guidance for crafting of a management response? Is it envisaged that this is involvement through the PSC, or involvement in day-to-day implementation?	I have elaborated
23	p. 60, Recommendation 7: enhanced risk management	Request for clarity: Are you referring to risks TO project implementation (i.e. things that are external to the project but that might affects its success), or the social and environmental safeguards risks the project might trigger? OR performance risks? There are several systems in place for monitoring and responding to risks: the project's SESP should be updated annually as part of the PIR process; similarly, UNDP CO is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date risk register in ATLAS, and this has to be updated, in consultation with the PSC and the RTA at least once a year as part of the PIR; Further, there is a performance risk dashboard in PIMS+ which is managed by the BPPS NCE team. Ensuring that the PSC risk management activities are well-integrated into these risk monitoring and management pathways is clearly very important – do you have thoughts on how this could be done? Or could this be built into this recommendation	I was trying to get across then need to not only identify risks but come up with solutions / mitigation measures and posing the possibility of risk management taking on a more strategic angle in some cases, led by the PMU.
24	p. 61, Recommendation 12: engage all stakeholders	Can you clarify: are the stakeholders being referred to here the Conservancy Trusts/Committees, general stakeholders?	Some Safari operators who are in theory co-financers need to be brought more into the project. There are also some Conservancies who are not formally involved, but would like to be. Text amended

25	p. 61, Recommendation 14: economic assessment	Can you clarify who should undertake this and what measures you think the project should put in place if the timeframe for doing this falls after project closure? Otherwise it is difficult for the project to develop an actionable management response.	Text added
26	P. 36 Overview of Small Grant Projects	There is need to verify the actual name of the NGO. The project has not extended a small grant to Development Association. The full name of the organisation should Lower Guruve Development Association (LGDA).	Amended – editing error on my part Additional text also added on ZELA, which was missing
27	P.37 Overview of Small Grant Projects	The identified and approved project (Small Grants) had no provision to procure bicycles in the proposal.	Text amended
28	P 38 Overview of Small Grant Projects	The statement needs be qualified. It not clear if it is one farmer per ward or per district.	Text revised
29	P38 Overview of Small Grant Projects	There need to add more information on how the project is piloting bee keeping to mitigate HWC.	Text added
30	P. 41 Output 4.3. Gender strategy developed and used to guide project implementation, monitoring and reporting mainstreaming	There is need to expand this statement explaining the context. I am assuming you mean one women as a councillor.	Corrected. Yes, was meant to say 1 women councillor
31	P.43 3.2.1.5 Technical Committee	The statement need to be simplified. It is not clear which organisations are being referred to.	Text amended. This is a general statement regarding participation
32	P.45 3.2.3 Work Planning	There is need to state the name of the baseline survey under consideration.	Text amended (now as footnote). Earlier section of report has move examples of activities delayed

33	P9	Whilst the analysis on the status and progress made under the various outcome areas, output areas and indicators is noted and well articulated, your reflections on the theory change of the project and status in terms of contribution to the bigger picture.	Text added on ToC in sections 3.1.1 and 3.3.2
----	----	---	---