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Management Response to the Terminal Evaluation (TE)

*Réponse de la direction à l’évaluation finale (EF)*

**PIMS 1617 W-Arly-Pendjari "WAP" Project**

**Projet WAP**

Enhancing the effectiveness and catalyzing the sustainability of the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) protected area system

*Renforcer l’efficacité et catalyser la durabilité du système des aires protégées du W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Period: June 2013 – April 2014** *Report translated in 30 Jun 2014**report accepted on 15 Apr 2014 (RTA) and 23 Apr 2015 (UNOPS)***UNDP and UNOPS Management Response:** **Initiated April 2014 / updated (n/a)** | **Période de l’évaluation: Juin 2013 – Avril 2014** *Rapport traduit en 30 juin 2014**Rapport accepté le 15 avril 2014 (RTA) et le 23 avril 2014 (UNOPS)* **Réponse de la direction du PNUD et de l'UNOPS:****Initié en avril 2014 / actualisée en (s/o)**  |

I) Overview | Panorama

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:**  | **Renforcer l’efficacité et catalyser la durabilité du système des aires protégées du W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP)****Enhancing the effectiveness and catalysing the sustainability of the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) protected area system** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GEF Project ID:ID de projet du FEM : | 1197 | Finance DataDonnées financières | *at endorsement (Million US$)**(unless otherwise indicated)* | *at project end (Million US$)**(unless otherwise indicated)* |
| GEF Agency Project ID:ID de projet du PNUD :  | UNDP PIMS 1617 Atlas Award# / Project ID# UNDP: 43891 / 51403UNOPS: 51403 / 60168 | GEF financing:Financement du FEM :  | *In USD*: PDF-B (proj. prep.) 467,130FSP 5,154,741TOTAL grant (net of fees) 5,621,871 | *In USD*: PDF-B (proj. prep.) 467,130FSP 5,154,741TOTAL grant (net of fees) 5,621,871 |
| Country:Pays : | Regional: Burkina Faso (lead), Benin and Niger | IA/EA own:Financement de l’agence FEM : | $0.015 (during PDF phase) | $0.015 (fully disbursed + some funds from Niger and Burkina Faso COs) |
| Region: / Région : | Africa | Government:Gouvernement :  | $2,300 | $0,335 |
| Focal Area: Domaine focal : | Biodiversity | Other:Autre:  | $18,614  | $27,013 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):Objectifs du domaine focal FEM :  | Biodiversity, Protected Areas (SO1 / SP3) | Total co-financing:Cofinancement total : | $20,914 | $27,348  |
| Executing Agency:Agent d’exécution : | UNOPS | Total Project Cost:Coût total du projet : | $26 million | ~ $33 million |
| Other Partners involved:Autres partenaires participant au projet : | National PA agencies, IUCN, UEMOA, EU, AFAUDEB, FSOA Proj (WB), PAGAP Proj, Gov of Togo, APF, several NGOs | UNDP ProDoc Signature (date project began):Signature du DP (Date de début du projet) :  | 13 Dec-2007 |
| (Operational) Closing Date:Date de clôture (opérationnelle): | Proposed / proposée : Dec 2013 | Actual / réel: April / Avril 2014 *(all project activities ended in Nov 2013, only TE management response pending)**(toutes les activités du projet sont finies en novembre 2013 ; il ne reste que la réponse de la direction à l’évaluation finale)* |

II) Ratings | Notation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | **1 Suivi et évaluation** | ***Rating / Notation*** |
| M&E design at entry | Conception du suivi et de l’évaluation à l’entrée | S |
| M&E Plan Implementation | Mise en œuvre du plan de suivi et d’évaluation | S |
| Overall quality of M&E | Qualité globale du suivi et de l’évaluation | MS |
| **2. IA& EA Execution** | **2 A*gence d’exécution/agence de réalisation***  | ***Rating / Notation*** |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation | Qualité de la mise en œuvre par le PNUD | MS |
| Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (UNOPS) | Qualité de l’exécution : agence d’exécution (UNOPS) | S |
| Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | Qualité globale de la mise en œuvre et de l’exécution | S |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **3 Évaluation des résultats**  | ***Rating / Notation*** |
| Relevance  | Pertinence  | S |
| Effectiveness | Efficacité | S |
| Efficiency  | Efficience  | S |
| **Overall Project Outcome Rating**Outcome 1)Outcome 2)Outcome 3) Outcome 4) | **Note globale de la réalisation du projet**Résultat 1)Résultat 2)Résultat 3) Résultat 4) | **MS\*** -  |
| **4. Sustainability** | **4 Durabilité** | ***Rating***  | ***Notation*** |
| Financial resources: | Ressources financières : | MU | MI |
| Socio-economic: | Socioéconomique: | ML | ML |
| Institutional framework and governance: | Cadre institutionnel et gouvernance : | ML | ML |
| Environmental : | Environnemental : | ML | ML |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability: | Probabilité globale de la durabilité : | ML | ML |

[\*] Rating per Outcome not provided, but the topic is analysed in the report in several passages, in particular in Tables 3 and 4.)

 Notation par résultat pas donné, mais le niveau de réalisation du projet est analysé dans le rapport dans plusieurs passages, surtout dans les tableaux 3 et 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating Scale** | **Échelles de notations** |
|  |  |

III) Summary and update | Sommaire et mise à jour

| **Main issues with the evaluation** **Principales conclusions de l’évaluation**  | **General response** (page numbering refers to the French version)**Réponse générale** |
| --- | --- |
| The TE assessed the extent to which the project has achieved **results and impacts**, and through those, whether it has **generated global biodiversity benefits**, as well **as other associated benefits** (e.g. socio-economic, capacity related, policy advancements etc.) – benefits which will likely be sustained within a reasonably foreseeable future. **The key focus** of the evaluation of results, impacts and benefits has revolved around the WAP project’s success in reduction the pressure on biological resources of the WAP Protected Area (PA) Complex by working on (Outcome 1) supportive communities (mostly in the periphery of the Complex); (Outcome 2) on the national capacity for PA management; and (Outcome 3) on the regional cohesion with respect to a concerted management model for the WAP PA sub-system. The project also focused on the effectiveness of project monitoring, including through learning and knowledge dissemination, and through creating a culture of adaptive feedback and evaluation among WAP stakeholders (Outcome 4). The TE’s overall rating for the project was MS, mainly *“due to weaknesses observed for certain products under Outcome 3*”. (page 10) [Note globale de la réalisation du projet (MS) en raison de faiblesses observées pour certains produits du Résultat 3.]The TE stressed the following with respect to **performance and mentions the main difficulties encountered**: *“The objective of the WAP [project] of "enhancing the effectiveness and catalysing the sustainability of the [WAP’s] protected areas system" has been largely achieved, despite difficulties [that were] more or less predictable and which the project had to face during its implementation.”* (page 11)[L’objectif du WAP de « **renforcer l’efficacité et catalyser la durabilité du système des aires protégées** » est largement atteint, en dépit de difficultés plus ou moins prévisibles auxquelles il lui a fallu faire face pendant son intervention.] *“Among the difficulties, it is important to recall the delay in the project’s inception, though this did not represent a constraint to it [in its ability to achieve results].”* (page 11)[Parmi les difficultés, il importe de rappeler le retard au démarrage du projet, bien que cela ne lui ait pas été rédhibitoire.]The TE also assessed various aspects of **project sustainability** (financial, socio-economic, institutional, governance framework related, and not least also environmental). The TE pointed out to a **moderate to substantial risk** that some of the project outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.The TE equally looked at elements such as **relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** with respect to project performance and the production of outcomes. These were satisfactorily assessed. According to TE report, the justification for the MS rating for the project’s **overall performance** is grounded on the fact that much has been achieved, but there were shortcomings. On the positive side, a number of **achievements** were pointed out by the TE, in particular: 1) The WAP project has contributed to *“[c]apacity building, improving management efficiency by applying appropriate tools, [rolling out] training and communication, [promoting] conflict management, monitoring, micro-projects, the greening of local development plans (PDC), and developing a master plan [for the WAP], etc.”* (page 11)[Un renforcement des capacités, une amélioration de l’efficacité de gestion au moyen notamment d’outils adaptés, les formations et la communication, la gestion des conflits, la surveillance, les microprojets, le reverdissement des PDC, les schémas directeurs, etc.]2) *“The WAP project has also contributed to “[a]dvancing on the issue of [financial] sustainability of the [WAP’s] protected areas system, even if a more lasting solution has not yet been put in place. The same applies to the establishment of a regional body, for which proposed regulatory texts are yet to be finalized.”* (ibid.)[Faire avancer la question de la durabilité des SAP, même si la solution définitive n’est pas encore acquise. Il en est de même pour l’organe régional dont les projets de texte réglementaire restent à finaliser.]On the **shortcomings**, the following has been highlighted :*“Although the project was well designed and generally well executed, the underestimation of the budget provided by the GEF has constrained the final implementation phase, which was reflected on the timing for the conclusion of [activities under] Outcome 2 (adaptive management), and to a lesser extent under Outcome 3 [regional coordination].”* (page 9)[Bien que le projet ait été bien conçu et qu’il se soit globalement bien déroulé, la sous-estimation du budget mis à disposition par le FEM a gêné la phase finale d’exécution, ce qui s’est ressenti sur le bouclage à temps du Résultat 2 (gestion adaptative) et, dans une moindre mesure du Résultat 3.]The TE insists that the WAP project had a very short duration and that it had an insufficient budget:*“The planned project duration of only 5 years, counting from PRODOC signature, was too short with respect to its ambitious goals; also its budget was underestimated.”* (page 14)[La durée prévue du projet de seulement 5 ans à partir de la signature du document de projet était trop courte par rapport à ses objectifs ambitieux ; aussi le budget il a été sous-estimée.]*“Critique points […] Insufficient duration for such an ambitious project to be executed in a short time (5 years). Intervention with this level of ambition should not be slated for less than 10 years duration.”* (page 35)[Les critiques au projet WAP […] La durée insuffisante du projet trop ambitieux pour s’inscrire dans des délais courts (5 ans). Les ambitions d’intervention ne devraient pas se caler sur des périodes inférieures à 10 ans.]Yet, this is not presented, nor discussed, as a project design issue. The quality at entry was in fact assessed by the TE as ‘Satisfactory’. This is somewhat contradictory. Another shortcoming behind the MS rating has been the issues of sustainability, in particular the **financial sustainability one, rated MU (moderately unlikely) by the TE**. The TE indicated that the WAP Complex had a weak financial sustainability status at project end, however hard, quantitative evidence had not been presented by the TE. At the same time, UNDP also notes that the project had various opportunities to carry out studies on financial sustainability, which could have helped the project make the case for it and advance on the issue of PA finance. Yet, the project did not do it; and the TE did not discuss this issue. UNDP also notes, in various passages, that the TE seemed to confound the issue of financial sustainability of the WAP Complex with the operationalization of a trust fund, in particular the FSOA, which is the way still in progress after many years, and currently supported by national WB-GEF project implemented in Benin. In general, the analysis and the presentation of lessons and recommendations remained brief in the TE report, with many aspects left implicit in the way they are presented. The TE’s style of writing requires some level of interpretation to be understood by those who do not know the WAP project and its context. **Summary of analysis  on the WAP project performance (pages 19-20)** ***“The timing for the implementation of WAP project activities has been generally respected.*** *Considering the [financial] situation of the project at the time of planned [operational] closure, the overall assessment shows the following observations:”***[Le calendrier prévu pour l’exécution des activités du WAP a été globalement respecté**. En considérant la situation du projet au moment de sa clôture anticipée, le bilan donne les constats ci-après:]* ***The overall [sustainability] objectives*** *(political, ecological and socio-economic): of the WAP [project] displayed, during a short period, tangible and measurable performance (indicators 1, 2, 3, 4), without however being able to fully explore the possibilities, in part due to lack of resources and time to implement [activities]. Nonetheless, some elements of fragility remain.*

[les **objectifs globaux** (**Durabilité politique, financière, écologique et socio-économique**) : le WAP a, en peu de temps, réalisé des performances appréciables et mesurables (indicateurs 1, 2, 3, 4) sans toutefois avoir pu aller au bout de ses possibilités, en partie pour des raisons d’insuffisance de ressources et de temps d’exécution. Quelques éléments de fragilité demeurent malgré tout.] * ***Outcome 1 - Emergence of communities supporting Protected Areas*** *(indicators 5, 6, 7) [was] a fairly successful experimental approach. The level of expectations [from beneficiaries] is such that a more widespread impact will need to be produced by expanding the [WAP project’s] activities.*

[le **Résultat 1**- **Emergence de communautés soutenant les Aires Protégées** (indicateurs 5, 6, 7) : démarche expérimentale assez réussie. Le niveau des attentes est cependant tel qu’un effet de masse doit être produit en prolongement des activités WAP.]* ***Outcome 2 - Protected Areas effectively******managed*** *(indicators 8, 9). The management weaknesses have been identified and [ecological] inventories initiated.*

[le **Résultat 2**- **Aires Protégées gérées efficacement** (indicateurs 8, 9). Les faiblesses de gestion ont été identifiées et les inventaires initiés.]* ***Outcome 3 - Regional Operational Coordination WAP complex*** *(indicators 10, 11). The preparation of the [WAP’s] master plan will facilitate the development of [individual PAs] Management and Operational Plans (PAG).*

[le **Résultat 3**- **Coordination régionale opérationnelle du complexe WAP** (indicateurs 10, 11). L’élaboration des schémas directeurs va faciliter l’établissement des Plans d’Aménagement et de Gestion (PAG).]* ***Outcome 4 - Adaptive Management*** *(indicators 12, 13, 14). Building on the results from a concerted and continued dialogue with partners.”*

[le **Résultat 4**- **Gestion adaptative** (indicateurs 12, 13, 14). Capitalisation, concertation partenariale.] » The TE further points out in conclusion:*“The WAP project officials have clearly been aware of their [capacity] shortcomings, and found thereby ways to overcome their issues and achieve the [project’s] main objectives (especially under Outcomes 1 and 4). The overall situation in June 2013 clearly reflects the ability of the WAP [project] to produce positive results in a financially adverse and time constrained context.”* (page 20)[Les responsables du projet WAP ont clairement pris conscience de ses handicaps de façon à trouver des issues de contournement pour ses objectifs majeurs (surtout Résultats 1 et 4). **La situation globale en juin 2013 reflète nettement une capacité du WAP à produire des résultats positifs dans un contexte financier et temporel qui ne lui était pas favorable.]***“There are other elements that can explain the relatively successful outcome of a project that the TE had initially considered as ‘unusual’.”* (pages 11 and repeated in 34)[D’autres éléments entrent dans l’explication d’un aboutissement relativement heureux pour un projet que l’évaluation finale a considéré au début comme « inhabituel ».]Regrets, Lessons and RecommendationsThe TE lists five 5 lessons in connection with the WAP project implementation, presented as “risks and hypothesis”. The language is somewhat telegraphic, but we make an effort through the translation to transmit the message of what is being meant (numbered for the ease of reference):“*Risks and hypotheses*:1. *“****Limited financial resources*** *from the onset (equivalent to less than $1.5/ha for the WAP complex!). This surely affected the WAP project, [though it was] complemented by co-financing.*

[Au départ **peu de moyens financiers** (équivalant à moins $1,5/Ha du complexe WAP !) affectés, de façon sûre, au projet WAP et complétés par des cofinancements.]1. ***Risk: limited time available*** *to achieve very high ambitions. This imposed a sustained pace of work on the project team, hoping to fulfil the mission entrusted to the WAP Project.*

[**Risque** : **peu de temps disponible** pour réaliser des ambitions très élevées. Cela a imposé un rythme de travail soutenu de l’équipe du projet pour espérer remplir la mission confiée au projet WAP.]1. ***Hypothesis: An open collaboration between national PA technical services****, from which most of the project staff recruited came from, for the benefit of WAP project. This collaboration,* ***which was not required****, was in fact instituted. This deserves a thought for the future: the relationships between projects and technical services are not always [sufficiently] easy to ensure good results. It is obvious that the general approach of the WAP [project], which focused on the periphery of the PA complex, has facilitated this [collaborative] institutional attitude; this would probably not have been the case, if the main emphasis was on the management of [core] protected areas.*

[**Hypothèse** : Une **franche collaboration des administrations nationales**, d’où proviennent la plupart des personnels recrutés dans le projet, au bénéfice du WAP. Cette collaboration, non exigée, a été instaurée de facto. Elle mérite une réflexion pour l’avenir : les relations projets/administrations ne montrent pas toujours la sérénité, gage de bons résultats. Il reste évident que l’approche générale du WAP, qui mettait en avant la périphérie a facilité[,] cette attitude institutionnelle qui n’aurait probablement pas été identique si l’accent avait d’abord été mis sur les aires protégées.]1. ***Risk: An excellent recruitment of the project staff*** *(especially due to their level of competency and their team spirit), it was not immediately consolidated, but it allowed the project to overcome pitfalls, taking advantage of the professional experience and field relationships held by these officials.*

[**Risque** : Un **excellent recrutement des personnels du projet** (par la compétence et surtout l’esprit d’équipe) ; cela n’était pas joué à l’avance mais a permis de surmonter les écueils, en profitant des expériences professionnelles et du champ de relations constituées par ces responsables.]1. ***Hypothesis: A direct project management*** *by an executive agency such as UNOPS, which did not awake the initial enthusiasm of all stakeholders, including the technical services. But the effectiveness of the project’s [operational] management has benefited considerably from this execution modality, [which had] not previously applied to the WAP complex.”*

[**Hypothèse** : Une **gestion directe** par une agence d’exécution, comme l’UNOPS, qui ne suscitait pas l’enthousiasme initiale de tous les parties prenants, notamment administratifs. Mais l’efficacité de gestion du projet a profité largement de ce mode gestion non appliqué antérieurement dans le cadre du complexe WAP.] There are also a few **regrets**, which the TE pointed out. We highlight the following: The WAP should be a programme, not a project, but its success would have depended on (i) a deeper acceptance of its regional character; and (ii) the success of financial mechanisms like the FSOA. The TE also assessed **UNDP’s comparative advantage for developing and supporting a project like the WAP**. The conclusions, which have a bearing on the project replication potential, are assessed further down. Finally, the TE assesses the extent to which the **14 recommendations** from the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) have been followed through. It also complements this with a set of **8 new recommendations**. This is discussed further down.  | The RTA for this project has been following it since June 2005, i.e. when a critical phase of the project preparation process started, and has followed it from cradle to grave. The RTA is pleased to see that the project produced tangible results, which has been confirmed by the TE, in spite of a number of constraints, some of which are pointed out by the TE. UNDP Country Office (CO) project oversight was ensured at the regional level by UNDP Burkina Faso Office, but it had much support from the Benin and Niger UNDP COs. The process of reviewing the report by country-based stakeholders and UNOPS followed a fairly quick process. The CO reviewed the report sometime in November 2013 and had no major comments. The RTA also reviewed the TE report around the same time, but had quite a few issues with respect to its quality. Three RTA reviews were necessary to bring the report to a minimally required level of quality. The RTA prepared a separate **Note for the file** on the report review process for the CO sign in acknowledgement. The Note assesses the report’s overall quality and makes recommendations to UNOPS for selecting in the future TE consultants who have previous experience in GEF evaluations – and that the RTA and CO should participate in the process. This seemed to have been the pivot issue behind the fair quality of the TE report. There have **two** **key points of contention** in the RTA review: (i) the fact that the TE affirmed that the WAP project only lasted 3.5 years, without presenting factual evidence to underpin this; and (ii) statements made in the TE about a purportedly deliberate decision to close the project prematurely – a decision, according to the TE imposed on the project team. There was no evidence to support the second set of statements either. **Most issues related to the quality of the TE report, including statements that were not evidence-based, have been addressed by April 2014****UNDP disagrees outright with the TE that a duration of 5 years (nominal, proximate or actual) can be considered as too short**, as the TE pointed out in various passages (pages 14, 15, 19, 35, 39). This is the practically the norm for full-size GEF projects. The project duration was planned for 5 years in the PRODOC and, from all accounts, it lasted for a good 5 years. Counting from the date of PRODOC signature (Dec 2007) to end 2013, **the actual project duration was 6.0 years**. Counting from the day the project manager was hired (01-Oct-08) to the termination of UNOPS-led activities (31-Dec-2013), the **effective project duration is 5.2 years.** The actual operational closure at the level of UNDP will take place when this management response has been accepted by the UNDP lead CO. In addition, UNDP also disagrees outright with the TE on the idea that a new follow-on project to the WAP should last 10-15 years, as suggested in at least two passages. *“[…] In this context, consolidation call an intervention project for 10-15 year guarantee more tangible results.”* (page 10 and repeated in page 40)[… Dans cette perspective, une consolidation appellerait une intervention de projet sur 10-15 ans pour avoir la garantie de résultats encore plus palpables.]Projects for 10-15 years that address drivers to biodiversity loss are not at all realistic. We are very unlikely to find financiers and donors that are willing to sustain their support for so long. It is in turn important to prepare projects that are well balanced vis-à-vis the time allotted for implementation, the budget and the level of ambition. This recommendation is however not made in those terms in the TE, even though the intention is probably there.As per the TOR, the TE was expected to assess the extent to which the project has achieved impacts or has progressed towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should have been brought out in the TE would include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.UNDP has not seen an in-depth assessment of these elements in the TE report. The project was slated to produce most of its impacts on the ground through the reduction of ecological stress, in particular by working on the periphery of the WAP Complex, and by working at PA systemic level. The baseline analysis at pipeline entry indicated that other partners were already involved in supporting the management of core PAs in the WAP Complex. Due to a protracted project start, the situation changed. By mid-2008, the GEF WAP project was the only active intervention at scale at the level of the WAP Complex and with many expectations to fulfil. The TE makes this point, but only in concluding remarks and by leaving some room for interpretation – it refers to “*le Grand WAP*” and “*le petit WAP*”, which one also needs to guess the meaning of, to fully understand TE statements. “*Initially, for many community based stakeholder, the WAP [project] was generally expected as the "Great WAP" because of the significant expectations [they had towards it], in line with what had been achieved with the previous project, the ECOPAS. Finally, the "Little WAP" arrived; and it had to manage disappointments, because the funds did not reach the expected level. Yet, despite the limited funding, the [local] population became effectively aware of the goods and services provided by biodiversity conservation. For consolidating [results], a new intervention would require a 10-15 year project to ensure more tangible results. Nevertheless, conservation managers have benefited from some equipment (bicycles ...), training (on GIS and anti-poaching...), etc.., which have significantly improved the capacity of personnel involved in the surveillance of protected areas.*” (page 38)[Au départ, pour de nombreux acteurs des communautés de base, le WAP était généralement attendu comme le « Grand WAP » en raison de l’énormité des espérances, en prolongement de ce qu’avait fait le précédent projet ECOPAS. Finalement le « Petit WAP » est arrivé ; il a fallu déchanter car les moyens financiers n’ont pas suivi. Pourtant, malgré le financement limité, la prise de conscience par les populations des biens et services assurés par la conservation de la biodiversité est effective. Une consolidation appellerait une intervention de projet sur 10-15 ans pour avoir la garantie de résultats plus palpables. Malgré tout, les gestionnaires de la conservation ont pu disposer de petits équipements (vélos…), de formations (cartographie, LAB…), etc., qui ont sensiblement amélioré les capacités des personnels chargés de la surveillance des aires protégées.]**Given that most report quality issues have been addressed, UNDP can say that it generally agrees with the TE findings**, but would have rated the project’s overall performance as **S** (instead of **MS**), in line with the rating attributed by both CO and the RTA in the 2013 PIR for progress toward meeting the project’s development objectives. The PIR’s **S** ratings by both CO and RTA are not however uncritical of the project’s shortcomings. Both recognise the issues faced by WAP project, which had been clearly laid out in the PIR’s comments section. UNDP does not deny that the project inception was lengthy and will learn – is learning – from lessons offered by the WAP project and other regional projects in West Africa (e.g. under the Endemic Livestock project). **UNDP agrees with the remainder of the TE ratings, with one other small point of dissent.** Both the UNDP CO and UNDP GEF RTA think that the **quality of UNDP supervision** deserved a better rating than **MS**. Both note that the evidence to underpin this specific TE’s ratings is scant. **On the issue of sustainability**, the TE took a rather critical stand, pointing out that the project results risk not being sustained in time, if not soon complemented by other forms of support to PA management. The TE stresses the need to bring community based interventions in the WAP’s periphery to scale. UNDP agrees. However, also there, the analysis of sustainability should be overly focused on the financial sustainability of the WAP Complex, as it seems to have been in the TE. Furthermore, financial sustainability is important and should have been addressed by the project, but it does not hinge on the operationalization of a trust fund, which the TE seems to suggest. On this matter, UNDP notes that while trust funds can be important for strengthening the financial sustainability of protected area systems, they are but one of the elements that contribute to it, and in fact not the most important one.UNDP would also like to comment on **a statement made by the TE under lesson #3 on collaboration between the project and technical services not being a ‘requirement’. UNDP does not agree with it.** In a project like the WAP – or in any other UNDP project, for that matter – collaboration between national technical services, who are often project beneficiaries, is indeed a minimum operating criteria for project conception and implementation. UNDP would not make investments, nor roll out a development project on the ground, without the full engagement, support and collaboration of technical services. This is irrespective of the fact that the WAP project worked mostly in the periphery of the Complex, rather than in core PAs.Beyond the points raised above, UNDP’s management response to specific points in the TE will revolve around the two following aspects:* **TE recommandations**
* **Discussion on UNDP’s comparative advantage for developing and supporting a project like the WAP**

These respectively are treated in under **chapter IV** and the **annex** to this document further down**.**It is important to point out that the main lessons extracted from this management response and which are directly implementable by UNDP are applicable to:(1) **The EU financed PAPE project**, currently on-going and where UNDP COs play the role of project implementing partner; (2) **New UNDP-GEF projects that may be proposed in GEF6**, and for which UNDP highlights two issues that should be addressed through new interventions, if governments so prioritise: **wildlife crime and financial fluxes.** Other lessons are welcome, but UNDP does not think that new interventions should be open-ended nor 10-15 years in duration. It is not possible to mobilise financiers for such long periods of time. A project with 6-7 years duration could however be considered. Finally, UNDP urges UNOPS to ensure the completion of the task of translating the TE report. It was clearly stated in the TORs that this was UNOPS' responsibility. This was concluded on 10 June 2014.[COMPLETED ON 17 June 2014] |

IV) Recommendations and Response | Recommandations et Réponses

| **Recommendations from the evaluation process and main response****Recommandations des processus d’évaluation et principales réponses** |
| --- |

| **Follow up on MTE Recommendations and management response****Suivi des recommandations de l’évaluation à mi-parcours et réponse de la direction** |
| --- |
| The TE states:***“8 recommendations were actually implemented (R2, R3, R4, R6, R7, R10, R12 and R13);*** ***4 recommendations have not had time to be completed (R1, R5, R11 and R14);*** ***2 recommendations appeared not be feasible for the WAP [project] to implement*** *within the prescribed time-frame* ***(R8 and R9).*** *They would not really depended on the WAP [project], and the project cannot in any way be blamed for the non-realization of these recommendations.”***[8 recommandations sont effectivement réalisées** (**R2, R3, R4, R6, R7, R10, R12** et **R13**) ; **4 recommandations n’ont pas eu le temps d’être achevées** (**R1, R5, R11** et **R14**) ; **2 recommandations sont apparues non exécutables par le WAP** dans les délais d’achèvement qui l’ont concerné (**R8** et **R9**). Elles ne dépendaient pas réellement du WAP et la non réalisation de[] ces recommandations ne peut en aucun cas lui être reprochée.]The matrix below provides an overview.  | **UNDP generally agrees with the follow up, but has a couple of comments:** * UNDP notes that the “database” of the WAP (R6) remains not functional and not open to access by the public.
* UNDP does think that the WAP project could have done more to address the issue of PA finance and mobilisaiton of additional funds to the WAP Complex. UNDP also does not think that this would require a “definite solution”, which the TE implied, but rather the achievement of progress towards improved financial sustainability. There is very little knowledge about the fluxes of funds and finance to and from the WAP Complex. The application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard, which was done once in 2008/9 had many shortfalls and data gaps, which specialised technical assistance could have helped the project deal with. This opportunity was not grabbed.
 |

| **#**  | **Recalled MTR Recommandations (2012)****Recommandations de l’évaluation à mi-parcours (2012)** | **Level of achievement by the (2013)****Exécution à l’évaluation finale (2013)** | **Additional recommendation made by the TE (Report, Table 10) and Management Response****Recommandations additionnelles par l’évaluation finales et réponse de la direction**(TE Tableau 10 - Recommandations : propositions visant au suivi du WAP) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R.1 | Assess the implementation of the operational program for continuing training in PAs management and of the training plan for beneficiaries of the micro-projects.[Effectuer un suivi opérationnel de la mise en oeuvre du plan opérationnel de formation continue en gestion des AP et du plan de formation des bénéficiaires de microprojets, ainsi qu’une analyse des impacts des différentes formations réalisées] | Not achievedNon achevés  | *“Finalising the best practices manual [on PA management]”*[Finalisation et édition des manuels des bonnes pratiques de gestion]

|  |
| --- |
| Mgt Response: The drafts were not finalised by the WAP team but were taken over by the PAPE. However, there is vast literature on PA management available, including for free and in French (e.g. e-learning modules at [www.cbd.int/protected](http://www.cbd.int/protected) which were proposed in the MTR’s mgt response). No need to reinvent it. The question is how to make sure PA managers actually benefit from such facilities or how to otherwise organise training in a cost-effective manner.  |
| Lesson: New projects for the WAPOK and the PAPE to consider this. |

  |
| R.2 | Suivi de la mise en œuvre (microprojets)  | Réalisé  |  |
| R.3 | Communication / diffusion Bulletin  | Réalisée  |  |
| R.4 | Sensibilisation IEC en périphérie  | Réalisée  |  |
| R.5 | Base de données de partage de l’information  | Réalisée  |  |
| R.6 | *“Define the operational guidelines and approaches for carrying out the consolidation phase, more specifically with the aim of assessing all initiatives and activities that have been conducted within the core PAs of the WAP complex and its periphery, to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and gaps in the different approaches followed, […].”*[Définir des lignes opérationnelles et les approches choisies pour réaliser la phase de capitalisation, avec pour objectifs notamment d’analyser les différentes initiatives et activités qui ont été menées au sein des AP du complexe WAP et en périphérie, d’évaluer les forces, les faiblesses et les gaps des différentes approches suivies….] | Not achievedNon achevés | *“See TE recommendation #4”*[Voir recommandation pour l’évaluation finale #4]

|  |
| --- |
| Mgt Response: Financial sustainability of PA systems is important and this should have been addressed by the project. Yet, achieving results on this front does not hinge on the operationalization of a trust fund, which the TE seems to suggest. On this matter, UNDP notes that while trust funds can be important for strengthening the financial sustainability of protected area systems, they are but one of the elements that contribute to it, and in fact not the most important one. |
| Action: refer to actions under recommendation 4 in Section IV, further down. |

  |
| R.7 | Lignes opérationnelles de capitalisation  | Réalisées  |  |
| R.8 | Evaluation finale en début 2014  | Anticipée  |  |
| R.9 | Fonds additionnels de fonctionnement du WAP  | Non obtenus  |  |
| R.10 | Allègement des charges récurrentes du WAP  | Réalisé mais insuffisant |  |
| R.11 | Modalités de cofinancements WAP/PAPE Planification conjointe (régionale – nationale) *“Clarify and operationalize the terms of PAPE/WAP co-financing agreements, in particular the joint planning procedures to be put in place at regional and national level.”*[Clarifier et opérationnaliser les modalités des cofinancements PAPE /WAP et notamment les procédures de planification conjointe et l’élaboration des PTA conjoints au niveau régional et national à mettre en place.] | Initiated Not achievedEntamées Non achevées | *Co-financing to be retained [by the project] must come from projects with intervention periods are [the same as its own].*[Les cofinancements à retenir doivent provenir de projets dont les périodes d’intervention sont identiques.]

|  |
| --- |
| Mgt Response: UNDP does not think that the recommendation made by the TE is feasible for either governments, agencies or financiers to follow through at this stage – therefore it is not useful, except as a generic lesson. The financing of specific programmes that are presented as co-financing to a GEF project (or to an EU project for that matter) depend on a number of different factors. Very rarely will we see a situation where the period of financing of a given project is the exact same as that of the intervention that it co-finances. In the MTR’s management response, specific targets for activities to be co-financed per outcome were established, but not achieved, as a response to this very recommendation. The following had also been recommended: “*The success of joint planning requires the integration of all partners’ annual work plans across the [WAP] complex and concerted implementation through a single Technical Monitoring Committee (CTS). UEMOA should strongly support this approach in accordance with the recommendation of the Niamey’s [2012] CTS.”*[La réussite de la planification conjointe passe par l’intégration de tous les PTA des différents partenaires à l’échelle du complexe et leur mise en œuvre concertée à travers un seul et unique comité technique de suivi (CTS). L’UEMOA doit appuyer fortement cette approche conformément à la recommandation du CTS de Niamey.]In hindsight, some joint activities were carried out or co-supported by the PAPE, though in the WAP project’s workplan for its last year. UNDP recognises that ensuring joint planning (if not joint implementation) would ultimately depend on whether beneficiary countries express their priorities to funding agencies and do their best to ensure the mutual convergence and synergy of related projects. In the specific case of the WAP-PAPE, the desire for convergence was not clearly expressed by countries. In fact, they preferred to create new units for managing the PAPE, instead of building on the units that the WAP had already in place. There was some level of joint work-planning, but the timing of processes was not very helpful. Yet, this does not mean it is not feasible to pursue this in other context – it can be beneficial.  |
| Lesson: UNDP will address this on a case by case basis, if and when joint workplanning and implementation by related projects become actual. |

  |
| R.12 | Réunions conjointes (CO, CTS) WAP/PAPE  | Réalisées  |  |
| R.13 | Dotation de fonctionnement supplémentaire à la coordination Bénin  | Réalisée  |  |
| R.14 | Strengthen dialogue between the three countries, UEMOA and the other technical and financing partners to enable the establishment and operationalization of a regional coordination mechanism.[Renforcer le dialogue entre les trois Etats, l’UEMOA et les autres PTF, à travers une proactivité du PAPE et du WAP pour permettre la création et l’opérationnalisation d’un mécanisme de coordination régionale.]  | EntaméesNon achevées  | *“Absolute coordination between projects working on the same [geopgraphical] space and conservation activities.”*[Coordination absolue entre projets intervenant sur le même espace et dans des activités de conservation.]

|  |
| --- |
| Mgt Response: For the same reason that recommendation #11 was not feasible to follow, limited results were achieved, in spite of the dialogue, which did take place. Absolute coordination will remain as wishful thinking by the TE, while realpolitik will dictate actual priorities and decisions. No action required.  |

 |

| **TE Recommendations and Management Response****Recommandations de l’évaluation finale et réponse de la direction** |
| --- |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 1.****Sur La régionalité : Effectuer un effort de conclusion du mécanisme de coordination régionale, élément phare en vue de l’application concrète de la gestion concertée des ressources à l’échelle d’un complexe régional tel que le WAP, ou au-delà (WAPO)** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***RTA agrees, but notes that this is by and large already being catered for by the PAPE project. **There are however emerging issues that are not being sufficiently addressed through current interventions, and which could benefit from new UNDP supported interventions at the regional level. The first is the issue of PA finance and the second, the surge in poaching in the WAP Complex linked to international wildlife crime – which, in the WAP, is primarily targeting elephants.** UNDP also believes that the PAPE project is providing a solid basis for strengthening the management of the WAPOK zone, but it is likely not doing enough with respect to these two issues so that concrete results can be yielded. Poaching and wildlife crime in the WAPOK is mostly linked to a global increase in the demand for ivory, primarily from far east Asia. UNDP also notes that the WAP zone is currently the only complex of protected areas in West Africa that still harbours viable populations of elephants. UNDP is designing new programmes with focus on wildlife crime and would like to propose a new regional GEF intervention that will help countries address this cross-border, governance and conservation issue. With respect to PA finance, UNDP recognizes that the GEF WAP project has not adequately addressed the issues and much still remains to be done in terms of even establishing a sufficient information basis on financial flows that can justify a new PA finance GEF project. The priorities need however to be set by countries.  |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Le bureau pays du PNUD au Burkina Faso approuve cette recommandation. Le projet WAP a fait beaucoup d’efforts en vue de la promotion et l’amélioration de l’approche régionale, mais cette responsabilité relève à présent du projet PAPE, à travers l’UEMOA qui doit travailler à l’atteinte de cet objectif.** |
| **UNOPS: UNOPS agrees with this recommendation, even if WAP Project made many efforts in order to promote and enhance a regional approach it’s up to PAPE now to achieve this objective.** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| Organise a regional meeting to programme GEF6 in the WAPOK.  | June 2014 | CO Togo is offering to lead | More consultations are needed. Early GEF programming is recommended. Refer also to Action #2 under Recommendation 4. It also applies here.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 2.****Sur Le montage institutionnel et la tutelle : Le montage institutionnel des projets régionaux à caractère conservatoire : l’implication des tutelles techniques est à systématiser. L’expérience du WAP a montré les possibilités de collaborer efficacement dans le cadre.**  |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***Regional UNDP-GEF conservation projects are not a novelty, but they are not the easier projects to negotiate and implement. In terms of systematizing what works and what could be improved, we mention (i) early and careful negotiations during project development stage, especially with respect to sensitive issues (country leadership, management arrangements); (ii) support from supranational bodies; (iii) build on solid national baseline of conservation experience. |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **L’implication d’une tutelle technique est importante dans ce type de projet, mais elle peut se faire sans impliquer systématiquement une autre agence au niveau régional, surtout quand elle n’est pas représentée dans les BP couverts. Les BP peuvent bien jouer ce rôle. Cette option réduirait les coûts de transactions, responsabiliserait d’avantage le BP en charge de la tutelle technique et améliorerait le suivi sur le terrain.**  |
| **UNOPS: no particular comment.** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| Take these lessons into account in the development of new GEF6 regional projects:1. Early and careful negotiations during project development stage, especially with respect to sensitive issues (country leadership, management arrangements);
2. Support from supranational bodies;
3. Build on solid national baseline of conservation experience.
 | As from now (Apr 2014) on  | UNDP-GEF, UNDP COs | n/a |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 3.****Sur le rôle futur des structures d’exécution de projets : Le rôle futur des structures d’exécution habituelles doit se limiter à une intervention d’appui-conseil seul et non de d’exécution des projets de cette nature.** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 16-Apr-2014]***UNDP does not necessarily agree and believes that the TE has misunderstood the role of UNOPS vis-à-vis that of UNDP. |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Le BP du Burkina Faso n’est pas certain que ce rôle ait été bien compris par l’évaluateur** |
| **UNOPS: UNOPS was asked to execute this project on behalf of UNDP; UNOPS agrees that a national execution would be ideal in order to reinforce national capacity and ownership, but UNOPS executed this project in constant consultation and cooperation with national structures.**  |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| None at this stage | - | - | - |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 4.****Sur le financement durable et les fonds fiduciaires : Le financement durable et la question des fonds fiduciaires sont devenus des lignes rouges pour toute prétention de pérennisation des actions conservatoires telles que menées par le WAP. L’intervention du WAP, en transition entre deux grands projets régionaux financièrement mieux dotés (ECOPAS et PAPE), illustre les limites d’opérations ponctuelles qu’il faut convertir en actions structurelles, planifiées sur le moyen ou long terme. L’implication d’une institution comme l’UEMOA offre de bonnes perspectives de solution rapide de la question du financement durable ; à défaut, ce sont les projets de fonds fiduciaires régionaux qui devraient apporter cette solution.** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***UNDP does not fully agree and does not think there are quick solutions. What is missing however is a more thorough and quantified understanding of the finance issue at the level of the WAP Complex. This should still be pursued as a follow on action.  |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Le BP du PNUD au Burkina Faso ne partage pas totalement ce point de vue. La question du financement durable des AP n’est pas si facile à régler surtout dans le contexte du projet WAP ; il en est de même dans le contexte du projet PAPE, même si des efforts sont en cours, en dehors de l’alternative des fonds fudiciaires**  |
| **UNOPS: It’s not an easy objective to be achieved the financial viability of the Complex; the Project made some efforts, maybe not enough, due also to project budget constraints** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| 1) With the remaining balance under the WAP project, the CO Burkina Faso could carry out essential financial studies that were not carried out by the WAP UNOPS team. If this is not feasible from an operational point of view, probe if the PAPE could possible co-support such studies. RTA can be in charge of designing TOR.  | Initiate discussions with countries in June 2014 | UNDP-GEF, UNDP COs | There appears to be a balance of ~$30K under the WAP. It does not appear to be feasible to ask UNOPS to carry out further studies under its contract with UNDP. We need to probe whether this can be done under biz unit BFA10. However, CO points out: “Rôle de l’UEMOA et non du PNUD/BF". |
| 2) Possibly prepare quick annual work plan for 2014 under BFA10 and applicable budget revision, containing under Outcome 4.  | asp | UNDP CO (subject to further disucssions) | As above.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 5.****Sur la création d’agences nationales d’exécution : La création d’agences nationales d’exécution pour les projets FEM, conformément aux recommandations d’un Conseil d’administration du FEM (2010), va dans le sens de la résolution des questions de financement durable qu’un instrument de ce genre peut faciliter. Certaines difficultés rencontrées par le projet WAP seraient ainsi évitées, à travers l’amélioration de la capacité de négociation des pays.**  |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***UNDP believes that the TE has misunderstood issues. The GEF Council has not recommended the creation of national implementing GEF agencies that can access GEF funds. The efforts towards direct access are geared towards existing institutions (national, regional or global) that have the capability and fiduciary standards for developing and executing GEF projects. Also, this will have no bearing on the financial sustainability issue at the level of the WAP Complex. Even if national or regional institutions would eventually qualify as GEF Agencies, it will not at all mean that funds would quickly flow in at rate to sort out the financial issue.  |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Il est à craindre une incompréhension de la recommandation du Conseil du FEM; dans tous les cas, cette recommandation ne saurait régler le problème du financement durable de la conservation des Aires Protégées** |
| **UNOPS: no particular comments on this.**  |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| None at this stage | - | - | - |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 6.****Sur les Petites subventions (Small Grants) : L’intérêt des petites subventions (Small Grants) appelle un élargissement d’impact en raison des nombreuses attentes suscitées. La flexibilité et la rapidité de mise en œuvre en périphérie donnent beaucoup de crédit à cette stratégie d’incitation.****L’U.E., en réaction aux résultats des microprojets du WAP, a déjà décidé d’engager sur cette seule activité, dans le cadre du PAPE, un montant supérieur à tout le budget du WAP (€4,7 millions) !** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***UNDP believes that the TE was not sufficiently informed about the exact mechanism for PAPE funds geared towards civil society organisations on the ground operating in the WAPOK zone. The mechanisms will be quite different from those of the WAP Projects’ micro-grant component. This limits the usefulness and feasibility of implementing the recommendation. |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Dans le cadre du PAPE, le small grant est géré directement par l’UE et le mécanisme est différent de celui du projet WAP** |
| **UNOPS: UNOPS acknowledges the success of the WAP Micro-grants in the field and the satisfaction from beneficiaires; as UNOPS is not implementing PAPE Project it cannot say anything about PAPE mechanism of grants.** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| None at this stage | - | - | - |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 7.****Sur la démultiplication du verdissement des PDC : La démultiplication du verdissement des PDC, au-delà des trois premières communes ayant fait l’objet de test par le WAP, s’impose désormais comme une nécessité, non seulement pour se concilier les populations riveraines, mais représente une occasion supplémentaire de faire de la gestion adaptative à travers la mise en cohérence de la périphérie avec les objectifs de conservation dans les aires protégées.** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***UNDP agrees with the recommendation and would like to highlight that this already being done, at least in Burkina Faso, through other UNDP projects. |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Des initiatives similaires sont en cours dans le cadre du PAPE (dans les 3 pays) et même d’autres projets du BP ; néanmoins, une évaluation de ces activités devrait être faite avant la démultiplication du verdissement des PDC.** |
| **UNOPS: UNOPS agrees on the importance of this activity and acknowledges the success of this activity within WAP Project (test project for other future environmental projects in the same zone)** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| Probe the possibility of expanding the initiative to other WAPOK countries, other than just Burkina Faso, with the caveat that there are no immediate funding resources for this, at least not from GEF.  | When applicable (this is but a generic lesson) | UNDP COs | The initiative (green PDCs) had limited scope under the WAP. Yet, PEI implementation is Burkina has offered good lessons, financed by bilateral and core funds. Replication in other countries is feasible but not automatically applicable.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommandation 8.****Sur les Schémas directeurs : Schémas directeurs doivent rapidement être poursuivis par le PAPE pour aboutir à la formulation des PAG pour toutes les aires protégées du complexe WAP (et au-delà du WAPO).** |
| **Réponse de la direction | Management Response** |
| **PNUD/FEM | UNDP-GEF*****[Updated 27-Apr-2014]***UNDP agrees, but notes that this is already being catered for under the PAPE. |
| **PNUD Burkina Faso | UNDP Country Office Burkina Faso** **Cette recommandation est déjà prise en charge par le PAPE et en cours d’application. Un schéma directeur général du WAPO est déjà élaboré et validé par le Conseil des Ministres du PAPE. Tous les plans d’aménagement et de gestion (PAG) des AP sont en cours d’actualisation. Ils seront finalisés courant 2014 et leur mise en œuvre prévue courant 2015.** |
| **UNOPS: UNOPS agrees, and this activity will be taken over by PAPE.** |
| **Actions clés | Key Actions** | **Calendrier | Time Frame**  | **Unités Responsables | Responsible Units** | **Observations | Comments** |
| None at this stage | - | - | - |
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| Discussion on UNDP’s comparative advantage – Lessons from the WAP TE |

TE Table 7

Avantages comparatifs PNUD sur ce projet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | TE opinion | UNDP’s management response |
| **Pertinence**  | Excellent montage du projet régionalConception d’un cadre de concertation multi-acteurs (administrations, bailleurs, communautés, ONG, etc.)  | UNDP agrees and would like to continue supporting countries through regional initiatives.  |
| **Efficacité** | Approche de conservation par la périphérie des AP. Démonstrativité des micro-projets L’autonomie de gestion (par l’intermédiaire de l’UNOPS)  | If countries agree, UNDP would like to propose similar arrangements, but with a caveat of allowing for the implementation of activities that are national by nature within a regional project through implementation mechanisms that strengthen national ownership and capacity.  |
| **Efficience**  | Orientations stratégiques Gestion adaptative Outils de gestion Valorisation des acquis de la conservation  | UNDP and the GEF are further developing and improving tools, including training modules, improved Tracking Tools and other. UNDP is currently the largest GEF Agency for protected areas and has significant experience in this domain.  |
| **Durabilité**  | Souci de capitalisation des résultats Liens avec les autres projets (antérieurs ou ultérieurs) en conservation, pour la continuité des actions  | More thought will be put into this aspect, but synergies with other related project are always by default sought. UNDP recognises though that it is mostly up to the project to realise possible benefits from synergies and collaboration – and that this is not always straight forward (the case of WAP-PAPE e.g.).  |
| **Impact**  | Très positif (opportunité de la période d’intervention du WAP, appropriation des résultats, etc.) | UNDP believes that the TE has highlighted ‘positive’ impacts (rather "very positive"), yet developing follow on initiatives (such as the one on fiancé and wildlife crime) will be key in order to continue to address emerging PA issues at the level of the WAP Complex, and in fact to in the entire WAPOK Complex.  |

TE Table 8

Rectifications à opérer en cas de réplication (PNUD)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **TE opinion** | **UNDP’s management response** |
| **Pertinence**  | Les délais de mise en place des instruments de régionalité  | UNDP believes that this was very much outside the scope of its intervention. The emergence of UEMOA as a regional body with interest in transfrontier protected area management is a recent event (only since 2008). They are mirroring what similar bodies like SADAC and COMIFAC had done in other parts of Africa with respect to TFCAs. This involvement was not “on the cards” during project development phase -- it could not have been. It happened without the involvement of the WAP project. Yet, it is most welcome and positive. It certainly strengthens the "*régionalité*".  |
| **Efficacité** | L’instabilité institutionnelle (administrations des pays) qui génère des lenteurs La capacité de négociation des pays à améliorer La durée d’intervention du projet à mettre en rapport avec les ambitions de long terme  | Many of the topics here are addressed to countries and their PA agencies. UNDP takes note of these in the design of its programmes and respective support modality.  |
| **Efficience**  | Les arrangements de gestion au niveau du PNUD (entre bureaux – pays) pour optimiser l’utilisation de ressources additionnelles  | UNDP agrees and will discuss this internally to ensure improved harmonisation of additional funding, if and when these may become actual.  |
| **Durabilité**  | La maîtrise du financement durable régional La capacité réelle de mobilisation des cofinancements Le réseau régional des AP pas assez solide | UNDP takes note and agrees on the need to strengthen financial sustainability, but it should be a multi-model approach (and not restricted to the consolidation of a trust fund as the panacea solution) and deeply linked to the PA management effectiveness issues.  |