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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Context of the outcome evaluation**

This outcome evaluation takes place within the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). It is taking place at the end of the 2nd UNDAF for Angola (2009 - 2014[[1]](#footnote-1)) and prior to the development of the next UNDAF and Country Prorgamme Action Plan.

Only one outcome from the CPD/CPAP is reviewed, namely the outcome related to environment and sustainable development. The evaluation period covers all environmental interventions implemented by UNDP, between 2009 and 2013, in the Republic of Angola taking into account all sources of funding and all modalities of implementation. The main evaluation criteria used in the analysis were:

* Relevance;
* Sustainability, and;
* Effectiveness.

**Purpose of the outcome**

The primary objective of the evaluation is to:

* Provide recommendations on how best to implement future environment related CPAP outcomes.

The secondary objectives are:

* To evaluate the impact of UNDP interventions and its contribution in building national capacity for the protection of the environment, and;
* To review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector, international organizations in Programme implementation and comment on its sustainability.

**Findings and conclusions**

The work during the period 2009 - 2013, both on the part of UNDP and the GoA (particularly the ME) and other partners, should not be underestimated, it is considerable and represents an impressive human endeavor. At times it may have been fractious, challenging and on occasions even appeared dysfunctional, but it has been the ability of all sides to remain engaged with each other and the issues; which is of significance. In some instances UNDP staff have moved from UNDP to Ministry posts and on several occasions, UNDP has been invited to be part of the Angolan Delegation for participating in international conventions, such as the Conference of the Parties (COP) for the UNFCCC which provides some insight into the value placed upon the relationship. Without this relationship it would be hard to see where the important and broad focus of the support for this sector would have come from because there does not appear to be any other external agency with as comprehensive an environment sector as UNDP in Angola. As a result there have been numerous developments which have either been carried over from previous planning periods and completed, or initiated during this planning period which represent an increasingly sophisticated response to the environmental challenges faced by Angola as the country moves from recovery to development.

However, the indicative targets provided in the UNDAF and CPAP SRF were too general and limits a reasonable assessment of the achievements or otherwise of the planned outcome(s).

In particular the evaluation highlights:

* **The strategic role of UNDP:** Given the transitional stage of Angola, the UNDP has, by necessity, played (in the absence of other significant external players in this field) multiple and important roles in the development of a coherent environmental sector in Angola. These have included; political advocacy, mobilizing external financing, stakeholder coordination and project implementation. Therefore UNDP has been providing numerous different and necessary support roles.
* **The tactical role of UNDP at the macro-level:** While it is broadly accepted that a successful outcome to any intervention in the environmental sphere will be achieved by mainstreaming, these approaches require a certain level of functional capacity and governance which is appearing in Angola but still requires significant external support. At the macro-level this is apparent and is noted in the Draft Country Programme Document for Angola (2015-2019); "*while policies and strategies for addressing biodiversity, climate change and environmental sustainability have been articulated, translating them into action has been impeded by weak institutional capacity, the need to work across sectors, and insufficient tools and capabilities to ensure compliance with essential standards such as mandatory impact assessments before major public or private works projects are carried out*”. This was also manifest in the SLM project in which project outcomes requiring high-level decisions did not perform well and impeded “on-the-ground” progress in a number of instances. UNDP has on a number of occasions stepped in to ensure that there has been continuity or to move the process forwards when these constraints have threatened the outcome.
* **The tactical role of UNDP at the micro-level:** At the micro-level mainstreaming requires a certain level of capacity and experience which Angola is building but is still “a work in progress”. This manifests itself in the need to continue direct support to projects as a means to build that body of capacity and experience as a sustainable basis for mainstreaming environment. Drawing on the SLM project experience, this was illustrated across a spectrum of implementation activities from including difficulties in engaging national consultants with SLM experience, local NGOs planting trees without removing the nursery bags or provincial research institutions budgets that provided amply for the purchase of vehicles but made no provision for the development of human resources, field trails or research. UNDP was in a position to provide, or leverage, small but important amounts of material or intellectual assistance at critical times.
* **Stakeholder engagement:** Following on from the points made above, it is reasonable to argue that a narrow stakeholder engagement would not have been as effective as the broader stakeholder engagement which UNDP has pursued. It might be argued that focusing all resources on one level (e.g. political advocacy) might be more efficient use of resources, but the evaluation disagrees with this and feels that the wide range of stakeholder engagement (and at different levels within government and society) has been successful given the particular transitional circumstances in Angola. While the next steps might be to ensure that these different levels of stakeholders “talk” directly to each other, the use of UNDP as a conduit has thus far proved effective.
* **Focus of projects:** The type and subject of projects planned and implemented by UNDP Angola in the environmental field has been diverse, both in the level, and the focus, of intervention. The evaluation agrees with this approach because of the transitional stage which Angola is currently at and this report provides a recommendations to ensure that this diversity of project remains part of a coherent approach to achieving the outcome.

UNDP Environment Outcome Evaluation Ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Rating | Comments |
| Overall outcome | Satisfactory | **The outcome has not been achieved** and was necessarily ambitious. The indicators in the SRF(s) do not fully describe the outcome. Despite this, **progress has been satisfactory within the timeframe (2009 – 2013)** with a suite of international and national policy implements being enacted, capacity building, and training taking place. Two projects were implemented with varying degrees of success and considerable financial support for the sector has been leveraged. However, implementation still appears to be weak. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* improve the outcome statement, provide a broader range of indicators for monitoring and evaluation.  |
| Outputs | Satisfactory | The outputs are **satisfactory.** The two projects implemented have allowed UNDP to work strategically and tactically at different scales or levels and for UNDP to utilize to best advantage its “soft” assistance. They have brought together a broad diversity of stakeholders and provided significant national experience and capacity building. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* strengthen the cross sector planning using a scenario planning approach to ensure that the different outputs remain part of a coherent intervention. |
| Sustainability | Satisfactory | The sustainability of this outcome is deemed **satisfactory** within the context that UNDP continues support to this sector in the medium future. However, the achievements thus far remain vulnerable. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* strengthen the environment sector within UNDP by elevating it to the same level as both poverty and governance and ensuring cross–sector coordination. |
| Relevance | Satisfactory | Environment is **highly relevant** as indicated in the GoA policy framework and as the basis underpinning social and economic development in Angola. As the country moves from a recovery to a development footing this importance is likely to grow both in terms of increased environmental degradation due to short term economic development priorities and through its contribution to development through the provision of life supporting ecosystem goods and services. |

**RecommendationsRecommendation 1: Environment is elevated to an operational unit within UNDP CO:** Environment is currently nested within the poverty unit. While this has served the sector well thus far, it is now necessary to elevate environment to a unit within the organizational structure of the CO. Given the number and complexity of the planned projects (Annex 6) this is critical.

**Recommendation 2: Greater internal integration between operational units:** There is greater need for internal integration within UNDP between the poverty, governance and (presumably) environment clusters. The three areas are clearly linked. For instance to attempt to alleviate poverty without addressing the ecosystem’s ability to continue to provide ecosystem goods and services is nonsensical. To attempt either without addressing the issues of governance is unlikely to succeed. Perhaps this is the burden of UNDP’s responsibilities in as much as the organization cannot measure success within a narrow cross-section of issues. However, it is strongly recommended that environment is given equal status in the UNDP CO hierarchy in the next strategic programme and that the three focal areas, poverty, governance and environment are “held together” using scenario planning (recommendation 7).

**Recommendation 3: A partnership strategy is designed and established with clear priorities for each agency, means of communication and a forum for ensuring that each agency is working towards a common goal and a means of regular review of progress:** This should be clearly articulated in the next UNDAF. It is important to comment that this will take time, a process of frank and open negotiation. However, time invested in developing this now will only lead to greater efficiencies later down the line. No one should be in any doubt that time spent on this is wasted time, if it is not done the time will likely be spent later but with less positive outcomes.

**Recommendation 4: Implement GEF small grants programme:** Given that project financing is becoming increasingly sophisticated in terms of its expectations (e.g. mainstreaming) whereas Angola is still facing challenges that are a legacy of a prolonged and protracted conflict which often needs flexibility and direct financing of small-scale inputs. UNDP evaluates and considers (with *due diligence* to the national capacities to support it) implementing a GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) to act as a multiplier for project outputs and outcomes.

**Recommendation 5: The CPAP outcome statement is revised during the next planning period (2015 – 2019):** The CPAP currently states that; **“***Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective”.* This statement serves reasonably well as an outcome but in any future outcome statement it will be important to include some mention of improved environmental governance, which is; the ability to make policies, laws and agreements work. Arguably as “pro-poor growth” is explicit in UNDP mainstreaming therefore it might not be necessary to include this, although the outcome is speaking to a wider audience so the inclusion of poverty reduction aspects may be considered a necessary safeguard.

There is a difference between the UNDAF and CPAP related to climate change (referred to in the UNDAF statement) and it may be desirable to harmonize both statements in this aspect. This could be achieved through the inclusion of the term “resilience” as opposed to “sustainability” and the statement might include “*the provision of a broad range of ecosystem goods and services”* as a means to address climate change aspects.

**Recommendation 6: A broader range of indicators are used to monitor progress and effectiveness of the outcome:** The present indicators are too narrow in focus therefore it is recommended that a broader range of indicators are used covering five key areas:

* **Policy/enabling environment:** these would be the indicators currently in use and reflect a range of agreements (national/regional/global), policy papers, laws, etc.
* **Human resource capacities:** these would measure the reduction in the skills gaps and could include building capacity in agencies and institutions, NGOs/CSOs, academic institutions, etc.
* **Financial resources:** these would measure the financial resources available and leveraged for spending on the environment and would need to be disaggregated into government (budget allocation), donor, private sector/community investment, etc.
* **Programmes and management:** these would measure the number of programmes or activities which link the wise **management** of natural resources to the **sustainable utilization** of those resources. For instance, charcoal production would need to demonstrate a link between production and management of forest resources but would also include the protected areas system.
* **National monitoring:** these would include reporting on international agreements and conventions but also provide for a broader set of national parameters including national compliance across other sectors of government.

**Recommendation 7: Scenario Planning is developed as a support tool for UNDP activities across the three key focal areas; poverty, governance and environment:** The evaluation recognizes the difficulties of supporting a *process* and effecting an *adaptive change*. Clearly there is a pressing need for strengthening and filling the gaps in the enabling environment; there is a need to build and strengthen existing institutional capacities, there is critical need for improved socio-economic conditions and the sustainable use of resources to benefit socio-economic development.

Therefore, the enabling environment, mainstreaming, assistance to the protected areas, assistance to local socio-economic development, up-scaling project experience and improving protected areas, etc., are all reasonable project or programme responses. However, on their own they are unlikely to bring about the sort of large scale change in such a way that the natural wealth of Angola is managed sustainably in the near future, indeed a considerable quantity of this wealth could be lost before such changes take place due to trade-offs between short-term economic gains and the longer term impacts of this outcome.

Neither are they likely to affect the sort of collective action, that is; to get agreement on these bigger issues such as those surrounding institutional management of these resources, mining, solid and liquid waste disposal, agriculture, biodiversity conservation versus immediate economic development gains, *ad infinitum* which are a prerequisite to the achievement of this outcome, or any reasonable refinements of the outcome statement in the future.

Therefore, the long term solutions lies not just in these material actions (the enabling environment, charcoal production, protected areas, community development, etc… even to get partners to agree upon courses of action) but in also facilitating a collective action, a means to get stakeholders and key players to agree on the trade-offs necessary to make development sustainable and ensuring that environmental concerns are included within planning and development considerations, that these are translated into actions on the ground and that espoused policy becomes practice.

However, such a process is extremely difficult to achieve within the construct of projects which are the principal tool available to UNDP. Projects are, by their very nature, time-bound which sets in motion a conflict between project and process, the process invariably moving at a different speed to the project’s timeframe. Furthermore, success is usually measured by tangible outputs that contribute to an outcome, the outcomes contributing to an objective. This hierarchical and directional process can in itself be a constraint on achieving a favorable result by focusing on a single desired future when there are possibly multiple futures, better or worse, dependent upon different courses of actions and externalities and to an extent the perceptions of the observer.

What is missing is a means to identify these plausible future scenarios and to understand how to avoid the undesirable and to achieve the favorable futures. The difficulty with a conventional approach is the lack of any mechanism that will convince organizations, agencies, institutions and individuals, that it may be necessary to change the way that they behave, the way they perceive and think about an issue, in order to avoid the undesirable futures. Therefore it is recommended that UNDP utilise scenario planning to facilitate this process.

**Lessons learned**

1. **Partnership arrangements are important:** Partnership arrangements are important but partnerships between institutions are the sum of partnerships (or relations) between the individuals within those institutions. If those people are not involved in their design, and in any future adaptations then they have all the characteristics of a badly arranged marriage. They might, indeed they sometimes do, work, but they cause so much stress and unhappiness, both of which lead to inefficiencies and that costs money, even if we are not concerned with the fate of the partners. Establishing these relationships needs more than a document, it requires investing the time initially to negotiate the partnership, providing a framework for partners to address the issues and conflicts which will invariably arise during the relationship.
2. **More care should be given to selecting indicators:** Whether it is in programme or project design there should be more thought given to indicators. In this instance the indicators provide only a small insight into the effectiveness of any intervention. Whether it is because people are tired and develop indicators as the very last part of any design process or they are failing to understand the purpose to which they will be put. Greater thought, and perhaps also guidance should be given when formulating these indicators because they are not just to be used during periodic external examination of performance and progress they are like the instruments in an aircraft cockpit providing important information to the pilot. In this instance the narrow selection of indicators can be compared with flying an airplane using just the fuel gauge. Many other things could be going wrong but the pilot still flies on because there is fuel in the tanks. It was not clear how much time was given to developing the indicators. Based upon past experience of programme SRFs (and project SRFs) it is not unreasonable to hazard a guess that not much time was committed. Often indicators and targets are the output of a single workshop in which many participants are thinking about them for the very first time and it is left to a few individuals to construct the SRF.
3. **Any agency working in the environment sector in Angola will, for the immediate future, need to work at different levels:** A strong body of technical experts, practitioners, academics, NGOs and CSOs still needs to be built in Angola. It would be unwise to underestimate the effect of many years of disruption at this level. These people are there, they are capable and able but they need time to develop a depth of experience. Focusing at the higher and central institutional level is also critical but this needs to be stepped down to a provincial and then to a very local level. Clearly Angola is in a hurry to catch up for lost time and to return to normality but investing at these levels is critical to this process. This was manifest in the Okavango Basin project in which there was poor community participation. However, the SLM project demonstrated that when resources were made available at provincial and community levels through the vehicle of a project they could be utilized very effectively. Clearly this has implications to future project designs which will form a sizeable component in achieving future outcomes.

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Planning Framework at UNDP Angola Country Office for the Environment and Sustainable Development sector**

1. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) is the strategic programme framework that describes the collective response of the United Nations (UN) system to national development priorities jointly determined by the Government of Angola (GOA) and the UN agencies. The stated outcomes of the UNDAF and its results matrix are the collective, coherent and integrated programming and monitoring framework for country-level contributions. To this end it identified four outcomes: Governance, justice and data for development, social sectors (health, water, environment, sanitation and hygiene [WESH] and education), HIV and AIDS[[2]](#footnote-2), and sustainable economic development.
2. In relation to the environmental sector of UNDPs engagement in Angola the UNDAF was intended to: *strengthen[ed] pro-poor economic growth and accountable macroeconomic management, integrated rural development, management of natural resources and energy to promote environmental protection, energy efficiency and adaptation to climate change*.
3. According to the UNDAF (2009 – 2013) the planning framework and means of implementation was to be through:
* **Capacity development:** which “*is central to the UNDAF in creating an enabling environment to facilitate collective commitment towards results and reflecting an ongoing dynamic in establishing the ideal conditions for sustained investment in human resources. This should ensure that the necessary capacity is developed, through the implementation of comprehensive capacity development strategies, to facilitate the achievement of the GoA/UNDAF objectives and to keep “Angola em movimento” as a central part of UNDAF’s implementation and coordination*”.
* **Joint programmes:** which would be “c*haracterized by common results, integrated work plans, integrated evaluation framework, and joint funding dispositions – are powerful instruments to enhance effectiveness, efficiency and impact. For this reason the possibility for other joint programmes will be further investigated, on the basis of similar ongoing efforts in areas such as, HIV/AIDS, justice reform, data collection, and water and sanitation. The results expected from the joint programmes are based on the UNDAF Results Matrix and M&E plan.*

*In other areas in which the expertise of several UN organizations will be contributing to the achievement of the same outputs, specific collaborative arrangements will be developed. The guiding principle for determining these arrangements will be maximum efficiency and effectiveness for the UN as a whole. It is anticipated that in many cases this will be achieved through joint work planning and definition of functions, with the implementation itself carried out independently, but with joint monitoring and evaluation.*

*Geographic incidence could also represent an important factor in the choice establishment of joint programmes.*

*The UN agencies involved could unite their programme support in the field. When several agencies are present in the same location, a local coordination mechanism should be put into place. When only one or a few agencies are present, they shall do their best to cooperate with other agencies’ programmes. Partners should share information and provide updates on the Joint Programmes and undertake field evaluation visits jointly. An annual review is recommended, to be carried out by all partners, and resulting in a single progress report.*”

1. The CPD for UNDP Angola and the Country Programme and Action Plan (CPAP) 2009 – 2013, extended to 2014, provides the focus of UNDP operations, programmes and activities during the period 2009 to 2014. The CPAP focused on upstream and downstream strategic matters in the four programmatic focus areas, namely: *Poverty Reduction and Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Democratic Governance, Crisis Prevention and Recovery,* and *Environment and Sustainable Development*.
2. According to the CPAP, achieving the outcome “*Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment into national development plans and programmes”* was largely to be carried out through, *inter alia,* providing support to mainstreaming environmental issues into the poverty reduction strategies and development planning, assisting the government and other stakeholders in ensuring a proper use and management of natural resources through an adequate legal and institutional framework with strong civil society participation.

## **1.2 Scope of the evaluation**

1. Only one outcome from the CPD/CPAP is reviewed, namely the outcome related to environment and sustainable development. The evaluation period covers all environmental interventions implemented by UNDP, between 2009 and 2013, in the Republic of Angola taking into account all sources of funding and all modalities of implementation. The main evaluation criteria used in the analysis were:
* Relevance;
* Sustainability, and;
* Effectiveness.
1. These criteria were chosen because the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) produced in November 2013 largely covers operational, performance issues and results for this sector and the evaluation’s main purpose is to assist in the development of the next CPAP to:
* Provide recommendations on how best to implement future environment related CPAP outcomes, and;
* Improve the partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector, international organizations, etc., in Programme implementation and its sustainability
1. Taking into account that the following two projects have been implemented and evaluated during the specific period under revision, they provide an important window into the effectiveness of UNDPs programme. The Specific projects that will be part of this analysis are:
* The Least Developed Countries and Small Islands Developing States (LDC and SIDS) Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management (SLM project).
* Environment Protection and Sustainable Management of the Okavango River Basin Project (Okavango Basin project).
1. As a focus of UNDP activities these two projects represent, to some extent, the “sharp end” of the UNDP, GOA, development partners, etc., the internal agency and national policies, their soft and hard assistance, the programme, activities, etc., in brining development assistance to this sector. Furthermore, they have already been scrutinized through a standard UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation process. However, it is important to note that: i) the SLM project was a GEF-financed small project (under one million US$) and that; ii) the Okavango Basin project was a trans-boundary project. Therefore neither can reflect the entire spectrum of the UNDP outcome although they provide important insights into partnership arrangements, the efficiency of UNDP, relations with the GOA, the effectiveness and relevance of UNDPs environmental programme. The SLM project is of particular interests because, sustainable land management *per se* is an area which encompasses most of the challenges faced by this sector; economic, socio-political and ecological/environmental. Therefore the SLM project is in many ways a microcosm of the larger situation.

## **1.3 Purpose of the outcome evaluation**

1. This evaluation is taking place at the end of the current (2009 – 2013) CPAP. The purpose of this evaluation is to take stock of its work and contribution and influence in support to the development of the national capacity for the environmental protection of natural resources and the management, to ensure that its planned programme and portfolio are relevant to national priorities and support the achievement of the planned outcome. Furthermore it will assess to what extent and in which ways UNDP has influenced the partners involved in environmental management to contribute to the attainment of this outcome.
2. The primary objective of the evaluation is to:
* Provide recommendations on how best to implement future environment related CPAP outcomes.
1. The secondary objectives are:
* To evaluate the impact of UNDP interventions and its contribution in building national capacity for the protection of the environment, and;
* To review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector, international organizations in Programme implementation and comment on its sustainability.
1. The evaluation findings and recommendations will be used by the UNDP CO Angola to inform the 2015-2019 environment programme. Specifically they will be used to help formulate the next CPAP (2015 – 2019) currently being developed.
2. The UNDP Strategic Plan (SP) (2015 – 2017) provides the context for the recommendations produced by this report. The SP can be characterized as a sophisticated response to the development challenges in Angola and one in which the environment, in its broadest sense, is mainstreamed across the entire remit of the County Office (CO) with three key aspects of work focusing on:
3. How to adopt sustainable development pathways;

*“(UNDP) will assist programme countries to design and implement development pathways that can tackle the connected issues of poverty, inequality and exclusion while transforming productive capacities, avoiding the irreversible depletion of social and* ***natural capital*** *and* ***lowering risks arising from shocks****. Our aim will be to help improve the* ***resource endowments*** *of the poor[[3]](#footnote-3) and boost their prospects for employment and livelihoods[[4]](#footnote-4). We will do so in a disciplined way, building on the most promising parts of our current portfolio and offering strong connections to issues of* ***environmental sustainability, governance and resilience****. This will demand thought leadership, advice on ‘big picture’ reforms, capacity-building, action to boost employment and livelihoods and greater attention to* ***effective risk management****”.*

1. How to build and/or strengthen inclusive and effective democratic governance;

*“(UNDP) will assist countries to maintain or secure peaceful and democratic governance, either when faced with large-scale changes or confronting specific challenges such as reforming constitutions, organizing credible elections or strengthening parliaments. We will also help governance institutions adapt to changing public expectations and deliver clear benefits to citizens, whether in terms of better services,* ***improved access to resources*** *needed for employment and livelihoods or greater security of persons and property. In designing our work, we will bring together our ability to advocate, advise, promote dialogue, achieve consensus and build institutions. We will also pay attention to the strong connections that exist between democratic governance and progress towards* ***sustainable development pathways*** *and* ***resilience****”.*

1. How to build resilience.

*“All areas of (UNDP) work proposed in this Strategic Plan will help build resilience whether, for instance, through greater employment and livelihoods,* ***more equitable access to resources****, better protection against economic and* ***environmental shocks****,* ***peaceful settlement of disputes*** *or progress towards democratic governance. These are elements that help build bridges between humanitarian, peacebuilding and longer-term development efforts, to* ***reduce risks****,* ***prevent crises (whether from man-made or natural causes),*** *avert major development setbacks and promote* ***human security****[[5]](#footnote-5). In this particular area of work, we will focus on two additional issues that are absolutely crucial going forward: rapid and effective recovery from conflict-induced crises in those cases where prevention has fallen short; and* ***a much stronger ability to prepare for and deal with the consequences of natural disasters****, especially as they are* ***exacerbated by climate change****. The inclusion of these two issues within the same area of work reflects primarily the unifying theme of recovery from a range of crises. It does not imply that conflict and natural disasters are necessarily connected. This may happen, but only in specific cases”[[6]](#footnote-6).*

1. The purpose of these recommendations are to assist the CO in developing the necessary interventions to translate these statements into internal policies and actions towards these expected outcomes (the Country Development Programme, CPD). Four points are worth considering, the first two being largely conceptual but nonetheless critical, the third and fourth being of a practical, or “mechanical” nature:
2. **The broad scale and scope of the environment sector** encompasses all other sectors and underpins human existence itself making it extremely difficult to find an effective starting point. In other words determining whether the best approach is advocacy, policy formulation, technical assistance, capacity building, direct project support, etc., makes it hard to focus resources effectively. This is particularly so in the case of a transitional society such as Angola where the reality is that, at this point in the transitional process, it is not unreasonable to conclude that all of these are necessary.
3. **The complexity of the environment sector** and the cause and effect relationships between the three principle drivers of change; the economic socio-political and the environmental/ecological drivers are all highly unpredictable and highly dynamic. Furthermore we are invariably dealing with ecological time scales which transcend the normal planning periods, indeed they might extend beyond normal human time horizons, so much so that, because they are so long, we tend to cast aside as unmanageable. Yet, paradoxically, our planning and interventions must remain dynamic and adaptive.
4. **The resources available to UNDP to affect change** are, for a large part, provided in the form of projects. Projects are very important because they provide a test bed for learning, they provide experience, they provide a certain amount of security to make mistakes and learn from them and they can provide home-grown solutions to the problems a country faces which are arguably more durable than “imported” solutions, and lastly they provide direct assistance (material, technical, financial) to a level where it can have a profound effect. However, the source of funding to a large extent dictates the type of project. In the case of the Global Environmental Facility[[7]](#footnote-7) (GEF) it is important to consider that the design of interventions within the GEF portfolio of Operational Programmes (OPs) has evolved over a number of funding cycles becoming progressively more sophisticated beginning in the early years with very focused and single issue projects to the current more holistic approaches such as mainstreaming. While this is a wise and reasonable progression; in the case of Angola it underestimates the disruptive nature of three decades of conflict and arguably there is still a short term need for very focused projects to build a body of national experience in academia, in governmental and non-governmental organizations and within civil society, not necessarily before mainstreaming takes place; but concurrently.
5. **The three key work areas outlined in the UNDP SP and articulated in the CDP** are very sophisticated[[8]](#footnote-8) well thought through approaches. However, once implementation begins the ability of actors to “scale in” to very specific detail and “scale out” to much broader and cross-cutting issues will be challenging. There is significant risk that, under the pressure of different sector, agency or institutional agendas and mandates debate becomes polarised or becomes entrenched in detail and discussion and progress is stalled while specific arguments, agendas or self-interests are pursued. In short, it is impossible for an individual to hold on to all the threads of the “argument” at any one time. Invariably there is a high risk that progress stalls over specific points or problems which cannot necessarily be addressed at a particular time. In short, our conventional planning tools struggle to cope with this level of complexity and when coupled with administrative responsibilities, there is little time to process information and craft responses.
6. Therefore a critical purpose of this evaluation is to consider the necessary measures to integrate the aims and objectives of the UNDPSP and the CO CDP to ensure that the ideals expressed in these documents are successfully implemented. To this end section 5 of this report makes a specific recommendation (recommendation 7).

## **1.4 Key products of the outcome evaluation**

1. The process of evaluation is an important component of UNDP’s adaptive management approach. It provides an opportunity for an independent and external evaluator to dispassionately and critically assess the sum of all policies, operational methods, programmes and activities during a specific programme period, with the participation of involved staff and partners and to provide feedback to those parties in order to learn lessons and improve the efficacy of UNDPs activities.
2. The main products of this evaluation are a:
* Final evaluation report: submitted at the conclusion of the assignment providing ratings for the performance of this outcome and recommendations for the formulation of the next CPAP (2015 – 2019).

## **1.5 Key issues addressed by the outcome evaluation**

1. The evaluation will consider:
* Were stated outcomes achieved?
* What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
* To what extent has UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
* Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

## **1.6 Methodology**

1. The *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators* states that “…*.there is no official blueprint for how to conduct an outcome evaluation”* and adds that; “*….the role of the Evaluator is to pass judgment based on his or her best professional opinion, (UNDP)[[9]](#footnote-9)”* in order to do the following:
* Review the change in the outcome.
* Analyze the influencing factors.
* Address the contributions of UNDP and partners.
* Make suggestions on how to improve the approach to obtaining results.
1. The consultant worked under the overall supervision of the UNDP Deputy Country Director, and directly reported to the UNDP Environment Programme Specialist. The assignment was home-based and during the outcome evaluation process, the evaluator applied a qualitative approach, using a mix of the following methods for data collection *and analysis:*
* Desk review of relevant documents;
* Discussions with UNDP Angola senior management and program staff;
* Sharing the draft report with key stakeholders and an opportunity for their feedback;
* Jointly defining the conclusions and recommendations with the UNDP Angola senior management and program staffand ensuring that there is a common understanding of any weaknesses or shortcomings in the outcome and an understanding of the reasons for, and the appropriate detail of, any remedial actions that might be necessary.
1. The evaluation took due consideration of three points in approaching the work:
	1. The evaluation is of a single outcome in the country programme *Environment and Sustainable Development* in a larger country programme including outcomes in three other programme areas: *Poverty Reduction and Achievement of MDGs, Fostering Democratic Governance,* and *Crisis Prevention and Recovery.*
	2. The Assessment of Development Results, Evaluation of UNDPContribution, Angola (ADR) report, carried out by the UNDP Evaluation Office had just taken place and was published in November 2013 and documents to a large extent the situation of the overall UNDP country programme *vis-a-vis* a range of issues which have relevance to this evaluation.
	3. The main objective of this outcome evaluation is to provide recommendations on how best to plan and implement future environment-related CPAP outcomes.
2. The section on findings and conclusions includes the **ratings** assigned by the outcome evaluator to the outcome, outputs and, to the sustainability and relevance of the outcome.

## **1.7 Structure of the evaluation report**

1. The structure of this report closely follows the structure recommended by UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators and to provide maximum utility for the primary objective, that is; *to provide recommendations on how best to plan and implement future environment related CPAP outcomes*.
2. Therefore the remainder of this evaluation report is structured in the following way:

**Section 2:** Provides contextual information for the outcome and the evaluation. It places the outcome within the overall development context of the Republic of Angola providing information on key partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries as well as the challenges of, and expectations from, the specific outcome and places it within a temporal scale.

**Section 3:** Presents the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation. It provides an assessment of whether the outcome has been achieved, what factors have affected it both positively and negatively, the efficiency of UNDP contributions to the outcome and the nature and efficiency of the UNDP partnership strategy. This section includes the **ratings** assigned by the outcome evaluator to the outcome, outputs and, if where relevant, to the sustainability and relevance of the outcome.

**Section 4:** Provides a set of recommendations for the formulation of the UNDP Environment programme during the subsequent CPAP including what corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in this outcome

**Section 5:** Provides the basis for learning from the evaluation, documenting the main lessons that can be drawn from the outcome experience which may have generic application both for UNDP and its partners and the best and worst practices in designing, undertaking, monitoring and evaluating outputs, activities and partnerships around this outcome.

# **2 THE DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

1. The development context presented here is largely drawn from a number documents including, *inter alia*, the UNDAF, CPAP ADR (2012), MDG Goals Report (2010), the Final Evaluation reports from the SLM and Okavango Basin projects as well as background (including web-based) information from other agencies (e.g. the African Development Bank, European Union, etc.) and GOA material.
2. Maybe include here a para or two explain the national context and the environmental sector… During the past decade Angola has experienced unprecedented economic growth producing growth rates of over 8%. However, over 85% of state revenues are derived from the oil sector and this impressive growth has not been reflected in human development. With a human development index (HDI) of 0.508 (ranking 148 out of 187 countries), the GOA is committed to diversifying the economy through the National Development Plan (2012) into agriculture, industry, tourism and fisheries.
3. While there are many positive developments and despite impressive GOA investment in economic and social infrastructure, expanding health and educational facilities and augmenting human capital through pro-poor policies and programmes the national poverty rate is 36.6% (58.3% in rural areas and 18.7% in urban areas, according to the integrated survey on population wellbeing (2010).
4. Institutionally the sector has been restructured with the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Environment becoming the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment and has faced some challenges in integrating policies across institutions. While policies and strategies for addressing biodiversity, climate change and environmental sustainability have been articulated, translating them into action has been impeded by weak institutional capacity, the need to work across sectors, and insufficient tools and capabilities to ensure compliance with essential standards such as mandatory impact assessments before major public or private works projects are carried out[[10]](#footnote-10).
5. “*Angola has made progress in strengthening democratic institutions and practices, and revamping governance structures, especially at the municipal level. Two elections, a revised constitution, the creation of human rights institutions, and increasing engagement by civil society groups in the development dialogue, have been important steps in building democratic space. Greater citizen engagement – and enhanced state capacity to respond – would improve service delivery and meaningful participation in decision-making at the national and sub-national levels*[[11]](#footnote-11)”, which is of particular relevance to sustainable natural resource management and the resilience of communities and ecosystems.
6. Angola faces many environmental challenges. Weakened institutional, technical, academic and community capacities to manage the environment sustainably are a regrettable outcome of decades of war as have the circumstances which necessarily led to short term planning and low investment (time, economic resources, management practices, etc.) in environmental management. These have resulted in broad spectrum of environmental challenges unsustainable agriculture, deforestation/unsustainable use of forests, and overgrazing of rangelands which have contributed to overexploitation of the soil, leading to erosion (including threatening urban developments and infrastructure), soil exhaustion and desertification. Extractive industries have created pollution of land, air and water bodies. Water management has broader regional as well as national implications and given the geographic circumstances is an uncertain and unpredictable resource in both scarcity and abundance.
7. Exploitation of biodiversity resources including fisheries has in many instances resulted in chronic resource depletion.

## **2.1 UNDP involvement in the environment sector**

1. UNDP work towards the environment outcome has been steadily growing in both scope and importance reflecting the changing priorities of the Angolan Government and national context as the country has shifted from post-conflict crisis prevention and recovery to a more development-focused agenda.
2. UNDP’s has been involved in this sector since the mid-1990s. Since 2004, with the development of the first UNDAF and Country Programme Document (CPD) for 2005 – 2009 it has begun to move from post-conflict crisis prevention and continues progressively and incrementally into the second UNDAF and CPAP (2009 – 2013) at which point it begins to reflect (and is aligned both temporally and thematically) the GOA aspirations as set out in the government programme 2009 – 2013 as set out in the Sustainable Development Programme document.
3. Particular emphasis was placed on ensuring the effective implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), adaptation to climate change and other related international conventions recently ratified or to be ratified by Angola (e.g. the Kyoto Protocol and other multi-lateral environmental agreements [MEAs]) including supporting the development and implementation of follow-on projects in biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification.
4. Importantly interventions were to focus on capacity assessments and capacity development strategies to contribute sustainable ecosystem health and enhancing livelihoods or the rural population.
5. Furthermore, this outcome was being developed in the changing national context with the emphasis of both government and donors shifting from post-conflict recovery to development oriented programmes.
6. The ADR makes a clear and strong case for the UNDP involvement in this sector citing the growing awareness of the role of environmental security, in its broadest possible terms, in all sectors and particularly related to land degradation and erosion. It would also appear that the GOA sees considerable importance in Angola playing a greater role in regional and global environmental issues creating a need to join and ratify a number of regional and international agreements and conventions, a role that has been largely supported by UNDP. This has in turn led to the need to “mainstream” environment at a national level, in particular by creating an adequate legal and institutional framework and strong civil society participation. This process has, it would seem, increased the awareness of the environment-poverty linkages (nationally and institutionally) which are typical of the sort challenges faced by the recently ended UNDP-GEF financed Building Capacity for Sustainable Land Use and Management in Angola project.
7. In total UNDP has implemented seven projects in this outcome area compared to fifteen in crisis recovery and prevention, eight in democratic governance and thirty in poverty reduction and MDG achievement. This figure is provided for information only and the evaluation draws no conclusions from the comparative number of projects per sector.
8. Within the UNDP CO structure environment is nested within the Poverty Unit and headed by a Focal Point suggesting a subordinated hierarchy which is not reflected by the portfolio of projects carried out (see Annex 6). These past, present and future projects reflect a broad range of issues and levels of intervention which would ordinarily require the dedication of an entire unit within the CO.

### Table 1 UN agency planning framework

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Planning/Policy Document | Period covered (or most recent version) | Objectives | Prepared by |
| Common Country Assessment (CCA) | 2002 to present | Assesses the country’s situation, identifies main challenges | UNDP |
| United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) | 1st UNDAF 2005 – 20082nd UNDAF 2009 - 2013 | i) Defines the common UN agency programming prioritiesii) Establishes a common planning framework for UN agencies in the countryiii) Jointly agreed outcomes | UN Agencies (led by UNDP)Participation of GOA partners |
| Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) | 2005 - 2008 |  |  |
| Country Programme Document (CPD) | 2009 - 2013 | Contributes to the achievement of the objectives of the Government’s Medium Term Development Plan (2009-2013), Poverty Reduction Strategy for (2004-2006) and Sustainable Development Plan for (2009-2013) | Consultation with GOAConsultation with other development partners |
| Country Programme Action Plan | 2009 - 2013 | Describes the:i) expected results from the Country Programmeii) the agency’s distinctive roleiii) the arrangements for programming management and M&Eiv) the standard legal provisions applicable to each agency that establishes the commitments of the agency and government | UNDPParticipation of GOA partnersParticipation of main Implementing Partners |

## **2.2 Key partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries**

1. The key partners from the GOA has naturally been the Ministry of Environment (ME) however, as was demonstrated in the SLM project and the Okavango Basin project the Ministry of Agriculture (MA), Ministry of Water and Energy and various governmental committees and secretariats have also partnered with UNDP in this outcome area, and academic institutions.
2. From the UN system, UNDP has mainly partner with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), as a significant partner (the Executing Agency) in the Okavango Basin project.
3. The principal donor has been the GEF (NBSAP, Okavango Basin and SLM projects) and is likely to remain so being the largest public investor in environmental projects, however, the European Union[[12]](#footnote-12) (EU) have also recently partnered with UNDP. It is important to stress that the relationship between the UNDP and the GEF is likely to play some part in shaping the future engagement through the selection of GEF Operational Programmes and their project design requirements.
4. NGO and CSO partnerships have on the whole been small but very significant. UNDP partnered successfully with the international NGO Development Workshop during the SLM project. However, an important aspect of this project has been the ability of UNDP to “step down” to a very local level through the vehicle of a project to provide technical, training, material and financial assistance to small non-government or civil society organizations (e.g. ASADEF [Solidarity between Handicapped Peoples Association], AJAPA [Youth Association]).
5. UNDP has also partnered successfully, and could probably do more in the future in this area, in working with academic institutions. In particular during the SLM project by providing greater flexibility of funding to the University of Huambo, Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias.
6. The beneficiaries are varied and many reflecting the utilitarian nature of the UNDP approach to this outcome in Angola. At a regional level there were national beneficiaries Angola, Botswana and Namibia and clearly at an institutional level the national government partners have benefited from the training and capacity building which is an integral component of UNDP-GEF projects and in the case of the SLM project the level of benefit has reached the “grass-root” level with direct benefits of financing, capacity building and training, empowerment, etc., going to NGOs and civil society groups.
7. Certainly UNDP has been successful when partnering with local organizations or entities allowing funding to reach areas which have thus far been largely excluded from the development process in many ways. While this is, in some measure, a reflection of the magnitude of the challenges facing Angola, particularly in the rural areas, it is also a measure of the UNDPs willingness to go down to the “grassroots” levels (mostly through the vehicle of a project) and the flexibility of financing which it is willing to enter into. Should be useful to reflect on the diverse nature of partnerships and its impact? Also to explain which partnership was more effective or better coordinate or something more than listing partners? Was the strategy clear since the beginning? Or refer the reader to next sections for more details

# **3 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

1. The findings and conclusions of the evaluation report reflect the scope presented in the ToR. Therefore the findings and conclusions in the report take their lead from the nature of the exercise (to provide recommendations on how best to implement future environment-related CPAP outcomes) and reflect the four categories of analysis: i) the outcome’s status, ii) the factors which have affected it, iii) the UNDP contributions or inputs and iv) the partnerships strategies that UNDP engaged in. This section also includes the **ratings** assigned by the outcome evaluator to the outcome, outputs and, if relevant, to the sustainability and relevance of the outcome.

## **3.1 Status of the outcome**

1. In the UNDP monitoring and evaluation framework the outcome, its achievement or progress towards it, is assessed and measured against the indicators provided in the UNDAF and CPAP documents (2009 – 2013). The use of these two outcome statements and associated indicators is not a contradiction but reflects a different scale at which the outcome is examined and indicators measured, in other words using finer or wider detail to determine the outcome. However, in doing this it is also within the remit of the Evaluation to consider the suitability and appropriateness of the indicators originally chosen and even to critically examine the outcome itself, considering what were the driving forces which influenced it, and whether it was appropriate given the specific circumstances in Angola at the time of formulating the UNDAF and CPAP; the latter being, a country in which government and donors were faced with many immediate and pressing problems of real human consequence, recovering from a protracted and highly disruptive period of conflict. It is not unreasonable to consider that these immediate problems, with their human dimension, might take precedence over longer term issues of environmental resilience, critical though they might be to underpinning any social and economic development gains.

### **3.1.1 Quality of the indicators**

1. The outcome exists in two forms; as a narrative, and as described by the indicators in the Strategic Results Framework (SRF). Theoretically there should be an equivalence between the outcome described as a narrative, and the sum of the indicators. In this instance the Evaluation considers that the indicators do not entirely reflect the outcome but represent only a component of this, admittedly a component most relevant to mainstreaming but to narrow to fully reflect the outcome. While the given indicators do reflect a component of the narrative outcome they do not reflect the whole story. They do not necessarily reflect the achievements of UNDP (or indeed the partners); what UNDP provided, (monitoring role, political advocacy, stakeholder’s role, what UNDP did (projects), what UNDP delivered (was it relevant, effective, efficient, and sustainable?).
2. However, the indicators are not just re-stating the outcome. They serve two important purposes. Without priority, they firstly serve a contractual purpose. That is, they provide a measure by which the performance of UNDPs work can be measured, in other words; “is UNDP doing what it said it would do?” This is essentially an *audit* function.
3. The second purpose of the indicators is to measure the effect or impact of the interventions. In other words; “having done what it said it would do, are the various UNDP interventions having the desired result and if not, what should be changed? What have we not understood about the whole system? Which assumptions are false?” This is essentially an *adaptive management* function.
4. Quite clearly in the CPAP what are given as indicators are better suited as targets and *vice versa* (see Annex 5).
5. The evaluation assumes that this was a confusion during the time of the CPAP formulation which, in the evaluations experience (outside of this outcome), is quite common in focusing on making indicators SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable Relevant and Time-bound[[13]](#footnote-13)). The result is the equivalence of flying an airplane using just the fuel gauge. Other things may not be working but it is OK to continue to fly because there is still fuel.
6. Regardless, the evaluation can still measure the successful achievement of the outcome against the given indicators and consider that it has achieved the outcome. However, this would not reflect the list of achievements documented in section 3.1.7 and provide only a small and possibly distorting view on the circumstances of the outcome.
7. The information, or perspective, coming from the two key projects within this sector (the Okavango Basin and the SLM projects, but particularly the latter project) confirms that it is not so simple that it can be measured by the number of policies, programmes, plans and Conventions created and it is also important to consider the *planning process* in qualitative terms ofhow plans are arrived at. Arguably it is the difference between defining the *enabling environment* through a suite of policies, laws and regulations rather than being “focused very closely on the legal, bureaucratic, fiscal, informational, political and cultural factors that might impact on the stakeholders to engage in the process” (Brinkerhoff 2004[[14]](#footnote-14)).
8. While the indicators from the UNDAF and CPAP (2009 – 2013) have provided some indication thus far (even with the apparent juxtaposition of indicators and targets in the CPAP) it would be important to develop a more sophisticated set of indicators for future programmes because indicators are not just measures of success, they are also (probably more importantly) a means monitor and adapt interventions in light of experience and changes in circumstances.
9. Therefore the Evaluation raises this issue here and provides a recommendation to improve the quality of the indicators in section 4.
10. **3.1.2 UNDAF Outcome**

***UNDAF Outcome 4 from SRF[[15]](#footnote-15):*** *Strengthened pro-poor economic growth and accountable macroeconomic management and integrated rural development, natural resources and energy management to promote environmental protection and adaptation to climate change.*

### **3.1.3 UNDAF indicators**

1. As stated in section 3.1.1, the UNDAF indicator is a reasonable measure of the outcome within the 2009 – 2013 lifetime of the development action framework however, it provides little in the way of qualitative information and does not reflect the longer term description of the outcome which would require something more substantive than plans and reports. It might have been more informative if it had been combined with a number of other indicators which might have reflected the larger national *enabling environment* in the environmental sector. For instance institutional capacities and budget spending on the environment might also have been included providing some indication of the effectiveness of “environmental plans and strategic reports”. For instance the Final Evaluation of the Okavango Basin project noted that “*the SAP [Strategic Action Plan] will require the involvement of more sectors than just water and environment. As a policy document, it will also require accession by authorities higher than OKACOM [*Permanent Okavango River Basin Commission*] representatives in each country. As part of the process towards conclusion of the SAP, all sectors that have a stake in the basin need to be involved in the negotiations*”. In the SLM project GoA in-kind co-financing of US$400,000 never materialized. Thus on its own the UNDAF indicator is either incomplete or too specific having the nature of a target rather than an indicator and in the same (SLM) project the difficulties in establishing inter-ministry collaboration were a significant factor in limiting the successful outcomes of the project, neither issues would be detected by this single indicator. However, the ADR report found that: “*evidence of the increasingly important role carried out by environmental and sustainable development issues, a substantial increase was witnessed in the number of projects in this thematic area in 2011. Between 2007 and 2010, the number of projects remained constant. The increase may be explained by the more explicit and active manner in which the issue was introduced to the national agenda, and by the capacity demonstrated by UNDP, together with MINAMB [ME], in obtaining relevant funding (especially from GEF), and an increase in the ministry’s policy-making capacity*”[[16]](#footnote-16).

### Table 2 UDAF indicators and achievements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Baseline | Targets | Achievement |
| Number of environmental plans and strategic reports approved | N/A | 7 | The 2010 MDG report for Angola lists 4 Laws, 1 decree, 6 programmes, and the creation of units of integrated environmental disclosure in Agrarian Development Stations (EDAs)The Relatório de Progresso (2011 – 2012) for the UNDAF (2009 – 2013) highlights the integrated programme of environmental protection, climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity and reducing the risk of environmental disaster, the process of starting the UNFCCC strategy, participation by the Angolan Delegation in Rio +20 World Summit on Sustainable Development, ME participation in the 18th Conference of the UNFCCC |

### **3.1.4 CPAP Outcome**

***CPAP Programme Outcome 6[[17]](#footnote-17):*** *Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective.*[[18]](#footnote-18)

### **3.1.5 CPAP indicators**

### Table 3 CPAP and achievements as presented in the CPAP

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Baselines | Targets | Achievement |
| i) Number of national policies on sustainable development | i) Lack of integrated national environmental policy | i) National Biodiversity programme is capacitated and supported in the NBSAP | National Action Plan approved. Six thematic studies published. |
| ii) Number of programmes focusing on mainstreaming environmental protection | ii) Poor capacity to monitor environmental trends | ii) Sustainable land use models are identified and being replicated across the country | National Action Plan finalized. 9 studies produced. |
| iii) Number of programmes and policies on sustainable use of resources (land and water) | iii) Ministry of environment established in 2008 | iii) Effective strategies and plans (including regional) are defined for sustainable use of water resources | Transboundary Diagnosis Analysis published. National Action Plan approved. Strategic Action Plan (SAP) endorsed by Botswana and Namibia. Angola has not endorsed yet.  SAP ProDoc under preparation for implementation. |
| iv) Number of international Environmental Conventions being reported/monitored | iv) Lack of monitoring and control of environmental impact of economic activities | iv) Environmental trends are being monitored, including climate change focus, by national institutions | Convention on Biodiversity  -- through National Communications --, Montreal Protocol (customs tariff) |

### **3.1.6 The Outcome**

1. Evaluation takes place with the benefit of hindsight. For the purpose of evaluation it is important to “un-pack” the outcome before it can be assessed. The UNDAF Outcome is of a larger scale than the CPAP outcome but distilling its individual elements it is clear that:
* Economic growth should be experienced by the poor;
* The macroeconomic management should be accountable, presumably financially as well environmentally;
* Rural development is intended to be multi-faceted including agricultures but also financial and social services and infrastructure[[19]](#footnote-19);
* Natural resources management should, presumably, be in line with environmental protection and adaptation to climate change;
* Energy management should, presumably, be in line with environmental protection and adaptation to climate change;
1. The CPAP outcome offers a more focused description:
* The ability of management agencies to mainstream environmental protection in national development plans and programmes;
* This process should benefit the poor and provide for (presumably) economic and social development.
1. It is therefore important to look carefully at two aspects of the outcome statement; “*mainstreaming*” and “*a pro-poor growth perspective*”.
2. Using the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative which interprets environmental mainstreaming specifically in terms of “*integrating poverty-environment linkages into national development planning processes and their outputs, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Millennium Development Goal (MDG) strategies*”[[20]](#footnote-20) the issue of pro-poor growth would seem to be explicitly recognized in the process of mainstreaming environment. Therefore it might simply remain to look closely at the way in which national capacities have been strengthened to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes. In particular to critically examine both the means by which this has been done and the effectiveness of what has been achieved, always bearing in mind that this outcome represents the desired status at the end of the particular (2009 – 2013) implementation phase and not the eventual outcome which might reasonably be expected to reflect a resolution of the many challenges facing Angola today. The inclusion of climate change in the UNDAF outcome statement and the selection of the two project themes (SLM and trans-boundary water resources) in the UNDP programme of work up to 2013 might also reflect concerns about sustainability and ecosystem resilience which are increasingly underpinning work in this sector.

### **3.1.7 Achievement of the outcome**

1. The outcome and the indicators provided in the CPAP SRF to a large extent, reflect a broader outcome than the two specific projects that will be part of this analysis, namely; the SLM project and the Okavango Basin project. However, the SRF(s) include projects and programmes that are currently planned/formulating but have not yet been fully developed/implemented (see Annex 6) which, when operational, will broadly cover all areas of the outcome.
2. Therefore, it is these two projects (SLM and Okavango Basin) which represent much of the focus of the work of UNDP Angola during the period under review (2009 – 2013) and thus they provide some of the clearest insight into the achievement of the outcome. It is also worth noting that these two projects provide different perspectives on the outcome. The former providing a more detailed and focused insight into the challenges of building national capacities and an enabling environment, including national partnerships; while the latter reflects the broader challenges of multi-country projects, trans-boundary cooperation and inter-agency partnerships. Both are useful because they throw open a window on the strengths and weakness within UNDP and the outcome *per se*.
3. The SLM project is of particular importance to this evaluation in understanding the level of achievement of the outcome[[21]](#footnote-21), the efforts of UNDP, the major challenges to the outcome and the most effective modifications which might reasonably be expected in future programmes. While it is unusual for an outcome to focus on a particular project in this instance it is reasonable because the SLM project was a microcosm of the larger outcome working in the area where the three principle drivers which shape the outcome; socio-political/administrative, economic and ecological/environmental, collide. Elements of the successes, challenges and failures observed within this project are embodied at all levels throughout the outcome. These are summarized below:
* **The strategic role of UNDP:** Given the transitional stage of Angola, the UNDP has, by necessity, played (in the absence of other significant external players in this field) multiple and important roles in the development of a coherent environmental sector in Angola. These have included; political advocacy, mobilizing external financing, stakeholder coordination and project implementation. Therefore UNDP has been providing numerous different and necessary support roles.
* **The tactical role of UNDP at the macro-level:** While it is broadly accepted that a successful outcome to any intervention in the environmental sphere will be achieved by mainstreaming (see section 3.1.6), these approaches require a certain level of functional capacity and governance which is appearing in Angola but still requires significant external support. At the macro-level this is apparent and is noted in the Draft Country Programme Document for Angola (2015-2019); "*while policies and strategies for addressing biodiversity, climate change and environmental sustainability have been articulated, translating them into action has been impeded by weak institutional capacity, the need to work across sectors, and insufficient tools and capabilities to ensure compliance with essential standards such as mandatory impact assessments before major public or private works projects are carried out*”. This was also manifest in the SLM project in which project outcomes requiring high-level decisions did not perform well and impeded “on-the-ground” progress in a number of instances. UNDP has on a number of occasions stepped in to ensure that there has been continuity or to move the process forwards when these constraints have threatened the outcome.
* **The tactical role of UNDP at the micro-level:** At the micro-level mainstreaming requires a certain level of capacity and experience which Angola is building but is still “a work in progress”. This manifests itself in the need to continue direct support to projects as a means to build that body of capacity and experience as a sustainable basis for mainstreaming environment. Drawing on the SLM project experience, this was illustrated across a spectrum of implementation activities from including difficulties in engaging national consultants with SLM experience, local NGOs planting trees without removing the nursery bags or provincial research institutions budgets that provided amply for the purchase of vehicles but made no provision for the development of human resources and field trails or research. UNDP was in a position to provide, or leverage, small but important amounts of material or intellectual assistance at critical times.
* **Stakeholder engagement:** Following on from the points made above, it is reasonable to argue that a narrow stakeholder engagement would not have been as effective as the broader stakeholder engagement which UNDP has pursued. It might be argued that focusing all resources on one level (e.g. political advocacy) might be more efficient use of resources, but the Evaluation disagrees with this and feels that the wide range of stakeholder engagement (and at different levels within government and society) has been successful given the particular transitional circumstances in Angola. While the next steps might be to ensure that these different levels of stakeholders “talk” directly to each other, the use of UNDP as a conduit has thus far proved effective.
* **Focus of projects:** The type and subject of projects planned and implemented by UNDP Angola in the environmental field has been diverse, both in the level, and the focus, of intervention. The evaluation agrees with this approach because of the transitional stage which Angola is currently at and this report provides a recommendation (see section 4 of this report) to ensure that this diversity of project remains part of a coherent approach to achieving the outcome.
1. While the given targets for the indicators in the CPAP and UNDAF have largely been met, by themselves they do not amount to a fundamental change in circumstances if one considers that the purpose of strengthening national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective is to ensure that development takes place without discounting *the ecosystems ability to sustain life through the provision of a broad range of ecosystem goods and services upon which human social and economic development depends upon.* To be clear, this is a weakness in the indicators and not a reflection upon the scope and intensity of UNDPs’ work between 2009 – 2013.
2. Admittedly the addition of what might be termed ecosystem resilience in these terms is expecting much from a three year planning period but ultimately it must be the critical outcome of any environment programme.
3. However, the work during this period, both on the part of UNDP and the GoA (particularly the ME) and other partners, should not be underestimated, it is considerable and represents an impressive human endeavor. At times it may have been fractious, challenging and on occasions even appeared dysfunctional, but it has been the ability of all sides to remain engaged with each other and the issues which is of significance. In some instances UNDP staff have moved from UNDP to Ministry posts and on several occasions, UNDP has been invited to be part of the Angolan Delegation for participating in international conventions, such as the Conference of the Parties for the UNFCCC which provides some insight into the value placed upon the relationship. Without this relationship it would be hard to see where the important and broad focus of the support for this sector would have come from because there does not appear to be any other external agency with as comprehensive an environment sector as UNDP in Angola. As a result there have been numerous developments which have either been carried over from previous planning periods and completed, or initiated during this planning period (see Tables 1 and 2 and Annex 6) which represent an increasingly sophisticated response to the environmental challenges faced by Angola as the country moves from recovery to development.
4. However, the attainment of the targets provided in the UNDAF and CPAP SRF do not represent the complete achievement of the outcome but progress towards it. **Therefore the outcome has not been achieved but the progress has been satisfactory**.

### Table 4 Outcome ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Rating | Comments |
| Overall outcome | Satisfactory | **The outcome has not been achieved** and was necessarily ambitious. The indicators in the SRF(s) do not fully describe the outcome. Despite this, **progress has been satisfactory within the timeframe (2009 – 2013)** with a suite of international and national policy implements being enacted, capacity building, and training taking place. Two projects were implemented with varying degrees of success and considerable financial support for the sector has been leveraged. However, implementation still appears to be weak. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* improve the outcome statement, provide a broader range of indicators for monitoring and evaluation.  |
| Outputs | Satisfactory | The outputs are **satisfactory.** The two projects implemented have allowed UNDP to work strategically and tactically at different scales or levels and for UNDP to utilize to best advantage its “soft” assistance. They have brought together a broad diversity of stakeholders and provided significant national experience and capacity building. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* strengthen the cross sector planning using a scenario planning approach to ensure that the different outputs remain part of a coherent intervention. |
| Sustainability | Satisfactory | The sustainability of this outcome is deemed **satisfactory** within the context that UNDP continues support to this sector in the medium future. However, the achievements thus far remain vulnerable. Recommendations are made in this report to; *inter alia:* strengthen the environment sector within UNDP by elevating it to the same level as both poverty and governance and ensuring cross–sector coordination. |
| Relevance | Satisfactory | Environment is **highly relevant** as indicated in the GOA policy framework and as the basis underpinning social and economic development in Angola. As the country moves from a recovery to a development footing this importance is likely to grow both in terms of increased environmental degradation due to short term economic development priorities and through its contribution to development through the provision of life supporting ecosystem goods and services. |

### **3.1.8 Progress towards the outcome**

1. Given the observations in the previous section it is possible to conclude that, even if: “*without discounting the ecosystems ability to sustain life through the provision of a broad range of ecosystem goods and services upon which human social and economic development depends upon*” were added to the outcome statement there has been considerable progress towards the outcome. This represents considerable achievement by UNDP (and the partners) particularly so given the challenges faced by Angola in moving from recovery to development, the size of the country and the modest investment of UNDP.
2. This progress can be characterized thus:
* UNDP has, with varying degrees of success, completed two complex projects under extremely difficult circumstances. Regardless of the successes or failures within these projects UNDP has stayed with the process despite the difficulties. Failure in these projects would have been characterized by a process of “writing off” the projects when they encountered difficulties, which clearly did not happen, thus both projects have been part of a larger learning process. There should be no doubt that this is not some sort of “second prize” but rather a *raisons d'être* of projects *per se* in as much as they absorb the risks and in the process individuals and institutions gain experience, the outcome is the sum of the projects outputs, good or bad, and the processes followed to achieve these. Under this analysis the process of implementing a project, no matter how challenging, is as important as the sum of all the outputs The UNDP monitoring and evaluation has been active in identifying the key lessons arising from this process as a means to inform future planning activities.
* Angola has progressively become involved in a number of international environmental conventions and agreements all of which impose monitoring and reporting burdens upon a country, UNDP has played a major role in both instigating and ensuring that there is the capacity to fulfill these responsibilities/international commitments.
* UNDP through what is termed “soft assistance” namely; policy advice and dialogue, advocacy, and coordination, facilitating political (with a small “p”) solutions and partnerships (no matter how dysfunctional they may have appeared at times) has built coalitions and institutional capacities both at a provincial level and the central level, in government, and, in some instances at the local government and civil society level. This latter statement appears to be true in just one particular circumstance, the SLM project. It is not possible to draw any concrete conclusions during this evaluation based upon this, but a reasonable assumption might indicate that environmental issues (be they land tenure, soil fertility, access to natural resources, livelihood or any number of other issues and given the right approach) provides a focus and a conduit for UNDP to work at these very local levels.
* Progress has been made on reaching regional agreements, for instance through the Okavango Basin project. These agreements albeit in their infancy, and sometimes stretched, are the basis of future regional cooperation and reflect not only upon Angola but also on the other countries in terms of reaching a consensus.
1. The outcome, as determined by the UNDAF and CPAP indicators was poorly defined. However, if the outcome statements from both the UNDAF and the CPAP are “unpacked” (see section 3.1.5, para. 34 – 36) then it is reasonable to state that progress has been good and the outcome is (in the terms of a *Theory of Change* approach) in an intermediate state and on a reasonable “trajectory”. Therefore the evaluation fairly describes the status of the outcome as satisfactory.

## **3.2 Relevance of the outcome**

1. The relevance of the sector is examined from three perspectives, the relevance to:
2. Angola (in particular the GOA) taking into account the transition from post-conflict to development, is the outcome consistent with the country needs and global priorities:
* The outcome is reflected in the Angolan Strategic Programme of Long-Term Development (2025) outcomes: *Sustainable management of environment and energy; and the National environmental action plan, national biodiversity strategy and action plan implemented progressively.*
* Angola is very interested to assert itself in terms of its regional responsibilities. Environmental Agreements and Conventions, by their very nature, provide a good platform for this.
* While the country is still very much focusing on the immediate development needs sustainable environmental management or resilience is likely to take on an increasing significance as the impact of rapid development creates environmental damage and the need to manage for a continued flow of ecosystem goods and services to underpin social and economic development gains.
1. UNDP in relation to the resources allocated to the sector and the position within the CO structure:
* Until now environment has been nested in the Poverty Unit and headed by a Focal Point. As stated above, environmental or ecosystem resilience underpins social and economic development and it is therefore unsurprising in many ways that the progrmme is housed within the Poverty Unit. However, wise environmental management requires good governance. Not governance in the strict political or electoral sense but in a broader sense as the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management (Eagles 2008) and a systems “capacity for learning and self-organisation to adapt to change” (Gunderson and Holling 2002). Furthermore, in rural areas, and to a very large degree in urban areas when one considers the essential nature of ecosystems goods and services, environmental issues are critical, they underpin human development. Therefore environment becomes crosscutting within the United Nations Development Assistance Plan[[22]](#footnote-22) (UNDAP) and UNDP CPAP in both poverty alleviation and strengthening governance.
* Land tenure is an emerging issue in Angola and one which needs to be addressed to maintain peace and security. Many countries in the region have demonstrated the role that natural resource management and particularly community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) can play in creating effective and sustainable systems, building resilience (against natural disasters and directional changes such as climate), devolving authority and responsibility and building social capital. All these are within the remit of “environment”.
* Women play an important role in the management of biodiversity and in rural circumstances women often have a high dependency on biodiversity and other natural resources for their livelihood security and its sustainable management is of real and practical concern to them.
* A recent UNDP study has demonstrated and documented the role of natural resources in effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration[[23]](#footnote-23) which has real and practical applications to the broad focus of UNDP’s work in Angola
1. UNDPs approach to the sector vis-à-vis an advocacy approach in order to mobilize greater government investment or direct technical and material assistance to addressing the challenges:
* Angola has emerged from a protracted civil war which has disrupted many of the normal development processes. Only recently has the country begun to move from a recovery to ta development focused footing. The environmental outcome anticipated in both UNDAF and CPAP is complex and requires an intervention working at a multiplicity of scales and on a multiplicity of issues. The key drivers which shape this outcome, the economic, socio-political and ecological/environmental are both complex and unpredictable.
1. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that:
2. While it is hard to demonstrate with available GOA budgetary data national spending on the environment still falls well below what is necessary, which is understandable considering the pressing needs for poverty alleviation, infrastructure, health, etc. However, there are signs that the GOA is committing resources for instance in committing to regional and global Conventions and agreements, in establishing the ME and in the ongoing development of the national policy framework. However, it will be sometime before this sector will be able continue to develop sufficiently for the country’s needs without external assistance.
3. Whilst arguments about the role of the environment in development, environmental governance, the role of women and the impact of weak environmental management on their position in society, land tenure and the role of natural resource management in disarmament and post conflict reconstruction might be dismissed as “theoretical”, and indeed, this might be one interpretation of the position that is reflected by UNDPs position on the environment (i.e. low priority compared to electoral reform, HIV-AIDS, poverty reduction, etc., as measured by investment and projects or position in the institutional hierarchy). Another interpretation, and the one favored by this evaluation, is that, given the chronic and pressing needs on human, material and financial resources in post-conflict Angola there has been considerable resources allocated but these are not sufficient for the future and the environment programme will need to be given greater relevance in future country programmes.
4. Advocacy plays a critical role in the environmental programme. Raising awareness at all levels of society given the current short term needs of much of the population is critical and will make the difference between a proactive and a reactive response. However, given the scale and complexity of the environmental challenges in Angola any intervention requires a mix of technical, project, and advocacy. Advocacy alone will be insufficient. Therefore UNDPs mixed approach has been, and will remain for some time to come, the most relevant approach.
5. On this basis the evaluation is able to conclude, by the measures given above, that the relevance of the outcome is satisfactory.

## **3.3 Factors affecting the outcome**

1. A number of factors have affected the outcome and are expressed here with reference to the evaluations specific recommendation (section 4) to address them. The positive factors have largely been dealt with under other sections of this report:
* **National institutional capacities are still weak.** “*A common finding for many donor-supported projects is that over-optimistic assumptions are made at the outset about the institutional environment to support project objectives at “purpose”* [outcome] *level, with the consequence that objectives, or timescales for meeting them, often prove unrealistic*”[[24]](#footnote-24). These are not just technical capacities but also the means to deal with adaptive challenges, *the means for achieving direction, control, and coordination that determines the effectiveness of management*. However, the bulk of financing is normally provided through projects, (while this assumption is not true for Angola *per se* because it contrasts with the low per centage that external aid represents in the total expenditure in Angola it does reflect the position in the environmental sector because it represents not just a source of financing but also technical assistance, capacity building and training, etc.)*,*  which is to say, not an ideal tool for addressing adaptive challenges, particularly when that tool has been designed with another specific and different focus (e.g. SLM or trans-boundary water management, etc.). At times this has been manifest in delays in, *inter alia,* reaching decisions, difficulties in coordination across agencies (government and donors) and poor communications and difficulties encountered in building institutional capacities[[25]](#footnote-25). It was noted by the CO that this was true of all projects regardless of their budget, which might suggest at minimum that financing is not the primary constraint. **Recommendation 5.**
* **For the immediate future projects will still need considerable direct support by UNDP.** Despite the last statements above and the 2011 – 2012 UNDAF Progress Report stating that there is a need to move from direct implementation to strengthening the capacity of national institutions to actually implement activities there is strong evidence from the past projects in the Environment Portfolio that projects will still need considerable direct support albeit in tandem with building institutional capacities. This duel role will requires considerable material and human resources on the part of UNDP.

The decentralization process is not yet effective for the purpose of project implementation and institutionally there is little experience in dealing directly with local level issues as these relate to rural situations. Project management capacities still need to be built and as has been expressed elsewhere in this report mobilization of resources, availability of technical expertise and the capacity to facilitate coalitions of interest are all characteristics of UNDP which still need to be increased within the national institutions. Based upon the experience of the SLM project and in developing a number of other environmental projects in the UNDP portfolio it would be premature for UNDP to withdraw its current practice of playing a high profile and active role in project implementation. **Recommendations 1, 2 and 4.**

* **Angola is still implementing a “first generation” of environmental projects.** There is often a contradiction between the increasingly sophisticated[[26]](#footnote-26) approach of funding agencies (e.g. The Global Environmental Facility, GEF in this instance) and the immediate and transitional needs of developing sustainable environmental management. This is best illustrated by the SLM project in which SLM technologies and techniques needed to be developed, and practiced before they can be mainstreamed. While many of these can be transposed using best practices from other projects and countries, in environmental management and particularly in SLM the best approaches are usually a result of trial and error and the development of home grown solutions to land degradation problems. This is because land degradation can be assisted by technology which can be easily transferred but the root causes of land degradation are the product of multiple drivers; cultural, economic, financial, historic, environmental, *ad infinitum*. Many countries implementing such projects already have a body of practice and are looking to a “second generation” of such projects, thus they are ready to move from practice to mainstreaming. Angola, as result of circumstances still needs to develop these practices but is constrained by the requirements of the funding agencies. For instance, in the SLM project this was noticeable in that academic institutions have the intellect and the commitment but they need to have the time and very often external material, financial and technical resources to develop the “home grown” practices. While it is not premature to begin mainstreaming it is of equal or even greater importance for the enabling environment to have relevance “on the ground” which is probably most effectively developed through a conventional project approach which in part at least has practical or “field” interventions. **Recommendations 1, 4 and 5.**
* **The internal efficiency of the CO has at times negatively affected the outcome.** According to the ADR: “*some informants and reports suggest that crucial aspects – particularly regarding issues of efficiency – that negatively affected UNDP’s effectiveness and sustainability. These include constraints associated with internal bureaucratic processes (disbursement of funds, recruitment of personnel, and acknowledgment and authorization of actions in the legal framework). In some cases, these affected the pace of implementation of programmed activities, while they significantly impacted content in others*”[[27]](#footnote-27). **Recommendation 2 (also 1).**
* **Inter-agency coordination has been challenging.** This was manifest in the Okavango Basin project with the relationship between UNDP (Implementing Agency) and the FAO (Executing Agency) and was also picked up in the ADR which noted that: “*UNDP has sought to contribute to the United Nations system, but synergies between agencies have not been highly significant. This is partially reflected by the low number of joint programmes and the duplication of efforts and resources*”[[28]](#footnote-28). Furthermore, the instances of joint programmes or projects have, as was the case in the Okavango Basin project, resulted in a poor achievement of outcomes according to the final evaluations. **Recommendation 3 (support with 5).**
* **Cross sectoral integration, partnerships and dealing with complexity, uncertainty and issues of scale will not happen by themselves.** In assessing the outcomes of the two principle projects in the Environment Portfolio (and in common with many other UNDP COs) it is apparent that the achievement of the outcome would have been much greater if the portfolio (or programme) had a specific “tool” or methodology to deal with the complexity, the unpredictability, to allow stakeholders to address issues of temporal and spatial scale and to enable a broad participation and integration with other sectors (e.g. the Poverty and Governance clusters or at a cross-sector scale within government and within civil society). The gains from good environmental governance are not always immediate, neither are they always felt by those who have the power to make decisions. Furthermore, building resilience into planning is not a technical challenge, it is a collective action challenge. As such it is extremely difficult, though not impossible, to achieve successful outcomes (as was evident in both the Okavango Basin and SLM project). What was lacking was a “tool” or “methodology” to engage all stakeholders in a manner that is able to convince them to change the positions which they currently hold in order to achieve a “greater good”. **Recommendation 5.**
* **The delay of the decentralization process in the country has been a limitation for the possibility to work at the provincial level.** The decision making process is still very centralized in the capital, Luanda. This makes it more difficult to engage with government at the provincial level. However, it is still necessary for UNDP to be operating at the provincial level as has been argued throughout this evaluation because it is still necessary to build capacity at this level. **Recommendation 2 and 7.**
* **Environmental interventions require extended involvement by UNDP if they are to be effective and gains in human capacity development are reduced between projects.** While projects will make up a large part of UNDP’s intervention these cannot provide the medium term continuous support which is particularly important in building human capacities to address environmental problems. In reality this is a task for the GOA but UNDP CO can also play a part. **Recommendation 4.**

## **3.4 UNDP contributions to the outcome through outputs**

1. Increased financial mobilization (see Annex 6) and the two projects completed during this period (2009 – 2013) are the most visible outputs of UNDP towards this outcome. These are the:
* Environmental Protection and Sustainable Management of the Okavango River Basin Project (Okavango Basin project) which started in November 2004 and closed in August 2010 which included a suspension period lasting almost a year. The project was intended to *alleviate imminent and long-term threats to the linked land and water systems of the Okavango River through the joint management of the Okavango River Basin water resources and the protection of its linked aquatic ecosystems, comprising all wetlands, fluvial and lacustrine systems, and their biological diversity* and produced the following outcomes:
	+ Outcome 1: **Functioning mechanisms for joint management**. Some mechanisms had been put in place but they were not functioning as effectively as they should. Achievement was rated as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.
	+ Outcome 2: Completion of a **Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (DSS)**. Technical information had been collected, the DSS had been developed and a great deal of analysis had been carried out. However, there was concern that the TDA would not have the full ownership required to serve as a robust foundation for the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and progress was rated **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.
	+ Outcome 3: The **Strategic Action Programme** targeted had not been finalised with only a first draft having been produced by the end of the project and progress was rated **Unsatisfactory (U)**. UNDP CO continued to develop the SAP post project.
* The Building Capacity for Sustainable Land Use and Management in Angola project (SLM project) which started in October 2008 with a planned implementation period of four years and the project closed its operations in March 2013. The project’s goal was: *Improved capacity in SLM contributes to ecosystem health and functionality while at the same time enhancing the livelihoods of particularly the rural populations* and the immediate objective was: *Capacity developed for sustainable land management for key SLM stakeholders and sustainable land management principles mainstreamed into national policies, plans and processes* and produced the following outcomes:
	+ Outcome 1: **Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed.** The project worked with, was instrumental in, building a coalition of, *inter alia;* provincial state institutions (*e.g.* the Faculty of Agrarian Science), NGOs (*e.g.* Development Workshop), other agencies (*e.g.* FAO), in order to focus on various aspects which are affecting land management. It worked well with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the Provincial Government in implementing field-based initiatives and enjoys considerable support amongst these stakeholders. In terms of achieving the outcome the project clearly placed SLM on the agenda and built lasting capacity amongst the partners and stakeholders, including working with the provincial government on urban SLM issues. While these gains remain vulnerable due to financial constraints they represent considerable achievements and their vulnerability is in some part as a result of the poorer performance of outcomes 2 and 4. Rated **Satisfactory.**
	+ Outcome 2: **SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development:** While there was activity towards this outcome it was hard to see any progress. Changes in central government institutions, problems related to a transitional process, poor communications between provincial and central government levels and weaknesses in *inter* and *intra-*institutional communication and collaboration militated against a successful outcome which would include SLM principles and incentives being drafted into a suite of policy and regulatory documents at a national level. The project worked closely with the FAO which was implementing a project working with the GOA to develop land law and this contains some important provisions for SLM such as the recognition of communal land tenure and a provision to recover large farms that are inactive. However, the evaluation expected to see greater involvement at the central level to drive SLM-related reforms across a suite of enabling legislation. There was no sign that this had taken place. Rated **Moderately Unsatisfactory.**
	+ Outcome 3:**National Action Programme completed:** There was an unstated (but reasonable) assumption in the original project design that the NAP would be completed at an early stage in the project because it was necessary to have the NAP in order to develop the Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) and develop a national monitoring system. In the event this was not the case and the development of the NAP was a lengthy process. A NAP was produced and is awaiting signature and validation by Parliament. Initially, and prior to the project, the process of developing the NAP appeared to have had a very narrow participation with little opportunity public consultation. At one point the document was even considered to be “confidential” by the Ministry of Environment. However, the project was able to open the process up to a broader institutional and public participation through regional workshops covering eighteen provinces and collating the feedback from these workshops for inclusion in the document. Given the need for a broader spectrum of participation of government (at central and provincial levels) agencies, CSOs, donors and land-users involved in developing the document, the project played a considerable facilitation role in developing the NAP. Rated **Moderately Satisfactory.**
	+ Outcome 4: **Medium Term Investment Plan being financed and implemented (and linked to TerrAfrica):** This outcome was entirely co-financed. The medium term investment plan was to have been the Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) based upon the Global Mechanism (GM) format. However, the development of the IFS was largely dependent upon the NAP being in place (see above). While there was some training overseas (Lisbon) on developing the IFS, this was not utilized within the project. The lack of progress in this area could not all be attributed to the delays in developing the NAP. It is not unreasonable to have expected to see some sort of preparation in place so that the IFS could be rapidly developed following acceptance of the NAP by the GoA. Furthermore, the FE questioned just how realistic the IFS development could have been given that it would need quite sophisticated and transparent accounting national systems in place. Rated **Unsatisfactory.**
1. The SLM had a fifth outcome which is included here because it illustrates the UNDP “soft assistance” which can be an important comparative advantage:

*Outcome 5:***Adaptive management and learning in place (project effectively managed):** Due to the UNDP CO involvement and a willingness to try and support the PMU past the closure of the project using CO funds there were sufficient grounds to consider this as an outcome. The PMU had developed considerable trust and respect at the provincial level amongst many stakeholders which, given the specific circumstances of this project (*i.e.* starting from a very low baseline with little awareness or organization for SLM) was an important outcome in itself. Furthermore, there was a strong argument and considerable local support across a range of stakeholders for continued engagement in SLM by the UNDP and that SLM was firmly placed upon the GoA agenda. Rated **Satisfactory.**

1. While these two projects are the more visible aspect of the environment portfolio outcome there are equally significant but much less visible outputs that have had a profound effect on the outcome. The ADR, as does the Final Evaluations of the SLM and Okavango Basin projects, identifies these as variously:
* Developing a positive relationship with government.
* Working with government as a key partner in both policy making and developing a legal framework particularly in areas such as biodiversity, ozone depletion, climate change, desertification and a range of other international Agreement and Convention obligations (including accompanying the GOA delegation to COP meetings on occasions) and measured to some extent by the willingness to continue developing and working in projects.
* Attracting international financing and fund raising, in particular working with the GEF.
* Strengthening capacities in national institutions, non-governmental organizations and civil society groups and academic institutions.
* Stimulating and facilitating dialogue and debate on environmental topics.
* Working at all levels from grassroots through to central government. The ability to “step down” and “step up”, to work at different levels switching from local to national, regional to international scales has been a deciding factor to determining that projects and their contributions to the outcomes have been successful, in particular in ensuring that while bottlenecks at one scale do not necessarily affect the rate of progress at another scale.
* Environmental awareness and education.
* Supporting targeted technical studies.
* Leading by example through good practices and humility and embedding these principles in partners, building a “coalition of the good” by insisting on high levels of transparency and accountability in all its dealings with partners. The process followed by UNDP, can be characterized as that of being in control but not necessarily controlling the outcome. This “soft touch” approach is extremely important and carries with it considerable personal and institutional risks but inevitably leads to more tangible and lasting outcomes.
1. This evaluation could add that the UNDP appears to be the preferred partner of the GOA for GEF-funded projects as expressed by the ME.
2. All of these outputs have been very relevant to the outcome which is a notable achievement given the pressing short-term development needs currently experienced by Angola and the high risk that an environment programme could easily drift towards wholly development focused programme and not maintain the balance between environmental and development interests. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome has remained focused on the core issues.
3. However, even a cursory glance at the final evaluations of both the Okavango Basin and the SLM projects suggests that there have been difficulties experienced by these projects which have resulted in delays and on one occasion even the suspension of the Okavango Basin project. While some of these issues were directly related to partners in that project it would also seem that internal inefficiencies within the CO have contributed to this as has the bureaucratic process of the principle funding agency, the GEF. However, there is no doubt that a large number of good quality outputs (as noted above) have been delivered, normally due to a dogged perseverance on the part of UNDP although the timeliness of these outputs has not always been good.
4. Annex 6 provides an account of the UNDP environment projects that have been developed during the period 2009 – 2013 which also provides an important perspective on the outcome. In particular, and using a *Theory of Change* approach in assessing the outcome, it sheds light on the “quality” or status of an intermediate state of the outcome. During this period, two projects have been completed and seven projects have either started (three) or have been approved (one) or are identified and are at varying degrees of preparation (three). One of these (Strategic Environment Programme, 2012-2015) is financed from UNDP TRAC funds (US$2,400,000) and of the completed projects UNDP CO contributed US$300,000 in-kind (Okavango Basin project) and US$723,207 cash (SLM project).

## **3.5 UNDP partnership strategy**

1. Evaluating the partnership strategy is challenging. The UNDAF SRF provides some insight to the development UN agency partnerships. Annex 4 provides an account of these arrangements from the UNDAF.
2. Notwithstanding the problems encountered in the Okavango Basin project (where the causes of conflict appear to have been largely outside Angola) there appears to have been an important partnership established between UNDP and FAO through the SLM project on areas of land tenure, but it is hard to find other examples elsewhere. However, starting with the UNDAF document and carrying it through to the present moment in time, this evaluation finds it hard to discern exactly what the partnership strategy with other UN agencies, and the means to implement any partnership, are. In the absence of any formal and meaningful arrangements it appears to have been left to the individuals to sort out the operational modalities themselves. It would be an important requisite for strengthening a partnership arrangement might reasonably to have an existing one already. Apart from the *ad hoc* arrangements between individuals this evaluation is at a loss to find anything resembling one.
3. That said, UNDP appears to have developed very successful partnerships, albeit at times tested to the limit, with other actors in the environment field (e.g. Development Workshop and other local NGOs ADRA), indeed the ADR, the SLM project FE and to a large extent the Okavango Basin FE single out the ability of UNDP to absorb, recover and find a way forwards from disputes between partners. The ADR in particular and the SLM FE to some extent single out this feature of the UNDP approach; as a coalition builder. Which leaves this particular evaluation feeling inconclusive on the issue of the UNDAF partnership strategy. Certainly the UNDAF document does not provide sufficient detail to develop a workable relationship. Perhaps there has been inter-agency competition for resources such as GEF funding as sometimes happens. If this is the case it does not appear to have been driven from within Angola, for instance in the Okavango Basin project the difficulties encountered in the project largely appear to have been the result of misunderstanding emanating from the regional level*.* However, the lack of any discernable partnership strategy can only have exacerbated this. That said, if there is an existing strategy, if the existing strategy isn’t working, then develop a better one. Essentially this is a leadership issue and one that should not be left to the completion of planning cycles but addressed within an existing cycle.
4. There is sufficient evidence that there are enduring GOA partnerships, although these are at times tested. The ADR makes it clear that UNDPs financial contribution to development activities is small in comparison with other donors but it is still **considered an important partner** for its facilitation, advisory and capacity building roles, which might reasonably be considered a meaningful basis for a relationship than the size of the organizations’ purse.
5. Both projects (Okavango Basin and SLM) indicate that there was significant **participation** in the development of these during their design and the outcome is very closely aligned with the GOA priorities and expectations. It is not obvious whether this participation extended to the grassroots level but this might reasonably be expected given the transitional stage at this point in time. The Okavango Basin FE certainly raised issue at the level of grass root or community participation in the project’s implementation and to some extent these were evident in the SLM project although this project reached a grassroots level in its implementation, the planning and development of the project were largely confined to an institutional level.

# **4 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The recommendations provided by this evaluation are based upon the limited time resources to develop the evaluation and the material resources to carry out a country visit and assessment. Therefore it is important to state that these recommendations are based upon the **following conclusion:**
	1. The environment outcome as articulated in the UNDAF and the CPAP documents has, given the time frame involved (2009 – 2013/2014) and the means to describe the outcome (the indicators) made satisfactory progress. It was never going to be wholly achievable in the time frame for monitoring and evaluation but it has progressed from the beginning of the evaluation period to the end of that timeframe in a manner, with outputs and situational changes, which give the evaluation a good measure of confidence to state that it is satisfactory. In fact it has achieved a great deal and UNDP’s attention to *process* suggests that these changes are systemic and sustainable.
	2. However, this is a transitional or intermediate (in the language of *Theory of Change*) state and there is still considerable ground to be covered, which could equally be lost depending upon the next moves.
	3. While the ADR makes it abundantly clear that UNDP is, by a financial measure at least, a small player in development, it has considerable intellectual, social and political capital which amounts to *trust*. While this often leads to delays and a very drawn out process of delivering assistance it provides a good foundations for outputs and outcomes.
2. Therefore the evaluation makes the **following recommendations**:

**Recommendation 1: Environment is elevated to an operational unit within UNDP CO:** Environment is currently nested within the poverty unit. While this has served the sector well thus far, it is now necessary to elevate environment to a unit within the organizational structure of the CO. Given the number and complexity of the planned projects (Annex 6) this is critical.

**Recommendation 2: Greater internal integration between operational units:** There is greater need for internal integration within UNDP between the poverty, governance and (presumably) environment clusters. The three areas are clearly linked. For instance to attempt to alleviate poverty without addressing the ecosystems ability to continue to provide ecosystem goods and services is nonsensical. To attempt either without addressing the issues of governance is unlikely to succeed. Perhaps this is the burden of UNDP’s responsibilities in as much as the organization cannot measure success within a narrow cross-section of issues. However, it is strongly recommended that environment is given equal status in the UNDP CO hierarchy in the next strategic programme and that the three focal areas, poverty, governance and environment are “held together” using scenario planning (recommendation 7).

**Recommendation 3: A partnership strategy is designed and established with clear priorities for each agency, means of communication and a forum for ensuring that each agency is working towards a common goal and a means of regular review of progress:** This should be clearly articulated in the next UNDAF. It is important to comment that this will take time, a process of frank and open negotiation. However, time invested in developing this now will only lead to greater efficiencies later down the line. No one should be in any doubt that time spent on this is wasted time, if it is not done the time will likely be spent later but with less positive outcomes.

**Recommendation 4: Implement GEF small grants programme:** Given that project financing is becoming increasingly sophisticated in terms of its expectations (e.g. mainstreaming) whereas Angola is still facing challenges that are a legacy of a prolonged and protracted conflict which often needs flexibility and direct financing of small-scale inputs. UNDP evaluates and considers (with *due diligence* to the national capacities to support it) implementing a GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) to act as a multiplier for project outputs and outcomes.

**Recommendation 5: The CPAP outcome statement is revised during the next planning period (2015 – 2019):** The CPAP currently states that; **“***Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective”.* This statement serves reasonably well as an outcome but in any future outcome statement it will be important to include some mention of improved environmental governance, which is; the ability to make policies, laws and agreements work. The term “resilience” Arguably as “pro-poor growth” is explicit in UNDP mainstreaming therefore it might not be necessary to include this, although the outcome is speaking to a wider audience so the inclusion of poverty reduction aspects may be considered a necessary safeguard.

There is a difference between the UNDAF and CPAP related to climate change (referred to in the UNDAF statement) and it may be desirable to harmonize both statements in this aspect. This could be achieved through the inclusion of the term “resilience” as opposed to “sustainability” and the statement might include “*the provision of a broad range of ecosystem goods and services”* as a means to address climate change aspects.

**Recommendation 6: A broader range of indicators are used to monitor progress and effectiveness of the outcome:** The present indicators are too narrow in focus therefore it is recommended that a broader range of indicators are used covering five key areas:

* + Policy/enabling environment: these would be the indicators currently in use and reflect a range of agreements (national/regional/global), policy papers, laws, etc.
	+ Human resource capacities: these would measure the reduction in the skills gaps and could include building capacity in agencies and institutions, NGOs/CSOs, academic institutions, etc.
	+ Financial resources: these would measure the financial resources available and leveraged for spending on the environment and would need to be disaggregated into government (budget allocation), donor, private sector/community investment, etc.
	+ Programmes and management: these would measure the number of programmes or activities which link the wise **management** of natural resources to the **sustainable utilization** of those resources. For instance, charcoal production would need to demonstrate a link between production and management of forest resources but would also include the protected areas system.
	+ National monitoring: these would include reporting on international agreements and conventions but also provide for a broader set of national parameters including national compliance across other sectors of government.

**Recommendation 7: Scenario Planning is developed as a support tool for UNDP activities across the three key focal areas; poverty, governance and environment:** Section 3.3 of this report identified the difficulties of supporting a *process* and effecting an *adaptive change*. Clearly there is a pressing need for strengthening and filling the gaps in the enabling environment; there is a need to build and strengthen existing institutional capacities, there is critical need for improved socio-economic conditions and the sustainable use of resources to benefit socio-economic development.

Therefore, the enabling environment, mainstreaming, assistance to the protected areas, assistance to local socio-economic development, up-scaling project experience and improving protected areas, etc., are all reasonable project or programme responses. However, on their own they are unlikely to bring about the sort of large scale change in such a way that the natural wealth of Angola is managed sustainably in the near future, indeed a considerable quantity of this wealth could be lost before such changes take place due to trade-offs between short-term economic gains and the longer term impacts of this outcome.

Neither are they likely to affect the sort of collective action, that is; to get agreement on these bigger issues such as those surrounding institutional management of these resources, mining, solid and liquid waste disposal, agriculture, biodiversity conservation versus immediate economic development gains, *ad infinitum* which are a prerequisite to the achievement of this outcome, or any reasonable refinements of the outcome statement in the future.

Therefore, the long term solutions lies not just in these material actions (the enabling environment, charcoal production, protected areas, community development, etc… even to get partners to agree upon courses of action) but in also facilitating a collective action, a means to get stakeholders and key players to agree on the trade-offs necessary to make development sustainable and ensuring that environmental concerns are included within planning and development considerations, that these are translated into actions on the ground and that espoused policy becomes practice.

However, such a process is extremely difficult to achieve within the construct of projects which are the principal tool available to UNDP. Projects are, by their very nature, time-bound which sets in motion a conflict between project and process, the process invariably moving at a different speed to the project’s timeframe. Furthermore, success is usually measured by tangible outputs that contribute to an outcome, the outcomes contributing to an objective. This hierarchical and directional process can in itself be a constraint on achieving a favorable result by focusing on a single desired future when there are possibly multiple futures, better or worse, dependent upon different courses of actions and externalities and to an extent the perceptions of the observer.

What is missing is a means to identify these plausible future scenarios and to understand how to avoid the undesirable and to achieve the favorable futures. The difficulty with a conventional approach is the lack of any mechanism that will convince organizations, agencies, institutions and individuals, that it may be necessary to change the way that they behave, the way they perceive and think about an issue, in order to avoid the undesirable futures.

Therefore it is recommended that UNDP utilise scenario planning to facilitate this process (see Annex 7).

# **5 LESSONS LEARNED**

1. Three lessons are drawn from this experience:
2. **Partnership arrangements are important:** Partnership arrangements are important but partnerships between institutions are the sum of partnerships (or relations) between the individuals within those institutions. If those people are not involved in their design, and in any future adaptations then they have all the characteristics of a badly arranged marriage. They might, indeed they sometimes do, work, but they cause so much stress and unhappiness, both of which lead to inefficiencies and that costs money, even if we are not concerned with the fate of the partners. Establishing these relationships needs more than a document, it requires investing the time initially to negotiate the partnership, providing a framework for partners to address the issues and conflicts which will invariably arise during the relationship.
3. **More care should be given to selecting indicators:** Whether it is in programme or project design there should be more thought given to indicators. In this instance the indicators provide only a small insight into the effectiveness of any intervention. Whether it is because people are tired and develop indicators as the very last part of any design process or they are failing to understand the purpose to which they will be put. Greater thought, and perhaps also guidance should be given when formulating these indicators because they are not just to be used during periodic external examination of performance and progress they are like the instruments in an aircraft cockpit providing important information to the pilot. In this instance the narrow selection of indicators can be compared with flying an airplane using just the fuel gauge. Many other things could be going wrong but the pilot still flies on because there is fuel in the tanks. It was not clear how much time was given to developing the indicators. Based upon past experience of programme SRFs (and project SRFs) it is not unreasonable to hazard a guess that not much time was committed. Often indicators and targets are the output of a single workshop in which many participants are thinking about them for the very first time and it is left to a few individuals to construct the SRF.
4. **Any agency working in the environment sector in Angola will, for the immediate future, need to work at different levels:** A strong body of technical experts, practitioners, academics, NGOs and CSOs still needs to be built in Angola. It would be unwise to underestimate the effect of many years of disruption at this level. These people are there, they are capable and able but they need time to develop a depth of experience. Focusing at the higher and central institutional level is also critical but this needs to be stepped down to a provincial and then to a very local level. Clearly Angola is in a hurry to catch up for lost time and to return to normality but investing at these levels is critical to this process. This was manifest in the Okavango Basin project in which there was poor community participation. However, the SLM project demonstrated that when resources were made available at provincial and community levels through the vehicle of a project they could be utilized very effectively. Clearly this has implications to future project designs which will form a sizeable component in achieving future outcomes.

**ANNEXES**

### Annex 1 ToR Angola Environment Portfolio Outcome Evaluation

**CONTEXT**

According to the evaluation plan of the UNDP Country Office in Angola an outcome evaluation on the Environmental Program is planned to be conducted during the current cycle (2009-2014).

The evaluation will be based on reviewing how the UNDP Angola Environmental portfolio has met the environmental objectives outlined in the UNDAF (2009-2014) and CPAP (2009-2014) core documents:

UNDAF Outcome 4: National and decentralized institutions strengthened integrated rural development guaranteeing food security based on **environmental protection of natural resources and the management and adaptation to climate change**.

Furthermore the UNDAF Outcome #4 states: Environmental protection is a matter of concern for the Government, and the UN agencies will support the development of strategies for the protection and sustainable use of natural resources, such as Land Water, and Bio-Diversity, as well as mainstreaming environmental protection strategies at a national level and in various sectors. The need for climate change adaptation is also a recognized priority which will also be supported by UN agencies, namely through natural disaster mitigation strategies and programmes.

CPAP Programme Component: **Environment and Sustainable Development.** Expected Outcomes: Strengthened National capacities to mainstream environment into national development plans and programmes

Outcome evaluations move away from the old approach of assessing project results against project objectives, towards an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions. Outcome evaluations work backwards from the outcome; they take the outcome as their starting point and then assess a number of variables.

In this context, UNDP would like to take stock of its work and contribution and influence in support to the development of the national capacity for the environmental protection of natural resources and the management, to ensure that its planned programme and portfolio are relevant to national priorities and support the achievement of the planned outcome. The aim is also to take stock of how UNDP has influenced the partners to contribute to the attainment of this outcome.

**EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

**Evaluation Scope**

The evaluation period will cover environmental interventions implemented by UNDP, between 2009 and 2013, in the Republic of Angola taking into account all sources of funding and all modalities of implementation. The main evaluation areas to be analyzed are: i) relevance, ii) sustainability and iii) effectiveness. The evaluation findings and recommendations will be used by the UNDP CO Angola to inform the 2015-2019 environment programme.

Specific projects that will be part of this analysis are:

* LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management
* Environment Protection and Sustainable Management of the Okavango River Basin Project

**Evaluation Objectives**

* **Primary objective**: Provide recommendations on how best to implement future environment related CPAP outcomes.
* **Secondary objectives**:
	+ Evaluate the impact of UNDP interventions and its contribution in building national capacity for the protection of the environment.
	+ Review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector, international organizations in Programme implementation and comment on its sustainability;

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

* Were stated outcomes achieved?
* What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
* To what extent has UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcomes?
* Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

\* Evaluation questions could be refined in consultation with the evaluation consultant.

**METHODOLOGY**

Overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodologies is provided in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. Based on these guiding documents, the evaluator should develop a suitable methodology for the outcome evaluation, particularly taking into account that only one outcome is being reviewed, namely the CPD/CPAP outcome related to environment and sustainable development.

The consultant will work under the overall supervision of the UNDP Deputy Country Director, and will directly report to the UNDP Environment Programme Specialist. The assignment is home-based and during the outcome evaluation process, the evaluator is expected to apply a qualitative approach, using a mix of the following methods for data collection and analysis:

* Desk review of relevant documents;
* Discussions with UNDP Angola senior management and program staff;
* Interviews of partners and stakeholders (through on-line questionnaires and/or conference calls or any other kind of telecommuting tool could be applied);
* Validation of preliminary findings through a webinar validation workshop.

**EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**

The consultant is expected to produce an Outcome Evaluation Report that highlights the findings, recommendations and lessons learnt, and give a rating of performance. This report should follow the Outcome Evaluation Report Template and include all sections recommended therein (see attached template).

* **Draft evaluation report**— A draft of the evaluation report will be reviewed by the programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria (see Annex 7).
* **Presentation of preliminary findings**: the consultant will prepare a presentation (preferably in Portuguese) based on findings reported in the draft report. UNDP Angola will organize a teleconference/webinar, in which the consultant will make the presentation and feedback from invited key stakeholders will be collected.
* **Final evaluation report—**to be submitted at the conclusion of the assignment.

**REQUIRED COMPETENCIES FOR THE EVALUATION CONSULTANT**

* At least a Masters’ Degree or above in the natural resources management, environment, development, Social Sciences or relevant area (max. score: 10)
* Minimum of 10 years of professional expertise in international development co-operation (max. score: 10)
* Minimum of 5 years of professional expertise in project/programme evaluation and result-based management evaluation (max. score: 10)
* Strong working knowledge of UNDP or the UN system in the environment sector (max. score: 10)
* Strong understanding of capacity development (max. score: 5)
* Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (max. score: 5)
* Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills (max. score: 5)
* Good professional knowledge of the Africa region (max. score: 5)
* knowledge and understanding of environmental issues in Angola (max. score: 10)
* Working knowledge of Portuguese or Spanish (will be an asset) (max. score: 5)

NOTE 1: Evidence such as resumes, work samples, and references could be requested by UNDP to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

NOTE 2: Evaluators must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.

NOTE 3: Max. score = 75.

**TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

The duration of the assignment is up to 12 working days, including writing and submission of the final report.

* **Expected starting date**: 20 May 2014
* **Expected Completion date**: 6 June 2014
* **Submission of draft report and presentation**: 7 working days
* **Submission of final report (\*)**: 5 working days after UNDP feedback from the validation workshop of the presentation/draft report. The final report should be submitted no later than 6 June 2014.

***\**** *Please find required formats for the evaluation report in the annexes.*

**EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation´.

Evaluators must address in the design and implementation of the evaluation evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers. For example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

The consultant should carefully read, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System’*,*which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

### Annex 2 Individuals consulted

A copy of the draft report was shared with the following key stakeholders:

Dr. Giza Gaspar-Martins: Director Nacional de Alterações Climáticas (Ministry of Environment)

Dra. Kamia Carvalho: Directora Nacional do Ambiente (Ministry of Environment)

Dr. Allan Cain: Head of NGO (Development Workshop)

Dr. Paulo Vicente: UN Partner (Food and Agriculture Organization, Angola)

Mr. Amilcar Salumbo: Project Manager UNDP-GEF SLM project

### Annex 3 Documents consulted

Assistance Development Results (Evaluation of UNDP Contribution, Angola)

Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (Angola)

Building Capacity for Sustainable Land Use and Management in Angola, Terminal Evaluation, Final Draft, 5th June 2014. UNDP PIMS 3379

Terminal Evaluation , Environmental Protection and Sustainable Management of the Okavango River Basin Project (raf/00/g33/a/1g/12), 2010

Country Programme and Action Plan (CPAP) 2009 – 2013

Country Development Programme, CPD

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), Angola, 2009 – 2013

UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017. Changing with the World; Helping countries to achieve the simultaneous eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion

UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluations

### Annex 4 UN Partnership arrangements (UNDAF 2009 – 2013)

**UNDP:** support for the development of national capacity to mainstream environment into national development plans and programmes

**FAO:** Support the implementation of environmental conservation laws, Contribute to institutional capacity development for forestry conservation, Support design / preparation of programme for promotion and development of Bio fuels

**UNESCO:** Support the setting up and operation of a national multi-disciplinary team for the development of a national strategy for DESD, facilitate the establishment of partnerships for the promotion of Global, regional and national policies, guidelines, frameworks and global regional and national conventions aiming at sustainable development from the sociocultural, environmental and economic points of view. Facilitate journalism networks and research on sustainable development issues and science journalism.

**UNIDO:** support the improvement of the policy framework for energy and development and create capacity to implement the National Standards for the Management of Energy

The indicators, baselines and targets were:

**Indicator (UNDP):** Number of environmental plans and strategic reports approved’ Baseline: not applicable, Target: 7

**Indicator (UNESCO):** Development and implementation of the National Strategy for the DESD, Baseline: No, Target: Yes

**Indicator (UNIDO):** Establishment of National Standards for the Management of Energy, Baseline: not established, Target: established

Noticeably, for whatever reasons, the FAO did not provide an indicator, baseline or target. It is not immediately clear whether this is a difference in reporting (monitoring and evaluation) approaches or a disregard for results based management but it becomes progressively unclear when the roles as assigned in the UNDAF are included:

**UNDP:** support for the development of national capacity to mainstream environment into national development plans and programmes.

**FAO:** Support the implementation of environmental conservation laws, contribute to institutional capacity development for forestry conservation, support design / preparation of programme for promotion and development of Bio fuels.

**UNESCO:** Support the setting up and operation of a national multi-disciplinary team for the development of a national strategy for DESD, facilitate the establishment of partnerships for the promotion of Global, regional and national policies, guidelines, frameworks and global regional and national conventions aiming at sustainable development from the sociocultural, environmental and economic points of view. Facilitate journalism networks and research on sustainable development issues and science journalism.

**UNIDO:** support the improvement of the policy framework for energy and development and create capacity to implement the National Standards for the Management of Energy.

### Annex 5 CPAP Indicators and targets juxtaposed

The CPAP indicators are confusing, indeed it would provide more logic if the given targets were indicators and *vice versa*. When rearranged in this way they provide a reasonable set of indicators for this CPAP outcome. Therefore, for the purpose of this evaluation the CPAP indicators and targets have been swapped so that the targets are indicators and *vice versa.* Thus:

* Indicator: National Biodiversity programme ~~is~~ capacitated and supported in the NBSAP
	+ Target: Number of national policies on sustainable development
* Indicator: Sustainable land use models ~~are~~ identified and being replicated across the country
	+ Target: Number of programmes focusing on mainstreaming environmental protection
* Indicator: Effective strategies and plans (including regional) ~~are~~ defined for sustainable use of water resources
	+ Target: Number of programmes and policies on sustainable use of resources (land and water)
* Indicator: Environmental trends ~~are~~ being monitored, including climate change focus, by national institutions
	+ Target: Number of international Environmental Conventions being reported/monitored

### Annex 6 UNDP Environment projects in progress or under development at 2013

| **Project** | **Budget and Funding** | **Duration and Site** | **Partners** | **Summary and Comments** | **Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ozone Depletion | $82.382,-Montreal Protocol | 2009-2011Luanda | Ministry of Environment; UNDP HQs | CO supports UNDP HQs. Preparation of a Hydrochlorofluorocarbon Phase-out Management Plan (HPMP) for Angola. Stage 1 in particular will result in the phase out of 10% of its agreed baseline HCFC consumption, equivalent to 29 ODS tones (or 1.59 ODP tones) in line with the obligation taken by the Government of Angola under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. | On-going – preparation for training in Cabinda, Namibe and Luanda underway.Discussion with the unit for reimbursement of outstanding funds of 2013 in value of 27.771.91 |
| Strategic Environment Programme (2012-2015) | TRAC fundsA minimum of $2,400,000 committed  | On-going | Signed IN 2013 between the Ministry of Environment and the UNDP | 5 key strategic areas:1. Strengthened national capacities for mainstreaming environmental protection into national development plans;
2. Effective implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP);
3. Strengthened institutional capacity for sustainable natural resource management in land and water;
4. Climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies and action plans mainstreamed into national development plans and policy;
5. Institutional capacity expanded and strengthened for monitoring environmental trends at a nationwide scale;
6. Effective implementation of the National Plan for Environmental Education and Awareness (NPEEA) and environmental awareness activities at national and provincial levels.
 | On-going – under implementation |
| National Biodiversity Project: Rehabilitation of the Iona National Park  | GEF 4-START allocation – BD: $2,000,000EU-10ºDEF: EUR 3,900,000 | 2013-2016Namibe ProvinceNational level | GEF;GoA - MINAMBEuropean Union; | PIF inherited from the World Bank. Project designed under GEF IV cycle. Two key components: 1) rehabilitation of Iona National Park; 2) capacity building at national level on protected areas | On-going – under implementation |
| Expansion and strengthening of Angola’s Protected Area system | GEF 5-START allocation – BD: $5,800,000 | 5 yearsKissama, Cangandala, Bicuar, Maiombe, Mavinga, Luiana-Luingue NPsNational level | GEFGoA - MINAMB | Two key components: 1) At the protected area system’s level, the GEF investment will facilitate the achievement of ambitious targets set by the government for expanding the terrestrial protected area network to be more representative of Angolan ecosystems. 2) At the level of sites, the project will focus GEF resources on continuing the implementation of the PA rehabilitation programme for three priority national parks. | PRODOC approved by the GEF.Final version submitted to the GEF to be sent by the RTA |
| PREPARATORY PROJECTPromoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin | LDCF/GEF: $8,200,000 | 4 yearsCunene province | GEFGoA: MINAMB, Civil Protection, INAMET, Instituto Recursos Hidricos (MINEA)  | Preparatory phase3 components: 1) Transfer of appropriate technologies and related capacity building for climate and environmental monitoring infrastructure; 2) Enhanced human and institutional capacity for increased sustainable rural livlihoods among vulnerable communities; 3) 3.Increased understanding of climate change adaptation and practices in climate-resilient development planning at the local community and government levels | Development of the PRODOC in its final stage. Deadline for submission: June 2014Expected starting date: Q4\_2014 |
| PREPARATORY PROJECTPromotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through aValue Chain Approach | GEF 5-START allocation – Climate Change Mitigation: $4,620,000Funds approved by the GEF for the preparation of the PRODOC: $100,000 | 4-5 yearsTo be determined: Huambo, Huila, Kwanza-Sul | GEF,GoA: MINAMB | Main components:1.Biomass data collection and institutional strengthening of biomass energy stakeholders 2.Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production (improved kilns) and efficient combustion in at least eight (8) selected charcoal-producing municipios (municipalities) in 1-2 target Provinces (selected from among Huambo, Benguela, Kwanza-Sul and/or Huila)3.Dissemination of charcoal briquetting machines to enterprises in selected peri-urban areas of Luanda and/or BenguelaSustainable charcoal and briquetting certification and marketing scheme at selected retailers in Luanda and Benguela  | PIF (Concept Note) approved by the GEF (April, 1st 2014). Now, we have to start the preparation of the PRODOC. For doing this, an Initiation Plan is being prepared to be signed by the RR. |
| PREPARATORY PROJECTAddressing UrgentCoastal Adaptation Needs and Capacity Gaps in Angola | LDCF/GEF$6,180,000 ($1,000,000 will be received by UNDP)Funds approved by the GEF for the preparation of the PRODOC will be managed by UNEP | 4 yearsLuanda, Namibe, Cabinda, Bengo | UNEP/UNDPGEFMINAMB | Main components:1. Enhanced scientific and technicalcapacity for adaptation in coastal zone áreas2. Local demonstrations and capacity building interventions on ecosystems restoration andAdaptation measures in coastal areas, and showcasing their associated benefits3. Enhanced Institutional coordination and systemic capacity for proactive adaptation in Angola (component to be implemented by UNDP) | PIF (Concept Note) approved by the GEF (Oct, 29th 2013). Now, we have to start the preparation of the PRODOC. UNEP is leading/managing this process. |

### Annex 7 Scenario planning

Scenario planning[[29]](#footnote-29) is an approach which can be applied to complex situations and also as a means to affect the cognitive processes of participants, in other words it can change the way people think about a problem.

Scenario planning was applied to business planning by Pierre Wack at the multinational corporation, Shell Oil, to examine the threats and opportunities faced by Shell in the energy sector during the early 1970’s. The use of scenarios greatly assisted Shell in its business operations during the 1973 “oil crisis” resulting in Shell considerably improving its own position in the oil industry during a period of great uncertainty.

Scenarios were also used as a tool for conflict resolution during South Africa’s transition from Apartheid to a new democratic disposition in the early 1990’s. In this instance the use of scenarios firstly assisted in convincing senior policy makers in the (old) South African government of the inevitability of change and secondly assisted the range of political stakeholders in visioning the future of a democratic South Africa and the possible consequences of not accepting a peaceful and democratic transition to the “new” South Africa.

In the environmental sector the use of scenario planning is a relatively recent development. Scenario planning was used in the Millennium Assessment report to evaluate global environmental threats and highlight the need for alternative actions to prevent catastrophic environmental and ecological events.

The core of scenario planning is the identification of those elements that are shaping events or systems. These elements known as “drivers” interact with each other often at different physical and temporal scales. Most conventional planning systems are based on the assumption that drivers are constant (or predictable) and yet because of their interaction drivers are invariably in a state of change and this is often unpredictable. Sometimes this change is quick and at other times the change may be slower. Scenario planning is based on understanding what constitutes the current system drivers and the cause and effect relationship between the drivers. This understanding also helps to understand the scale (both physical and temporal) and impact that various drivers have on a system. Once the drivers are identified and their relationship understood, scenario planning provides a methodology for examining how the drivers might possibly interact in the future. Since driver interactions in socio-political, economic and environmental systems are complex the scenario planning process attempts to analyse possible and plausible future driver relationships rather than creating predicted futures.

While scenario planning may be used in different ways as outlined above there are certain consistent elements regarding the use of scenario planning:

* There is no one single scenario planning methodology and approaches will vary depending on the issues to be address and the scale of the scenario plan.
* Scenario planning is a systematic way of looking into and “rehearsing the future” without attempting to be predictive.
* Scenario planning helps us understand the “drivers” that are shaping the present and how they may influence the future.
* Scenario planning helps us understand that the future is not pre-determined. We can influence the future by understanding and managing those current drivers over which we might have control. The example of carbon emissions and their effect on climate change is a case in point.
* Scenario planning helps us prepare for the uncertainties, shocks and surprises that will inevitably arise in any socio-ecological system.
* It is important however to realise that scenario planning has its limitations and as such scenario planning is not about predicting the future nor is it necessarily a replacement for conventional forms of planning.

Scenario planning can be used by policy makers, planners, managers and even communities to:

* Assist in testing existing plans and strategies in different futures, for instance in “climate proofing” plans or testing the veracity of ecotourism as a viable livelihood in the event of regional instability, or the eventual social and economic costs of poorly regulated mining, etc.
* Identifying the key drivers for long term monitoring in an adaptive management system.
* Guide short term management responses where “rapid response scenario planning” is used.
* Visually demonstrate the importance of drivers that might hitherto have been considered irrelevant.
* Assist stakeholders in communicating their aspirations in large scale planning processes.
* To build understanding and consensus on key issues between stakeholders in order to work towards a common vision.

Further, scenario planning is a useful tool to engage with “wicked problems”. Given the complexity and multiplicity of different interests and agendas affecting protected areas, biodiversity conservation and community development in the project area the project is facing what might be termed a “wicked problem”. “The criteria for judging the validity of a “solution” to a wicked problem are strongly stakeholder dependent”. However, the judgments of different stakeholders …“are likely to differ widely to accord with their group or personal interests, their special value-sets, and their ideological predilections.” Different stakeholders see different solutions as simply better or worse”[[30]](#footnote-30). Lastly, solving one wicked problem invariably creates more problems.

In this sense scenario planning can be a powerful tool for building consensus within a group with widely differing backgrounds and agendas and would provide a mechanism to hold programme components together, navigate through a process in which the outcomes are not easily pre-determined and mainstream the outcomes within the various interest groups.
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