

SUSTAINABLE FINANCING OF THE PROTECTED AREA SYSTEM IN MOZAMBIQUE

UNDP GEF PIMS 3938
GEF Project ID 3753

MID-TERM REVIEW

Review time frame - November 3 to December 20 2014

Date of submission
March 6, 2015

Region: Africa; Country: Mozambique

Implementing Partners

Ministry of Tourism (MITUR)
Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP)
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

Reviewer: Brian J Huntley (Independent Consultant)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Project summary table	4
Project description.....	5
Review rating table.....	6
Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	7
1. INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 Purpose of the review	11
1.2 Scope and methodology	11
1.3 Structure of the review report.....	12
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	13
2.1 Project start and duration	13
2.2 Problems that the project seeks to address.....	15
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project.....	16
2.4 Baseline indicators established.....	16
2.5 Main stakeholders	17
2.6 Expected results	17
3. FINDINGS.....	17
3.1 Project strategy and design	17
3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework.....	19
3.1.2 Assumptions and risks	20
3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design.....	23
3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation.....	24
3.1.5 Replication approach.....	25
3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage.....	26
3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions in the sector (See section 3.1.3)	26
3.1.8 Management arrangements (See also sections 3.3; 3.5).....	26
3.2 Progress towards results and capacity building	27
3.2.1 Attainment of project targets.....	27
3.2.2 Implementation of Tracking Tools	30
3.2.3 Results by Component and Output.....	31
3.3 Implementation and adaptive management.....	40
3.3.1 Work planning	40
3.3.2 Adaptive management approach	41
3.3.3 Innovation	43
3.3.4 Socio-economic benefits generated, including gender aspects	43
3.3.5 Approach to partnerships.....	43
3.3.6 Project finance and co-finance	44
3.3.7 Monitoring systems.....	45
3.3.8 Risk management (see section 3.1.2)	47
3.3.9 Reporting and communication.....	47

3.4 Project results.....	48
3.4.1 Overall results.....	48
3.4.2 Relevance	48
3.4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency	49
3.4.4 Country ownership	50
3.4.5 Mainstreaming.....	50
3.4.6 Sustainability.....	51
3.4.7 Impact.....	52
3.5 Management arrangements.....	52
3.5.1 Overall project management.....	52
3.5.2 Quality of implementation by the Implementing Partners.....	54
3.5.3 Quality of support and supervision by UNDP, including UNDP-GEF.....	54
4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS.....	55
4.1 Strengths, challenges and opportunities	56
Strengths	56
Challenges and opportunities	56
4.2 Lessons learned	57
4.3 High Level Recommendations	58
4.4 Detail of Conclusions and Recommendations	58
5. Annexes.....	62
Annex 1. UNDP-GEF Project: Mid-Term review Terms of Reference	63
Annex 2. Programme and Persons Interviewed	79
Annex 3. Project Results Framework.....	82
Annex 4. Documents consulted during the MTR	82
Annex 5. Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity)	84
Annex 6. Co-financing table.....	84
Annex 7. Definitions of GEF-UNDP Project Progress Ratings	85

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project summary table

Project Title	Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique
----------------------	---

Key data

GEF Project ID (PMIS): UNDP GEF PIMS:	3753 3839
ATLAS info:	Business Unit MOZ10
IP MITUR: IP GRP: IP WWF:	Award # Proj. IDs: 00060497 / 00076184 00062665 / 00080154 00062668 / 00080157
Country(ies):	Mozambique
Region:	Africa
Focal Area:	Biodiversity
Trust Fund	GEF TF
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective	BD-SP1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level

Key Milestones

PIF Approval Date	Nov 2008
CEO Endorsement Date	20-Aug-2010
PRODOC Signature Dates	
IP MITUR:	14-Dec-2011
IP GRP:	03-Dec-2011
IP WWF:	05-Dec-2011
Date project manager hired:	01-Nov-2012
Inception Workshop date:	19-Nov 2012
Planned closing date:	31-Dec-2016, as per cover pages of ProDocs
If revised, proposed op. closing date:	No extensions yet requested or approved
First PIR produced	2013
Last PIR concluded	Oct 2014

Key Partners

Exec. Agent / Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) (CSO) Gorongosa Restoration Project (CSO) WWF (World Wildlife Fund)
Other Partners:	BIOFUND Carr Foundation

Key Financing Data

Project financing	<u>at CEO endorsement stage</u>	<u>at mid-term stage*</u>
[1] GEF financing:	\$4,850,000	\$1,061,606.82
[2] UNDP contribution:	\$200,000	\$45,392.91
[3] Government:	\$500,000	to be assessed by MTR
[4] Other partners:	\$13,168,190	to be assessed by MTR
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	\$14,118,190	to be assessed by MTR
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	\$18,968,190	to be assessed by MTR

Project description

This project addresses the need to reduce the funding gap in the investments needed to effectively manage the national system of protected areas of Mozambique which covered a total area of some 13,941,800 ha (>17% of the national territory) at project development, and has expanded to 22% at MTR. The current funding baselines are well below the levels required to ensure that the protected area system properly serves to protect biodiversity. The project provides catalytic investments in securing the long-term financial sustainability of Mozambique's protected areas. The project will strengthen both sides of the financing equation – revenue and expenditure - by: (i) supporting the strategic and business planning processes in protected area institutions; (ii) improving the financial management processes and systems in PA institutions; (iii) testing and developing mechanisms for increasing income from conventional financial sources for protected areas (trust funds, user fees) and developing innovative alternative means of revenue generation (carbon payments and biodiversity offsets; and (iv) identifying opportunities for potential cost savings in protected area management by evaluating the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnership approaches in and around Gorongosa Mountain in the Gorongosa National Park. Partnerships are at the core of the project strategy. The key partners are the Ministry of Tourism and its National Administration for Conservation Areas, the Gorongosa Restoration Project and WWF-Mozambique. The project is supported by GEF-UNDP in alignment with GEF 4 Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity Focal Area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems', consistent with Strategic Programme 1 'Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level.'

Since project inception, two changes have occurred that influence project implementation. First, the establishment of ANAC as the national administration for protected areas has resulted in some institutional changes, and second, political conflict resulting in security challenges have limited project activities in some areas.

Review rating table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	n/a	The project is one of the first GEF interventions in the area of PA financial sustainability in Africa and therefore has limited GEF-based experience to which to refer. The overall context, the strategic and design conceptual framework, and the detail of all activities, roles and responsibilities are presented in an excellent Project Document which provides an ambitious but country relevant strategy with systematic, logical and coherent design – linking three separate components with a common objective. Many innovative approaches are introduced and by MTR have shown progress despite some challenges.
Progress towards results	Objective achievement - MS Moderately Satisfactory Outcome 1 achievement rating – MU Moderately unsatisfactory	MS - Project is expected to reach its major global environmental objectives with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. MU - Project is expected to reach its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to reach only some of its objectives

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
	Outcome 2 achievement rating - MS Moderately Satisfactory	MS – Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance
	Outcome 3 achievement rating – S Satisfactory	S– Project is expected to reach most of its major environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	MU - Moderately unsatisfactory	The project has been managed in a marginally effective and responsive manner but not fully in accordance with the workplan, schedule and budget
Sustainability	ML – Moderately Likely	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards outcomes at MTR

Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

Significant progress has been made in several project activities, most importantly in the establishment and recent capitalization of the Biofund; in community-based nurseries on Serra da Gorongosa; and in introducing innovative concepts such as biodiversity offsets and measures of carbon stocks in natural ecosystems. Parallel to the project, the success of the Gorongosa Rehabilitation Project, where game numbers in the country's protected area icon have increased dramatically in the past ten years, underpins the optimism and national pride that many Mozambican conservation professionals have today.

These advances will need to be translated into effective improvements in the core 'sustainable financing' objective of the project, however, as deep systemic challenges remain. In the two years before planned project conclusion, the project leadership must implement radical actions to address the weaknesses in the Project Management Unit (PMU), and in capacity building and financial administration and reporting systems within the target institution – ANAC.

The adjustment of the project duration dates was made official in the cover pages of all three ProDocs. Considering that the planned duration is of five years and that the ProDocs were signed in end 2011, the project was then foreseen to end by December 2016. This served only to compensate for relatively long time

elapsed between the project's endorsement by the GEF CEO and the agency's approval, marked by ProDoc signature. This adjusted is not to be regarded as a project extension in strict terms. An extension beyond the end-2016 date because of slow delivery however is possible, but it will need to be officially requested by one or more implementing partners and well justified. Above all, it should be conditional on the restructuring of the PMU to ensure the effective completion of component 1 activities and the integration of the project's three components into a whole greater than the sum of the parts.

It is important to emphasize that the project is part of a process, not an end in itself. It therefore seeks to 'contribute' and to 'strengthen' capacity and sustainability – and is not expected to deliver full capacity in financial sustainability per se. However, it will have limited impact if the central focus of the project – financial sustainability – is neglected in pursuit of more immediate and operational activities.

Specific strengths of the project include:

- A very detailed and well-prepared ProDoc and Project Results Framework (Logframe) provides guidance to all aspects of the project's implementation.
- Strong co-financing and collaboration with similar initiatives that expand the impact of the project, e.g. USFS, Blue Forests, USAID, BBOP, etc.
- Innovative approaches to achieving core objectives through exploring community-based ecosystem management, assessing carbon trading baselines and biodiversity offset concepts and practice.
- The capitalisation of over UD\$17 million for the Biofund.

Challenges and opportunities include:

- Lack of an actively shared common vision around 'sustainable financing' as the core objective of the project.
- Lack of a clear and recognizable identity and ownership of the overall project through 'project champions'.
- The ProDoc is in some respects too ambitious and too detailed, and each output needs a more achievable focus.
- Project Management Unit weaknesses have been neglected by MITUR and the Project Board and need urgent strengthening and restructuring through the appointment of a new Project Manager and Financial Assistant with appropriate project management and financial administration skills.
- Complex procurement and fund transfer processes need specific training and the commitment of IPs to submit complete documentation timeously to resolve delays in disbursements.
- The security situation in the Gorongosa District, although stabilized, has had a negative impact on tourism numbers visiting this and other PAs, with serious impacts on income streams and employment opportunities, and thus on the core 'sustainable financing' objective.

High Level Recommendations include:

- The Board must meet quarterly to ensure adequate project management and performance monitoring using the Project Results Framework as a guide.
- The Project Management Unit must be restructured with strengthened leadership arrangements.
- A facilitated workshop of key IPs and stakeholders must be convened to develop a shared understanding of the project objective and intended outputs, using the Logframe and Tracking Tools as integrative project management tools.

Acknowledgements

The kind assistance and hospitality in Mozambique of the many project stakeholders who participated in the MTR is gratefully acknowledged. At UNDP, the Country Director Mr Matthias Naab, the Head of the Environment Unit, Ms Nadia Vaz, the Programme Specialist Mr Janeiro Avelino, and the Senior Project Advisor, Mr Giacomo Cozzolino, all made special efforts to assist the MTR process. Messrs Bartolomeu Soto (Director General) and Raimundo Matusse (Project Manager) at ANAC gave valuable insights into the history and operations of the project, as did Ms. Anselmina Liphola, Biodiversity Focal Point at MICOA. At Gorongosa National Park, Messrs Greg Carr, Vasco Galante, Mateus Mutemba, Mike Marchington, Pedro Muagura, Adolfo Macadona, Marc Stalmans and Quinton Haarhoff demonstrated the progress being made under difficult conditions. Mr Luis Honwana, Ms Alexandra Jorge and Ms Celeste Chitara, of the Biofund, shared their experience in the establishment and development of the fund, while Ms Anabela Rodrigues and Mr Rito Mabunda described the catalytic role played by WWF-Mozambique in Component 3 of the project. It was also possible and rewarding to meet with consultants who have contributed to the conceptual and technical aspects – Mr Sean Nazerali of Verde Azul Consult, Dr Almeida Siteo and Dr Valerio Macandza of UEM (Eduardo Mondlane University). Ms Fabiana Issler, UNDP RTA, was able to describe the evolution of the project from concept, in 2008, to MTR, and give guidance on the review process. All these and other participants in this innovative project who made time available for the MTR are thanked.

Acronyms and abbreviations

ADF	French Development Agency/ <i>Agence Française de Développement</i>	MPescas	Ministry of Fisheries/ <i>Ministério das Pescas</i>
ANAC	National Administration of Conservation Areas/ <i>Agencia Nacional de Áreas de Conservação</i>	MITUR	Ministry of Tourism/ <i>Ministério de Turismo</i>
AWP	Annual Work Plan	MTR	Mid-Term Review
BBOP	Business and Biodiversity Offsets Project	NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
Biofund	Foundation for the Conservation of Biodiversity/ <i>Fundação para a Conservação da Biodiversidade</i>	PA	Protected Area
CAFÉ	African Consortium of Environmental Funds	PIF	Project Information Form
CI	Conservation International	PIR	Project Implementation Review
DNAC	National Directorate of Conservation Areas/ <i>Direcção Nacional das Áreas de Conservação</i>	PMU	Project Management Unit
GEF	Global Environment Fund	PPD	Project Design Document
GNP	Gorongosa National Park	PPG	Project Preparation Grant
GRP	Gorongosa Restoration Project	ProDoc	Project Document
GTAG	Technical Working Group	RedLAC	Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds
IP	Implementing Partner	RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
KfW	German Development Bank/Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau	SPA	Senior Project Advisor
Logframe	Project Results Framework	TOR	Terms of Reference
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee	UEM	Eduardo Mondlane University
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
MF	Ministry of Finance	UNDP CO	UNDP Country Office
MICOA	Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs/ <i>Ministério para Coordenação da Accção Ambiental</i>	USAID	United States Agency for International Development
MINAG	Ministry of Agriculture/ <i>Ministério da Agricultura</i>	USFS	US Forest Service
MITUR	Ministry of Tourism/ <i>Ministério do Turismo</i>	WWF	World Wildlife Fund
MOZBIO	Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project		
MPD	Ministry of Planning and Development/ <i>Ministério da Planificação e Desenvolvimento</i>		

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the review

The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR), as described in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) is *'to gain an independent, evidence-based analysis of the progress made by the project'*.

This MTR identifies existing and potential problems inherent in the project design; assesses progress towards achieving its objectives; identifies and documents lessons learned; and makes recommendations for specific measures that can be taken to improve the project and/or its management effectiveness.

This MTR also independently validates the level of achievement of project indicators. It documents information available on co-financing and on tracking tools. Progress towards realizing project goals is evaluated in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability.

This MTR addresses issues of project design, strategy, performance, quality of reports and intellectual products, and the efficacy of its monitoring and evaluation system.

1.2 Scope and methodology

Although not specified in the MTR Terms of Reference, the review covers the period November 2012 (date of appointment of Project Manager) to November 2014 (date of the MTR field mission).

Although MTRs usually aim to be timed to coincide with 50% disbursement of funds, at end November 2014, disbursements to the Implementation Partners totaled 35% of available funds (component 1 – 22%; 2 – 38%; 3 – 53%).

The MTR was initiated in early November 2014 by the examination of all documentation provided by the UNDP CO. This included the relevant Project Documents (ProDocs), annexes to the ProDocs, which included consultancy reports prepared during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG), the 2013 and 2014 Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), and some quarterly and annual reports. As an 'evidence-based' review, the MTR is dependent on the evidence presented. In this respect the limited access to some ANAC information was a constraint, but should not limit the scope of the report.

The MTR included extensive interviews with key stakeholders and some of the consultants engaged by the Project Management Unit. The interviews were preceded by sending the interviewees a copy of the MTR TOR and in most cases, specific questions. As it was not possible to make arrangements for structured

group discussions due to the lack of simultaneous availability of stakeholders, interviews were usually one-on-one discussions focused on the level of progress towards achieving the outputs of each component, measured against the Logframe indicators.

The field mission included a visit to Gorongosa National Park (GNP) and to the project activities on Serra da Gorongosa and surrounding buffer zone.

An itinerary and list of persons interviewed is presented in Annex 2.

1.3 Structure of the review report

This report follows the format provided in the TOR, which is in line with that of the recently published UNDP 'Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'. Differences between the 'Guidelines' and the TOR format are trivial, and in most cases the TOR format is followed. As far as possible, the repetition inherent in the format is avoided by cross-referencing.

In undertaking the MTR, it soon became evident that the project comprises three very different components, implemented by three very different institutions, with different capacities, leadership styles and visions of what is intended and expected from the project. Thus preparing a report that synthesizes the results from three separate threads of activity into one coherent statement is difficult. It will be necessary to frequently refer to these differences in vision and performance to provide a fair reflection of both the strengths and weaknesses of the project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project start and duration

The concept of a GEF-financed project aimed at supporting the development of financial sustainability for the protected area system of Mozambique emerged during various independent initiatives taken in 2007/2009. A key meeting was the workshop sponsored by MITUR and MICOA, with French Development Bank (AFD) and other donor support, to review the opportunities available for sustainable financing of protected areas, held in Maputo in 2007. A direct result of the workshop was the development of a 'trust fund' project with support from AFD, the German Development Bank (KfW), WWF-Mozambique, and since January 2009, UNDP.

In consultation with many stakeholders, UNDP assisted MITUR and MICOA in the development and submission of a Full-Size Project proposal to GEF during 2009. The preparation of the GEF Project Document was simultaneous to many other initiatives that influenced its design and later implementation. These parallel initiatives developed at different paces, as did the institutions involved. This had significant influences on the structure and implementation of the GEF project.

MITUR had already entered into a co-management agreement with the Carr Foundation in January 2008, when a 20-year contract to protect and restore the ecosystem of Gorongosa was signed.

The Project Information Form (PIF) was approved in November 2008, which accessed funds for the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, during which UNDP supported the commissioning of several important background studies, in particular that guiding the development of the 'Foundation for Conservation of Biodiversity' (Biofund), which initiated its Founders Committee in May 2009.

During the period April to July 2010, co-financing letters in support of the GEF project, totaling US\$13.8 million, were signed by the AFD, KfW, WWF Mozambique, the Carr Foundation, MITUR and UNDP Mozambique.

On 20 August 2010, the GEF CEO endorsed the Project Document (ProDoc) and approved a grant of US\$5 million (which included a \$150 000 project preparation grant) towards the execution of the project by UNDP.

The termination date was later adjusted to the end of 2016 on the cover pages of all three ProDocs, reflecting a normal project duration of approximately 5 years.

A Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) was established and met on 23 September 2011. The meeting was guided by the UNDP, in particular by the

Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) for Biodiversity, who briefed the members on the expectations of the ProDoc and the responsibilities of the Project Board. The project would be split into three ProDocs, for implementation by the three Implementing Partners (IPs) as a single integrated project. It was noted that *'the Project Board must include the representatives of the three IPs, donors, government institutions and the Gorongosa communities'*. Annual Reports would be prepared by the Project Management Unit (PMU) based on reports submitted by each IP. Furthermore, each IP would submit individual Audit reports.

An important requirement of UNDP was that *'The Project Implementation Review should be prepared in a collaborative manner by all three IPs and under the leadership of the Project Manager.'*

The Project Inception Workshop was held on 18 July 2012 and the first meeting of the Project Board was convened on 19 July 2012.

The PMU was established with the appointment of the Project Manager, a Project Assistant and Project Officer on 1 December 2012.

During the initial years of project conception and establishment, significant changes in the leadership and staffing of key positions occurred within DNAC/ANAC, WWF, MITUR, MICOA and UNDP, with impacts on the institutional arrangements, expectations and performance of the project as a whole.

Since mid-2014, a period of stability in most of these institutions has provided an improved chance of success for the project, but significant challenges still remain to be addressed.

The main events and activities relating to the project, to the date of the Mid-Term Review, are presented below.

Date	Event
2007	Workshop on Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas
2008, Oct	Project Information Form approved
2009, May	Biofund Founders Committee established
2009, 14 Oct	Launch of Prep phase
2010, Apr-Jul	Co-financing letters
2010, 20 Aug	GEF CEO endorsement
2010, May-Oct	Technical reports for PPG presented
2010, 14 Oct	Coordinator engaged by MITUR
2011, Aug	Official establishment of Biofund
2011, 23 Sept	Local Project Appraisal Committee established
2011, Nov	ProDocs signed
2011, 15 Dec	1 st General Assembly Meeting of Biofund
2011, 22 Dec	Moz govt. signature – Project start
2012, 18 Jun	Inception workshop (official launching)
2012, 19 Jun	First Board Meeting

2012, 1 Nov	Appointment of PMU
2012, 14 Dec	RTA training of PMU (technical inception workshop)
2012, 14 Dec	Submission of first Annual Work plan and budget for 2013
2013, 6 Mar	Drafting of TORs for consultants for Component 1
2013, 13 Apr	Offsets Workshop
2013, Sept	Call for consultancies published
2013, Oct	1 st Donors' Meeting Biofund
2014, 26/31 May	Technical Capacity Development Course
2014, 19 June	2 nd General Assembly of Biofund
2014, 24 July	Appointment of SPA
2014, Aug/Nov	Consultants appointed for Components 1.1, 1.2, 3.2
2014, November	Mid-Term Review

2.2 Problems that the project seeks to address

During the PPG phase, a study was commissioned to assess current and future financial needs for the protected area (PA) system of Mozambique. The study concluded that –

‘Currently the funding baselines for the PA system, and the capacities to administer and improve PA revenue streams, are well below the levels required to ensure that the protected area system properly serves its function as an important tool to protect biodiversity.’

The ProDoc identified three barriers to improving the financial sustainability of protected areas in Mozambique -

- i) Weak business planning skills and financial management capacities in PA institutions;
- ii) Limited evidence of the cost-effectiveness of community-based partnership approaches in the establishment and management of PAs; and
- iii) Insufficient revenue streams to address the PA ‘funding gap’.

The project was designed to support the removal of these three barriers by creating the enabling conditions for, and strengthening capacities to strengthen both sides of the financing equation – revenue generation and cost-effective expenditure by:

- (i) preparing and implementing business-oriented financial plans;*
- (ii) maintaining effective and efficient financial management systems;*
- (iii) improving the cost-effectiveness of community-based partnership approaches;*
- (iv) diversifying and increasing revenues for protected areas.*

The project would work at both the national (systemic) and at a site-based, (demonstration) levels. The project differs from most traditional PA interventions in that it focuses on medium-term financial sustainability rather

than immediate issues of biodiversity protection. This distinction has not been fully understood by the key IP responsible for the PA system of Mozambique – ANAC.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

In terms of the ProDoc, the project's **development goal** is to 'Contribute to improving the financial sustainability of Mozambique's protected area system'. The project has the **objective** to 'Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders'.

It is important to emphasize that the project is part of a process, not an end in itself. It therefore seeks to 'contribute' and to 'strengthen' capacity and sustainability – and not expected to deliver full capacity of financial sustainability per se. The baseline of the project is a post-conflict society with a weak economy, with high levels of poverty, weak institutions and weak governance systems. The country ranks 172 out of 177 countries in terms of the UN's Human Development Index. Thus the expectation of establishing a set of robust and financially sustainable components within the timeframe of the project is unrealistic. However, seen in the context of a contribution to Mozambique's developmental agenda, the project can and must deliver significant outputs with impact on both biodiversity conservation and on financial sustainability of the protected areas system.

2.4 Baseline indicators established

During project preparation a set of specific, measurable, time-bound and relevant indicators were established, 24 in all, across the three components. A weakness in these indicators lies in many being beyond the capacity of the three Implementing Partners to measure with any precision, or in some cases, to deliver. This is because of the lack of existing capacity, or, in the case of Gorongosa, influences outside the control of the project. Some indicators required significant research on baselines before these could be quantified. Such quantification had not been done at project start, so rather weak estimates were included in the Logframe.

It is significant that no amendments to the ProDoc, nor its Logframe and its indicators were recommended at the project Inception Workshop. Minor adjustments to indicators for Component 2 were made in April 2014. The Logframe has not yet been used as a project management tool.

2.5 Main stakeholders

The key stakeholders in the project are the three Implementing Partners – Ministry of Tourism (through DNAC and later, ANAC); the Gorongosa Rehabilitation Project (supported by the Carr Foundation); and WWF (working with the Biofund).

The project document lists many other ministries (MICOA, MINAG, MPD, MF, MPescas) plus other government agencies at national, provincial and local levels, plus Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM), plus donor agencies – as stakeholders. While several of these stakeholders participated in project development and in many of the workshops initiated or supported by the project, their active engagement in the project implementation – including attendance of Board meetings – has declined with time.

It is also noted that participation by civil society, either represented by NGOs, or by intended beneficiaries (such as the Gorongosa community), has been weak. At present, civil society is most strongly represented through organisations such as WWF, Eduardo Mondlane University and the newly established Biofund. ‘Grassroots’ organisations are only marginally involved.

2.6 Expected results

The expected outputs, outcomes and impacts of the project are detailed in the analysis of results discussed below in section 3.2.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Project strategy and design

The project addresses the considerable challenge of meeting the financial gap of over 90% in government funding required to effectively manage Mozambique’s 13,9 m ha of conservation areas. Most of this gap is currently met by donor grants.

The project was developed and aligned with GEF 4 Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity Focal Area, ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems’, consistent with Strategic Programme 1 ‘Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level’. As such, the project is one of the first GEF interventions in the area of PA financial sustainability in Africa and therefore has limited GEF-based experience to which to refer.

The overall context, the strategic and design conceptual framework, and the detail of all activities, roles and responsibilities are presented in the Project

Document (ProDoc) which serves as the basis on which all project matters are founded.

The ProDoc is an excellent document fulfilling all the requirements of the GEF. It provides a systematic, logical and potentially coherent design – linking three separate components with a common objective, stated as –

Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's protected area system, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders.

As described in the ProDoc the achievement of financial sustainability for the protected area system faces three barriers –

- i) Weak business planning skills and financial management capacities in PA institutions;*
- ii) Limited evidence of the cost-effectiveness of community-based partnership approaches in the establishment and management of PAs; and*
- iii) Insufficient revenue streams to address the PA funding gap.*

The ProDoc provides a well-designed approach to overcoming these barriers to financial sustainability. However, in terms of coherence it has a fundamental weakness, not evident in the ProDoc, but revealed in implementation. The early decision to split the project into three separate ProDocs had the unintended consequence of splitting it into three separate projects, without emphasis of a clear common vision, without a shared commitment and without a nationally recognized identity. This division into three 'silos' has had negative impacts not anticipated during the project's preparation. This potential weakness should have been addressed by careful and skillful management of the integration process by the PMU, through workshops using the LogFrame as a tool, and through regular communication by the PMU with all stakeholders on progress towards the central objective of financial sustainability. These reporting responsibilities of the PMU are spelled out in detail in the ProDoc.

The project has been designed and built around three separate initiatives 1 - the formation of ANAC, 2 - the rehabilitation of Gorongosa National Park, and 3 - the establishment of a conservation trust fund. As projects within the GEF biodiversity portfolio, each of these initiatives has the common goal of ultimately delivering national and global biodiversity benefits. Each has a medium-term commitment to improving financial sustainability (the central objective in component 3, less clearly so in components 1 and 2).

A distinction must be made between the implementing partners. Activities relating to two key components (2&3) were already in motion at project design stage and had independent champions and 'owners'. The GEF intervention served to strengthen these two existing activities and build them into the project through integration in the ProDoc development. The ProDoc fine-tuned the design and structure of these two components within the over-arching 'financial sustainability' focus. It is apparent that, from the success and ability to respond

to serious challenges, the GRP has performed well in response to the project design. So too has WWF.

However, the ProDoc design and development process clearly lacked adequate, sustained and committed participation and resulting 'buy-in' by the frequently changing MITUR leadership. Here the design failed to adequately recognize the importance of sustained charismatic, dynamic, competent and energetic leadership for a collaborative project.

The design demands high levels of professional and technical competence. In some respects, it has required the use of consultants to take the lead in preparing 'road maps' for the introduction and implementation of innovative approaches, such as conservation trust funds, carbon stock measures, biodiversity off-sets and ecologically sound agricultural and re-forestation processes. These background papers were prepared during PPG, and expanded as the project proceeded. These innovative approaches will take a decade to reach full impact. But they will test and even deliver on Mozambique's ability to achieve greater financial sustainability for its conservation areas.

As already emphasized, the project design addresses the fundamental barriers to sustainable financing. As such, it does not address many of the immediate priorities of concern to MITUR in relation to day-to-day operational needs – such as vehicles, equipment, surveys, anti-poaching etc. – that might be considered of higher priority than the longer-term goal of financial sustainability. This has resulted in the perception that the project lacks 'country ownership' – although the Local Project Appraisal Committee, at its first meeting in 2011, agreed that the ProDoc addressed country needs.

While the project might respond to country needs, it must do more. It needs to be 'country driven' – not 'ProDoc driven'. Here is a critical weakness – the lack of a visible national champion within the Board or PMU, and a recognizable identity for the project, are clear barriers to success.

In summary, the ProDoc provides an excellent strategy and design. Its weakness is in its unrealistic expectations and weak central project leadership. This does not suggest a lack of high professional capacity in Mozambique, but rather indicates that much more can be achieved by the project if current weaknesses are remedied.

3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework

The Project Results Framework (Logframe) presented in the ProDoc is well structured, logical and detailed. It is consistent with the overall project strategy and with the opportunities for successful implementation in the context of national needs and priorities. It presents clearly defined, measurable and time-bound targets and indicators. Although all the outputs are relevant to achieving the project objective, several are overly ambitious if capacity constraints are

considered (see section 2.4). Further analysis of each output and indicator is presented in section 3.2.1 and annex 3.

3.1.2 Assumptions and risks

The ProDoc provides a focused analysis of risks and assumptions, with detailed proposals on mitigation measures. At MTR the veracity of these key assumptions varies from one to another (see Box below).

Of greater importance are four assumptions not listed in the ProDoc.

First, there is an expectation, or assumption, that an excellent ProDoc will ensure successful project implementation. The ProDoc is a model of good design and concise content and context, with great detail presented in relation to each activity. It is a fine recipe for effective implementation if it were to be used as a template for project management. However, without skilled and dedicated leadership, the fine structure and detail of the ProDoc is of little use, other than for careful MTR and TR assessment purposes. The failure of the PMU to provide the necessary leadership and strategic vision will be expanded upon later.

Second, it was assumed that the National Implementation Modality for Component 1 would be appropriate for this complex, multi-disciplinary project. The assumption probably extended to the expectation that a full capacity assessment of each Implementing Partner would be undertaken. However, prior to engaging a project team and finalizing the management arrangements no due-diligence of project management capacity and financial administration capacity was undertaken for DNAC/ANAC. A Micro Assessment of the mentioned entity to serve as implementing partner for Component 1 of the project was only carried out in May 2013, i.e. almost 1½ years after ProDoc signature date. The due-diligence ‘micro-assessment’ of project management capacity and financial administration capacity undertaken for DNAC/ANAC was conducted on a single day and six months after the PMU team had been appointed. It only assessed financial management capacity – not project management capacity – the core skill required of the PM. Furthermore, UNDP was not involved in the selection of the PMU team. The assumption that DNAC (later ANAC) had the capacity to implement the project was to prove erroneous. The Micro Assessment did raise a number of flags about the role of DNAC/ANAC as an Implementing Partner for the project’s component 1. It is not clear if the recommendations made were implemented. The Micro Assessment report made also a very superficial analysis of the PMU staff’s capacity for performing their duties, claiming not to have had access to staff curriculum.

A third assumption was that the Project Board would be strong enough to effectively monitor, and where necessary, remedy shortcomings in implementation. This was erroneous. Repeated requests by the UNDP CO for remedial action to be taken by MITUR to improve the capacity of the PMU have not been acted on.

A forth assumption, not considered in the ProDoc, was that political stability in the vulnerable Serra da Gorongosa area would persist, even in the build-up to national elections. This was to prove invalid, with serious implications for component 2. Although the situation has stabilized, tensions still exist. Discussions with two of the *Chefes do Posto* in the affected area confirmed that difficulties remain regarding deliberate setting of wild fires, poaching and land clearing, although in general, the GRP is respected and appreciated by most local communities.

The risks listed in the ProDoc, and comments on these, follow -

Risk	ProDoc Rating	MTR Comments on ProDoc Rating
Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas (ANAC)	High	<p>Correct. The creation of ANAC was approved in 2011 and its establishment planned for Jan 2012. It was eventually created through Decree nr.9/2013, on 26 February 2013. However, weak leadership created major challenges in effectiveness, and it was not until August 2014 with the appointment of a new Director General that the institution has been able to find direction.</p> <p>The mitigation measures proposed in the ProDoc anticipated a strong role for the Project, which would 'actively participate in, and support the work of, the inter-institutional Conservation Policy Working Group mandated to guide the inter-institutional and legislative reform processes for conservation areas.' No evidence of this contribution could be found.</p> <p>The 'High' rating also accurately predicted the risks implicit in the simple transfer of some DNAC staff across to the new ANAC without the infusion of new, carefully selected skills and competencies.</p>
The legal processes for the expansion of Gorongosa NP are not concluded timeously, resulting in delays to the implementation of activities in and around Gorongosa Mountain.	Moderate	<p>Too conservative. The new conservation area, embracing all land above 700 m on Serra da Gorongosa, was proclaimed in December 2010. However, this strengthening of conservation status of the mountain area coincided with the emergence of political unrest in the area. See below.</p>

Risk	ProDoc Rating	MTR Comments on ProDoc Rating
BIOFUND fails to secure capital investments	Moderate	Too conservative. The Biofund has, as of December 2014, secured its primary capital investments, and has a strong and effective management team guiding further growth.
Local communities living in the buffer areas around Gorongosa Mountain are unable to conclude and maintain co-management, partnership or Joint Venture agreements with the GRP	Low	Too optimistic. In reality, the political tensions in the area, not fully understood at time of ProDoc formulation, led to armed conflict in the area and the suspension of initially very successful activities on the mountain. The media coverage of the situation has resulted in a significant decline in tourism to GNP, seriously undermining the sustainable financing objective of the project. The impacts of the situation and the effective adaptive management decisions taken by the GRP will be detailed elsewhere in the MTR.
The current legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of financing mechanisms envisaged in the Financial Plan for Mozambique's system of protected areas	Low	Uncertain. No progress has been made in developing a Financial Plan, so this assumption is untested.
Resistance to increasing (or introducing new) entrance fees, user fees and other surcharges in national parks and national reserves. These conflicts cannot be timeously addressed and resolved.	Low	No progress has been made in this sub-component. The assumption is untested.

Further risks and assumptions, not included in the above Box, but detailed in the Project Results Framework, are considered below.

Component	Assumption	MTR Comments

Component	Assumption	MTR Comments
Project objective		
	– Government maintains its current financial allocations to PA institutions	Correct
	– Donor agencies sustain current levels of funding support to PAs	Correct
Outcome 1	– Financial data for the different categories of protected areas is made available	Erroneous – financial data have been very difficult to obtain
	– The PA agency regularly prepares accurate annual reports and is independently audited.	Erroneous – annual reports and audit statements have not been available
Outcome 2	– Carr Foundation, and other donors, sustain current levels of funding and operational support to GNP	Correct
	– The District Administration and local communities actively support project initiatives to protect evergreen forests on Gorongosa Mountain	Correct – despite the recent instability, support for the GRP appears to be strong
Outcome 3	– The National REDD strategy is developed and adopted by government	Incorrect – REDD strategy still in development
	- A proportion of income from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration can be ‘ring-fenced’ for reinvestment back into protected areas	Incorrect – such arrangements have yet to be established

3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design

The ProDoc details the mechanisms for collaboration with other similar initiatives in order to avoid overlaps and maximize synergies. It is not obvious how lessons from other projects were incorporated into project design.

During implementation, links with other projects were established via membership of the Board, although the effectiveness of such links is not clear from Board minutes, where no mention of such projects and mechanisms for collaborative activities via the Board or PMU are made. Collaboration with USAID and AFD has been very strong going beyond the formal meetings. In-depth discussions on consultancies ToR, project performance, funding procedures and credibility issues have been done with USAID and AFD, including regarding the development of Biofund. UNDP as part of the GTAB also provides contributions to the Biofund discussions

Within Component 3, WWF-Mozambique and the Biofund actively engaged with regional networks such as the Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds (RedLAC) and African Consortium of Environmental Funds (CAFÉ). Collaboration with the US Forest Service in the carbon stocks assessment has resulted in research capacity development leading to the production of excellent reports.

Component 2 learned from coffee farming experience in Zimbabwe, and incorporated Participatory Rural Appraisal approaches in its farmer support activities.

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

The intention of this project was that partnerships would be at the core of its strategy, embracing a broad diversity of stakeholders. A detailed stakeholder involvement plan was provided in the ProDoc. This included the Inception Workshop, the constitution of the Project Board, the establishment of the Project Management Unit, of community-partnership mechanisms, project communications, the involvement of local stakeholders in implementation, the formalization of cooperative governance structures (such as Biofund Board) and capacity building.

The engagement of stakeholders has been of mixed success. The Inception Workshop was well attended, but discussion was mostly on administrative rather than conceptual or developmental aspects. The Board initially met regularly, but more recently it has met infrequently and with diminishing interest from stakeholders. The discussion has focused entirely on administrative issues – mainly on problems with reporting processes or financial disbursements.

The level of stakeholder engagement in the WWF/Biofund activities has been good to excellent. Similarly, the GRP engagement, assisted by its Community Education Centre, has ensured good communication with local communities. During the MTR field mission, several communities were visited and the *Chefes do Posto* of two administrative areas were consulted. It was apparent that despite the difficulties being experienced in the area, the GRP and its activities on the mountain were understood and appreciated.

Unfortunately, the PMU has not played any significant role in stakeholder engagement or communication. From the TOR of the PMU, as described in the ProDoc, it might have been expected that the PMU would play a central and supportive role in developing and maintaining contact and communication between all project stakeholders. This has not happened. Not even an email newsletter, let alone a website, has been created. Feedback to stakeholders has, from the little evidence available, been infrequent and shallow.

Capacity building within ANAC, which has been very generously budgeted, has been almost non-existent. The single training course organized by the PMU was very short, very general and very superficial.

A summary of stakeholder participation, by institution, at the Inception Workshop and at Board meetings is given below. An x indicates that a representative was present at the meeting.

Stakeholder	Incept. WShop	BoardMeetings							
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
	July 2012	July 2012	July 2012	Oct 2012	Feb 2013	Dec 2013		Jan 2014	
MITUR (Chair)	x	x	-	x	x	x		x	x
MICOA	x	x	x	-		-		-	-
MINAG	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
MF	x	x	-	-	x	-		-	-
MINEC	-	-	-	-	x	-		-	-
MPescas	x	x	x	-	x	-		-	-
UNDP	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
PMU	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
DNAC/ANAC	x	x	-	x	-	x		x	x
GRP	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	-
WWF	x	x	x	-	x	x		-	x
Biofund	x	-	-	-	x	x		-	x
ACTF	x	-	-	-	-	x		x	-
Reps present	11	9	6	4	9	8		4	6

3.1.5 Replication approach

This project is in essence a set of pilot studies of various approaches to achieving financial sustainability for protected areas. It includes plans for direct replication (such as the use of templates for financial, business and management plans for PAs once tested in the project) and for scaling up from demonstration sites such as those in the GRP activities, mangrove carbon stocks and offset assessments.

The ProDoc anticipates that ‘the Project Manager will ensure the collation of all the project experiences and information. This knowledge database will then be made accessible to different PA stakeholder groups in order to support better decision-making processes.’ There is thus far no indication that these lessons are being collated and communicated towards a mechanism for replication to a wider programme.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP has a deep body of experience in GEF projects in Africa, and has played a leadership role in developing approaches to the sustainable financing of protected areas. It is therefore well placed to guide the execution of this project. In Mozambique, its Country Programme has a strong focus on poverty reduction, with relatively limited activities in the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. The UNDP Country Programme Document for Mozambique 2012 – 2015 describes a focus on governance and capacity building; strengthening civil society as an avenue for public voice and public accountability; ensuring better engagement and participation by local populations in their own development; improving the productive capacities, income and livelihoods of the rural poor and reducing vulnerability to natural disasters. The environment is mentioned in relation to adaptation to climate change, but biodiversity is not mentioned. Thus it is understandable that the energies of the UNDP CO have to be focused on its core business areas, and resources directed to these priorities rather than this project. UNDP is nevertheless able to bring its wide experience to bear in guiding the project towards recovering lost ground during its final years.

3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions in the sector (See section 3.1.3)

3.1.8 Management arrangements (See also sections 3.3; 3.5)

The day-to-day management arrangements for project implementation are discussed in section 3.5. Here we discuss the strategic and conceptual issues relating to project management.

The creation of a single GEF project around three separate initiatives was no doubt necessary to achieve the critical mass needed for a single GEF Full-Size Project. Such a design is common and usually successful in UNDP experience. However, it assumes strong central support and project management capacity to ensure coordination, integration and synergies through regular, structured and inspired leadership processes. Without such coherence, the three-part project simply falls apart, into three isolated activities.

It is recognized that there is little experience in the implementation of similar PA financing approaches in Africa, and as such, the current project is unusually innovative. However, the difficulties experienced by the project have nothing to do with innovative design, but everything to do with poor project leadership and strategic management. In fact the most innovative components (2&3) have advanced satisfactorily. It is in the key implementing partner – DNAC/ANAC – that problems have arisen with broad impact because the PMU is based in this MITUR directorate. As detailed in the ProDoc, the PMU is responsible for ensuring the effective coordination of activities and achievement of synergies that a collaborative project requires.

The choice of the National Implementation Modality (NIM) for Component 1 of the project has proven to be challenging. This Component is responsible for coordination, integration, reporting and communication and as such, its competent leadership of the project as a whole is essential. It has failed in all these functions. The opportunity to integrate three emerging activities - ANAC, GRP and Biofund was the trigger to the collaborative UNDP project and therefore the design was innovative despite the risk. The demands of the design, of 'marrying' three rather distinct components, had implications that were not anticipated by the Project Board before the PMU was appointed.

The lack of a clear and shared understanding of the core project objective and strategy has resulted in some rather *ad hoc* management decisions having been taken within Component 1. It is apparent that the GEF-UNDP funding is regarded as a 'soft option' to access funds for short-term needs within the ANAC programme but outside the ProDoc focus. The recent appointment of consultants to prepare management plans for Bazaruto and undertake socio-economic studies of Pomene and Marromeu, and to buy furniture and equipment, and prepare a strategy to combat illegal hunting – rather than ensuring that the key activities of component 1 are implemented as a first priority - are symptoms of poor project management and implementation rather than a failure of project design.

3.2 Progress towards results and capacity building

3.2.1 Attainment of project targets

The GEF-UNDP system for rating progress in projects uses very specific terminology and criteria that need to be consulted to obtain clarity. For ease of reference, the definitions are listed in Annex 7.

At the time of the 2013 PIR, progress toward results was rated 'Satisfactory' by the Project Manager and by the UNDP Country Office and 'Moderately Unsatisfactory' by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor. At the 2014 PIR, progress was rated 'Satisfactory' by the Project Manager, 'Moderately

Satisfactory' by the UNDP CO, and 'Moderately Satisfactory' by the UNDP-GEF RTA.

The overall rating for progress towards meeting the project's Development Objectives as assessed by the MTR is 'Moderately Satisfactory'. This rating indicates that the project is expected to reach its major relevant objectives with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. This rating is based on the situation at the time of the MTR – November 2014 – at which point very little progress had been made in Component 1, security issues were still having a negative impact on Component 2, and actual transfer of endowment funds to the Biofund had still to be realized. (The capitalization of the Biofund endowment took place immediately after the MTR mission). Further, the performance of the PMU had not been improved despite serious criticism of it by the UNDP in both 2013 and 2014 PIRs. At MTR, there is still concern that the PMU will not be restructured through the appointment of a new, suitably qualified and skilled project manager, and that donor funds will continue to be fruitlessly invested in this central project management unit.

A summary of performance against each of the 24 indicators of progress towards the Development Objective for each of the 10 project outputs is presented in Annex 3.

A summary of Result Ratings as evaluated during the MTR is presented below.

Component	Output	Rating
Objective: Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders	Overall	Moderately Satisfactory
	Indicator 1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	Indicator 2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	Indicator 3. Total budget (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	Indicator 4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	Moderately Unsatisfactory
<u>Component 1:</u> Sustainability of the protected area system institutionalised	Overall	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	<u>Output 1.1:</u> <i>A Financial Plan (FP) for Mozambique's system of conservation areas is adopted</i>	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	<u>Output 1.2:</u> <i>A strategic plan for the National Administration of Conservation Areas directs</i>	Moderately Unsatisfactory

Component	Output	Rating
	<i>the piloting of business planning processes in conservation areas</i>	
	<u>Output 1.3:</u> <i>Financial management processes and systems in ANAC are strengthened</i>	Unsatisfactory
Component 2: Co-management models in demonstration sites	Overall	Moderately Satisfactory
	<u>Output 2.1:</u> <i>The extent of deforestation on Gorongosa Mountain is contained, and reforestation and rehabilitation activities are expanded</i>	Moderately Satisfactory
	<u>Output 2.2:</u> <i>A joint venture tourism enterprise on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain provides an alternative source of income for local communities</i>	Moderately Satisfactory
	<u>Output 2.3:</u> <i>Improved productivity and sustainability of cultivated areas in the lowlands incentivizes local farmers to abandon slash-and-burn farming practices on Gorongosa Mountain</i>	Moderately Satisfactory
Component 3: Business planning and revenue generation	Overall	Satisfactory
	<u>Output 3.1:</u> <i>A Conservation Trust Fund is established, effectively administered and capitalized</i>	Highly Satisfactory
	<u>Output 3.2:</u> <i>The income from user fees in national parks, national reserves and marine reserves is improved</i>	Moderately Unsatisfactory
	<u>Output 3.3:</u> <i>The development of a pilot carbon sequestration project in the mangrove forests of a coastal conservation area is catalysed</i>	Satisfactory
	<u>Output 3.4:</u> <i>The potential for funding conservation areas from the implementation of biodiversity offset and compensation mechanisms is assessed</i>	Satisfactory

A more detailed narrative on the response of the project to the expectations of the ProDoc follows.

3.2.2 Implementation of Tracking Tools

In order to monitor progress in its Biodiversity Focal Area projects, the GEF-UNDP has developed a suite of Tracking Tools, which provide uniform measures of project targets and progress towards achieving these. Unfortunately, these Tracking Tools and their Scorecards are not consistently or actively applied by Implementing Partners and shared under the guidance of the PMU. In the case of this project, they were carefully prepared at the PPG stage and included in the ProDoc. At the time of the MTR, they had not been fully completed, but nevertheless, give an indication of results for the scorecards submitted.

Three Scorecards have been applied.

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) has been applied to Gorongosa National Park. At the time of the MTR, the 2013 METT had not been fully completed. Section I needs names of reviewers, section II needs details on staffing, section III needs rating of threats, section III needs detail of the area of terrestrial v marine PAs, and on donor and concession income and on financing needs. As a consequence, it is not possible, at MTR, to compare METT scores at project start with scores at MTR.

Although information indicated that the METT had been applied to several other PAs, these were not available to the MTR.

The second Scorecard is that for Capacity Development. The 2014 PIR states that capacity development is 'approaching the target'. This is misleading. The targets and scorecard measures are summarized below. It is evident that only marginal progress has been made in capacity development, nor would significant progress be expected within the short timeframe and very limited capacity development activities undertaken by the project. There was no evidence to indicate that the scorecard process was used to identify training priorities and that these were implemented with the funding made available for the capacity building purpose.

The changes in scores (as a percentage of the possible 100 points, from the Capacity Building Scorecards follow -

	Baseline ProDoc 2010	PIR 2014	End of Project Target 2016
Systemic	46	48	60
Institutional	46	46	55
Individual	35	37	50

The Financial Scorecard results of the ProDoc (2010) and 2013 are summarized below. The legal and regulatory frameworks have improved, while improvements in business planning have been limited, in fact the scorecard results seem overly optimistic. Results for revenue generation are also overly optimistic.

	2010			2013		
	<i>Actual score</i>	<i>Total possible</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Actual score</i>	<i>Total Possible</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks</i>	28	95	29	43	90	48
<i>Business planning and tools for cost-effective management</i>	7	61	11	11	59	19
<i>Tools for revenue generation</i>	12	71	17	23	71	32
<i>Total</i>	47	223	21	77	220	35

Of significance to this MTR were the data provided in the Financial Scorecard on the funding gap. The summary of these data indicate that estimates of the funding gap in 2013 for the Mozambican PA system is far greater than earlier estimates (2010) of funding required for basic, and even worse for optimal levels of management. These data are summarized below.

Income sources and estimated needs for Basic and optimal management of the PA system (US\$)	2010 (ProDoc)	2013(Tracking Tool)
Central Govt. funds est.	153 094	1 182 067
Donor funds	13 657 547	11 382 753
Tourism fees	1 284 063	1 352 022
Total finances available to the PA system	15 094 704	13 916 842
Total annual expenditure (estimate)	18 269 246	12 964 820
Basic management scenario	20 776 762	38 812 088
Optimum management scenario	32 295 271	46 574 505
Funding gap for optimal scenario	17 030 503	33 609 685

The quality of these estimates will be reviewed and the estimates improved during the current consultancies being implemented for component 1.1 of the project. Until more reliable figures are available, no meaningful interpretation of the past, current and future situation can be made.

3.2.3 Results by Component and Output

Under Component 1.

Sustainability of the Protected Area System institutionalized

Output 1.1. A Financial Plan for the system of protected areas adopted by government

This activity was planned in the ProDoc to build on the detailed assessments undertaken during the PPG (*Assessment of Data on Both Sides of the Financing Equation for Mozambique's Conservation Areas*). The outcomes of the financial plan prepared as Output 1.1 would support and focus the implementation of Outputs 1.2 and 1.3. The technical work in developing the Financial Plan was to be undertaken by a contracted financial planning service provider as a first priority. The service provider would be required to work with, train, and mentor pre-selected counterparts from each of the protected area institutions. This has not yet happened. The only training offered was a very superficial course covering all aspects of PA management. Two years have already been lost in this critically needed area of financial planning and capacity building. Due to bureaucratic and other delays, the service provider (Verde Azul) was only appointed in September 2014, nearly two years after the PMU was established.

The Terms of Reference for the recently appointed consultant follows that provided in the ProDoc, and initial work by the consultant provides significant improvements to the baseline financial information. It is not yet evident how the training of ANAC personnel will be conducted, as many key posts have yet to be created, advertised and filled. The TOR for the consultant does not detail training responsibilities.

Output 1.2: A strategic plan for the National Administration of Conservation Areas directs the piloting of business planning processes in conservation areas

The ProDoc provides very detailed and specific guidance on the execution of activities towards developing an overarching strategy for ANAC to move from a input-based to an output-based, results-oriented system. The proposed strategy would provide recommendations on those opportunities that are most cost-effective and viable, and outline a strategy for pursuing them. The business plans will be aligned with, and integrated into, the overall Management Plan of each conservation area.

The ProDoc furthermore is clear on the expectation that the Project Management Unit would provide support to ANAC in meeting its commitments under this Output (and Output 1.3 below) by contracting a Projects Officer to act as the institutional focal point for activities under this output. A Project Officer was appointed for a brief period at project initiation, but left soon afterwards. It was intended that ANAC, with the support of the PMU, would contract a specialist consultant in institutional strategic planning and performance-based budgeting to support it in the preparation of the strategic plan and annual performance plan and build capacity so that conservation area staff are able to update the business plan on an on-going basis.

Unfortunately, the procurement processes needed to meet the above intentions were too complicated for the PMU, which ultimately concluded that

responsibility for this outcome could more conveniently be transferred to a USAID funded project (SPEED) to be implemented by Miombo Consult. This consultancy initiated work in mid-2014.

Having abdicated the primary role in leading the Strategic Plan and Business Plan development process, the PMU proposed and the Board agreed that several preparatory studies, on the socio-economics and ecology of Pomene and Marromeu PAs, plus the revision of the management plan for Bazaruto NP, be funded under this component. A further consultancy, to develop an illegal hunting surveillance system, has also been approved. Work on these studies has only recently begun.

Output 1.3: Financial management processes and systems in ANAC are strengthened

As with output 1.2, it was intended that the PMU would appoint a Project Officer to guide this project, while ANAC, with the support of the Project Management Unit, would contract a chartered accounting firm to provide on-going professional and technical 'backstopping'. The chartered accounting firm would be required to physically locate key staff members within the agency to assist and support staff during the inception phase of ANAC's establishment.

These steps have not been taken, although a staff member with economics training has been located in the PMU. It has been stated in quarterly and annual reports that this staff member is overwhelmed with ANAC responsibilities given the absence of other personnel in ANAC able to undertake many of the financial administration needs of ANAC.

As a consequence of the lack of capacity in both the PMU and in ANAC, and the delayed initiation of activities 1.1 and 1.2, progress in this activity has been negligible. It might be noted that the list of activities in the ProDoc might be somewhat unrealistic given the capacity constraints in many government (but not NGO) institutions in Mozambique. However, the project was designed to recruit outside help, and has adequate funding to do so – so resources were available if energetically applied, and applied for the intended purposes.

An activity that does relate to 1.3 was a short (four-day) course offered to 28 ANAC personnel on general aspects of conservation management. The report on the course indicates that one session, summarised in two pages, covered financial management. This is the only activity that directly relates to the intended purpose of Component 1.3 reported on in PMU records.

As concluded by both the 2013 and 2014 PIRs, the PMU is not in a position to give leadership of direction to Financial Planning and Strategic Planning activities, although these skills were required in the post descriptions. The appointment of consultants (Verde Azul and Miombo) to lead this activity must

go beyond merely writing reports. It must include active training and skills development for ANAC senior management and administration staff.

Indicators for Component 1.

Seven quantifiable indicators are listed in the ProDoc Results Framework for Component 1. Of these, none can be judged to having advanced beyond initial steps. For three indicators (#5, 6 and 7), consultants have very recently been appointed. Two indicators (#8 and 10) are dependent on the approval of ANAC's Staff Establishment (i.e. its staff structure, staff levels, staff numbers, etc, as funded by government) while one (#9 on training) is wholly within the options available to the PMU to mobilise. The lack of any Audit as yet of ANAC makes indicator #11 un-measurable at present.

Under Component 2

Co-management models in demonstration sites

According to the ProDoc, this component is premised on the assumption that the sharing of responsibilities, rights, costs and benefits between protected areas and adjacent local communities can strengthen the overall effectiveness and long-term sustainability of protected areas. Such management effectiveness will therefore reduce expenditure on activities such as poacher control. A recent meta-analysis of community benefits commissioned by GEF STAP indicates that the benefits gained by communities living in or adjacent to PAs are far more limited than often expected, intended or claimed by PA managers (<http://www.stapgef.org/assessing-the-effects-of-terrestrial-protected-areas-on-human-well-being/>). Further, there is still little empirical evidence that the resources committed to developing community-based partnerships yield significant biodiversity, financial and social returns on investment.

This project was not designed in a manner that can provide counter-factual tests on the intended impacts, even though some of the indicators might add to the evidence base on the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnership approaches in and around protected areas.

The co-management of Gorongosa National Park by the Carr Foundation and the Mozambican government has been a highly successful model which merits replication elsewhere in Africa. The importance of this aspect of co-management should not be undervalued, and within the context of the GRP, is as important as the GRP/local community co-management activities.

The MTR took into account the fact that since October 2013 until October 2014, political and security issues on and around Serra da Gorongosa have seriously limited activities in this component. However, despite these factors, important progress has been made in sustaining activities, even if much reduced.

Output 2.1: The extent of deforestation on Gorongosa Mountain is contained, and reforestation and rehabilitation activities are expanded

Work under this output aims to support the implementation of a community-based reforestation and rehabilitation programme in the high biodiversity priority areas of Gorongosa Mountain; and the concurrent employment of community rangers to improve awareness and education, and ensure compliance with conservation legislation, in and around Gorongosa Mountain.

During the first year of project implementation, both of these activities made excellent progress.

The selection of indigenous tree species from both miombo and rain forest ecosystems and the collection of seeds from these made possible the establishment of highly successful nursery plantings. A total of 40 community nurseries were established and several hundred thousand seedlings grown in bags, ready for planting in target reforestation sites. Unfortunately the programme was interrupted by violent conflict and the evacuation of communities and staff from many areas of Serra da Gorongosa.

The MTR visited several of the nurseries and found that the health of the seedlings, many now over one metre height, is excellent. The nursery design, nursery practice and health of plants indicated high quality training and dedicated staff, many whom commenced work as community volunteers.

Quantification of the nursery products is difficult to undertake due to current inaccessibility of many of these. The September 2014 report from GRP list the following seedling numbers – total of 62 025 seedlings produced - Nhanguo: 19 500 ; Nhancuco:11 500; Canda 31 425. These nurseries represent a small sub-set of the whole project, and figures of several hundred thousand seedlings are given in earlier reports.

Initial planting in deforested areas had to be halted due to the security situation. In the interim, the GRP has made use of community radio, school projects and the GNP Community Education Centre to strengthen environmental education, awareness and conservation actions in the affected area.

Output 2.2: A joint venture tourism enterprise on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain provides an alternative source of income for local communities

Work under this output aimed to support the design, development, construction and operation of a Joint Venture tourism enterprise (comprising 12 self-catering units and a campsite) between the Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP) and the Tambara/ Canda/ Sandjungira communities on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain.

Due to the security situation on Serra da Gorongosa, and to the consequent significant drop in tourist interest in visiting the area, the GRP has proposed a change in siting and scale of the proposed venture. It is proposed that rather

than a high-capital investment 'self catering' lodge facility, a lower input camping area, with serviced sites, ablutions and direct park access, be established near the Panga Panga entrance to Gorongosa National Park. The concept design has been prepared and will form a basis for consultations with the Nhambita community, who adjoin the site and will be its primary beneficiaries.

The ProDoc provides fine-scale detail on the process and activities needed in this sub-component. It will be important that the guidance provided in the ProDoc be followed in developing and negotiating this Joint-Venture at Panga Panga with the Nhambita community. Funds are also available in the UNDP budget for the support of an independent legal advisor to assist the community in the negotiation process.

UNDP has now an excellent and thorough Social and Environmental Standards policy, a project screening tool and a stakeholder response mechanism. Consultation is implied. In addition, a compliance unit was created within UNDP to roll out the policy and ensure safeguards. UNDP did not have any of that when the project was designed. The guidance provided by UNDP is available at -

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-standards.html>

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html>

Output 2.3: Improved productivity and sustainability of cultivated areas in the lowlands incentivizes local farmers to abandon slash-and-burn farming practices on Gorongosa Mountain

Work under this output is directed at providing more sustainable agricultural alternatives in the buffer areas of Gorongosa Mountain as an incentive to local farmers to abandon the unsustainable slash and burn practices on the forested upper slopes of the mountain.

The ProDoc gives detailed but perhaps unrealistic output activities for this work. Given the situation in the area, the GRP team have adopted a more pragmatic approach in focusing on cash crops that can have immediate positive impact on both re-forestation goals and on livelihood improvements. Experimental planting of coffee trees in areas above 700 m, conducted prior to the project, indicate that selected cultivars of Arabica coffee can grow well in the areas currently being deforested for potato crops that otherwise rapidly exhaust the soils.

The agricultural advisor and project team have established a successful and very healthy coffee tree nursery in an area subject to heavy transformation. They have commenced with experimental inter-plantings of selected bean, maize and coffee cultivars as a 'learning by doing' demonstration for local farmers. The training component of this activity is clearly successful, as demonstrated in the high quality of community nurseries visited during the MTR.

Before the coffee production expands to scale, it will be important to conduct an assessment following UNDP environmental safeguard requirements. As referred to in 2.2 above.

Indicators for Component 2

Nine quantified indicators are listed for component 2. All of these relate to activities within the area affected by the security situation. However, all indicators had shown good prospects towards being met by project end in the absence of political instability. All will need to be reviewed should the situation continue.

The target of planting 500 000 indigenous trees above the new GNP limit of 700 m asl (#12) seems achievable but has halted at present.

Indicators of deforestation (#13), agricultural clearing (#14), wild fires (#17) can be measured against the baseline provided by the high definition satellite imagery recently purchased by the project. However, the distinction between dense miombo woodland and rainforest patches might make such monitoring difficult but not impossible given the new high resolution imagery available. Fire incidence and monitoring using remote sensing technologies is now adequate for use by the GRP team. A first assessment of forest loss using the new imagery indicated a loss of 934 ha during the period 2011/2013. This assessment can be refined as knowledge of the vegetation types and the definition of their distribution is improved by the GRP science team.

Due to the unsettled situation, household based socio-economic and livelihood indicators (# 15, 18) are not possible to track at present. Numbers of community members employed (#16, 19) are recorded monthly and have remained stable.

There is an urgent need for a careful audit of all statistics on indicators in this component. Widely differing data on nursery seedlings and saplings, and on trees plants, have been presented in quarterly reports and on the GRP website. The GRP must prepare accurate figures for baselines and changes from these. It has already done admirable work on wildlife population counts in GNP, and its research team can assist in collating and correcting the divergent data on nurseries, trees, human populations, land clearing, fire incidence and erosion on Serra da Gorongosa.

Under Component 3

Business planning and revenue generation

Four pilot projects were identified during the PPG and are considered to have the potential to catalyze new approaches to sustainable financing, and to reflect a new way of doing business. The pilots seek to place a value on protected area “goods and services”, and then adopt a business approach in order to sell them.

The concepts and practice of payments for such services are at an early stage of development, but the pilots are introducing these approaches to Mozambique.

Output 3.1: A Conservation Trust Fund is established, effectively administered and capitalized

The primary activities in this sub-component have been successfully achieved. These include –

- registration of the BIOFUND, which was legally registered in August 2011;
- election of the Board, and the constitution of other governing bodies;
- establishment of GTAB – technical support group – among donors AFD, USAID, UNDP, KfW, WWF – providing support on strategic issues;
- establishment and initial capitalisation of BIOFUND, and creation of a foreign fund for investment purposes;
- recruitment and equipping strong management team accommodated in appropriate offices and strengthened through regular training and skills development; and
- development of operational and strategic plans, policies and procedures, approval of endowment funds totalling US\$17m in December 2014, from KfW, World Bank and Conservation International, approaching the target of US\$20 million.

The progress in this activity has been admirable. Endowment funds of US\$17 million have been secured. Investment in a highly skilled and professional team has paid dividends in the rapid mobilisation of all activities. The Biofund has established a nationally recognisable identity and strong regional contacts. The activities of the Biofund team have been dynamic and purposeful, and have resulted in strong participation in such activities by stakeholders throughout Mozambique.

Output 3.2: The income from user fees in national parks, national reserves and marine reserves is improved

The ProDoc had anticipated that with the support of the Project Management Unit, ANAC would contract a tourism specialist to undertake all the technical work under this output. The tourism specialist would be required to work in close collaboration with MITUR and the relevant departments and institutions of the affected Ministries and Provincial Governments.

Unfortunately no progress was made with this activity, which has recently, together with sub-component 1.1, been transferred to a consultant. However, the more detailed and specific activities listed in the ProDoc do not seem to form part of the consultant's TOR. Reference to the ProDoc would be helpful in ensuring that the expected outputs are achieved.

Output 3.3: The development of a pilot carbon sequestration project in the mangrove forests of a coastal conservation area is catalysed

The activities listed in the ProDoc for this sub-component are highly unrealistic, given the complexity of carbon stock assessment, of Project Idea Note preparation and of Project Design Document preparation. The drop in the global price for carbon and the recent crash of oil prices suggests that carbon trading as a source of sustainable income for Mozambique's conservation areas is a long way away. Each of these activities might take several years to mobilise, given the technological and institutional challenges involved. However, the project has made excellent progress in the carbon stock assessment, together with a US Forest Service supported research group, in the mangrove ecosystem of the Zambezi delta.

Output 3.4: The potential for funding conservation areas from the implementation of biodiversity offset and compensation mechanisms is assessed

Clear activities for implementing this sub-component, by WWF under the oversight of MICOA, were described in the ProDoc. These included –

‘Contributing to building institutional and individual understanding of and capacities in the offset concept; piloting a compensation and biodiversity offset project; preparing a national compensation and offset policy framework.’

The project was initiated with a well attended and successful international workshop and training session on biodiversity offset concepts and mechanisms. With funding from another project supported by USAID, a consultancy to prepare a paper ‘Biodiversity Offsets in Mozambique – A Roadmap for Implementation’ – has been prepared. This document provides a detailed set of guidelines for policy and practice in offset actions in Mozambique.

Current work includes a desk assessment and mapping of critical habitats of Mozambique as a basis to identifying sites for possible offset projects, funded by the project via WWF and implemented by Eduardo Mondlane University. This project builds on the lessons learned from experience elsewhere in Africa and is guided by International Finance Corporation criteria.

Indicators for Component 3

Component 3 includes several innovative income generation activities. Of these, those implemented by WWF (#3.1, 3.3, 3.4) have moved forward very positively, although all will require some years to mature before funds are available to distribute for conservation activities.

Component 3.2, implemented by ANAC via the PMU has only just been initiated, having been added to the consultancy undertaking Component 1.1. This means that nearly two years have been lost in mobilising a promising source of additional income for the PA system.

3.3 Implementation and adaptive management

3.3.1 Work planning

The delays between project conception (2008) and start (2012) were much longer than for similar GEF projects. These delays were due to institutional changes, specifically in the slow process of transition from DNAC to ANAC and to changes in leadership in ANAC and partner institutions.

However, from the time of establishing a well-funded PMU in early 2012, the delays have been due to weaknesses in project management capacity and the lack of response from MITUR to address the situation, despite repeated requests for action from UNDP. This topic is discussed further under section 3.3.2.

Proactive, collaborative and coherent planning as such does not exist within the project as a whole. Each component has its own, individual work planning process. Annual work plans are submitted to the Board for approval and to UNDP at the end of each year – but in past experience the process is delayed by several months due to late submissions and slow processes.

The PMU has not been able to provide the support, coordination and synthesis needed to respond to the guidance structure provided by the Logframe and the detailed results-linked activities described in the ProDoc. Conceptual inputs to the planning process, building on the consultants' reports from the PPG and from on-going consultant activities, do not exist.

Adjustments to the work plans have been rather *ad hoc* as described in section 3.3.2 below. Further, the allocation of budget to result areas has not been consistent with the importance given these activities in the ProDoc. In the revised work plan for Component 1, Output 1.3 (Financial Management Processes and systems in ANAC are strengthened) for 2014, \$55 000 is budgeted for furniture and equipment for ANAC, plus \$28 000 for 'experience exchange to SADC for ANAC management group' while only \$3 000 is budgeted for communications and marketing, and only \$4 000 for meetings of working groups and stakeholder consultations. What is of real concern is the fact that only \$15 000 of this sub-component's \$224 000 budget for 2014 is allocated to short courses for PA managers. Together with a training allocation of \$70 000 under component 1.1, the total allocation for training in 2014 is a mere \$85 000, or 10% of the annual budget of \$858 000 allocated to ANAC. None of this \$85 000 has been used for training during 2014. This work plan demonstrates more clearly than any other item of evidence the profound lack of understanding of what the GEF-UNDP investment is intended to serve.

Recommendations to respond to the situation, through active use of the Logframe and Scorecard systems, will be presented later.

3.3.2 Adaptive management approach

The UNDP 'MTR Guidelines' define adaptive management in rather restrictive terms relating the project's ability to adapt to changes in project design. In the present project, changes have not been made in the design, but changes have been made around the design. These changes have been the result of capacity, institutional and political factors external to the actual design. The objective of the project and its structure remain unchanged. However, various activities have been changed, in some cases in an *ad hoc* manner, in others in response to exogenous factors such as security concerns.

Adaptive management responses have differed in each Component. The main challenge facing the PMU, as noted in every quarterly report, has been the complex process of procurement of goods and services. Further, it has also not had access to alternative funds to mobilize activities, in contrast to the other two IPs, which have been able to carry costs against other sources until reimbursed by UNDP. This practice is not common nor is it advised. A further constraint noted by the PMU was that funding from UNDP for the operations of the PMU was only released in May 2013, six months after the appointment of the PMU. However, the late submission of Board minutes, the poor quality of Annual Work Plans and lack of signatures on documents have consistently prevented UNDP from processing disbursements, despite regular annual reminders for timely submission of completed documents. While the other IPs, being NGOs with less rigid administrative constraints, were able to adapt to the flows of income and expenditure due to broader resources, the PMU, housed in ANAC, could not. However, even after the receipt of funds from UNDP, it was not until five months later, in September 2013 that the first call for consultancies was published. The actual appointment of consultants took place in mid to late 2014.

The PMU, as its adaptive strategy, has looked to other donors to fund certain of the activities allocated to ANAC within the ProDoc. Thus it has transferred sub-component 1.2 (Strategic Plan for ANAC) to a USAID funded project, which was seen to have less demanding administrative requirements. The budget saving on this has then been allocated to other activities, marginally related to the core business of the ProDoc, such as a management plan for the recently proclaimed Magoé PA and for office furniture and equipment for several other PAs. The minutes of the meeting of 24 April 2014 records -

'Dois concursos (Plano Estratégico da ANAC e Estratégia de Fiscalização) foram invalidados pelo doador e foi proposta pela ANAC a reorientação dos fundos GEF/PNUD para outras actividades também prementes e urgentes dentro da operacionalização das áreas de conservação, mas que tinham menor exigência/conflitos em relação aos procedimentos devido da diferente interpretação do regulamento de contratação de empreitada de obras publicas, fornecimento de bens e prestação de serviços ao Estado. Alternativas foram exploradas para a repetição dos concursos cancelados com doadores alternativos com procedimentos mais simplificados e os processos estão em curso para a adjudicação da elaboração do Plano Estratégia da ANAC através do USAID/SPEED

e o Projecto da fiscalização com o apoio da Agencia Francesa para o Desenvolvimento (AFD)... Fundos do projecto FSSAP planificados para esta actividade (1.2) foram propostos para serem reorientados para apoiar o estabelecimento do corpo de gestão do Parque Nacional de Magoé e para elaboração do Plano de Maneio.'

A more proactive adaptive management approach is that of the GRP, which after the disruption of activities on Serra da Gorongosa, met with the Project Board in April 2014 to propose a series of adjustments to its work plans which would maintain a focus on its core objectives, retain most of its staff, and secure the effective continuation of its activities.

These adaptive arrangements included, for sub-component 2.1, suspending activities in the areas of greatest insecurity and transferring them to safer areas, developing new nurseries in safe zones, maintaining some nurseries in affected areas through reduced teams, transferring the proposed siting of the eco-tourism joint venture to a new site and use of community radio for education and awareness raising. Thus despite the difficulties resulting from the security situation, the GRP activities have remained in focus and dynamic. The extensive and highly successful nurseries of indigenous forest trees for use in re-afforestation activities have been maintained and expanded.

With regard to component 2.2, an alternative site for a community-managed campsite at the Panga Panga entrance to Gorongosa, has been proposed. A pre-feasibility study has been initiated as a basis for consultation and negotiation with the local community at Nhambita. The proposal offers a cost-effective and realistic alternative to the original proposal for a site on Serra da Gorongosa.

With regard to component 2.3, the testing of shade coffee inter-planted with rows of beans and maize, as an alternative livelihood to potato crops, has proceeded.

Both Components 1 and 2 have informally requested extensions to the duration of the project beyond the end-2016 date. While the request for Component 2, on grounds of the security situation, is fully justified, that for Component 1 is a result of poor project management. Should the Board recommend, and UNDP approve, an extension by one year, this should be conditional on the restructuring of the PMU to ensure effective management of, and leadership by, the PMU.

The Board must embrace an adaptive management approach to the total overhaul of the PMU, not just for the benefit of the project, but to ensure that the goal of capacity in financial sustainability of the PA system is achieved. The restructuring must be designed and transparently implemented by MITUR/ANAC with strong participation by UNDP, and the budget allocations needed for an extension of the project must follow the restructuring process. While it is not proposed that the PMU restructuring move away from National Implementation Modality, it must result in performance standards expected by donors and partners. The posts should be advertised and the TOR should follow

those detailed in the ProDoc. Candidates should have their competencies evaluated against the skills required by the TOR.

3.3.3 Innovation

The project has initiated several highly innovative approaches to achieving greater financial sustainability. Each of these will have lead-times much longer than the project's duration, and each comes with significant risks. However, the project provides the needed development of enabling conditions for the national-level introduction of mechanisms such as carbon trading and biodiversity offsets. It will also build the evidence base of community-based ecotourism ventures on the margin of protected areas, and of reducing costs of poacher control by involvement with local communities in both patrolling and surveillance. Perhaps the most important of the innovations is that of the Carr Foundation/Mozambique Government partnership and co-management of Gorongosa National Park. The successful recovery of the management and wildlife assets of the Park has been remarkable and is a clear demonstration of the effectiveness of long-term agreements between an African government and a foreign philanthropist.

3.3.4 Socio-economic benefits generated, including gender aspects

Component 2 of the project is directed primarily at socio-economic improvement for the communities surrounding GNP and those who live on Serra da Gorongosa. The use of improved farming methods, nursery development, re-forestation and the potential of inter-cropping coffee with food crops, is an innovation that can bring substantial benefits to these isolated rural communities. Employment of 24 rangers and 51 nursery workers has added to direct income of these communities.

While all the projects remain male dominated, gender has not been a barrier for entry. Women have participated in all activities, including the physically challenging field research on mangrove carbon stock assessment and nursery development, and occupy leadership positions in WWF, Biofund and UNDP.

3.3.5 Approach to partnerships

The project is composed of a consortium of three Implementing Partners. Each of these has networks of partners of different strengths. Partnerships are at the core of the project strategy. However, the project itself lacks a network of partners sharing a common vision led by visible champions.

The central role that the PMU should play in developing and maintaining such a project network has been neglected. Communication processes, such as newsletters, workshops, joint publications, use of a project logo to give identity to project materials, simply do not exist. This is not due to lack of financial resources. The project is very generously funded. It is guided by an excellent ProDoc and by years of excellent models produced within the GEF-UNDP Biodiversity Focal Area.

In many respects, it appears that due to the lack of inspired central leadership, the project as such has been abandoned by its partners - each has simply focused on its own interests and project activities.

While it is rather late in the project programme, a concerted effort needs to be made to draw all participants together to share the common vision and goals of this large investment by UNDP and the project partners. Such a process would need careful structure and facilitation, which could best be achieved around the review of project Logframe and Scorecards. Although these instruments might appear dull and boring, a proper understanding of their integrative potential and their imaginative application, could provide powerful tools to communicate the cross-component benefits of the project.

3.3.6 Project finance and co-finance

An updated co-financing table was not prepared for the MTR. Data on co-financing require the active engagement by the PMU with each of the IPs, and with UNDP, plus regular assessments of each partner's contributions. This was not done by the Project Team, although required by UNDP guidelines for MTRs.

Component 3, by design, is focused on increasing the funding base to biodiversity conservation in Mozambique. Biofund has actively pursued new partnerships while strengthening existing interactions with AFD, KfW, USAID and CI. It has met with Banco de Mozambique, US Forest Service and the World Bank to source new funds for both the endowment fund and for new conservation projects. It has also worked with MICOA, MITUR, MINAG and UEM on developing the Project Design Document for potential carbon financing. Biofund, through its Technical Working Group and assisted by UNDP, has met with several donor countries (USA, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Denmark), plus Mozambican government ministries and the private sector to explore further co-financing of the biodiversity offsets initiative. It has also engaged with the new World Bank funded MOZBIO project to secure additional funding.

Several of the project outputs have drawn advantage from similar projects being undertaken in parallel to the various sub-components. The WWF/Biofund activity on carbon stocks has benefitted from the large investment in the mangrove carbon assessment made by the US Forest Service, while the Offsets activity will benefit greatly from the 'Offsets Roadmap' initiative, funded outside the project budget. Component 1.2 has been replaced by the USAID project on developing a Strategic Plan for ANAC. Such investments cannot be considered as

project co-financing, as no formal commitments to the project have been made by their funders. However, with the active engagement of the PMU and Board with these parallel projects, some formal agreements might be of value, and co-financing leveraged.

Financial management processes were not examined in any detail during the MTR. To date, the availability of funds has far exceeded their use, with the exception of the WWF component which had spent 53% by the MTR. One reason given for this is that disbursements from UNDP are very slow. However, deeper analysis indicated that often the absence of adequate information, such as asset registers of goods purchased with UNDP funds, prevented the release of further funds. The perceived (and perhaps real) complexity of the procurement and disbursement policies in ANAC and UNDP are a source of significant frustration and logjams in implementation and need resolution. Furthermore, as noted above, the late and incomplete submission of properly signed documentation prevents UNDP and GoM from dispersing funds as rapidly as might be desired.

The individual activities of the project appear to be generously funded. It was not possible during the MTR to review the effectiveness of use of these funds. Funding levels for some consultancies seemed very high – but this might be due to the high cost of specialist consultants in Mozambique. The rather *ad hoc* manner in which funds designated for specific activities in component 1 were reallocated for other uses raises a concern that financial management of the budget is not as cautious and as focused to the Logframe results areas as might be desired by the donors. Purchases of equipment and office furniture seem to enjoy a higher priority than investment in skills development.

3.3.7 Monitoring systems

The project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system is described in the ProDoc and is detailed in the Project Results Framework (Logframe). The ProDoc notes '*All of the project's Implementing Partners are expected to cooperate under the leadership of the PM to successfully carry out M&E activities under the project.*'

The Logframe, its outputs, indicators and means of verification were examined by the full membership of the project IPs and other stakeholders at the Inception Workshop in July 2012. No changes to the Logframe outputs and indicators were requested. The Logframe forms the main M&E instrument for the project.

Four formal processes are in place to ensure overall M&E of the project. The first is the inception phase, which started in July 2012 and the final report was produced around November of the same year. The second is the Project Implementation Review (PIR) that has taken place in mid-2013 and mid-2014. The PIR should continue to take place annually till operational closure and always at mid-year. The third is the present Mid-Term Review. The fourth is the Terminal Evaluation (TE) that occurs at the end of the project.

The PIR process has been poorly managed by the PMU. The process is supposed to be interactive, but the IP responses to the PIRs of both 2013 and 2014 were either not solicited or not received. From the overly generous assessment rating given in both PIRs, it is apparent that the PM does not understand the purpose or process of the PIR – the key annual M&E system in the GEF project cycle.

Ideally, the M&E process should be ongoing, with the PMU convening workshops to review progress against outputs and indicators at regular, facilitated and integrative workshops. The approach used thus far has comprised individual IP self-evaluations being submitted to the PMU by email. The approach unfortunately lacks the benefit of face-to-face discussions and synthesis between components, leading to lessons being learned and capacity being built. The opportunity for constructive engagement has thus been neglected. Peer pressure and peer review are key ingredients for success in collaborative projects.

The ongoing political crisis in Sofala and Manica from early 2012 resulted in serious challenges for the project and, exacerbated by the weak central leadership, led to the RTA calling in the 2013 PIR for ‘an action plan to address the threats and weaknesses in the project to be prepared and submitted by December 2013.’ This did not happen. It was not until April 2014, nine months later, that a meeting was called to review the situation.

On 24 April 2014, in the light of the deteriorating security situation on Serra da Gorongosa, a workshop of all participants was held to consider adjustments that should be made to the project work plan (especially Component 2) to respond to the situation. The meeting was attended by representatives of ANAC, MITUR, ACTTF, MICOA, MPescas, GNP, WWF, UNDP and Biofund. The meeting agreed that each IP should undertake a self-evaluation of its progress, challenges, and needs for changes to its work plans, both in response to the situation and as a preparation for the MTR. These self-evaluations were submitted to the PMU in May 2014. The consolidated project ‘self-evaluation’ was finalized in August 2014 and is a useful but inexcusably late contribution to the M&E process.

In the ‘self-evaluation’, Component 1 focused on the constraints to project implementation, due to the legal and bureaucratic systems in both ANAC and UNDP pertaining to procurement of goods and services (principally for the appointment of consultants). Another key constraint was the delay in approval of the Statutes of ANAC, and most particularly its staff establishment, which prevented the appointment of key officials. A further problem noted was the lack of effective communication between the three IPs and the infrequency of meetings for sharing of experience. Little real progress was reported for Component 1, other than several consultants having been or planned for appointed in mid to late 2014.

Reporting on the ‘self evaluation’ by both Carr Foundation (GRP) GRP and WWF (Biofund) was directed at actual progress against each activity, with proposals for adaptive management (GRP) and increased funding sources (Biofund), with minimal reference to problems.

The M&E process in the project is weak. Given that \$39 000 was budgeted for the M&E component of the PMU for 2014 (excluding the MTR), funds were available for more strongly structured and integrated M&E processes.

3.3.8 Risk management (see section 3.1.2)

3.3.9 Reporting and communication

Reporting by the three IPs is conducted quarterly and annually, following GEF-UNDP formats. An overall annual report is compiled by the PMU on the basis of the three IP submissions. While reporting is a basic governance requirement, it also offers opportunities for promoting the relevance and successes of projects to stakeholders. It also provides the opportunity for feedback from the Board and stakeholders. The reports submitted by each IP differ in comprehensiveness, quality and relevance. In general, the project as a whole has done little to document its achievements. At a component level, both the Carr Foundation and WWF Biofund have done exemplary work in communication and marketing their activities.

The response to the reports by the Project Board and stakeholders appears to be very limited. At the 8th meeting of the Board, attended by the MTR, brief Annual Reports were tabled at the meeting, but had minimal substantive content and discussions focused on administrative problems rather than project results. There was no discussion of content, adaptive management responses or of lessons learned. From an analysis of the minutes of earlier Board meetings, it is apparent that quarterly and annual reports are not taken seriously, nor their results synthesized in terms of impact and lessons. All IPs and components have been advised to share their reports at least a week in advance, but this is not accomplished and limits discussion at the Board.

The PMU, in its self-evaluation, goes to considerable lengths to account for the delays that have occurred in its reporting. The delays, inter alia, are due to the resignation of the Technical Officer – which appears to have occurred in late 2012. It is not clear why the available full-time team (PM and PAA) could not take on the task of completing the rather brief reports required by UNDP in the absence of the TO. It is also mentioned that delays were caused due to changes in the formats of reports and changes in the opinions and requirements of UNDP project officials. These explanations seem to exaggerate the problems rather than simply ensuring, as the PMU, that good quality reports are prepared and submitted on time.

The reports from Carr Foundation (GRP) are perhaps rather brief, but they itemize progress against each output and activity in a quantified manner. Statistics are a little inconsistent, especially regarding the numbers of seedlings in production and actually planted, and improvement to the quantification of the re-forestation project is needed. Once the situation permits, an audit of the

nursery stock, of trees planted, and of fire-belts prepared, ranger days performed and patrol tracks opened should be undertaken. The planning and design of re-afforestation activities should be mapped out and trial plantations tested before large-scale plantings begin. UNDP guidance on social and environment impacts should be followed. The GRP has the resources and capacity to do this efficiently.

Reporting by the WWF/Biofund has been regular, comprehensive and widely distributed to stakeholders, as written reports and through oral presentations and even public events.

Communication between IPs and outwards from the PMU to the wider stakeholder community has been weak. The PMU pointed to the agreement, at the first Board meeting, that institutional representatives would communicate project results and issues both inwards and outwards. This was taken to mean that the PMU had no authority to take on a communications role. This is either a naïve or convenient excuse for the total lack of proper and effective communication – a responsibility clearly defined in the PM's TOR as described in the ProDoc. The PMU indicated that it had planned to develop a project website, but had not done so due to other pressures. A simple newsletter, emailed to all stakeholders, might be an adequate interim solution. At a more strategic design level, it is evident that the budget for communication and marketing in Component 1 is \$12 000 or less than 2% of the Component's total budget for 2014. However, even this would suffice for informal e-bulletin communication.

Both the GRP and Biofund have developed effective communication processes (pamphlets, events, community radio), but the link to the overall project is not clearly indicated. The absence of a unique project logo and identity is one of the projects major communications and marketing weaknesses.

3.3.10 Synergies with related projects, programmes and initiatives (See section 3.1.7)

3.4 Project results

3.4.1 Overall results

The results towards achievement of each component, output and indicator of the project have been discussed in detail in section 3.2 and in Annex 3. Here the more generic features of the project performance are described.

3.4.2 Relevance

The project is a key investment of the UNDP in relation to the GEF 4 Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity Focal Area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems', consistent with Strategic Programme 1 'Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level.' It is designed to reduce the huge funding gap of the Mozambique PA system and thus contribute to the country's conservation and socio-economic sustainability. Its success will provide models for wider application throughout the region, where tourism in PA systems plays a significant role in the national economies.

The national and institutional relevance of the project was recognized by the IPs at the first Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAP) meeting of September 2011. MITUR deemed it very relevant to the newly created ANAC, the establishment of which had been approved by government on 25 May 2011. WWF stated that the recently created Biofund strengthens the relevance of the project, while GRP recognized its importance to the recent inclusion of the area above 700 m altitude on Serra da Gorongosa within the National Park conservation area.

Despite the initial enthusiasm expressed by MITUR for the project, it is not obvious that ANAC appreciates the relevance and potential of the project as a mechanism to strengthen its capacity to achieve financial sustainability. The weak leadership given by DNAC/ANAC to the Project Board, and the lack of serious commitment to achieving the outputs agreed in the ProDoc for Components 1.1; 1.2; 1.3; and 3.2; and their substitution with other activities on a somewhat *ad hoc* basis, suggests that there exists a perceived lack of relevance for the project. It has perhaps become a soft option to fill funding gaps in ANAC activities that lack government funding sources.

3.4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

The ultimate effectiveness of the project will be measured on a basis of the improved revenue from a range of existing and new financial mechanisms, improving the cost-effectiveness of operational management costs through community-based partnership approaches and developing the financial planning and management capacity of protected area institutions.

At Mid-Term, few quantitative measures of effectiveness are available. None of the activities of Component 1 have been initiated, Component 2 has been disrupted by political instability, and Component 3 is still in the capitalization and concept communication mode. (The capitalization of Biofund, in December 2014, occurred after the MTR mission). This does not mean that outputs will not be achieved by end of project, but at the time of the MTR, cost-effectiveness, could not be quantitatively assessed.

From the foregoing discussions on MTR findings on project management and the lack of implementation of Component 1, it can only be concluded that the central management of the project has been weak. The same conclusion does not apply

to Components 2 and 3, which have, under difficult circumstances, and in areas of novel interventions, have demonstrated admirable efficiency.

3.4.4 Country ownership

The issue of country ownership of the project was addressed at the first meeting to the LPAC. Each IP recognized the importance of the project to reaching national goals of effective management of a representative system of protected areas as an integral part of the country's overall strategy to address the threats and root causes of biodiversity loss.

The MTR found an exceptional level of national commitment, pride and competence in nearly all project activities. Perhaps the greatest weakness is that the project lacks an easily recognized logo and name, which could add to a sense of national ownership.

3.4.5 Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming has a specific interpretation within the GEF – *'Biodiversity mainstreaming is the process of embedding biodiversity considerations into policies, strategies and practices of key public and private actors that impact or rely on biodiversity, so that it is conserved and sustainably and equitably used both locally and globally.'* <http://www.stapgef.org/mainstreaming-biodiversity-in-practice/>. Mainstreaming more broadly implies embedding environmentally responsible policies and practices into all walks of life. Experience reviewed by GEF-STAP over the past decade indicates that successful mainstreaming requires strong governance, strong institutions and strong leadership.

A key element of the mainstreaming process is legislation. Throughout the project preparation phase, active linkages were made with national legislation and national institutions. The replication approaches adopted in all components should serve to mainstream the lessons learned into other sectors. The purpose of Component 1 was to infuse the national system of PAs with a results-driven rather than an inputs-driven financial management philosophy, which could permeate beyond ANAC and across MITUR. The role of MICOA in its responsibility to oversee the implementation of both carbon sequestration and biodiversity offsets outputs, might be expected to have wider impact across the environmental activities coordinated by MICOA.

Mainstreaming, although a fundamental approach in UNDP projects, has not been fully embraced in this project. Mainstreaming is not a passive process, and unless there is a more focused effort to promote lessons learned beyond each project silo, the mainstreaming impact of the project will be limited. Perhaps this is more a reflection on biodiversity mainstreaming at national government level

being a relatively new concept, and like biodiversity offsets, the concept needs to be introduced into Mocambique through a national workshop. The concept of sustainable financing was introduced via a national workshop which in fact triggered the process leading to this project and to the establishment of the Biofund. So Mozambique is fertile ground for sowing new concepts.

3.4.6 Sustainability

The slow initiation of the project probably accounts for the absence of any discussion to date on financial, socio-economic, and environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results. Yet the core objective of the project is about sustainability. There is an urgent need to commence assessments of risks and mitigation approaches to the long-term legacy of the project and to define an exit strategy.

Financial and institutional sustainability is the central focus of the project's design. Financial data remain imprecise and trends in income and expenditure and the reduction in the funding gap cannot be determined with any accuracy at present. The outputs from Component 1.1 and 3.1, 3.2 should be used as a basis for a workshop of all IPs around financial sustainability. Similarly, the outputs of Component 1.2 can frame questions around institutional sustainability. These two legs will assist in framing discussions around the outputs of Components 2 and 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4.

It is noted that an early recommendation the Local Project Appraisal Committee was *'MITUR make every effort during project implementation to integrate PMU staff under state budget'*. The staff for the PMU were deployed from the existing MITUR staff, but paid by the project, without introducing new skills to the newly created ANAC. The value and impact of the project on ANAC needs further assessment, ideally following the workshops on sustainability suggested above.

Environmental sustainability is central to the outputs expected from Component 2.1 and 2.3. While these activities are under threat due to the security situation, once this has been removed the re-afforestation, wild fire management and soil erosion reduction activities can be resumed. The sound scientific basis on which species for re-afforestation have been selected, and the success of the initial nurseries and plantings indicate that the re-afforestation activity is well designed. The development of coffee plantations as a buffer to the forest margins for the gradual recovery of the indigenous forest flora is to be commended. However, due caution will be needed in the broader implementation of coffee production at scale. It is recommended that reference be made to the UNDP Environmental Safeguards.

Social sustainability is an outcome expected of Component 2. Impacts have already been demonstrated in the hands-on training – learning by doing – of the nursery and sustainable agricultural activities. Skills already learned by the

farmers in the Serra da Gorongosa are clear in the success of the nurseries. Further training in coffee and food crop production and marketing will follow. These expectations are at risk due to political and security threats that are outside of the control of the project. The proposed eco-tourism joint venture also has promise of social benefits, building on the broader success in tourism and community development attained by the GRP. The ProDoc and budget make provision for independent legal support for the community involved in the joint venture, to ensure due consultation and fair sharing of decision-making and of benefits arising from the project. The social benefits are less obvious for Components 1 and 3, but should the funding gap be reduced and the overall financial sustainability of the PA system secured, the social benefits for all stakeholders will be strengthened.

3.4.7 Impact

It is too early to speak of impact of the project in quantitative terms. The 24 indicators for the project activities are still too coarse to offer meaningful measures. In qualitative terms, there is no doubt that the overall GRP and WWF initiatives are introducing innovations that if successful will have great impact on the biodiversity conservation programme in Mozambique. With regard to Component 1, no results are available to suggest any impact.

3.5 Management arrangements

3.5.1 Overall project management

The roles and responsibilities for project management arrangements are detailed in the ProDoc. Prior to the establishment of the Project Board, the Local Project Appraisal Committee, at its first meeting in September 2011 agreed that the Project Management Unit (PMU) *'will ensure cohesion in the planning and implementation of activities in the three ProDocs. The PMU will be placed at MITUR. There will be a training session on the implementation procedures to all IPs. This training will ascertain how activities could be coordinated before the establishment of the PMU. However, the concerted planning and the common reporting system required for the 3 ProDocs will attenuate the risk of lack of coordination among IPs.'*

The LPAC goes on to record *'To avoid the risk of dispersed activities due to the project fragmentation into 3 documents and in order to minimize costs, a technical executive committee should be created. This committee should meet four times per year while the Board meets twice per year.'*

The ProDoc notes that *'the day-to-day administration of the project will be carried out by a Project Management Unit (PMU), comprising a Project Manager (PM), an Administrative Assistant (PAA) and a Project Technical Officer (PTO). The Project Management Unit (PMU) should ensure coordinated and timely inputs from the IPs.'*

The ProDoc was very clear on the broad responsibilities of the PMU and of the PM. In terms of qualifications, several key attributes were noted – *'At least 10 years of experience in business and/or natural resource planning and management (preferably in the context of protected area financial planning and management); Ability to effectively coordinate a large, multi-stakeholder project; Strong drafting, presentation and reporting skills'*

The demands on the PMU to manage a large multi-faceted collaborative project are significant and require strong support from all IPs, and particularly the Board. Furthermore, MITUR (through ANAC) has overall responsibility for the implementation of the project and is responsible for the direct implementation of a number of activities under Component 1 and 3 of the project.

The level of commitment and institutional capacity of MITUR to fulfil its leadership role during the formative years of the project appears to have been very weak. The situation has now changed with new leadership in ANAC, but it is clear that the level of capacity within the PMU does not match the expectations of the ProDoc. The absence of a Project Officer, and the late appointment of consultants and of the UNDP appointed Senior Project Advisor, have contributed to the problem, but many basic functions of the PMU could have been performed with the available team.

At a minimum, timely preparation and submission of quarterly reports, annual reports, work plans and some form of newsletter on project activities could be expected. The huge delays in preparation of TORs for consultants (clearly defined in the ProDoc appendices) and the superficial nature of quarterly reports submitted by the PMU (focusing on details of administrative tasks, not on project results) indicates that the training described in the LPAC was inadequate or simply did not happen. The role of the PMU as a coordinating and synthesising unit has not been evident. Linkages between IPs and stakeholders, a prime role of the PMU, have been weak or absent.

In all respects, the PMU has not met expectations and thus needs restructuring as described above in 3.3.2 to ensure delivery of its responsibilities. The restructuring process will need to follow normal organisational review processes, with the transfer of the PM and FA to suitable positions in the developing ANAC organisational structure. Simultaneously, the Project Board should lead the recruitment of a suitably qualified PM with proven project management and leadership skills, for appointment after consultation by IPs and UNDP. Similarly, a new FA will need to be selected from candidates with strong project financial management and accounting skills.

3.5.2 Quality of implementation by the Implementing Partners

The role and performance of the PMU has been discussed above (3.5.1). With regard to the other IPs, both the GRP and WWF have performed admirably. WWF took the decision to appoint a highly qualified and competent team to establish the Biofund, and the team's performance in preparing and implementing each component of its work plan has been excellent. The pilot projects led by WWF in carbon stock assessment and biodiversity offset policy and practice have been effective. Both activities need to be sustained to ensure continued impact.

Similarly, the GRP has attracted and retained highly competent advisors, field managers and community teams. Despite the security challenges that the GRP have faced, the implementation of their activities have been focused, effective and efficient, while observing care regarding the safety of their staff and stakeholders.

3.5.3 Quality of support and supervision by UNDP, including UNDP-GEF

The decision to follow a National Implementation Modality for this project places constraints on the level of direct engagement in project activities expected or possible from UNDP. It is apparent that UNDP was not consulted in the selection and appointment of the PMU team. UNDP's experience in the complexities of managing GEF projects would have been of relevance in the process. UNDP CO has, on several occasions, expressed its concerns regarding the poor performance of the PMU, but without any effective response from MITUR.

The role of the UNDP CO was emphasized by the RTA in the 2013 PIR – *'It will be important to ensure that the UNDP co-financing effectively realizes and that the UNDP CO can provide the adequate day-to-day oversight support to ensure that the project is served by the technical assistance it needs. In particular, this RTA recommends a full-time CTA to support the project, at least for 2 years. Thereafter, a part-time arrangement can be possible.'* The 2014 PIR reports that the *'UNDP team has made a good step forward on this by carrying out training on procedures for project management of projects funded by UNDP. In addition, to ensure a the project implementation in conformity with UNDP Guidelines regular meetings between WWF, BIOFUND, MITUR and UNDP involving technical and financial staff were carried out throughout the reporting period.'* However, the continued lack of progress in project reporting, timeous work plan development, financial reporting and disbursements as raised at the 8th meeting of the Project Board on 1 December 2014 indicates that even more training of the IPs in project administration is needed.

A Senior Project Advisor (SPA) was only appointed in July 2014, in a part-time capacity, and with limited opportunities to influence the performance of the PMU. The present PMU arrangements leave in doubt the chances of success of SPA interventions in this project.

It is unfortunate that a SPA was not appointed by UNDP at project start. The stated purpose of the SPA is to provide professional and technical 'backstopping' to the PM and PTO. The delayed appointment of a SPA places the SPA in a difficult position, as many of the weaknesses in the PMU have become institutionalized and will be difficult to remedy. The SPA must provide deeper technical leadership than mere 'backstopping'. The lack of any effort to integrate activities and results from the three IPs, and especially to translate the lessons learned from both IP and consultants' findings, by the PMU to date will need a concerted effort by the SPA to redress.

At a financial administration level, concerns were expressed by all IPs regarding the processes required by UNDP to expedite fund transfers. This might be an unfounded complaint, but there is clearly need for training to clarify each step, timeline and documentation needed for the disbursement process to avoid further frustrations. Continued guidance from UNDP will be needed.

With regard to the role of the UNDP-GEF, the RTA played a significant supportive role in developing the ProDoc, in leading the Inception Workshop, and in contributing to the two PIRs. Given the weaknesses in this project, it might be expected that further support from the UNDP-GEF will be needed, particularly in the use of the Project Results Framework as a management tool, in convening and facilitating the integration of project results, and in finalizing the Tracking Tools.

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

The conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned through the MTR process are summarized below, with greater detail being provided for each of the conclusions and recommendations relating to these in the table below the highlights.

In brief, it can be said that significant progress has been made in several project activities, most importantly in the establishment and recent capitalization of the Biofund, in community-based nurseries on Serra da Gorongosa, and in introducing new innovational concepts such as biodiversity offsets and measures of carbon stocks in natural ecosystems. Parallel to the project, the success of the Gorongosa Rehabilitation Project, where game numbers in the country's protected area icon have increased dramatically in the past ten years, underpins the optimism and national pride that many Mozambican conservation professionals have today.

None of these advances will have major impacts on the core ‘sustainable financing’ objective of the project, however, as deep systemic challenges remain. In the two years remaining before project conclusion, the project leadership must implement radical actions to address the weaknesses in overall project management, and in capacity building and financial administration and reporting systems within the target institution – ANAC.

At MTR, no formal request for the extension beyond project end at December 2016 had been made, although informal suggestions of an extension to Components 1 and 2 were heard. The MTR does not recommend any extensions. However, any extension to Component 1 must be conditional on the total overhaul of the PMU. This overhaul must in fact be undertaken as an active adaptive strategy lead by the Board as an urgent priority.

It is important to emphasize that the project is part of a process, not an end in itself. It therefore seeks to ‘contribute’ and to ‘strengthen’ capacity and sustainability – and is not expected to deliver full capacity in financial sustainability per se. However, it will have limited impact if the central focus of the project – financial sustainability – is neglected in pursuit of more immediate and operational activities.

4.1 Strengths, challenges and opportunities

Strengths

- A very detailed and well-prepared ProDoc and Project Results Framework provides guidance to all aspects of the project’s implementation.
- Strong co-financing and collaboration with similar initiatives that expand the impact of the project, e.g. USFS; Blue Forests; USAID; BBOP; etc.
- Innovative approaches to achieving core objectives through exploring community-based ecosystem management, assessing carbon trading baselines and biodiversity offset concepts and practice.
- Strong leadership in components 2 and 3 leading to progress despite challenges.
- Adaptive management in component 2 under a difficult security situation.
- Good to Very Good Consultant’s Reports providing guidance and ‘road maps’.
- Enthusiasm, pride and competence of most participants.
- The recent dramatic recovery of wildlife population numbers in Gorongosa National Park, although not resulting from the project’s intervention, demonstrates the potential of the Mozambican PA system under effective management.

Challenges and opportunities

- Lack of an actively shared common vision around 'sustainable financing' as the core objective of the project.
- Lack of regular integration across components that results in three independent 'silos'.
- Lack of a clear and recognizable identity and ownership of the overall project through project 'champions'.
- The ProDoc is in some respects too ambitious and too detailed, and each output needs a more achievable focus.
- Inadequate reference to Indicators in reporting and a need for the revision of un-measurable indicators.
- Project Management Unit weaknesses have been neglected by MITUR and need urgent strengthening and restructuring.
- Complex procurement and fund transfer processes need specific training and the commitment of IPs to submit complete documentation timeously to resolve delays in disbursements.
- The Logframe and Key Results Framework and Tracking Tools, especially PA financial data, must be used at least once a year as a project management tool through a workshop of all IPs.
- The security situation in the Gorongosa District, although stabilized, has had a negative impact on tourism numbers visiting this and other PAs, with serious impacts on income streams and employment opportunities.
- The potential for any overlap in activities between the new World Bank funded MozBio project and the current project must be avoided and synergies created.

4.2 Lessons learned

- An excellent ProDoc, but one that is highly ambitious, does not automatically guarantee project success.
- ProDoc development must be country driven – not consultant driven.
- Due-diligence assessment of all Implementation Partners is essential at start of project and any weaknesses identified and addressed.
- The National Implementation Modality does not work in countries with weak institutions. Due-diligence of national institutions needs to assess human resource capacities for project management as well as legislative responsibilities and processes.
- Stakeholder and Implementing Partners must commit to focal objectives and avoid opportunistic deviations from agreed project outputs and activities.
- Committed, passionate and competent leadership is needed with strong champions in both government and civil society.
- Project Management is not the same as Project Administration and requires special skills, commitment and professionalism.
- Difficult decisions are the responsibility of the Board and must not be neglected.

4.3 High Level Recommendations

- The Board must meet quarterly to ensure adequate project management and performance monitoring using the Project Results Framework as a guide.
- The Project Management Unit must be restructured with strengthened leadership arrangements.
- Training of the ANAC leadership and administration teams in financial management and project management must be focused and regular.
- A facilitated workshop of key IPs and stakeholders must be convened to develop a shared understanding of the project objective and intended outputs, using the Logframe and Tracking Tools as integrative project management tools.
- The extension of project by one year to compensate for the slow start is possible, but should be conditional on the restructuring of the PMU to ensure effective completion of component 1 activities and the integration of the three components into a whole greater than the sum of the parts.
- The lack of a recognizable identity and the documentation and communication of the project's achievements must be addressed.

4.4 Detail of Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion	Recommendation
<i>Project strategy and design</i>	
1. The ProDoc is an excellent document providing a systematic, logical and potentially coherent design – linking three separate components with a common objective.	<i>1. The project needs to be 'country driven' – not 'ProDoc driven'. The critical weaknesses – the lack of a visible national champion within the Board or PMU, and a recognizable identity for the project, are clear barriers to success – and need to be addressed.</i>
2. The early decision to split the project into three separate ProDocs had the unintended consequence of splitting it into three separate projects, without emphasis of a clear common vision, without a shared commitment and without a nationally recognized identity. This division into three 'silos' has had negative impacts not anticipated during the project's preparation.	<i>2. While it is rather late in the project programme, a concerted effort needs to be made to draw all participants together to share the common vision and goals of this large investment by UNDP and the project partners. Such a process would need to be implemented through a workshop with careful structure and facilitation, which could best be achieved around the review of project Logframe and Scorecards. Although these instruments might appear dull and boring, a proper understanding of their integrative potential and their imaginative application, could provide powerful tools to communicate the cross-</i>

Conclusion	Recommendation
	<i>component benefits of the project.</i>
3. The ProDoc is in some respects too ambitious and too detailed, and each output needs a more achievable focus.	<i>3. The workshop described in #2 should revise the description of some indicators.</i>
4. The delays in project start-up between project conception (2008) and start-up (2012) were much longer than for similar GEF projects. These delays were due to institutional changes, specifically in the slow process of transition from DNAC to ANAC and to changes in leadership in partner institutions. Delays in implementation continued after project start due to weaknesses in the PMU.	<i>4. From the time of establishing a well-funded PMU in early 2012, the delays have been due to weaknesses in project management capacity and the lack of response from MITUR to address the situation, despite requests for action from UNDP. This topic is discussed further under section 3.3.2. Both Components 1 and 2 have informally requested extensions to the duration of the project. Whether an extension for any of the three components is justified needs to be reviewed by the Board.</i>
5. The project should be seen as part of a process, not an end in itself. It therefore seeks to 'contribute' and to 'strengthen' capacity and sustainability – not deliver full capacity of financial sustainability per se.	<i>5. The expectation of establishing a set of robust and financially sustainable results within the timeframe of the project is unrealistic and should be considered in any response to the MTR evaluation.</i>
6. The project has initiated several highly innovative approaches to achieving greater financial sustainability. Each of these will have lead-times much longer than the project's duration, and each comes with significant risks.	<i>6. The continued investment in the three innovations – community-based reforestation and eco-tourism, carbon trading, and offset mechanisms - should be encouraged through other funding after the end of this project.</i>
Project management arrangements	
7. The assumption that the National Implementation Modality would be appropriate for this complex, multi-disciplinary project was incorrect. The assumption probably extended to the expectation that a full capacity assessment/due-diligence audit of each Implementing Partner would be undertaken.	<i>7. The Board should undertake a radical review of the project management structure of the project. If the project is to be extended for an additional year (to end 2017), this should be conditional on an early solution being implemented to the project leadership arrangements.</i>
8. Lack of a clear and recognizable identity and ownership of the overall project through 'champions'	<i>8. The Board chair should become the project champion, and a suitable logo designed to identify all project documents.</i>
9. The perceived complexity of the procurement and disbursement policies in ANAC (GoM) and UNDP are a source of delays in implementation	<i>9. ANAC and UNDP should undertake further training of the financial managers of each IP, and should provide a template of dates, reporting</i>

Conclusion	Recommendation
and need resolution. Delays are due to lack of compliance with standard process requirements rather than complexity.	<i>requirements and governance processes that can be monitored as part of the person's performance assessment.</i>
10. Proactive, collaborative and coherent planning as such does not exist within the project as a whole. Each component has its own, individual work planning process. Conceptual inputs to the planning process, building on the consultants' reports from the PPG and from on-going consultant activities, do not exist.	<i>10. The workshop recommended in #2 should build around the Logframe but also integrate lessons learned from each component, to develop the conceptual model of 'sustainable financing' into an way of thinking – not just a set of separate activities.</i>
11. The Board initially met regularly, but more recently it has met infrequently and with diminishing interest from stakeholders. The discussion has focused entirely on administrative issues – mainly on problems with reporting processes or financial disbursements. In particular, the response to the reports by the Project Board and stakeholders appears to be very is limited.	11. The success of Board meetings is largely dependent on the structure and content of its agenda. The agenda should be prepared and distributed at least 10 days before meetings, and should include discussion points that go beyond mere administrative issues. A standing item on the agenda should be monitoring of each component's performance, using the UNDP PIR Rating Scale as a guide.
12. The lack of a clear and shared understanding of the core project objective and strategy has resulted in some rather ad hoc management decisions having been taken within Component 1.	12. Financial allocations should be determined on the criteria of the Logframe, not on opportunistic responses to short-term needs of IPs.
Stakeholder Participation	
13. Participation by civil society, either represented by NGOs, or by intended beneficiaries (such as the Gorongosa community), has been weak. Communication with stakeholders has been weak.	<i>13. The PMU should play a central and supportive role in developing and maintaining contact and communication between all project stakeholders. A simple newsletter, emailed to all stakeholders, might be an adequate interim solution.</i>
14. While all the projects remain male dominated, gender has not been a barrier for entry. Women have participated in all activities, including the physically challenging field research on mangrove carbon stock assessment, nursery development and occupy leadership positions in WWF, Biofund and UNDP.	<i>14. Each IP should maintain a log of gender participation in its various activities (project management, workshops, field work) as a primary information source. More importantly, it should report on how gender issues are being addressed in its activities.</i>

Conclusion	Recommendation
Project results	
15. The overall rating for progress towards meeting the project's Development Objectives as assessed by the MTR is 'Moderately Satisfactory'.	<i>15. The UNDP Rating criteria are strict. Each IP should become familiar with the definitions and direct their activities to improving ratings with each PIR. Poor ratings have been due mostly to the weaknesses within the PMU - which in turn result from weak procurement processes.</i>
16. Reporting quality has been mixed. Reports should focus on progress towards each outcome, not problems of project management.	<i>16. Project reports must be concise but focused on project progress towards each output, measured against indicators, and relevant to the core objective of the project.</i>
17. Capacity building within ANAC, which has been very generously budgeted, has been almost non-existent. The single training course organized by the PMU was very short, very general and very superficial.	<i>17. The PMU should be required to prepare a focused financial management training programme for ANAC personnel for early implementation and ongoing monitoring of impact. Funds allocated for non-core activities should be transferred to this key priority.</i>
18. The Quarterly reports from GRP are perhaps rather brief, but they itemize progress against each output and activity in a quantified manner. Statistics are a little inconsistent, especially regarding the numbers of seedlings in production and actually planted, and improvement to the quantification of the re-afforestation project is needed.	<i>18. Where data can be collected for both baselines and monitoring, these data should be improved with each successive report. Consolidation of data, and correction of prior inaccurate data should be reported.</i>
19. The proposal to transfer the eco-tourism Joint Venture to the Panga Panga entrance is supported.	<i>19. It will be important that the guidance provided in the ProDoc be followed in developing and negotiating this Joint-Venture at Panga Panga with the Nhambita community. Funds are also available in the UNDP budget for the support of an independent legal advisor to assist the community in the negotiation process, which in turn should follow UNDP guidance on social and environmental impacts.</i>
20. The progress with community nurseries for indigenous tree planting on Serra da Gorongosa is commended.	<i>20. Before the coffee production expands to scale, it will be important to conduct an assessment following UNDP</i>

Conclusion	Recommendation
The proposed pilot testing of coffee production is also supported.	<i>environmental safeguard requirements.</i>
21. The appointment of a consultant to mobilize Component 1.1 and 3.2 is commended. The activities in both sub-components (as described in the ProDoc) include a significant and essential investment in training of ANAC personnel. This is not clear in the consultant's TOR.	<i>21. Training and mentoring in financial management, plus on-going evaluation of impacts, must be part of Component 1.1 and 3.2 outputs.</i>
22. The slow initiation of the project probably accounts for the absence of any discussion to date on financial, socio-economic, and environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results.	<i>22. The Board, assisted by the PMU, should design a project exit strategy to ensure the long-term legacy of the project.</i>

5. Annexes

(annexes 3, 5 & 6 submitted separately)

Annex 1. UNDP-GEF Project: Mid-Term review Terms of Reference

Project UNDP-GEF PIMS 3938 Mozambique PA Finance

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-size projects, financed by GEF and implemented with UNDP, need to undergo a mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal evaluation (TE). This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

These Terms of Reference (TOR) outline the expectations to the MTR for the project in question. The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

Project Title		Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique	
GEF Project ID (PMIS):	3753	PIF Approval Date	Nov 2008
UNDP GEF PIMS:	3938	CEO Endorsement Date	20-Aug-2010
ATLAS Business Unit Award # Proj. IDs:	MOZ10	PRODOC Signature Dates	
IP MITUR:	00060497 / 00076184	IP MITUR:	14-Dec-2011
IP GRP:	00062665 / 00080154	IP GRP:	03-Dec-2011
IP WWF:	00062668 / 00080157	IP WWF:	05-Dec-2011
Country(ies):	Mozambique	Date project manager hired:	01-Nov-2012
Region:	Africa	Inception Workshop date:	19-Nov 2012
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Planned planed closing date:	Sep-2015
Trust Fund	GEF TF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	31-Dec-2016 (as per ProDocs)
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective	BD-SP1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level	First PIR produced	2013
		Last PIR concluded	Oct 2013
Exec. Agent / Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) (CSO) Gorongosa Restoration Project (CSO) WWF (World Wildlife Fund)		
Other Partners:	BIOFUND Carr Foundation		

Project financing	<i>at CEO endorsement stage</i>	<i>at mid-term stage*</i>
[1] GEF financing:	\$4,850,000	\$1,061,606.82
[2] UNDP contribution:	\$200,000	\$45,392.91
[3] Government:	\$500,000	to be assessed by MTR
[4] Other partners:	\$13,168,190	to be assessed by MTR
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	\$14,118,190	to be assessed by MTR
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	\$18,968,190	to be assessed by MTR

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

The national system of protected areas of Mozambique covers a total area of some 13,941,800 ha (>17% of the national territory), of which 360,900 ha are marine and 13,580,900 ha terrestrial.

Currently the funding baselines for protected areas, and the capacities to administer and improve protected area revenue streams, are well below the levels required to ensure that the protected area system properly serves its function as an important tool to protect biodiversity. The project will thus seek to achieve a catalytic investment in securing the long-term financial sustainability of Mozambique's protected areas.

At the PA systemic level (the first component), the project will support the Government of Mozambique in developing a financial plan to direct the long-term sustainable financing of the protected area system. It will then strengthen the institutional and individual capacities of the protected area institution/s to implement this financial plan by: (i) supporting the strategic and business planning processes in protected area institutions; and (ii) improving the financial management processes and systems in PA institutions. The project will then support the integration of the national and institutional financial sustainability plans into the business and management planning of individual protected areas. It is envisaged that the development of a generic business plan template and preparation guidelines will enable the future replication of the business planning approach across the entire system of protected areas. Since the project's inception, there were important institutional changes, in particular the establishment, in 2013, of the National Conservation Areas Administration (ANAC). The entity assumed responsibility for component 1.

A second component of the project, was slated to identify opportunities for potential cost savings in protected area management by evaluating the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnership approaches in and around Gorongosa Mountain in the Gorongosa National Park. In 2008, the Government of Mozambique and the US-based Carr Foundation announced that they had signed a 20-year agreement to restore and co-manage the park, which is assigned to CSO Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP). GRP is accessing GEF funding through the project to develop knowledge from the implementation of different community-based partnerships, so as to contribute to the global, regional and national evidence base of the cost-effectiveness of different types of community-based partnerships. Since 2012, there has been however insecurity in the Gorongosa zone, possibly threatening the Park's tourism potential. A reassessment of the way forward is needed.

Finally, the project will test and develop mechanisms for increasing income from conventional financial sources for protected areas (trust fund, user fees) and developing innovative alternatives means of revenue generation (carbon payments and biodiversity offsets. The lessons learnt from the implementation of pilot carbon and biodiversity offset initiatives will guide the future adoption and operationalisation of these revenue-generating mechanisms across the national system of protected areas). WWF has been responsible for the implementation of this third component, through which the establishment of a national conservation trust fund (BIOFUND) is a key result. BIOFUND would then assume in due course the responsibility for implementing key activities under the third component.

The project was designed to generally improve the sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, by approaching the issue of costs, revenues, flow of funds and how these are to be dynamically balanced to make a more effective contribution to biodiversity conservation.

Project Objective: To strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's protected area system, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between private, NGO and community stakeholders.

Expected Outcomes:

- Component 1: Sustainability of the protected area system institutionalized
- Component 2: Co-management models in demonstration sites
- Component 3: Business planning and revenue generation

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

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

The purpose of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress made by the project so far. The MTR will identify potential problems inherent in the project design; to assess progress towards achieving its objectives; to identify and document lessons learned (including those that can improve the design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects); and to make recommendations for specific measures that can be taken to improve the project and/or its management.

The MTR provides an opportunity to assess early signs of success or failure of the project and propose the necessary adjustments.

The MTR should significantly assist the project in formulating useful and feasible recommendations for a more strategic, focused and results-oriented project implementation. It will also independently validate the level of achievement of key project indicators, as well as the level of co-financing realization and the project's contribution to focal area outcomes through the tracking tools.

The mid-term review process is initiated by UNDP and aims to rectify the course of the project in order for it to perform better and to achieve its objectives cost effectively.

As an integral part of the project cycle, the MTR will analyse its achievements in the light of its original goals. It will consider the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project. It will also identify factors that facilitated or impeded progress towards achieving the project objectives. In order to correct the course of the project, the MTR should address issues related to performance, project design, strategy, the quality of project reports, of its intellectual production and the efficacy of its Monitoring & Evaluation system.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, in line with relevant policies.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex F](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. While it is important to conduct a rigorous and up to date assessment of the progress of the project implementation, the MTR should also result in a set of practical recommendations for the project's main stakeholders and lessons learned to help define the future direction of the project.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the project team, beneficiaries, government counterparts (in particular the implementing partner and the GEF operational focal point), UNDP Country Office, the UNDP GEF Technical Adviser and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Maputo. In other circumstances, a visit to Gorongosa National Park would be envisaged, but at current stage, this needs approval from UN Department of Security. Interviews will be held with the following institutions, organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Tourism (MITUR), Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA), Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), National Directorate for Administration of Protected Areas (ANAC), Gorongosa Restoration Project (the Carr Foundation), WWF Mozambique, Biodiversity Conservation Foundation (BioFund), and other stakeholders involved into Biodiversity/Conservation field.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal/policy documents, and any other

materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A non-exhaustive list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

Other specific tasks that are expected by the MTR team includes:

- (1) A critical review of the GEF focal area tracking tools for the project. The tracking tool forms which will be completed by the project team (the Financial Scorecard by the BIOFUND/WWF team and the METT by the GRP team) prior to the MTR mission. The review must include comparison with tracking tool results at the baseline stage. The role of the MTR will be to validate project achievements expressed through the GEF focal area tracking tools at mid-term and identify any issues linked to topics covered by the tools.

Validate the level of co-financing mobilization by the project. The analysis will consist of comparing, for each of the co-financiers, the amounts committed at project approval stage, to the likelihood of these commitments to materializing at project end, and to the current level of disbursement. Amounts mobilized after project approval will also be included in the analysis. Detailed and summary tables are to be completed as per [Annex D](#).

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

6. MID TERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

Table 1.

Deliverable*	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
MTR Inception Report	Review team clarifies timing and method of review	No later than 1 week before the start of the review mission	Review team submits to UNDP Country Office (CO)
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of review mission	Project management unit and UNDP Country Office
Draft Final Report	Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, Project Unit, GEF OFP and the key projects stakeholder, in particular the implementing partners, the co-financiers and project board members
Final Report	Revised report with a response matrix detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO.

Deliverable*	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
	review report.		

* Deliverables will be in English, with the exception of the Presentation of Initial Findings, which needs be translated into Portuguese by the MTR Team. UNDP will engage translating services for both the draft and final versions of the report.

7. TEAM COMPOSITION

The MTR team will be composed of one international consultant, to be selected from the UNDP GEF EBD approved roster. This consultant will then include in his/her proposal, the sub-contracting of a national evaluator to be part of the team.

The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The international evaluator will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the following technical areas:
 - Biodiversity conservation, protected area management, policies and planning
 - Finance; specific experience in conservation finance is a plus
 - Institutional development and capacity building, in particular with respect to the environment sector.
- For the international consultant: ability to read and understand Portuguese and to speak it at minimal at working level.
- For the national consultant: ability to read and speak English at working level,

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP CO in Mozambique.

The UNDP CO will contract the selected team of evaluators through an individual contract issued to the international consultant. The contract will apply a lump-sum approach and should cover both the consultancy fees for the team, travel costs (tickets and per diem). It will be the responsibility of the international consultant to sub-contract the national consultant.

The CO and Project Teams will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange a field visit (if security permits), coordinate with the Government etc., UNDP GEF and others.

9. TIME FRAME

Although the lump-sum approach to contracting will apply, UNDP expects the number of time worked by each consultant to cover approximately 5 weeks for entire MTR. This does not include the time needed for UNDP CO to complete the translation of the Draft report, which will likely take 2-3 weeks. In this light, the total duration of the MTR will be according to the following plan:

Table 2.

Activity	Approximate timing	Preferred starting date	Target completion Date
Preparation, concluding with inception report	1 week	From contract signature	02 May 2014
Evaluation Mission	2 weeks	04 May 2014 (travel day out)	16 May 2014 (last working day in country)
Workshop on preliminary findings	(1 day during mission)	Thu 15 May 2014	
Draft Evaluation Report	5-10 working days	19 May 2014	02 Jun 2014
<i>Translation of Draft report (no working days for consultants)</i>	<i>2 weeks</i>	<i>02 Jun 2014</i>	<i>16 Jun 2014</i>
<i>Dissemination of draft report among stakeholders (no working days for consultants)</i>	<i>3-4 weeks</i>	<i>16 Jun 2014</i>	<i>07 Jul 2014</i>
Final Report	1 week	07 Jul 2014	14 Jul 2014

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MRT report
30%	Following submission and acceptance (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply via email, in response to the **Invitation to Submit an Offer with respect to the MID-TERM REVIEW process for the UNDP GEF project “Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique”**, following instructions contained in the invitation letter.

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment, including total fee, per diem and travel costs.

12. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

ANNEX C. RATING SCALE

ANNEX D. CO-FINANCING MATRIX

ANNEX E: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Review Report

ANNEX F. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

ANNEX G. EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

TOR ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPD: More efficient use of available resources to promote equitable and sustainable economic development
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: <i>Increased equitable economic opportunities to ensure sustainable livelihoods for both men and women.</i>
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Result Area: (according to the project's objective)
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: SO 1 - Catalyzing the sustainability of protected areas; SP 1 Sustainable financing of protected area (PA) systems at the national level
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: SP 1 - PA systems secure increased revenue and diversification of revenue streams to meet total expenditures required to meet management objectives; Reduction in financing gap to meet PA management objectives
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: SP 1 - Total revenue and diversification in revenue streams

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective Strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of Mozambique's Protected Area System, including financial sustainability, through working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders	1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	21%	>45%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Government maintains its current financial allocations to PA institutionsDonor agencies sustain current levels of funding support to PAsCurrent levels of revenues generated from use of protected areas is maintainedModels of PA co-management with private foundations and donor agencies are continued Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">BIOFUND fails to attract capital investmentPolitical and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation AreasThe legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 46% Institutional: 46% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 60% Institutional: 55% Individual: 50%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	3. Total budget (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$14.9 million (as at 2008/9)	US\$18.9 million ¹	Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement. Audited reports of donor-funded projects.	
	4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>10	Annual financial reports of MITUR, MINAG, MPescas and Protected Areas under co-management agreement	
Outcome 1 Sustainability of the Protected Area System institutionalized	Outputs: 1.1 A Financial Plan for Mozambique's system of conservation areas is adopted 1.2 A Strategic Plan for the National Administration of Conservation Areas directs the piloting of business planning processes in conservation areas 1.3 Financial management processes and systems in the National Administration of Conservation Areas are strengthened				
	5. Financial plan for system of protected areas adopted by government	No	Yes	Recommendation of CONDES Annual Report of MITUR/MICOA	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Financial data for the different categories of protected areas is made available

¹ No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	6. Achievement (%) of performance targets detailed in the PA agency's Annual Performance Plan	No plan	60%	Annual Report of PA agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– The PA agency regularly prepares accurate annual reports and is independently audited. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas– The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	7. Number of protected areas with business plans that enable the sourcing of adequate funds for the implementation of PA management plan	3	8	Annual Report of PA agency	
	8. Ratio of human resource to operational costs in PA agency	PA agency still to be established	60:40 (human resource: operating costs)	Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency	
	9. Number of protected area staff completing in-house specialized financial management training and skills development programmes	0	Specialized: 5 General: 40	Annual Report of PA agency	
	10. Recruitment of staff to approved posts in the organogram of new PA agency (% of posts with staff appointed)	0	75%	Annual Report of PA agency	
	11. % of audit queries adequately resolved by PA agency	N/A	>80%	Audited Financial Report of PA agency	
Outcome 2 Co-management models in demonstration sites	Outputs: 2.1 The extent of deforestation on Gorongosa Mountain is contained, and reforestation and rehabilitation activities are expanded 2.2 A joint venture tourism enterprise on the lower slopes of Gorongosa Mountain provides an alternative source of income for local communities 2.3 Improved productivity and sustainability of cultivated areas in the lowlands incentivises local farmers to abandon slash-and-burn farming practices on Gorongosa Mountain				
	12. Number of native tree species planted on the Gorongosa Mountain slopes	15,000 ²	80,000	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Carr Foundation, and other donors, sustain current levels of funding and operational support to GNP– The District Administration and local communities actively support project initiatives
	13. Total area (as a % of the original extent) of evergreen forest on Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m) deforested	36% ³	<36%	Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing	

² Data from 2009 and first trimester of 2010

³ Data from 2008

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	14. Number of agriculture clearings (<1ha in extent) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m)	8504	<100	Aerial photography, satellite imagery and ground truthing	<p>to protect evergreen forests on Gorongosa Mountain</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The legal processes for the expansion of GNP are not concluded timeously, resulting in delays to the implementation of activities in and around Gorongosa Mountain – Local communities living in the buffer areas around Gorongosa Mountain are unable to conclude and maintain co-management, partnership or Joint Venture agreements with the GRP
	15. Cost of enforcement and compliance in the proposed GNP expansion area (USD/km2/year)	185	>100	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	
	16. Number of community-based rangers employed by GNP	15	30	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report	
	17. Number of wildfires (>1 km2) in the Gorongosa Mountain (above 700m)	63	20	Aerial photography and satellite imagery	
	18. Average monthly household income of the Canda, Sandjungira and Tambara communities (US\$)	16-75	75-150	Data from National Institute of Statistics and Gorongosa SDAE	
	19. Number of employed community members in reforestation activities and tourism ventures	59	220	GNP Annual Report and audited Financial Report. Audited Financial Report of JV	
	20. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Gorongosa National Park	65%	>72% ⁴	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)	
Outcome 3 Business planning and revenue generation	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 A conservation trust fund is established, effectively administered and capitalised</p> <p>3.2 The income from user fees in national parks, national reserves and marine reserves is improved</p> <p>3.3 The development of a pilot carbon sequestration project in the mangrove forests of a coastal conservation area is catalysed</p> <p>3.4 The potential for funding conservation areas from the implementation of biodiversity offset and compensation mechanisms is assessed</p>				
	21. Capitalization of BIOFUND by donors/funders (US\$ committed)	US\$5.6m	US\$20m	BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The National REDD strategy is developed and adopted by government – A proportion of income from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration can be 'ring-fenced' for reinvestment back into protected areas
	22. Annual revenues generated from protected areas user fees (including concession income) (US\$)	US\$1,680,992 ⁵	>US\$2.5m ⁶	Annual Report and audited Financial Report of PA agency	

⁴ Includes the additional areas incorporated into the GNP

⁵ Of this amount, only 64% is however retained for re-investment in protected areas (20% is returned to the provincial state budget and 16% distributed to local communities)

⁶ No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	23. Average annual revenue generated for protected areas from biodiversity offsets and carbon sequestration (US\$)	US\$0	>US\$100,000	Project Implementation Reports	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BIOFUND fails to attract capital investment – Political and institutional conflicts delay the establishment of the new National Administration of Conservation Areas – The legislation does not adequately provide for the implementation of a number of potential PA financing mechanisms
	24. Annual average value of grants from BIOFUND to protected areas for operational and capital development costs	US\$0	US\$500,000	BIOFUND audited Annual Financial Report	

TOR ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document (complete with ancillary documentation)
- Inception Report
- Annual and quarterly work plans
- Quarterly progress reports
- Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's)
- Other monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Audit reports
- Focal Area Tracking Tools
- Mission reports and lessons learnt studies
- Previous evaluations
- Any studies prepared with project funds or related to the project
- Country Programme Document, UNDAF and other related documents

Public link to key documents: <https://www.dropbox.com/l/vag9DiTMZnABkEViDZA6zc?>

TOR ANNEX C. RATING SCALE

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

TOR ANNEX D. CO-FINANCING MATRIX

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

3a. Detailed matrix

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount disbursed at midterm	Amount likely to materialize at project end
Multilat. Agency	KfW - German Development Bank	In-Kind	210,000	<i>MTR to complete</i>	<i>MTR to complete</i>
Bilat. Agencies	AFD - French Development Agency	Grant	5,600,000		
NGO	WWF Mozambique	In-Kind	272,510		
NGO	WWF US	In-Kind	245,680		
NGO	Carr Foundation / Gorongosa Restoration Project	In-Kind (actually investments)	6,840,000		
Nat'l Gov't	MITUR	In-Kind	500,000		
Impl. Agency	UNDP Mozambique	Grant	200,000		
TOTAL			13,868,190		

3b. Summary matrix

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP's own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agencies (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants or cash co-finance								
Loans/Concessions								
- In-kind support								
- Other								
Totals								

TOR Annex E: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Review Report⁷

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Review time frame and date of review report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Review team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Review Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁸)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the review
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the review report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁹)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Progress toward Results and Capacity Building
 - Attainment of project targets (as per the project's logframe) (*)
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national counterparts (if applicable)
- 3.3 Implementation and Adaptive Management:
 - Work planning
 - Adaptive management approach (changes introduced to project design due to changing circumstances)
 - Innovation
 - Socio-economic benefits generated, including gender aspects
 - Approach to partnerships
 - Project finance and co-finance
 - Monitoring systems
 - Risk management
 - Reporting
 - Synergies with related projects, programmes and initiatives
- 3.4 Project Results
 - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 3.5 Management Arrangements:
 - Overall project management
 - Quality of implementation by the Implementing Partners

⁷The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁸ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁹ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings eTABLE OF CONTENTSxplanations.

- Quality of support and supervision provided by UNDP, including UNDP-GEF
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes
 - ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard)
 - Co-financing table

TOR ANNEX F. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

TOR ANNEX G. EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹⁰

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at place on date

Signature: _____

¹⁰www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 2. Programme and Persons Interviewed

Date/ day	Time	Person	Institution	Topic
30 Oct, Thu	19h00	Fabiana Isler	UNDP RTA	MTR process
17 Nov, Mon	15h00	Bartolomeu Soto	ANAC Dir. Gen.	MTR process
17 Nov, Mon	18h00	Charlotte Gobin	World Bank	CTFs
19 Nov, Wed	09h00	JHB-Maputo		
	11h00	Nadia Vaz, Janeiro Avelino, Matthias Naab	UNDP CO UNDP CD	MTR process Project history
	14h00	Raimundo Matusse,	PMU PM	MTR process, Prodoc, coordination of project
20 Nov, Thu	09h00	Luis Honwana, Alexandra Jorge, Celeste Chitara, Rito Mabunda	Biofund CEO WWF	MTR process, progress reports, consultants' reports
	12h00	Greg Carr, Vasco Galante	GRP	GRP background Flight to Gorongosa,
	15h00	Pedro Muagura, Mike Marchington	GRP	Logistics and meeting arrangements
	16h00	Pedro Muagura	GRP	Field study of habitat and wildlife populations
21 Nov, Fri	15h00	Pedro Muagura, Quinton Haarhoff,	GRP	Field visit and discussions on Park management processes, law enforcement, community relations, etc.
	16h00	Giacomo Cozzolino	UNDP	Discussions of approach to field visit and interviews
22 Nov, Sat	07h00	Pedro Muagura, Adolfo Macadona,	GRP agriculture and	Visits to forest tree nurseries on Serra

Date/ day	Time	Person	Institution	Topic
		Rui Sousa, Quinton Haarhoff	re-afforest- ation team	da Gorongosa and lower slopes, and meetings with teams on Serra da Gorongosa - Murombedzi, Nyankoko, Canda, Nhamadzi, Fundusi
	16h00	Galicio Antonio Viola Cerdilisa	Chefe do Posto, Nhamadzi Chefe do Posto, Vundusi	Discussions on Government support for community involvement in Gorongosa restoration project through improved agriculture and re- afforestation
	17h00	Herculano Ernesto	GRP Community Education Centre	Visit to CEC and facilities and programme activities
	18h00	Quinton Haarhoff	GRP Agriculture Advisor	Detailed discussions on Serra da Gorongosa rehabilitation and alternative agriculture projects and community involvement
23 Nov, Sun	08h00	Greg Carr	GRP Founder	Proposal on new siting of community partnership eco- tourism centre, including field inspection
	10h00	Mike Marchington Mateus Mutemba	GRP Director of Operations GNP Warden	Discussions on UNDP reporting and financial management systems Discussion of MTR process
24 Mon	06h30	Sean Nazerali	Consultant Verde Azul	Discussion on history of project; carbon; offsets

Date/ day	Time	Person	Institution	Topic
	07h00	Sergio	Researcher	Visit E O Wilson laboratories
	08h30	Depart for Beira		
25 Tues	19h45	Write-up Depart Beira		
26 Weds	08h15 10h00	Write-up Anabela Rodrigues	WWF- Mozambique	Discuss transfer of biofund; carbon; Mapping for offsets
	18h30	Fabiana Isler	UNDP	
27 Thu	10h00	Celeste at Biofund		Carbon project; Offsets
	12h00	Giacomo Cozzolino;		LogFrame performance
28 Fri	08h00	Almeida Siteo	UEM, Faculdade de Agronomia, Sala do CEAGRE.	Mapping of habitats for Offsets project
	10h00 12h30	Raimundo Matusse Bartolomeu Soto	PMU ANAC	Development of project; ANAC's role
	14h00 18h00	Nadia Vaz Fabiana Issler	UNDP UNDP RTA	Presentation of MTR Draft
29 Sat		Write up		
30 Sun		Write up		
1 Mon	08h30 10h00 15h00 16h00	Raimundo Matusse Board Meeting Anselmina Liphola Nadia Vaz	PMU MITUR MICOA UNDP CO	Briefing Feed back
2 Tue	07h00	Departure from MOZ		

Annex 3. Project Results Framework

(see separate attachment)

Annex 4. Documents consulted during the MTR

ANAC 2013/2014. Projecto Financiamento Sustentável do Sistema das Áreas Protegidas em Moçambique. Relatórios Anuais - UNDAF resultado 3.

Anon. 2010. Road Map for Establishment and Operation of a Mozambique Conservation Trust Fund.

Biofund 2014. Profile of the Foundation for the Conservation of Biodiversity – BIOFUND. 9 pp.

Biofund 2014. BIOFUND Business Plan: 2015. 33 pp.

Biofund 2014. Quarterly Reports, Annual Reports, Minutes of Board meetings.

CEAGRE 2014. Mapeamento de Habitats em Moçambique proposta técnica. Setembro 2014. 50 pp.

GRP 2012-2014 Annual Work Plans; Annual and Quarterly Progress reports.

GRP 2014. Technical Proposal. Gorongosa Mountain Protected Zone Proposal. 12 pp.

GRP. 2014. Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique. PRODOC 2. Progress report: January to June 2014

Huntley BJ, Redford KH. Mainstreaming biodiversity in practice: A STAP advisory document. Washington, DC: Global Environment Facility; 2014.

Moye, Melissa and Nazerali, Sean. 2010. Feasibility Study: Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas in Mozambique. Prepared with support from UNDP-GEF. World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Maputo, Mozambique.

Nazerali, Sean. 2014. Biodiversity Offsets in Mozambique - A Roadmap for Implementation.

Mabilana, H.A. and Del Castillo, E.M. 2013. Consultoria para o Geoprocessamento da área geográfica do projecto piloto para a determinação de estoques de carbono no Delta do Zambezi - Projecto Financiamento Sustentável para o Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Moçambique.

MITUR 2012/2014 – Actas do Conselho do Projecto FSSAPM – minutes of Board meetings I to VII.

MITUR 2013. Projecto Financiamento Sustentável do Sistema das Áreas Protegidas em Moçambique. Relatório Anual. 01/01/2013 – 31/12/2013

MITUR 2014. (Sustainable financing of the Protected Areas System in Mozambique). Relatório do Curso de capacitação técnica dos administradores de parques e reservas nacionais. (26-31 de maio de 2014)

MINTUR 2014. Ministério do Turismo - Administração nacional das áreas de conservação. Projecto Financiamento Sustentável do Sistema das Áreas Protegidas em Moçambique. Relatório Narrativo Trimestral.(abril-junho, 2014). Componente 1. UNDAF RESULTADO 3 Moçambique

MITUR 2014. Reunião do Conselho do Projecto. Acta Vi . Projecto Financiamento Sustentável do Sistema das Áreas Protegidas em Moçambique. 3 Abril 2014.

MITUR 2014. Projecto de Financiamento Sustentável do Sistema das Áreas Protegidas em Moçambique. Relatório de Auto avaliação do desempenho das componentes do projecto - “Sustainable financing of the Protected Areas System in Mozambique”. GEF/PNUD. Project ID 00076184

Pullin AS, Dalrymple S, Haddaway NR, Knight T. Assessing the effects of terrestrial protected areas on human well-being: A STAP advisory document. Washington, DC: Global Environment Facility; 2014.

Stringer, C.E. et al. 2014. The Zambezi River Delta Mangrove Carbon Project: A Pilot Baseline Assessment for REDD+ Reporting and Monitoring. Final Report. USAID. 56 pp.

Tua, Jon and Sean Nazerali. 2010. Assessment of Data on Both Sides of the Financing Equation.

WWF Mozambique. 2012-2014. Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique. Annual Work Plans and Annual Reports.

UNDP 2011. Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique. PIMS 3938. Project Document plus annexes.

UNDP 2012. Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique. Inception Workshop report. May, 2012

UNDP 2012. Country programme document for Mozambique (2012 - 2015)

UNDP 2013. 2013 Annual Project Review (APR)
Project Implementation Review (PIR) OF UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects.

UNDP 2014. Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique. Information for Mid Term Review. June 2012 – 15 August 2014. September 15, 2014

UNDP 2014. 2014 Project Implementation Review (PIR). Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System of Mozambique.

UNDP 2014. Annual Work Plan 2014. Project for Sustainable Financing of the Protected Areas System in Mozambique.

UNDP 2014. Guidance for conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed projects. UNDP New York. 60 pp.

Annex 5. Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity)

(See separate attachment)

Annex 6. Co-financing table & 6

(See as separate attachments)

Annex 7. Definitions of GEF-UNDP Project Progress Ratings

Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions

Highly Satisfactory (HS): Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

Satisfactory (S): Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.

Unsatisfactory (U): Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions

Highly Satisfactory (HS): Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

Satisfactory (S): Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.

Unsatisfactory (U): Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

