

REPORT

FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION (MTE) OF THE
NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY PROJECT:
CONSERVATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK

ANGOLA

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR: MARIA ONESTINI

MARCH 28 2016

I. OPENING PAGE:

TITLE OF UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECT:

1. National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park

UNDP AND GEF PROJECT ID#S:

2. UNDP ID: 4581
3. GEF ID: 4082

EVALUATION TIME FRAME AND DATE OF EVALUATION REPORT

4. Time frame: October to December 2015
5. March 28th 2016

REGION AND COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT:

- Africa, Angola

GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM/STRATEGIC PROGRAM

6. GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic programmes

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

7. Ministry of Environment (MINAMB) of Angola

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The international evaluation consultant would like to acknowledge and thank all who graciously shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of this process.

DISCLAIMER

Be stated that the analysis and recommendations contained in this document only represent the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the United Nations Development Programme, GEF, any other UN Agency, nor any of the donors or parties involved in the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park.

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

i.	Opening page:	2
	Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:	2
	UNDP and GEF project ID#s:	2
	Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report.....	2
	Region and countries included in the project:.....	2
	GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program	2
	Implementing Partner.....	2
	Acknowledgements	3
	Disclaimer	3
ii.	Table of Contents	4
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
1.	Executive Summary.....	8
	Project Information Table.....	8
	Project Description	8
	Project Progress Summary.....	9
	MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table.....	11
	Concise summary of conclusions.....	12
	Recommendation Summary	13
	Recommendations at the design level for future programming of gef funded – undp implemented projects.....	13
	Recommendations for remaining implementation period	13
	Recommendations for an Extension Request.....	14
2.	Introduction	15
	Purpose of the MTR and objectives.....	15
	Scope and Methodology: Principles of Design and Execution of The MTR, MTR Approach and Data Collection Methods, Limitations to The MTR	15
	Structure of the MTR Report	17
3.	Project Description and Background Context	17
	Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope	17
	Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted	17
	Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites.....	18

Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements.....	19
Project timing and milestones	19
Main stakeholders: summary list.....	20
4. Findings	21
4.1 Project Strategy	21
Project Design.....	21
Results Framework/Logframe	24
4.2 Progress Towards Results	25
Progress towards outcomes analysis	25
Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	34
4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management.....	36
Management Arrangements	36
Work planning	38
Finance and co-finance.....	39
Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems.....	40
Stakeholder engagement	41
Reporting.....	41
Communications.....	42
4.4 Sustainability.....	42
Financial risks to sustainability.....	42
Socio-economic to sustainability.....	43
Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	43
Environmental risks to sustainability	43
Extension Request	43
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	45
5.1 Conclusions	45
Lessons Learned	46
5.2 Recommendations.....	47
Recommendations at the design level for future programming of gef funded – undp implemented projects.....	47
Recommendations for remaining implementation period	48
Recommendations for an extension request	50
6. Annexes	52

III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Progress Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CO	(UNDP) Country Office
COP	Conference of Parties
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
EDF	European Development Fund
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographical Information System
HDI	Human Development Index
INBAC	<i>Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação</i>
INGA	<i>Instituto Nacional Gestão Ambiental</i>
KF	Kissama Foundation
MAT	Ministry of Territorial Affairs
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MINADEREP	<i>Ministério da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural e Pescas</i>
MINAMB	Ministry of Environment
MINPLAN	Ministry of Planning
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NIM	National Implementation (Modality)
NP	National Park
PIP	Public Investment Programme
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PLERNACA	<i>Plano Estratégico da Rede Nacional de Áreas de Conservação de Angola</i>
PNGA	<i>Programa Nacional de Gestão Ambiental</i>
PSC	Project Steering Committee

RCU	(UNDP) Regional Coordinating Unit
RTA	(UNDP) Regional Technical Adviser
TFCA	Trans-Frontier Conservation Area
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE

Project Title:	National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park			
GEF Project ID:	4082		at endorsement (US\$)	at mid – term (US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	4581	GEF financing:	US\$ 2 000 000	US\$ 1356101
Country:	Angola	UNDP:	US\$ 1 440 000	US\$ 479135
Region:	Africa	Government of Angola:	US\$ 2 000 000	-- ¹
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	European Union ²	US\$5 265 000 ³	US\$ 3754216
GEF OP/SP	GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic programmes	Total co-financing:	US\$8 405 000	US\$ 5589453
Implementing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	US\$10 705 000	
Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Environment of Angola	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		February 2013 ⁴
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: September 2017	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola has an overarching aim to establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola's globally unique biodiversity. The Project's objective is to catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park.

The Project tries to address a series of problems within a development context framework. Although Angola has experienced rapid economic growth since independence in 1975, a series of developmental problems strain the country's ability to develop, implement, and enforce integrated sustainable development and environmental policies. Angola's ability and capacity to manage natural resources in a sustainable manner is further obstructed by the country's lack of capacities to adequately accomplish and sustain environmental management. Lack of qualified personnel, weak state system, as well as poor infrastructure have been associated with these capacity gaps. Regarding the country's protected area system, Angola had, at the time of project development, a formal coverage of 6.6 percent⁵ of its national territory classified as protected areas of different sorts (national parks, nature reserves, etc.). However, these are formally classified as such since effective management of these areas is lacking. The Project's overall purpose is to address inclusively, through the intervention, barriers identified that hinder effective management, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in Angola.

¹ No financial data is available for co – financing from GoA.

² 10th EDF.

³ EUR 3900 000 .-

⁴ Project signature date.

⁵ Currently 12.6% is under protection.

The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes:

- *Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park.*
- *Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network.*

At a local level, (within Outcome 1) the project seeks to assist national government in rehabilitating what was the largest National Park in Angola at the time of project formulation⁶, Iona National Park of 15 150 square kilometres, through a series of components:

- (i) establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff complement for the park;
- (ii) renovation and construction of key park infrastructure (i.e. accommodation, offices, roads, water supply, waste management facilities, electrical supply, fencing, etc.);
- (iii) development of a park management planning system; and
- (iv) the piloting of a cooperative governance framework for the park.

Iona National Park was the largest protected area in Angola's system at the time of project formulation and design.⁷ It comprises 15 150 square kilometres, which was then 18 percent of all protected land in the country. The Park comprises desert and arid savanna ecosystems, woodlands, as well as 180 km of Atlantic coastline (which are an integral part of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem).

At the broader national level (and within Outcome 2), the project supports the Angolan Government in the establishment and operationalization of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently established Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC). It will specifically support the following components:

- (i) the preparation of a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system;
- (ii) the development of an organizational structure and functional staffing complement for the protected area system;
- (iii) an assessment of the current state (biodiversity, infrastructure, management, settlement, land use, etc.) of national parks and strict nature reserves; and
- (iv) the preparation of detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of these national parks and strict nature reserves.

PROJECT PROGRESS SUMMARY

Several expected outputs of the Project have been achieved or are in a process of being achieved, principally those which are more material dealing with infrastructure and equipment as well as with park staffing. This is one of the main achievements of the Project, since it has been able to establish a corps of trained rangers and construct and assemble infrastructure and equipment for park management at Iona National Park. Nevertheless, as the Project enters its third year of implementation (out of four years of planned operation) there are still very severe gaps. The major achievements of results thus far are within expected Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park. Although with delays, a great deal of outputs (particularly those related to staffing, infrastructure and equipment in Iona National Park) have been achieved. Within expected Outcome 2 (Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network) there is less evident progress towards results. This umbrella outcome dealing with strengthening institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network and from which links to rehabilitation of Iona National Park site and to future catalytic work in management is supposed to take place, is the outcome that is lagging behind. Studies, analysis, work with communities, development of tools and methodologies for protected area management has not taken place at the expected level. It is

⁶ Iona was the largest national park in the country at the time of project design.

⁷ Currently Iona National Park is the third largest protected area in the country.

this outcome with related products, outputs and effects that merits closer attention in the short run. The Project has made some good strides in the last year. In comparison to the seven percent budget delivery reflected in the 2014 PIR, the delivery of some products has been positive in the following period (2014 – 2015). In particular, strides in relation to staffing, infrastructure, and equipping. Overall, therefore, the delivery is uneven from expected output to expected output, as seen in the chart below, with some areas satisfactorily ranked and other areas unsatisfactorily so.

MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

TABLE 1: MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE FOR NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY PROJECT: CONSERVATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS	As a composite there are moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objective in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Although some outputs have been achieved in a moderately effective and a moderately efficient manner, many other outputs and outcomes that make up and articulate the objective have not been met at the expected mid-point levels. No shortcomings in terms of relevance.
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Although with delays, outputs (particularly those related to staffing, infrastructure and equipment in Iona National Park) have been achieved. No shortcomings in terms of relevance
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory MU	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Many if not most outputs have not been achieved within this Outcome, some have not even been begun to be implemented. Little ownership within this outcome. No shortcomings in terms of relevance.
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS	Major shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Shortcomings are related to very slow start up, practically lack of implementation in Project's first period, unclear roles, and deficient decision – making processes. No full adaptive management in first year of implementation; in second year changes in management more evident. No shortcomings in terms of relevance.
Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely ML	At the midpoint, and as a composite assessment, there are risks that not all key outcomes will carry on after project closure. Although some outputs and activities should carry on after closure, a series of them are at risk of not being fully sustained. Staff hired and trained by Project are not integrated into government as expected, for instance. A realistic financial strategy for protected areas management has not been drawn and deep budget cuts imply that commitment to finance protected areas management is doubtful at the level expected in the short and medium term. Methodologies, tools, instruments for planning (such as studies, management plans and strategies) have not been drawn, and therefore have not been implemented. Therefore, their sustainability without changes is doubtful even if achievements are made in remaining implementation period.

Reference: The ratings for performance follow a six – point scale (Highly satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)). The rating for sustainability follows a four – point scale (Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U); Highly Unlikely (HU)). The ratings explanations are found in annexes (see Annex 5: Rating Scales).

CONCISE SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola* has an overarching aim to establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola's globally unique biodiversity. The Project's objective is to catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park. The Project tries to address a series of problems within a development context framework. The Project's overall purpose is to address barriers identified that hinder effective management, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in Angola. The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes: Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park and Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network. At a local level, (within expected Outcome 1) the project seeks to assist national government in the physical rehabilitation of the largest National Park in Angola⁸, Iona National Park, through the renovation of infrastructure and through the establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff. At the broader national level (and within expected Outcome 2), the project supports the Angolan Government for the preparation and implementation of tools and frameworks for protected area management.

Several expected outputs have been achieved or are in a process of being achieved, principally those which are more material, dealing with infrastructure and equipment as well as with park staffing. This is one of the main achievements of the Project, since it has been able to establish a corps of trained rangers and construct and assemble infrastructure and equipment for park management at Iona National Park. Nevertheless, the Project enters its third year of implementation with severe gaps. Gaps are mainly within the expected Outcome 2, an outcome that although not as 'visual' as infrastructure, staffing and equipment, is highly significant. The tools, methodologies, policies, studies, capacity and similar expected outputs that make up this outcome (with the right implementation and capacity building) can generate the methods and processes to sustainably manage protected areas in Angola. The Project has had severe delays in project start up and implementation, and continues to be lagging in achieving what are to be results at its mid-point. In particular, this is the case for the expected outputs within Outcome 2. The project has critical management issues and convoluted partnership issues that, in many ways, hinder implementation processes.

The Project has been and continues to be relevant for the country, not only due to Angola's gaps with regards to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use but also with regard to broader capacity building needed in the country in its road to be more sustainable and to benefit relegated local populations living in the confines or near parks in seeking their insertion in the country with true sustainable development aims. Regarding the criteria of effectiveness and efficiency, issues, difficulties, and complications in implementation, decision – making, donors and partners relations, staffing, and other such matters have created situations that are causing postponements and delays as identified in this report. These issues have diminished the potential efficiency and effectiveness factors within the Project. With regards to the criterion of sustainability there are several forewarnings that must be noted if the achievements accomplished and to be accomplished are to be sustainable in the short and medium term after the Project is completed.

There is a lot at stake with this Project. It is supposed to be first phase for a second broader more ambitious project dealing with integral protected area management in Angola. And the achievements and lessons learned are to be the keystones for the second phase. Therefore, seeking positive sustainable and equitable outcomes in whatever time remains for implementation of the *National Biodiversity Project*:

⁸ Largest at the time of project formulation and design.

Conservation of Iona National Park not only is in benefit of the Project per se but also for further work in the country.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

1. Design of these sort of projects should be realistic and not only respond to an overall matrix, one size fits all type of approach.
2. Indicators are key components of design and log frame and should be set at design with their intention made unequivocal: to determine a project's impacts and effects.
3. Exit strategy and sustainability factors should be part of the design of a project. This should include a realistic framework for results to continue after external aid is concluded, including schemes for realistic financial structures and policy to sustain achievements even after project concludes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

1. The role, functions, and decision making processes of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) should be reviewed and adjustments should be made for it to function properly and transparently with all partners involved.
2. The work with local original communities (nomadic, semi nomadic, etc.) has to begin to take place soonest, and at this stage should include a sort of immediate emergency plan to initiate pilot interventions as soon as possible. Work with the communities should be based on development principles and up-to-date views on how to integrate indigenous / original communities in protected areas as well as taking into account the community rights to development.
3. Staffing and consulting roles should be clarified and streamlined in order to have an organizational unit with agile coordination, administration and management that has clear direction and reporting lines. Consultants should be hired and convened only when no in – country expertise is present, but always with the goal of generating and / or reinforcing capacity in the country.
4. A second workshop (with similar characteristics as the inception workshop held upon project launching) should be held in order to address key issues for the Project's conclusion phase, to reach comprehensive agreements on aspects that need to be reformulated in order to successfully conclude the intervention, and to clarify roles of different stakeholders. The workshop should be carried out with thorough preparation and with concrete proposals for reformulations or changes presented for analysis. All reformulations should take into account national issues and national needs.
5. The role of UNDP within the Project should be strengthened, fully applying its role to guide implementation. UNDP should leverage implementation closely. Firstly, by proactive participation in decision – making structures. Second, by exercising fully all the roles revealed at the design level such as providing financial and audit services to the project, overseeing financial expenditures against approved budgets, as well as providing technical support as necessary. UNDP should also create some exigence mechanisms where continued guidance and support is contingent upon achieving milestones. All of the above should be carried out

in conjunction with the Government of Angola's full assimilation of national implementation modalities guidelines and procedures and UNDP's role.

6. Project personnel should be trained and their capacity should be strengthened in order to be versant on all aspects of project implementation. In particular, there should be a transfer of knowledge of administration procedures, monitoring, implementation modalities, reporting and other requirements that implementation has.
7. Project should implement a communication strategy, not only a visibility strategy, where the challenges and issues in the sustainable management of protected areas lie in Angola and how the Project is facing them. It should go beyond mere visibility of partners but should document and communicate issues, achievements and challenges.
8. A sustainability strategy with concrete timeline should be generated soonest, not at the end of the Project's implementation. This exit strategy should include aspects of capacity sustainability, policy tools needed to sustain achievements in the short and medium term as well as a realistic financial strategy to maintain results in the long run.

RECCOMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

1. If an extension request is presented at the time when Project would supposedly conclude, it is this evaluation's assessment that it should be granted if the following aspects have been taken care in the interim between the mid-term review and the request:
 - There is a demonstrated substantial improvement in implementation, in particular in relation to Outcome 2 expected outputs, products and results.
 - There is a firm exit strategy delineated and sustainability aspects are already implemented by the time of the no – cost extension request.
 - There are substantial improvements with the Project's decision – making processes.
 - There is a demonstrated reformulation of aspects of the Project that need to be changed with alterations implemented as needed.
 - There is a clear understanding of the results – based framework which is expected to be followed and not just a request to spend allotted funds without a results-oriented strategy.
 - The request furthermore should be clearly articulated and indicate realistic time – bound results expected, and how these are to be achieved.
 - A thorough review of the log frame is carried out and presented with, inter alia, adjustments to it made that reflect an effort towards improving implementation and aiding in monitoring and measuring performance, maintaining expected outcomes.
 - A thorough review of the log frame indicators should take place.
 - As importantly is a review of verification methods, moving away from anecdotal verification and towards more substantive methods based on analysis, studies, and methodical obtained data.
 - Also regarding verification methods, the log frame should incorporate robustness in the way the indicators are analysed and verification methods are implemented.

2. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE MTR AND OBJECTIVES

As indicated in the monitoring and evaluation plan contained in the Project Document (PRODOC) the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola is to undergo a mandated independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The MTE has as its purpose to determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and to identify course correction if needed. It focuses on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; highlights issues requiring decisions and actions; and presents initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term.

Scope and Methodology: Principles of Design and Execution of The MTR, MTR Approach and Data Collection Methods, Limitations to The MTR

This mid-term evaluation has focused primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the project in light of the accomplished outcomes, objectives and effects. It includes the following scope:

- Assess progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document.
- Assess signs of project success or failure.
- Review the project's strategy in light of its sustainability risks.

The approach for the evaluation of the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola is determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this assignment and it follows methods and approach as stated in UNDP Manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and UNDP's *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. The analysis entails evaluating different stages and aspects of the project, including design and formulation; implementation; results; and the involvement of stakeholders in the project's processes and activities. It has been carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, and other key stakeholders.

In order to carry out this evaluation exercise, several data collection tools for analysing information from the principles of results-based evaluation (including relevance, ownership, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability) were used. Activities and results were evaluated for their (i) *Relevance*; (ii) *Effectiveness*; (iii) *Efficiency*; and (iv) *Sustainability*. Following UNDP/GEF guidelines, the relevant areas of the project are evaluated according to performance criteria and prospects of sustainability with ratings as summarized in the tables found in annexes (Annex 5: Rating Scales).

The tools chosen for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected in order to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allow for in-depth exploration and yield information that facilitated understanding of observed changes in outcomes and outputs (both intended and unintended) and the factors that contributed to the achievements or lack of accomplishments. Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

- *Document analysis*. In depth analysis of documentation was used as an instrument of analysis. The documentation analysis examined documents prepared during the

preparation and implementation phases of the project (i.e. PIF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic documents, monitoring reports). A list of consulted documents is found in annexes (see Annex 10: List of Documents Reviewed).

- *Key informant interviews:* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, funding partners, government actors, and local actors. The interviews were carried in person during the evaluation mission. A list of consulted stakeholders is found in annexes (see Annex 9: Lists of Persons Interviewed). Stakeholders to interview were chosen to be the key stakeholders from every single group directly and tangentially involved in the Project. The array of stakeholders, therefore, was a representative sample of actors involved such as the implementing agency, donors, national government representatives, provincial and local government representatives, project management unit, project staff, and representatives from communities living in Iona National Park. (See Annex 3: Sample Interview Guide used for data collection) Access to stakeholders was very good, and when access could not take place during the mission, questionnaires were sent to those individuals (see below *Questionnaires*).
- *Site visit/direct observation.* During the mission to Angola a site visit to Iona National Park took place, allowing for interviewing local stakeholders as well as to carry out direct observation at the Project's field site.
- *Focus groups.* During the site visit focus group discussion as a participatory technique for information gathering was used when dialogue was carried out engaging a cluster of stakeholders.
- *Questionnaire.* A questionnaire was developed and sent to those stakeholders who were not available in Angola during the mission. A questionnaire template is found in annexes (see Annex 4: Sample online questionnaire).

A first tool developed for the review process was an evaluation matrix (which can be found in Annex 2: MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology). This matrix guided data collection process and, as the evaluation proceeded, the matrix was used to collect and display data obtained from different sources that relate to relevant evaluation criteria and questions. The matrix contains Evaluative Criteria Questions (that is questions and where relevant sub questions related to each of the evaluation criteria contained in the evaluation); Indicators; Sources; and Methodology.

As all evaluations, there are a series of limitations. Although the evaluability was fair given access to inputs (from stakeholders through interview processes as well as from documentation this evaluation had access to) some limitations can be identified. First of all, the inherent limitation of time as a resource that presents limits to the evaluation process as well the low level of implementation found up to this review. Given the low level of implementation, several aspects of evaluation are limited given that there is very little to analyse in the sense that several of the processes, products, outputs, and outcomes have not been achieved to the degree expected they would at the Project's mid-point juncture. In very few instances there was no access to key stakeholders during the mission. This limitation was overcome by engaging several of these stakeholders through an online questionnaire.

A fourteen-day mission took place (with ten days in-country), mainly maintaining meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders at the national level, meetings with UN personnel, review of materials with key stakeholders, and interviews with local stakeholders at Namibe (local and provincial

stakeholders), Tombua, and Iona. As part of this mission, a site visit to Iona National Park took place. (See Annex 8: MTR mission itinerary)

STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT

The evaluation report is structured beginning with an executive summary, with project summary and project ratings tables, and with project progress, conclusions and recommendations of this report summarized. A second section introduces methodologies, scope and information of the execution of the mid-term review. A third section contains an overall project description within a developmental context, including an account of the problems the project sought to address, as well as its initial objectives. A fourth core section of this report deals basically with the evaluation findings, analytically observing the results framework and its reform, as well as linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector, indicators and main stakeholders involved in the projects are described, as well as what were the expected results. Furthermore, this section also deals with findings relating to the actual implementation of the project, including strategic issues such as adaptive management and partnership agreements, and monitoring. This fifth section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues. Recommendations for future actions and future projects. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation support documentation.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL, AND POLICY FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Although Angola has experienced rapid economic growth in recent years, its oil – based economy has suffered different shocks associated with a larger international crisis (2009) and drastic lowering of oil prices (currently). Macro economically the export – oriented economy, based on oil as well as on precious stones has not been a sufficient base for development factors. Angola continues to be categorized with low development indices. The Human Development Index ranking for Angola for 2014 is 149th, with a downward course (143rd in 2009, 146th in 2010). Overall, 54 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.

Environmental issues are also linked to these matters. Impact of main economic activities are not properly managed and the poor also place pressure on natural resources due to subsistence – level activities and subsistence patterns. For instance, poaching of wild animals, illegal logging and cutting down of forests for household consumption of wood and charcoal takes place in many areas of the country.

Angola's ability and capability to manage natural resources in a sustainable manner is further obstructed by the country's lack of capacities to adequately accomplish and sustain environmental management. Lack of qualified personnel, a weak state system (including weakness in administration and in the legal system), as well as poor infrastructure have been associated with these capacity gaps.

PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS: THREATS AND BARRIERS TARGETED

The Project tries to address a series of problems within a development context framework. Although Angola has experienced rapid economic growth since independence in 1975, a series of developmental problems strain the country's ability to develop, implement, and enforce integrated sustainable development and environmental policies.

After independence, a long-drawn-out civil war (from 1975 – 2002) left impacts at several levels, some related to natural resources. Rural areas were abandoned in favour of safer urban areas. The

resources themselves within protected areas have suffered severe degradation during and after the war. Decline of large mammal populations, decimation of birds and reptile populations, almost complete destruction of park's infrastructure, settlement in parks by human populations, widespread bush-meat hunting, and, in some cases, illegal occupation by private and commercial operations have all been documented. Park infrastructure at Iona Posto, Espinheira and Charojamba in Iona National Park were all destroyed during the war. Management of Angola's protected areas has been and still is inadequate or totally lacking. For instance, currently, these protected areas lack infrastructure, management tools, adequate financing and human resources to manage them.

Regarding the country's protected area system, Angola had --at the time of project design-- a formal coverage of 6.6 percent of its national territory classified as protected areas of different sorts (national parks, nature reserves, etc.). However, these were (and to a great extent are) just formally classified as such since effective management of these areas is lacking. Ineffective management is evident in the inadequate enforcement of norms; lacking, degraded, or simply inexistent infrastructure; low level of resources assigned to these areas; weak governance; as well as the general lack of management instruments. The protected areas also haul a large shortfall and issues due to the civil war, such as damage to existing park's infrastructure and the large mammals, birds and reptiles having been devastated or driven to local extinction during this war. The protected areas also have a number of communities living within their borders, and some of their activities also do impact the flora, fauna, and other natural resources in these areas. Furthermore, within some protected areas there is also illegal mining.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY: OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND EXPECTED RESULTS, DESCRIPTION OF FIELD SITES

The above is a contextual introduction to the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park*. It is with this framework that the Project was designed and is being implemented. The goal of the Project is to establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola's globally unique biodiversity. The Project's objective is to catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park. The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park.
- Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network.

At a local level, (within expected Outcome 1) the project seeks to assist national government in rehabilitating the largest National Park in Angola⁹, Iona National Park of 15 150 square kilometres, through a series of expect components:

- (i) establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff complement for the park;
- (ii) renovation and construction of key park infrastructure (i.e. accommodation, offices, roads, water supply, waste management facilities, electrical supply, fencing, etc.);
- (iii) development of a park management planning system; and
- (iv) the piloting of a cooperative governance framework for the park.

Iona National Park was the largest protected area in Angola's system at the time of design. It comprises 15 150 square kilometres, which (at time of design) was 18 percent of all land protected in the

⁹ Largest at the time of project design and formulation.

country. The Park comprises desert and arid savanna ecosystems, woodlands, as well as 180 km of Atlantic coastline (which are an integral part of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem).

At the broader national level (and within expected Outcome 2), the project supports the Angolan Government in the establishment and operationalization of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently established Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC). It will specifically support the following components:

- (i) the preparation of a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system;
- (ii) the development of an organizational structure and functional staffing complement for the protected area system;
- (iii) an assessment of the current state (biodiversity, infrastructure, management, settlement, land use, etc.) of national parks and strict nature reserves; and
- (iv) the preparation of detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of these national parks and strict nature reserves.

The Project has also been conceived as a first phase for a more wide-ranging intervention with the broad aim to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. It is thought that the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* would serve as a starting point for this broader, more ambitious intervention. Also, it is conceived that the current Project being evaluated would generate lessons learnt, management instruments, and background information that would be implemented and introduced within the follow up project.

The Project's overall purpose is to address, through the intervention, inclusively barriers identified that hinder effective management, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in Angola. This notion is attuned to the Government of Angola's strategies to address root causes of loss in biodiversity, which include: (i) rationalisation of boundaries of the current system of protected areas; (ii) rehabilitation of protected areas to ensure that they achieve their management objectives; (iii) implementation of management strategies in protected areas that harmonises conservation, sustainable use and tourism with the interests of local communities; and (iv) creation of new protected areas to ensure that important ecosystems, habitats and species are effectively conserved, as expressed in the country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2007-2012).

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS: SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT BOARD, KEY IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ARRANGEMENTS

The Project's implementing partner is the Ministry of Environment of Angola (MINAMB). UNDP is the Project's Implementing Agency, in a partnership with funders and donors (EU, GEF). Related to management and governance, the Project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC) to serve as the Project Board. Is chaired by MINAMB and includes representation from different institutions (EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP).

PROJECT TIMING AND MILESTONES

The *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola started in February 2013 and it has a planned duration of four years.¹⁰

¹⁰ Contract between EUD and UNDP was signed by EUD on 30 April 2013.

MAIN STAKEHOLDERS: SUMMARY LIST

At the design level a thorough stakeholder analysis took place. The purpose of this analysis was to identify main potential stakeholders and to consider their potential roles and responsibilities in the implementation and guidance of the Project. Following are the potential stakeholders identified. The main stakeholders identified (besides the implementing partners – i.e. Ministério do Ambiente (MINAMB)/ Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação, (INBAC)) are national government institutions (for example, Ministério das Finanças; Ministério da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural e Pescas; Ministério do Interior, Ministério do Planeamento; Ministério da Defesa Nacional; Ministério do Urbanismo e Construção; Ministério da Administração do Território; Ministério da Hotelaria e Turismo); provincial and local governments in the area of influence of Iona Park; as well as local stakeholders and user groups; Conselhos de Auscultação e Concertação Social (CACS); traditional authorities (Sobas) groups defined as resource user groups, as well as academic / research institutions and non – governmental organizations.

The main stakeholders' analysis not only identified institutions or typologies of institutions to be involved in the Project. It also carried out a strong analysis of their anticipated roles and responsibilities in project implementation. For instance, the roles of the Project's partners (Ministério do Ambiente (MINAMB) and Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação, (INBAC)) are clearly delineated indicating that the former will have overall responsibility for the implementation of the project and ensure that policy and policy-related reforms are adopted to aid in the implementation of project activities, and, for the latter, that it would be responsible for overseeing in situ implementation of activities.

Technical assistance and technical advising are anticipated roles and responsibilities of several institutions (such as Ministério da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural e Pescas (MINADERP) and Ministério do Urbanismo e Construção (MINUC)). Furthermore, leadership roles are expected of several different stakeholders/institutions. For example, from the Ministério do Planeamento (MINPLAN) by ensuring that sectoral integration of strategies and plans developed are aligned with other country – wide sectoral policies. A key planned role of these stakeholders is to deal with finance and eventually financial sustainability of project activities, such as the anticipated responsibility of MINPLAN to integrate the projected budgets for protected areas into the broader macro-economic programming for Angola.

The participation aspect of provincial and municipal authorities, of actors the design defines as resource user groups (such as farmers, fishermen, pastoralists, hunters), of academic institutions, of private individuals adjacent to protected areas, as well as of traditional communities through their representatives is raised and broadly defined. Participation is defined for several of these actors as either direct implementation participation in the activities and products that the Project was meant to produce or engagement in dialogue (defined as liaising, involving and/or consulting).

There are also other noteworthy anticipated roles and responsibilities, in particular due to processes and issues in implementation of the Project which are becoming key matters as implementation unfolds. For instance, it is anticipated that the Project would work with subnational governments in support of the ongoing provision of social (health, education, security) and infrastructural services (water, power, waste management.) to the communities living in Iona National Park. Also, it is anticipated that the Ministério da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural e Pescas (MINADERP) would provide assistance in the administration of rural development issues in protected areas (particularly as it relates to communities living in Iona National Park), sustainable forest management, management of sustainable agricultural activities and livestock management in protected areas.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 PROJECT STRATEGY

PROJECT DESIGN

The design of the Project follows standard structure for these sorts of interventions with intended outcomes, outputs, and activities within a framework of expected goal and objective. However, the logic of the project is frail in several aspects.

Outcomes are clearly established as intended short and medium term effects of the intervention (i.e. Rehabilitation of Iona National Park and Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network). Outputs (i.e. the products and services which should *result* from the completion of activities within a development intervention) are not expressed in that manner. They are defined more as activities themselves. For instance, this occurs in Outcome 1 (Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services or Develop an integrated park management plan). In the latter, for example, no results are sought beyond the development of a plan. The design does not indicate that this plan should or would be implemented within the outcome in order to seek concrete results. And, therefore, the outcome remains at an expected product level (i.e. development of a plan) not an outcome level (i.e. improving management).

The overall approach, nevertheless, is satisfactory, in the sense that barriers are identified and ways to overcome these are identified. That is, the design identifies the barriers and delineates processes/activities that to some extent could conceivably breach the gaps needed to create the conditions for effective management of protected areas in Angola.

Before a further analysis of design is carried out, however, it must be pointed out that the very first inception of this intervention did not originate as a UNDP project. The initial project preparation was for a GEF – financed World Bank implemented project. The GEF project effectively transferred from the World Bank to UNDP in May 2011. Therefore, some of the design components do not particularly correspond to the full components that a GEF-funded UNDP-implemented project should have. For instance, the emphasis on capacity – building directed through UNDP strategic mandates is present only very slightly in expected Outcome 1. This Outcome is also heavily reliant on infrastructure, which is also not characteristic of UNDP – implemented projects which are funded by GEF.

An overall design issue is not only as expressed in the log frame and indicators, and it has to do how realistic a design is vis – a – vis a particular country's condition. Although it is understood that these sort of projects are designed following a general conceptual template, national conditions and national characteristics need to be taken into account closely at the inception / design levels before introducing expected results that are either difficult or impossible to materialize. For instance, tourism is purported throughout the project design as the main means by which financing of protected areas management will emerge in Angola. Nevertheless, this assertion does not take into account that the country is not accessible to tourism in the degree needed to generate income for the protected areas.

Another issue to contend with in the design it is the choice for a pilot site. Generally, these projects do have a national scope and a local / site – level scope, which is of course the case in the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola. In this case the pilot site intervention (Iona National Park) has a large weight in the overall scope of the Project. Nevertheless, the choice of sites needs to follow strategic discerning since they are to be considered pilots for upscaling, replication, and subsequent phases. Iona National Park was not only the largest park in the Angolan Protected System at the time of project formulation, it is also remote and this (together with the sort of ecosystem that is

represented in the park) entails special characteristics which make an intervention that should showcase and pilot management very difficult or impossible to achieve within the scope of a preliminary / first phase project. The infrastructure and staffing needed to adequately manage a national park the size of Iona is substantial to say the least. Furthermore, and linked with the tourism issue presented above, travel to a remote area, with difficult access and lack of infrastructure, with the natural characteristics of the Park in the level needed to produce financial benefits to sustain monetarily at least part of management is impracticable. Some stakeholders uphold that the choice of Iona National Park was adequate given that other protected areas face similar or greater challenges, and do not represent biodiversity priority areas as Iona does. Nevertheless, it is asserted that the determined pilot site in this case was not the best fit for a preliminary intervention.

A thorough risk assessment was carried out at the design stage. Following is a chart with identified risks, impact and likelihood of the recognised threats.

FIGURE 1: RISK ASSESSMENT AT DESIGN

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT
<u>STRATEGIC</u> Local communities resident in the Park conflict with the park authorities over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource use practices in Iona	High	Likely	High
<u>POLITICAL</u> Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of the new National Institute for Biodiversity and Conservation Areas (INBAC)	High	Moderately likely	Medium
<u>STRATEGIC</u> The Government of Angola assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development	High	Moderately likely	Medium
<u>FINANCIAL</u> INBAC's financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as Government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in the protected area system	High	Unlikely	Low
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u> Climate change will exacerbate habitat fragmentation in the terrestrial ecosystems in and around Iona NP	Low	Moderately likely	Low

Source: Project Document.

Retrospectively, and as will be seen in other relevant sections of this report that pertain to sustainability, some risks to sustainability, and especially related to financial issues are present at higher risk levels than analysed. That is ranking financial issues as low is not reasonable. The environmental and strategic risks (above) appear to have been adequately estimated. At this stage, together with risk analysis, precise risk management strategies were stated. For instance, regarding social conflicts within park boundary, risk management has been stated as implementing process with local communities in order to reduce social conflict with the Park. Provision of development facilities and incentives to reduce pressure on natural resources were defined. However, none have been implemented as such.

At project design there has been acknowledgment of other rehabilitation of national parks projects carried out in Angola with external funding. Three initiatives are listed (Quiçama, Bicular and Cangandala Parks) in the Project Document and described briefly. And there are indications in the document that not all of them have been successful, yet no attempt in the ProDoc is made to establish

what lessons can be learned from successes and from the failures (which, incidentally are not even indicated in the document itself).

As indicated in the pertinent section above, stakeholder analysis took place at the design stage. Furthermore, planned stakeholder participation was also included in the project design, basically entailing dissemination of information, inclusion of relevant stakeholders in Project Steering Committee and other governance structures, as well as involvement of local stakeholders in implementation.

The relevance of a project is analysed in regards to the extent to which the results and activities are consistent with local and national development priorities, national and international conservation priorities, UNDP and GEF's focal area and operational program strategies. Regarding its relevance vis – a – vis country goals, these are expressed in different strategic and planning documents. These include Sub-Programme II ('Protection of biodiversity, flora, terrestrial and marine fauna') of the Programa Nacional de Gestão Ambiental (PNGA, 2009) objectives: "Restructuring the system of protected areas"; "Re-assess the status of the existing conservation areas and their infrastructure". Furthermore, the Project specifically aligns with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2007-2012) goals, such as "Rehabilitate the conservation areas and their infrastructure"; and Actions: "assess current status of biodiversity in conservation areas"; "rationalise, if necessary, the boundaries of the current conservation area"; "rehabilitate existing conservation areas"; "prepare management plans for the rationalisation and restoration of conservation areas"; "assess the status of communities living in and around conservation areas"; among others. The Project is, furthermore, also aligned with National Policy of Forest, Wildlife and Conservation Areas (2010) and the Plano Estratégico da Rede Nacional de Áreas de Conservação de Angola (PLERNACA, 2011). As to relevance expressed as coherence with general UN, UNDP, and GEF priorities and strategies, the Project is congruent with them. UNDAF 2009 – 2014 (current at the time of design, inception, and early implementation of the Project) for Angola expresses as an expected outcome "Strengthened pro-poor economic growth and accountable macroeconomic management and integrated rural development, natural resources and energy management to promote environmental protection and adaptation to climate change." While it is consistent with UNDP's Expected Country Programme Outcome 6 (of 2009-2013, again current at the time of design, inception, and early implementation of the Project): "Strengthen national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective" and to expected CPAC Output 6.1: Effective implementation of biodiversity strategy and action plan. As to alignment with GEF objectives, the Project is in-line with GEF's Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity focal area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems' and with Strategic Programme 3 of SO 1; 'Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks'.

The replication approach is firmly imbedded in this Project given that it has been designed as a first phase for a larger more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. The tools and processes developed through this project should serve as inputs for the second project to build upon. Another matter that points out that replication is rooted in the Project is the work being carried out to connect Iona Park with Namibia's Skeleton Coast protected area to set a Transboundary Conservation Area. Memorandums of understanding between the two countries and other processes such as technical exchanges are indicative of a replication approach in this matter.

UNDP's comparative advantage in relation to GEF – funded projects (and as relevant to this Project) lies in its practice in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, engaging government in the generation and strengthening of capacity, and non-governmental and community participation. UNDP assists countries in promoting, designing and implementing activities consistent with both sustainable development plans. UNDP comparative

advantage in this case also pertains to its programming experience in Angola in the subject. In the environment field the UNDP CO in Angola has recently completed and has ongoing projects in its portfolio dealing with strategic environmental institutional strengthening (including the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan), promoting climate-resilient development and enhancing adaptive capacity to climate change risks, for example.

With these issues, strategy and expectations the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* began to be implemented in Angola with a total budget planned is USD10 750 000, and planned co-finance is USD2 000 000 to be provided from the Government of Angola, USD 1 140 000 from UNDP TRAC funds, other UNDP funds of USD 300 000, USD2 000 000 from the GEF, and USD 5 265 000 from the European Union. The Project's national implementing partner is Ministry of Environment (MINAMB) of Angola and it is to be implemented in a national implementation modality (NIM).¹¹

RESULTS FRAMEWORK/LOGFRAME

The Project established baseline indicators in the Project Document (Logical Framework) at the level of Specific Objective and the two Expected Results (Outcomes). For each indicator, baseline and target figures are indicated. However, some of them are not specific, they are expressed as numbers or percentages without indicating clearly what the numbers refer to specifically. For instance, for the Project Objective a baseline indicator of 3% regarding the financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas is established. Nevertheless, it is not specified what that 3% is specific to. The same issue arises in the second set of baseline indicators. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system which are defined as Systemic: 42%, Institutional: 39%, and Individual: 35%. It is intuitive that these baseline indicators are related to data in the Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard in the first instance, and the Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard in the second case given that these are listed as means of verification. Nevertheless, this is not clearly stated in the document, and is never referred specifically as to what the numbers refer to within these scorecards, carrying with it uncertainty in the setting and use of indicators for several stakeholders. Others are more specific (for instance, Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park; or Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park; both for expected Outcome 1). In other cases, there are no baseline indicators available (for example, for expected Outcome 1 Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum. The complete list of Baseline Indicators can be found in Annex 6: Project's Log Frame. Indicators were added to the log frame after the inception meeting. These are found in Annex 7: : NEW LIST OF INDICATORS – AFTER INCEPTION WORKSHOP). Unfortunately, however these are not reflected in subsequent reporting (i.e. they are fully not reflecting in PIRs) and therefore not reflected in management nor monitoring.

Evaluations are asked to analyse if target indicators are SMART are (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound). Therefore, following this sort of analysis regarding achievement indicators¹² within the log frame, it can be stated that some of them are hindered by the same defects as baseline indicators of being non – *Specific*. For instance, some of them are not specific, they are expressed as numbers or percentages without indicating clearly what the numbers refer to specifically. For instance, for the Project Objective a target indicator of >10% regarding Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas is established. Nevertheless, it is not specified what that >10% is specific to, and again although intuitively they can be determined, several stakeholders express

¹¹ All of this information is found in a table format in the PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE at the beginning of this report as well as in the project finance table.

¹² Baseline indicators have been analyzed in the pertinent section for that within this report, see the section BASELINE INDICATORS ESTABLISHED.

bewilderment regarding these indicators due to their lack of expressed specificity. The same issue arises in the second set of achievement indicators by end of project for Capacity development indicator score for protected area system which are defined as Systemic: 55%, Institutional: 50%, and Individual: 45%. Here also it is intuitive that these achievement indicators are related to data in the Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard in the first instance, and the Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard in the second case given that these are listed as means of verification. Nevertheless, this is not clearly stated in the document, and is never referred specifically as to what exhaustively the numbers refer to within these scorecards, carrying with it uncertainty in the analysis of indicators by some actors. Others are appropriately very specific. For instance, Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park; or Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park; both for expected Outcome 1, as well as all of the achievement indicators from Outcome 2.

Some indicators are not *Achievable*. Perhaps they were deemed to be at the design stage, but, in hindsight and seeing what progress the Project has achieved at its mid-point, some indicators are deemed as too ambitious. For example, for Outcome 2, Indicator nº 21 “Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation”, is supposed to rise from 1 (baseline indicator) to 4 (achievement indicator). Yet there are no signs at the project mid-point that the number of protected areas with programmes for rationalisation/rehabilitation has risen beyond baseline.

On the whole, indicators are *Measurable*, given that expected results (quantitative or qualitative) can be measured, are expressed in metrics, and thus it is possible to assess whether they are achieved or not. They are also *Relevant* since (as seen in the relevance section of this report) they aim at outcomes which are aligned with pertinent development needs. Lastly they are *Time-bound* given that they are to be met within the Project’s implementation period. The complete list of Target Indicators can be found in Annex 6: Project’s Log Frame.

An important issue, however, are the verification sources. First, many are not available or are either methodologically very weak. Also, proxy verification sources when the ones indicated in the design are not available are either anecdotal or extremely weak. For instance, in PIR 2015, “shots were heard” is employed as a proxy verification method for the indicator “Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum” which is truly anecdotal when referring to poaching in a protected area of over 15 000 km². Furthermore, observers to the 2015 METT process have indicated that this was carried out without the methodological rigor needed for accuracy of this tool and that its results would not be dependable due to this issue. Other means of verification are not available to the Project at this point. For instance, national budgeting allocations as indicators are estimated by the Project and partners involved in reporting since, by their admission, information from the GoA is not available.

4.2 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES ANALYSIS

Expected results are expressed at different levels (goals, outputs, outcomes). As stated before, the overall goal of this intervention is “*to establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola’s globally unique biodiversity.*” The Project objective is “*to catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park.*” The expected outcomes, which in turn are to be operationalized by expected resulting outputs are indicated below.

Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park

Work under this outcome will focus on the establishment of a simple, but effective, administration to manage Iona National Park. The administrative structure proposed for the park will comprise a central administrative base at Espinheira, and a peripheral network of gate entry control points/ access control points.¹³ Expected outputs:

Output 1.1: Appoint, train, equip and deploy park staff

Output 1.2: Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services

Output 1.3: Develop an integrated park management plan

Output 1.4: Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park

Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network

Work under this outcome will focus on supporting the development of capacity in INBAC to assume the authority, responsibility and accountability for managing protected areas.¹⁴

Output 2.1: Prepare a Strategic Plan for the protected area system

Output 2.2: Develop the organisational structure and staff complement for the protected area system

Output 2.3: Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves

Output 2.4: Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves

The Project has had a very slow set up and start up. The first stage of the Project is completed and many of the expected objectives /results / products / outputs have not been achieved to the degree expected at mid – point. The matrix below charts progress towards results as achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets.

¹³ As indicated in the Project Document.

¹⁴ Idem above.

FIGURE 2: PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX (ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES AGAINST END-OF-PROJECT TARGETS)¹⁵

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	End-of-project Target ¹⁸	Level at 30 June 2015	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating ¹⁹	Justification for Rating
Objective: Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park	Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	at least 10%	5% Government has invested USD6M in Iona Park infrastructure, rehabilitated the training school at Quicama National Park, the entry gate, herbarium and conference room.		MS	Some investments catalysed, but cannot agree with the level here indicated since it deals with matters outside Iona (Quicama herbarium, etc.) and the objective / indicator says “through rehabilitating Iona National Park”

¹⁵ Note: The columns Project Strategy; Indicator; Baseline Level; End-of-project Target; Level at 30 June 2015 information provided by project documentation. Following guidelines, these columns are “populated with information from the results framework, scorecards, PIRs and the Project Document (see *GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING MIDTERM REVIEWS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS*). The subsequent three columns: Midterm Level & Assessment, Achievement Rating and Justification for Rating are formulated by the evaluation. Therefore, further detail on information contained in the first five columns is found in the annexed log frame (and of course ProDoc, PIRs, etc.)

¹⁶ As indicated above, this column is populated directly from project documentation (such as ProDoc, PIRs, etc.). Also in annexes the Log Frame of the Project as well as added indicators are found. Therefore, further information on indicators, baselines level and end of project targets can be found there.

¹⁷ As indicated above, this column is populated directly from project documentation (such as ProDoc, PIRs, etc.). Also in annexes the Log Frame of the Project as well as added indicators are found. Therefore, further information on indicators, baselines level and end of project targets can be found there.

¹⁸ As indicated above, this column is populated directly from project documentation (such as ProDoc, PIRs, etc.). Also in annexes the Log Frame of the Project as well as added indicators are found. Therefore, further information on indicators, baselines level and end of project targets can be found there.

¹⁹ Six - point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

	Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%	Systemic 46% - establishment of CBD for policy and strategic oversight over PAs Institutional 40% - INBAC fully functional and responsible for implementation of PAs management support programmes in addition a training school was rehabilitated in Kuando Kubango for development of rangers and Park Administrators. Park Administrators participated at the World Parks Congress to share and learn lessons for improved capacities. Individual 37%-20 park rangers and 17 staff were trained on security and use of GIS, 2 Managers trained on GEF procedures.		MS	Indicators on the way of being achieved, however verification sources (METT, scoring etc. are weak in how they arrive at these figures)
	Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	At least US\$8 million	Government has allocated \$82M for PAs in 2015 budget. Giving the target level of \$8M the result is over 100%.		MS	Although co-financing has taken place, the overall figure indicated of 82 Million USD is not reliable and impracticable.

	Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	At least 7	The methodology of METT has been adopted for all 7 PAs. However only Iona Park has started using the tool for data collection. Other parks are expected to come on stream in the near future.		MU	Only 1 of 7 PAs use METT methodology by this stage. Given this, it is impracticable to determine that the target of 7 will be achieved by project end.
Outcome 1) Rehabilitation of Iona National Park	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	0.07	5 points out of 102 possible, giving (Jan 2012) = 5%	Considerable improvement in the METT score has been attained since the original evaluation of November 20, 2011. The June 2015 METT evaluation returned a score of $32/102 = 31\%$ in comparison with only $5/102 = 5\%$ in 2011. In the 2011 assessment only three questions (1, 5 & 6) were awarded positive scores totalling 5 of a possible 9 points. The same total score for these three questions was also awarded in 2015. However, of the 39 questions that received zero scores in 2011, 23 received positive scores in the recent evaluation indicating a wide-ranging improvement in management		MS	Scoring improved due to intervention. Need to revise how METT scores are arrived at, assuring methodological robustness and not only suppositions as input data.

				effectiveness. The target of at least 45% in the final evaluation is considered attainable.			
	Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	12	12		HS	This is one of the successes of the Project at mid-point: the training, hiring, appointing and equipping of management staff. Need to ascertain sustainability (i.e. hired by GoA, etc.)
	Percentage (%) of park visitors obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	At least 80%	40% of Park visitors is reported. Registration and entry fees collection pilot system launch in October 2014, has been reformulated and submitted to the local government authority for approval.		U	In disagreement with self-reporting, no pilot system has been launched by mid-term. Registrations might be taking place, but entry fee structure, and collection are not determined nor piloted.
	Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km ²) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	More than 35% (by 2011/12)	Less than 20%	The aerial survey is yet to be conducted. Observations from the ground indicate an increase of at least 40% of the grassland habitats of the park overgrazed by livestock.		U	Although full trustworthy data is not available, indications in PIR specify an increase in overgrazing and not a decrease as expected by project-end. This is congruent with the fact that practically no work has been done with the traditional communities living in Iona National Park
	Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	At least 2000 At least 300 At least 3500 At least 500	Road count reports increase in wildlife populations as follows: 1815 270 3120		Unable to determine	Verification method weak, no complete studies carried out yet. Therefore, cannot determine what true population scores are and what is attributable

				420			to project implementation.
	Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	4 (of 16)	The hydrological study and the park management plan are in progress.		U	Studies incomplete, therefore implementation by project end of 4 springs and wells secured doubtful.
	Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	Less than 12	Less than 12. Shots were heard in Mupaca area located at east of Iona and further east towards Helola and Montenegro areas. Motorcycles are used to hunt wild animals within the Park in the south of Espinheira.		MS	Although by the fact of having park rangers to control it would be assumed that there are poaching incidents reported by park visitors, and police have corroborated the matter during field site visit, the method of verification is rather weak ("shots were heard").
	Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes.	0%	More than 60%	No change. 0% of communities living in the park are represented the park management decision-making processes. Community study and park management planning initiated but are not yet at the stage of informing the project on this indicator.		U	No change, communities not involved in Iona Park's decision making process at all.

	Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	a) Direct: 0 b) Indirect: 0	a) Direct: at least 10 b) Indirect: at least 30	a) Direct: 12 members of community are community agents (rangers) b) Indirect: 0		MS	Direct employment target obtained. Need to ascertain sustainability by formalizing hiring by GoA. Indirect employment still at baseline level, with no indication of processes that could feasibly entail the generation of employment for local community members living in or adjacent to Iona Park.
	Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park	US\$155/annum	At least US\$250/annum	The study on Community Profile is on going and data on income levels will be ready at finalization of the exercise.		U	Full data unavailable, however (besides the 12 rangers hired by the Project) there has been no output or product implemented that could feasibly generate income and/or improve living conditions of people living in the Park.
Outcome 2) Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network	Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Yes	Yes		U	Although the PIR self-reports full achievement of this Outcome, from this evaluation this is not agreed. As indicated in the ProDoc “the outputs necessary to achieve this outcome are” . . . “Prepare a Strategic Plan for the protected area system” . . .” Develop the organisational structure and staff complement for the protected area system” . . . “Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves” . . . and “Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of

							national parks and strict nature reserves". If the outputs have not been achieved, then it cannot be agreed that the outcome has been achieved.
	Organization al structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Yes	The Park Management Plan study is on going which will frame the organizational structure of the Park.		MS	In process to develop management plans.
	Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	At least 50%	Current level remains as reported in 2014.		HU	No change since baseline data.
	Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	20	17 government staff of INBAC and Park Administrators of Mavinga, Luengue-Luiana, Chimalavera and Cangandala, were trained in GIS.		MS	Training reported apparently in GIS only, yet it has begun. Need to train in other in – service training and skills in development programmes as stated in documentation.
	Number of senior protected area staff in a structured	0	3	1 senior staff, the Iona Park Administrator continue to be mentored by the		MU	It is not clear what this mentoring programme entails, what its strategic programming is, and what its results are or should be.

	mentoring programme			International Park Manager.			
	Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	7	Initiated.		U	Although this output is reported as initiated there are no national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value, not even Iona. Therefore, the likelihood of this being achieved by project end is rather slim.
	Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	4	1. Currently, only the Iona Park rehabilitation programme is under implementation.		U	No change from baseline. Therefore, target deemed unattainable since only Iona Park under implementation.

REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE

As seen above, several expected outputs have been achieved or are in a process of being achieved, principally those which are more material dealing with infrastructure and equipment as well as with park staffing. This is one of the main achievements of the Project, since it has been able to establish a corps of trained rangers and construct and assemble infrastructure and equipment for park management at Iona National Park.

Nevertheless, as the Project enters its third year of implementation (out of four years of planned operation) there are still very severe gaps. And the likelihood of meeting with many of the expected outcomes is doubtful unless rigorous restructuring of project implementation takes place.

Many of the activities are carried out without the implementation of holistic strategic planning. Although granted that the infrastructure and equipping of the chosen sites has been done based on the construction plan, overall the activities are carried out in a haphazard manner without accurate nor deliberate implementation of planning and lacking full connection to a management plan. There is a delinking between the needed management tools to effectively manage Iona National Park and the infrastructure and other investments taking place within the Park. Implementation of activities by government, as well as specific micro-management decisions imposed by partners, were not always in line with the project strategic planning, and thereby the results have been at times the decoupling of effective management tools from implemented investments. The different decision making processes therefore were not in line with planning and at times override project plans.

Expected Outcome 2 (which is the umbrella outcome dealing with strengthening institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network and from which links to rehabilitation of Iona National Park site and to future catalytic work in management is supposed to take place) is the Outcome that is lagging the greatest. Studies, analysis, work with communities, development of tools and methodologies for protected area management has not taken place at the expected level. It is this outcome with related products, outputs and effects that merits closer attention in the short run.

The work with original communities (nomadic, semi nomadic, etc.) has not achieved results and expected outcomes because it basically has not taken place as of yet. Except for the hiring of some park rangers from the communities themselves, there has been little engagement with the communities in the level needed to see results and to reduce their pressure on the Iona National Park's natural resources. A community study²⁰ was not availed at the time of the evaluation and initial pilot work with the communities should have been initiated simultaneously with this study, but it has not. Besides the over emphasis on the pressure that these populations can place on the Park's resources (which needs to be scientifically and exhaustively verified given that there are other pressures in hunting, mining, fishing, etc., and even planned tourism which do have impact) there is little thorough work with these communities which are supposed to be direct beneficiaries of the Project. There is no work with them in order to implement outputs that could control their pressure on the resources while aiding in their development, and at the same time respecting their rights. Although it is understood that work with ancestral communities is a long process, and some engagement has begun from the Project with these traditional communities, the work has not been fully deployed. The traditional communities' expectations are of course political in nature to some degree (and some of the expectations are beyond the Project as a whole), yet the involvement of government and forceful donors are revealing to the community members that the Project is also political in the sense that development processes and recognition of their rights should be a part of the conservation efforts expected. The community is well aware that promises are made but they don't see any benefits from the Project besides the hiring of a few members in the community by the Project, yet at the same time they are perceiving greater control by park staff.

The Project has made some good strides in the latter period. In comparison to the seven percent budget delivery reflected in the 2014 PIR, the delivery of some products has been positive in the following period (2014 – 2015). In particular, and as indicated above in relation to Outcome 1 and in relation to staffing, infrastructure, and equipping. Overall, therefore, the delivery is uneven between the two expected outcomes, as seen in the chart above, with some areas satisfactorily ranked and other areas unsatisfactorily so.

The effectiveness of a project is defined as the extent to which its objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved. Effectiveness is the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved. The valorisation of effectiveness or efficacy is used as an aggregate for judgment of the merit or worth of an activity, (i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact). While efficiency (or efficacy, or furthermore, cost-effectiveness) is defined as the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. Overall, the Project has been moderately satisfactory in terms of effectiveness with regard to Outcome 1. At the mid – point review period, several moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in this outcome have been identified. Nevertheless, even against earlier estimates, achievements in terms of park staffing, infrastructure, and gear have been achieved to a satisfactory level. Conversely, with regard to expected Outcome 2, the effectiveness has been rather minor. This assessment

²⁰ Which was subcontracted to a company, yet at the time of the evaluation it was not availed.

is made based on the premise that most of the expected outputs, processes, and outcomes have not been achieved or have been very partially achieved. Taking into account the two levels of achievement indicated above, a composite assessment regarding efficiency is that the Project has been rather slightly efficient. That is that the assessments of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results is that (in general and to date) this has only been slight.

As it connects to implementation, country ownership is challenging to determine with regards to the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola*. In some ways there is a suitable degree of country ownership, in particular as it relates to expressed ownership by government stakeholders (Ministry of Environment mainly), of the issue. That is, government expresses ownership regarding the issue of management of protected areas in Angola, its challenges and its needs to cohesively manage parks and impulse sustainable development.

Conversely, however, there is fragile ownership of the Project per se, with government on board in some aspects of its implementation and objective-seeking and not in others. As is seen in the section of sustainability (below) this could affect the sustainable impulse of whatever results the Project has achieved and/or would achieving in the short term. At other levels, the fragile ownership (besides the issue of discourse as stated above) is manifested by the low level of engagement of INBAC, which is the main beneficiary department of the Project within the GoA, as well as the weak leadership provided in national implementation, in particularly during the first year of operation. This was also associated, in part, to the incomplete setting up of the institutional structure (of INBAC) at the start of the project. The lack engagement can also be associated to other patterns and issues such as long delay in implementation associated by very slow decision making processes at government level and lack of delegation by government to national coordinator (e.g., long delays in contracting park staff, consultancy companies, etc.).

4.3 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The management arrangements established in the design and inception phases are the typical organizational provisions of a National Implementation Modality (NIM) intervention. The Project is to be implemented by the Ministry of Environment of Angola with UNDP overseeing implementation. The UNDP Country Office (in close cooperation with the MINAMB) is responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment and contracting of project staff; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by the Project Steering Committee (PSC); (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (v) ensuring that all activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures.²¹ The European Union (EU) delegates the implementation of joint-financing to UNDP.

The Ministry of Environment has overall responsibility for the Project in terms of achieving the project goal and objective through strategic oversight and guidance and is to designate a senior official as National Project Director to provide strategic oversight and guidance. At design level there is also guidelines on setting up a Project Management Unit (with a Coordinator, Administrative Assistant, and Park Manager). Related to management and governance, the Project should have a Project Steering Committee (PSC) to serve as the Project Board, chaired by MINAMB and including representation from different institutions (EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP).

²¹ As indicated in ProDoc.

These are management arrangements as far as they have been designed. The actual mechanics of management arrangements is not however totally reflected as defined in project design.

This project follows a national implementation modality (NIM). Therefore, the roles of the implementing partner (i.e. MINAMB) are key in implementation and in achieving results. Overall, the Government of Angola is responsible for the management and delivery of programme activities to achieve project outputs and outcome. UNDP's role in NIM projects is to oversee implementation. With these delineations in mind several execution, coordination and operational issues are evaluated.

First of all, several of the coordination and implementation issues are related to the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) which should serve as a decision – making / governance structure, approve work plans and oversee implementation.²² The Project Coordinator and Park Manager produce Annual Work and Budget Plans (with close engagement with technical – level structures) which are to be debated and approved in annual PSC meetings. These work and budget plans are a result of technical analysis. Yet there is a gap between the plans and what the PSC approves. Approved outputs and investments are, at times, not fully corresponding with the plans drawn with technical backing and related to the schemes that are set in project planning documents (ProDoc, etc.). That is, the technically developed plans are at times overlooked by the PSC. Furthermore, the meetings where decision making should take place are not adequately planned to facilitate decision making and foment transparency. They don't have the necessary preparation (that is, they are run without proper documents and analysis provided to members in order for them to make informed decisions), nor are they held in a timely manner to allow for members' participation. Overall then, decision-making is not wholly transparent and is not undertaken in a timely manner.

Although the anticipated PMU structure is simple (Project Coordinator, Administrative Assistant, and Park Manager of Iona), with the intention of harnessing experts as needed (nationally and internationally) as consultants/temporary basis, this has not been implemented as such. A very convoluted staffing pattern has taken place. The Project has a National Park Manager and an International Park Manager, it has a national Project Coordinator and it has had also an International Coordinator. The logic of mirroring national and international posts is not explicit and also it undermines a basic principle for these sorts of projects which is to generate and/or reinforce national capacities. Furthermore, it is not clear what directives and prerogatives the international staff has or had, who they report to or even what their role is to be in many cases. Although it is understood that Angola lacks national capacities in many areas related to sustainable natural resource management, including biodiversity management, generating and / or reinforcing national capacities is not being achieved by hiring “mirror” personnel to the national staff with unclear or duplicate roles. There should be an aim to hire transitional international experts in order to generate in country capacity when it is not available in a consulting/expert/temporary basis, not as parallel staff. This double staffing also impairs the overall impression of the project, and reporting, institutional roles, and responsibilities of staff are confused (and also confusing) by these mixed sorts of personnel.

The NIM modality of implementation that is used in this Project is not fully understood by most partners. In GEF funded UNDP implemented projects, national implementation mode is used when there is satisfactory capacity in national institutions to undertake the management of the project. The implementation of projects requires that the national institution acting as “Implementing Partner” has the technical as well as administrative capacity to assume the responsibility for mobilizing and applying

²² As indicated earlier in this report, the Committee is chaired by MINAMB and it includes representation from different institutions (EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP) involved in the project in different capacities.

effectively the required inputs in order to reach the expected outputs. On the other hand, it is expected that the national implementation mode will contribute to the building of national capacities. Therefore, it attempts to strike a balance between acknowledging a country's capabilities to manage a project but at the same time be fully committed to strengthening national capacities through the implementation of a project. A strategic value added of UNDP in these sort of projects is the corporate mandate to create and fulfil national capacities. NIM modalities are key processes to achieve this given that they foment greater national self-reliance by effective use and strengthening of the management capabilities; they drive enhanced technical expertise of national institutions and individuals through learning by doing; as well as enhance sustainability of development projects by increasing national ownership and commitment to development activities. Therefore, all parties involved should understand what the benefits (and perhaps drawbacks) of this sort of implementation modality and act accordingly.

UNDP's role is to guide implementation. From the national side their actual role in this project is seen as too strict or 'micromanagement'. However, it is this evaluation's perception that what is considered stringent is the regular guidance to implementation that UNDP administers in these sorts of projects. On the contrary, it is believed that UNDP could and should use more its prerogatives in implementation guidance in order to leverage improved implementation and successful completion of the Project.

The quality of technical support to be provided by UNDP could also be improved, if the Minister of Environment of Angola and other partners do agree to it, given the network of experts associated to UNDP and GEF at the regional and international level which do have knowledge and capacities to aid the country in developing methodologies and tools to sustainably and equitably manage protected areas. Up to date this has not materialized in the needed dimensions.

WORK PLANNING

The Project has had severe delays in project start up and implementation, and continues to be lagging in achieving what are to be results at its mid-point. Staffing issues, unclear roles and partnership agreements, nationally lingering ownership, lack of delegation of duties and responsibilities upon the Project, and unclear decision making processes have all hindered implementation. Some of these causes for delays have been resolved (at least at the time of evaluation), for instance such as some staffing issues. Others continue to be true and continue to pose problems in the future achievements of results.

A major concern for the issues found is that the Project's actual execution and implementation processes are not fully results – based and it does not follow work planning closely (log frame, design). There is a lack of general understanding by most stakeholders (government, board, project staff) of the framework / log frame as a management tool that links products / investments with results. Occasionally new issues and new products (not in the ProDoc) that are expected to be obtained by the Project arise (airplane, bridge) without an integral planning or understanding of how they fit into a results – based framework. Furthermore, micromanagement and a lack of delegation in decision – making, and at times decisions being reversed after work plans are drawn by project's technical team are indicative that work – planning within the Project is not followed adequately.

Adaptive management is defined as a project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (project objective, outcomes, or outputs) during implementation resulting from: (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions that changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original objectives were overambitious;

or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress.²³ In a strict sense, in the case of the *Conservation Of Iona National Park Project*, there have no formal overarching changes to project objective, outcome, and outputs. The only type of possible adaptive change located by this evaluation is the generation of a new list of indicators (that is, new indicators in addition to those in the Project Document) generated as a result of the inception workshop. Nevertheless, these are not used in monitoring or reporting (for instance, they are not part of PIRs) and therefore have not been assimilated in the implementing and monitoring processes.

Therefore, no adaptive management in a full and strict sense has taken place since formally there have been no changes in objectives, outputs or outcomes thus far and the proposed changes to indicators are not incorporated in the monitoring process. That being said, the project management unit together with UNDP have worked together in analysing shortcomings and proposing mitigation measures, in particular in order to deal with implementation rate. However, as stated above, work plans based on technical assessments are at times disrupted when either they are overturned by board decisions or by a sole partner without taking into account what is approved; or when there is a gap between the plans and what the PSC approves. Approved outputs and investments are, at times, not fully corresponding with the plans drawn with technical backing and related to the schemes that are set in project planning documents (ProDoc, etc.). That is, the technically developed work plans are at times overlooked by the PSC or decisions are made unilaterally without adequate process.

FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE

At the time of the mid-term assessment 52.2 percent of the total expected financing amount has been received for the project. This analysis is based in the comparison between the amount of funds confirmed at CEO endorsement and the actual amount contributed at the midterm review stage with information from GEF, UNDP, and the European Union as co – financiers. No data is available as to the actual amount contributed (grant, in kind, etc.) at the midterm evaluation stage from the Government of Angola. Therefore, an overall analysis cannot be made, only an analysis of the finance from other co – financiers besides the GoA. The actual amount contributed at the time of the mid-term assessment is of slightly over one half of the funds confirmed at endorsement. Although this might be a figure appropriate to a mid-term review, this figure is actually low when taking into account that the planned completion of the project is only a year away from the mid-term review.

²³ UNDP-GEF DIRECTORATE. *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, 2014.

TABLE 2: CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
GEF	GEF	Grant	2 000 000	1 356 101	67.8
European Union	European Union	Grant	5 265 000	3 754 216	71
Regular (UNDP TRAC)	UNDP	Grant	1 140 000	479 135	42
Other UNDP	UNDP	Grant	300 000	0	0
Government of Angola	Government of Angola	---	2000000	-- ²⁴	0
TOTAL			10 705 000	5 589 542	52.2

PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Monitoring at design includes standard mechanisms and tools which are customary for UNDP-implemented / GEF – funded projects. In the monitoring and evaluation plan drawn in the Project Document the stated types of monitoring activities are (up to mid-term review) as follows:

- Inception Workshop and Report
- Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.
- Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation
- ARR/PIR
- Periodic status/ progress reports (quarterly)
- Audits
- Visits to field sites.

Therefore, design at entry for monitoring and evaluation is the standard for the Project's specific context. However, to this added other reporting duties have been added and layered on top of the ones indicated above from the Project Document, which entail additional time and costs burden, also associated to the micromanagement by different stakeholders of the Project that is taking place in monitoring and reporting.²⁵

²⁴ No financial data is available for co – financing from GoA.

²⁵ This is a UNDP mandated evaluation following that Agency's and GEF guidelines to analyze this Project. However, the intervention, by virtue of having EU financing must also be audited and should report according to EU

The implementation of the monitoring instruments design has not, however, been as satisfactory. At the time of the mid-term evaluation there was no monitoring officer. Although visits to field site, PIRs, inception workshop, and other tools were implemented, there was no monitoring officer to follow up closely on the tools implemented in an organic manner. Also, the means of verification as in the Log Frame (see sector on achievement indicators) are weak.

Yet the major issue to deal with regarding monitoring are the few follow-up actions which were taken in response to the different monitoring tools. That is, the monitoring instruments are developed and drafted to a suitable degree, yet there is little evidence that they are used thoroughly and strategically to make adjustments to the Project when necessary. Other processes mediate, and when adjustments are attempted decisions are made that override what has been developed or recommended as part of the monitoring process. Other times lack of delegation and lagging decision making processes also curtail the utility of the monitoring processes.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

As seen in the section on design, at the project formulation level there was a strong stakeholder analysis. This not only identifying institutions or typologies of institutions to be involved in the Project since the design went further by carrying out a solid analysis of anticipated roles and responsibilities in project implementation.

Nevertheless, application of this analysis has varied and overall is not as strong in developing and leveraging partnerships with many direct and with tangential stakeholders. Engagement with critical governmental stakeholders at the provincial and local government levels is very strong and active. These levels of government express support of the objectives of the Project and have an active role in decision – making through their participation in the Project’s board.

However, this is not the case with some other areas of national government included in the stakeholder analysis since their role is either not as proactive as planned, is tangential or at times even non-existent. Regarding participation from non – state actors (non – governmental organizations, traditional communities) their engagement is also weak.

REPORTING

Reporting for the Project (as stated in other relevant sections of this report) is convoluted. As part of the monitoring plan, the Project undertakes and fulfils GEF reporting requisites. However, in addition, other reporting duties are layered on top of this due to the fact that the Project also reports to the EU.

With regard to reporting as required by UNDP and GEF reporting requisites, these are trimestral and annual reporting depending on each of the requirements for the different sort of reports that the Project must fulfil. Through these, changes in the project are shared with stakeholders and other partners. However, some questioning has arisen with regard to the quality of some information inputted in reports. For instance, METT scores are put in doubt in some cases given that they are not arrived at with the methodological rigor and robustness needed for this information to be reasonable and trustworthy.

guidelines. This evaluation does not analyze EU auditing and reporting since it is not in its mandate to do so, but it is mentioned here to indicate the multiple layers and different formats of reporting that the Project and UNDP must respond in order to keep with the donor’s requirements.

COMMUNICATIONS

An issue that does not pertain strictly to the evaluation but which has had an effect on coordination and implementation matters, as well as the interaction between partners, is what some partners identify as the Project's visibility.

The Project did not until recently have a concrete communication strategy. Yet, at some level this is understandable since it did not have, either, concrete delivery of products, outputs, etc. (as indicated above, only seven percent of budget was delivered in the first two years of the Project).

Currently, there is an agreement on visibility (i.e. communication strategy) and there have been strides acknowledging the partners and donors as well as communicating a better image of a Project as a whole. There is room for improvement, however, in particular with regard to this communication strategy. That is, it should not be perceived only as placing agreed upon logos on documents, on equipment and/or on billboards, but as an active communication of the issues present in Angola vis – a – vis protected area management and what the Project is doing to envisage and confront them. The communication strategy should brandish the newly agreed upon motto "*Conhecer para conservar*" (know to conserve) and truly make known what the issues are, how they are being faced within the Project, and what is being accomplished.

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

Mid-term evaluations, when dealing with sustainability, assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination. Sustainability is normally considered to be the prospect of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. Guidelines for GEF – funded / UNDP- implemented project evaluations establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability: financial, socio – economic, institutional framework and environmental. That is, at mid-point, evaluations attempt to identify early identification of risks to sustainability. In this case the sustainability issue is key. The project achievements will be null if sustainability cannot be secured before project end, especially for the continued protection and management of the Iona National Park.

FINANCIAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

Regarding financial risks, an evaluation ascertains if there are financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes as well as the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once granted assistance ends. In the case of the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* there are two aspects weaved into its potential financial sustainability. First, within the Project design it is indicated that the preparation of a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system will be drawn, which as indicated in several areas, would be heavily reliant on tourism as a source of funding for management costs. However, this business plan has not been developed to date and the issue of tourism as a major source of funding for protected areas in Angola is remote at best as seen in other sections of this report. The other financial pillar presented throughout the Project is government funding. Although there have been financial allocations for protected areas as well as specific allocations within the Project's framework as co – financing, they are at the moment jeopardized by budget cuts within government associated with the steep drop that oil prices are experiencing. Furthermore, earmarking financial resources for protected areas management has proven to be challenging for the GoA. Although the GoA and other donors and partners are intensely expecting follow – up funding to this Project which could further allot grants for protected areas management, at present there are high risks regarding genuine sustainable financing schemes outside of donor funded arrangements for maintaining Project results after current grants are allocated.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC TO SUSTAINABILITY

The socio - economic risks to sustainability identified are mainly those identified in the Project risk analysis. That is the relation of local communities resident in the protected areas (particularly traditional communities which have been living in the areas before they were declared parks or reserves and therefore uphold rights) coming into conflict with authorities over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource use practices (which is the case in Iona). The Project has not implemented many processes to aid in development of these communities while at the same time reducing or controlling the pressure that their livelihoods may have on natural resources.

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

The relatively high ownership of the Project expressed by national, provincial and local governments (the latter two in the Iona National Park area) as well their expressed support of long term objectives indicates that, at least at the official discourse level, there are no major threats to sustainability. Yet, risks to sustainability are identified at a more of political level or institutional framework in the sense that the staff trained and hired by the Project have not been assimilated into the proper government structures, for instance. Therefore, this issue is crucial when analysing risks to sustainability given that the capacity generated and built within the project for park rangers and their technical / supervision knowledge and practice is in danger of being lost if they are not incorporated as government staff. Since institutional tools and methodologies for protected area management that were to be developed within the second expected outcome have not been fully established as of yet, it is impossible to determine what are their risks vis-à-vis sustainable governance. Yet, as they unfold in the next stages of implementation, the Project should carefully consider what institutional and governance framework is needed for these tools and methodologies to be implemented and sustained in the long run.

The project did not include in its design a through sustainability strategy. The sustainability imbedded has been basically another project. An exit strategy that fully takes into account the transfer of results to national stakeholders for their sustained implementation and national ownership / support in the short and medium term is lacking besides the aforementioned implication of another donor phase.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

Regarding environmental risks to sustainability they are quite low. The remoteness and quasi pristine nature of Iona Park which is detrimental in some areas (for example, tourism potential hindered by inaccessibility) is however a buffer for environmental threats.

EXTENSION REQUEST

It is agreed by all parties that the gap in implementation verified thus far indicates that the Project cannot be finalised by completion date²⁶. Therefore, several stakeholders are considering a no – cost extension request.

This evaluation also ascertains that it is very unlikely that the Project can be completed in the remaining implementation timeframe. Therefore, an extension request ought to be granted but with substantial improvements to project planning, decision – making processes, and of course improved operational and implementation procedures in evidence between this mid-term evaluation and the

²⁶ Note that completion date is not agreed upon by all parties. Although the proposed completion date for some stakeholders is September 2017 (that is, five years from signature by stakeholders), other actors within the Project perceive that completion date should be in late 2016. This is a primordial issue that all stakeholders and partners should agree upon soonest.

extension application. That is, the extension ought to be granted if in the next months there are improvements in overall implementation.

The extension therefore should be contingent upon several factors and should halt the perception that implementation is just spending allotted funds. Many stakeholders have indicated that this is what they perceive implementation to be: to spend available funds in matters somewhat related to the proposed planning but not fully following the results – based framework that the involved agencies and donors expect to be followed. The extension request should be based on concrete indications that the Project is taking a different track and is now fully on board regarding results, that there is an improved implementation rate in the period from the mid-term review and the extension request, that key interventions have been completed, and that sustainability is being secured.

The request furthermore should be clearly articulated and indicate realistic time – bound results expected, as well as determine how these are to be achieved. Also, the extension application should demonstrate that in the period between this mid-point review and the request there have been substantial changes in decision – making processes, work planning, and implementation that have resulted from adaptive management. Specific suggestions are part of the conclusion / recommendations section of this report.

All of the above being said regarding the extension request, all stakeholders should be deeply aware of the new guidelines that GEF has regarding project extensions. Following these new rules, it is understood that extensions are generally not allowed unless a strong case can be formulated that significant progress will be made in the final years of project implementation. Furthermore, the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator must approve all project extensions.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola has an overarching aim to establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola's globally unique biodiversity. The Project's objective is to catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park.

The Project tries to address a series of problems within a development context framework. The Project's overall purpose is to address inclusively barriers identified that hinder effective management, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in Angola. The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park.
- Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network.

At a local level, (within expected Outcome 1) the project seeks to assist national government in the physical rehabilitation of what was the largest National Park in Angola at the time of project formulation, Iona National Park, through the renovation of infrastructure, and through the establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff team. At the broader national level (and within expected Outcome 2), the project supports the Angolan Government in the establishment and operationalization of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently established Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC) through the preparation and implementation of tools and frameworks for protected area management.

Several expected outputs have been achieved or are in a process of being achieved, principally those which are more material dealing with infrastructure and equipment as well as with park staffing. This is one of the main achievements of the Project, since it has been able to establish a corps of trained rangers and construct and assemble infrastructure and equipment for park management at Iona National Park. Nevertheless, the Project enters its third year of implementation with severe gaps. Gaps are mainly in the attainment of expected Outcome 2, an outcome that although not as 'visual' as infrastructure, staffing and equipment, is highly significant. The tools, methodologies, policies, studies, capacity (and similar expected outputs that make up this outcome) with the right implementation and capacity building, can generate the methods and processes to sustainably manage protected areas in Angola.

Although a high degree of implementation related to the rehabilitation of Iona National Park has been implemented lately, there continue to be issues with these. For instance, many of the outputs, activities, and products are carried out or implemented without strategic planning, even the infrastructure and equipping of the chosen sites has been done in a haphazard manner without accurate nor deliberate planning and lacking connection to a management plan. And, perhaps related to lack of attention to the management tools that are to be developed within the Projects realm, there is a delinking between the needed management tools to effectively manage Iona National Park and the infrastructure and other investments taking place within the Park.

Several conceptual gaps have also been identified. For instance, although Iona National Park has an extensive coastline, no concrete continuous processes related to coastal management within a protected area are manifest. Issues related to the coast and that do have a deep impact on natural resources within the confines of the park (being the extensive coastline a part of Iona Park) are not thoroughly acknowledged nor acted upon. Issues such as fishing, off shore illegal fishing which takes place

at a larger scale than subsistence livelihoods by local people, and the environmental impact that purported tourism can have in these areas and their natural resources is not fully acknowledged. Although it is claimed that management plans for the coastal area would be developed, they are not evident at the time of the mid-term evaluation.

Another gap, and a very important one not only from the point of view of natural resources but from the point of view of equity and development, relates to the local traditional communities living with the confines of Iona Park. The work with original communities (nomadic, semi nomadic, etc.) has not achieved results and expected outcomes because it basically has not taken place as of yet. There is a strong emphasis on the pressure that these populations can place on the Park's resources yet there is little analysis as to the extent of impact and scant thorough work with these communities. The Project takes the view of strict command and control to deal with these communities and there are no strategies visible in dealing with indigenous communities within protected areas (that is, no strategy nor plan for raising their development levels together with engaging them in conservation and sustainable use of park resources). Activities to support communities' engagement and livelihoods (as stakeholders and beneficiaries) should be among the highest priorities for implementation, with immediate start. This may imply developing and implementing a priority plan that can be drawn up at this stage to initiate as soon as possible with pilot interventions with the communities.

Lastly, conceptually the supposed financing and business plans that are to be developed and implemented are not feasible. At the design level national characteristics and circumstances were not adequately taken into account regarding this issue. Therefore, the feasibility of implementing substantial tourism-oriented business plans that can produce sufficient income to aid in the management of Iona National Park is simply not viable.

The Project has been and continues to be relevant for the country, not only due to Angola's gaps with regards to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use but also with regard to broader capacity building needed in the country in its road to be more sustainable and to benefit relegated local populations living in the confines or near parks in seeking their insertion in the country with true sustainable development aims. Regarding the criteria of effectiveness and efficiency, issues, difficulties, and complications in implementation, decision – making, donors and partners relations, staffing, and other such matters have created situations that are causing postponements and delays as identified in this report. These issues have diminished the potential efficiency and effectiveness factors within the Project. With regards to the criterion of sustainability there are several forewarnings that must be noted if the achievements accomplished and to be accomplished are to be sustainable in the short and medium term after the Project is completed.

There is a lot at stake with this Project. It is supposed to be first phase for a second broader more ambitious intervention dealing with integral protected area management in Angola. And the achievements as well as lessons learned from the Project are to be the keystones for the second phase. Therefore, seeking positive sustainable and equitable outcomes in whatever time remains for implementation of the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* not only is in benefit of the Project per se but also for further work in the country.

LESSONS LEARNED

- The value of a robust design cannot be overestimated and it is linked to successful implementation and obtaining developmental sustainable results. A strong design implies thorough knowledge of the country and of the areas of where the project would take place, and therefore needs to be realistic in terms of what can be achieved in a particular national context. Furthermore, robust design also implies the development of robust

methodological tools that can aid and further implementation and sustainability (such as indicators, log frames, means of verification, and the like).

- Challenges and risks manifest themselves in implementation, monitoring and evaluation when a project which originates in one agency is transferred to another implementing agency without accurately altering expected outputs and outcomes and without taking into account what the final implementation agency's value added and comparative advantages lie.
- When projects are implemented with the participation of multiple stakeholders, each one's role, functions, partnership arrangements, and responsibilities should be clearly delineated before project starts and adhered to throughout project implementation.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations presented here reflect corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, proposals for future directions underlining main objectives as well as actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project. Furthermore, they also include recommendations should the *National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park* in Angola present an extension request. The first set of suggested commendations (Recommendations at The Design Level for Future Programming of GEF Funded – UNDP Implemented Projects) are intended (evidently) for GEF and UNDP. The second and third set of recommendations are intended for UNDP CO in Angola, the Government of Angola, and the Project Management Unit as partners in implementation. There is no suggested time frame added for the recommendations for future programming given that it is understood these processes are not specifically time bound. It is suggested that the next two sets of recommendations be analysed and taken up as the stakeholders see fit as soon as possible since time is of the essence in implementation of the Project for it to meet with expectations.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

1. Design of these sort of projects should be realistic and not only respond to an overall matrix, one size fits all type of approach.
 - a. Design should take into account very deeply what the national characteristics are in regards to expected processes, outputs, and outcomes.
 - b. Inception and design should be based on thorough knowledge of the country and of the areas where the project would take place, with incorporated knowledge not only of the ecosystem, but also of true social – environmental dynamics, political issues, impacts and threats.
 - c. The choice of sites for on the ground interventions should also be realistic, choosing areas for piloting where intervention is truly feasible, always keeping in mind that projects pilot in sites and that these interventions should be experimental with expected replication after the project concludes based on successes at the site level.
2. Indicators are key components of design and log frame and should be set at design with their intention made unequivocal: to determine a project's impacts and effects.

- a. Baseline indicators should be sought or set for all expected outputs and outcomes. Without baseline data impact or effect cannot be measured nor attributed to an intervention.
 - b. Target indicators should be realistically set; that is, they must be set within the capacity to be achieved given the resources, time frame, and capacities.
 - c. Means of verification should be methodologically robust in order to give validity not only to monitoring but also to the analysis of effects, outcomes, and impact.
3. Exit strategy and sustainability factors should be part of the design of a project. This should include the realistic framework for results to continue after external aid is concluded, including schemes for accurate financial structures and policy to sustain achievements even after project concludes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

2. The role, functions, and decision making processes of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) should be reviewed and adjustments should be made for it to function properly and transparently with all partners involved. Specifically, it is suggested that:
 - PSC meetings should be held with sufficient preparation so that informed decision making can take place.
 - PSC should analyse technical proposals and work plans based on these proposals and not make decisions on activities / products outside of these.
 - Technical proposals and annual work plans presented to the PSC should follow design (i.e. Project Document), yet if there are suggested deviations from the design these should be substantiated technically, with indicators, and reflecting a results chain approach (inputs – outputs – outcomes – effect – impact).
 - PSC should hold meetings more often than once a year in order to speed up decision making processes as well as to monitor implementation.
 - PSC members who cannot fully participate should delegate decision making power in order to make this process agile and expeditious.
 - PSC members should be aware that their role is to steer, make decisions, and monitor, not to be directly engaged with operation.
3. The work with local communities (nomadic, semi nomadic, etc.) has to begin to take place soonest, and at this stage should include a sort of immediate emergency plan to initiate pilot interventions as soon as possible. Work with the communities should be based on development principles and up-to-date views on how to integrate indigenous / local communities in protected areas as well as taking into account the community rights to development. Thorough analysis on what the real impact of a small number of subsistence – level groups truly have on natural resources within an area as large as Iona Park should be the basis for this work and mechanisms to reduce pressure yet upgrade their livelihoods and quality of life should be implemented. In order for these communities to be on board with new management schemes, true incentives need to be developed and implemented since they are weary of the many unfulfilled promises received.
4. Staffing and consulting roles should be clarified and streamlined in order to have an organizational unit with agile coordination, administration and management that has clear direction and reporting lines. International consultants should be hired temporarily and

convened only when no in – country expertise is present, but always with the goal of generating and / or reinforcing capacity in the country.

5. A second workshop, with similar characteristics as the inception workshop held upon project launching, should be convened in order to address key issues for the Project's conclusion phase (some of which are expanded above), to reach comprehensive agreements on aspects that need to be reformulated in order to successfully conclude the intervention, and to clarify roles of different stakeholders. The workshop should be carried out with thorough preparation and with concrete proposals for reformulations or changes presented for analysis. All reformulations should take into account national issues and national needs. Specifically, it is recommended that in this re – launching workshop the following should be taken into account or addressed based on proposals and reformulations presented by the Project:
 - a. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms.
 - b. Discuss and agree upon how the PSC will operate promptly, efficiently and transparently, and clarify the way the Project must be implemented in its remaining time (i.e. in accordance with ProDoc, log frame, etc.).
 - c. Discuss reporting (financial and operational) procedures, issues and obligations clarifying roles as necessary.
 - d. Review indicators and re-establish or improve their relation with products and activities, expected results and expected objectives.²⁷
 - e. Review and agree upon means of verification in order for them to provide true monitoring information.
 - f. Review and agree upon mechanisms for decentralization of decision – making and implementation at the local level where relevant.
 - g. Fully involve stakeholders (from other government agencies besides the MINAMB, as well as civil society, academics) in order to move forward with implementation and seek and improve sustainability of the Project.
 - h. Agree upon a Project – generated road map that takes into account project implementation problems yet proposes time – bound milestones and how they will be monitored in order to further implementation.
6. The role of UNDP within the Project should be strengthened, fully applying its function to guide implementation. UNDP should leverage implementation closely. Firstly, by proactive participation in decision – making structures. Second, by exercising fully all the roles revealed at the design level such as providing financial and audit services to the project, overseeing financial expenditures against approved budgets, as well as providing technical support as necessary, with adequate staffing to be able to meet these functions. UNDP should also create some exigency mechanisms where continued guidance and support is contingent upon achieving milestones (milestones as indicated in a road map as proposed above). All of the above should be carried out in conjunction with the Government of Angola's full assimilation

²⁷ The section below dealing with recommendations for an eventual extension request contains specifics as to what could be changed regarding the log frame (including indicators) to provide guidance to improve progress towards outcomes.

of national implementation modalities guidelines and procedures as well as UNDP's role in national implementation modalities.

7. Project personnel should be trained and their capacity should be strengthened in order to be versant on all aspects of project implementation. In particular, there should be a transfer of knowledge of administration procedures, monitoring, implementation modalities, reporting and other requirements that implementation has.
8. Project should implement a communication strategy, not only a visibility strategy, where the challenges and issues in the sustainable management of protected areas lie in Angola and how the Project is facing them. It should go beyond mere visibility of partners but should document and communicate issues, achievements, and challenges.
9. A sustainability strategy with concrete timeline should be generated soonest, not at the end of the Project's implementation. This exit strategy should include aspects of capacity sustainability, policy tools needed to sustain achievements in the short and medium term as well as a realistic financial strategy to maintain results in the long run. Some suggested specifics regarding this strategy are:
 - a. Ensuring that policy tools needed to sustain achievements in the medium and long term are developed and enacted (such as norms and regulations to be drawn up and adopted creating/strengthening the legal structure for protected area management within existing national frameworks for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use).
 - b. Generate genuine sustainable financing schemes for maintaining achievements after Project conclusion, integrating projected budgeting for protected area management into broader macro-economic programming for Angola.
 - c. Ensuring that planned work with populations within Iona National Park (local and traditional communities) fully takes place within the Project in order to generate mechanisms to promote sustainable use of natural resources and advancing communities' developmental levels, not only due to their development rights but also as a means to maintain engagement and reduce social risks for sustaining achievements.
 - d. Ensuring that staff trained and hired by the Project (for example, park rangers) are assimilated into the proper government structures.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

10. If an extension request is presented at the time when the Project would supposedly conclude, it is this evaluation's assessment that it should be granted if the following aspects have been taken care of in the interim between the mid-term review and the request:
 - There is a demonstrated substantial improvement in implementation, in particular in relation to Outcome 2 expected outputs, products and results.
 - There is a firm exit strategy delineated and sustainability aspects are already implemented by the time of the no – cost extension request.
 - There are substantial improvements with the Project's decision – making processes.
 - There is a demonstrated reformulation of aspects of the Project that need to be changed with alterations implemented as needed.

- There is a clear understanding of the results – based framework which is expected to be followed and not just a request to spend allotted funds without a results-oriented strategy.
- The request furthermore should be clearly articulated and indicate realistic time – bound results expected and how these are to be achieved.
- A thorough review of the log frame is carried out and presented with, inter alia, adjustments to it made that reflect an effort towards improving implementation and aiding in monitoring and measuring performance, maintaining expected outcomes. The review should contain as a minimum, the following adjustments:
 - i. A thorough review of the log frame indicators should take place. For instance, where indicators are not sufficiently specified, these should be expressed in such a way.²⁸ Where indicators have been deemed obsolete between project formulation and implementation, they should be updated.²⁹ Overly ambitious indicators could also be revised and be adjusted to more fitting gauges.³⁰
 - ii. As important is a review of verification methods, moving away from anecdotal verification and towards more substantive methods based on analysis, studies, and methodically obtained data. Revised verification methods based on data and studies should be incorporated in revised log frame.
 - iii. Also regarding verification methods, the log frame should incorporate robustness in the way the indicators are analysed and verification methods are implemented. Tracking tools (METT, financial score card, etc.) need to be specified thoroughly in the revised log frame and when implemented they need to be realised in a methodologically robust manner, again not in a circumstantial manner and always based on systematically obtained data.

²⁸ For instance, as specified in the text of this report, there are several indicators that are intuitive, yet their lack of specificity leaves them open for interpretation and to confusion for some stakeholders. For example, when a target indicator of >10% regarding Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas is established. Nevertheless, it is not specified what that >10% is specific to. Or when Capacity development indicator score for protected area system which are defined as Systemic: 55%, Institutional: 50%, and Individual: 45%. Although it is intuitive to what they refer, several stakeholders do not perceive them as such and their specificity is left to interpretation.

²⁹ For instance, the original framework includes the issue of a “Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government” as an expected result. Yet, it is understood that a plan was already approved before project initiated as a strategic framework. Therefore, this indicator should be changed to norms adopted, creating the legal architecture for the implementation of the Plano de expansão da rede de Áreas de Conservação. This was also indicated in the review of indicators that took place after the Inception Workshop but this review has not been assimilated in Project reporting and monitoring instruments.

³⁰ For example, for expected Outcome 2 “Number of protected areas where a structured rationalization and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation”, is supposed to rise from 1 (baseline indicator) to 4 (achievement indicator). Given that this indicator is overly ambitious given the context and what can be expected that a project such as the one being evaluated here can achieve, a more realistic metric could be proposed.

ANNEX 1: MTR ToR (EXCLUDING ToR ANNEXES)

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the fullsize project titled National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park (PIMS 4581) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, which is to be undertaken in February 2015. The project started on February 2013 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (attached)*.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed as the first phase of a more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. For this phase of the national program, the project will focus outputs and activities - over a period of four years - at two levels of intervention. At a national level (Component 2), the project will support the government in the establishment and operationalisation of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently approved Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC). At a local level (Component 1), the project will seek to assist the government to rehabilitate a single protected area - the largest National Park in Angola, Iona National Park (15,150 km²). The total budget planned is USD10,750,000, and planned co-finance is USD2,000,000 to be provided from the Government of Angola, USD1,140,000 from UNDP TRAC funds, USD2,000,000 from the GEF, USD5,265,000 from the European Union. The total cash co-finance is USD8,040,000. The project will be implemented over a period of five years. The project will be nationally implemented (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment. The UNDP Country Office will monitor the project's implementation and achievement of the project outputs, and ensure the proper use of UNDP/GEF funds. Working in close cooperation with MINAMB, the UNDP Country Office (CO) will be responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment and contracting of project staff; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by the Project Steering Committee (PSC); (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (v) ensuring that all activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures. The European Union (EU) delegated the implementation of the joint-financing of 3.9 million Euros to the UNDP. The EU and UNDP have signed a 'Contribution Agreement' that entrusts the implementation of the specific budget tasks to the UNDP. MINAMB have the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives and designated a senior official to act as the National Project Director responsible for providing strategic oversight and guidance to project implementation. The Project Steering Committee ensures that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality. The PSC will be chaired by MINAMB. The PSC will include representation from: EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (attached list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Tombwa, and Iona National Park in Namibe province.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

³¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the

Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³³	Baseline Level ³⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ³⁵	End-ofproject Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ³⁶	Achievement Rating ³⁷	Justification for Rating
------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	--	------------------------------	----------------------	--	----------------------------------	--------------------------

³³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

³⁵ If available

³⁶ Colour code this column only

³⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Objective:	Indicator 1: Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	1%		>10%			
	Indicator 2: Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	0%		Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%			
	Indicator 3: Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	84% (estimate; information by GoA not available)		>US\$8 million			
	Indicator 4: Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	Achieved		>7			

Outcome 1:	Indicator 5: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	0		>45%			
	Indicator 6: Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	Partially achieved		12			
	Indicator 7: Percentage (%) of park visitors ³⁸ obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	0%		>80%			
	Indicator 8: Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km ²) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	0%		<20%			
	Indicator 9: Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	0		>2000 >300 >3500 >500			

³⁸ 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

Indicator 10: Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife specie	0 (of 16)	Not achieved		4 (of 16)			
---	-----------	--------------	--	-----------	--	--	--

Indicator 11: Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	1		<12			
Indicator 12: Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decisionmaking processes	0	0%		>60%			
Indicator 13: Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: achieved Indirect: 0		Direct: >10 Indirect: >30			
Indicator 14: Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park	US\$155/a nnum	No information		>US\$250 /annum			

Outcome 2:	Indicator 15: Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Achieved		Yes			
-------------------	---	----	----------	--	-----	--	--	--

	Indicator 16: Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Not achieved		Yes			
	Indicator 17: Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	Not achieved		>50%			
	Indicator 18: Number of protected area staff completing in- service training and skills development programmes	0	0		20			

Indicator 19: Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	1		3	
Indicator 20: Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	0		7	
Indicator 21: Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	Achieved		4	

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decisionmaking transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/

transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.³⁹

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for National Biodiversity Project:
Conservation of Iona National Park**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	

³⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 8 weeks including a 10 days visit to Luanda and Namibe starting *September*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
08 May 2015	Application closes
15 May	Select MTR Team
20 May	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
26 May	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
May: (tbd)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
10 days (r: 7-15)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
May (tbd)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
(tbd) May 08 days (r: 5-10)	Preparing draft report
(tbd) May days r: 1-2	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
28 March	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
3 April	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UN comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Angola.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity focal area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems';
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Southern Africa and similar context;

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity focal area, ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems’; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master’s degree in Biodiversity Conservation, or other closely related field.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Lumpsum or technical fee plus cost of actual travel and DSA

11. APPLICATION PROCESS¹⁰

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template¹¹ provided by UNDP; b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form¹²);

Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

- c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP, Rua Major Kanhangulo, Nr.197, C.P. 910 Luanda, Angola in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park (PIMS 4581) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY Aguiar Cuiundana aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org, Please fill in by 31 August 2015. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

ANNEX 2: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)

Evaluation Questions Per Criteria	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?			
How realistic were the project's intended outcomes?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?	Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Interviews
Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs?	Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria	Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument	Document analysis
Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Angola To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs?	• Coherence UNDP and GEF operational programming	UNDAF, UNDP/GEF Programming statements.	Document analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
To what extent were project results achieved?	See indicators in the project document results framework and log frame. (Analysis of indicators (SMART analysis)	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic	Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis
Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?	Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	Project documents	Document analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Was adaptive management used and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues	Project documents	Document analysis

How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?	Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were the indicators provided in the Project Document effectively used for measuring progress and performance?	Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency	Project documents Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated at project start-up?	Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency	Project documents	Interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
In what way may the benefits from the project be maintained or increased in the future?	See indicators in project document results framework and log frame	Project documents and reports	Document analysis
Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained	Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	Government of Angola, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Evidence that Mainstreaming has taken place	Project documents and	Document analysis

ANNEX 3: SAMPLE INTERVIEW GUIDE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

1. What has been your involvement with National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park?
2. What have been, in your opinion, the major achievements obtained in the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park?
3. What have been the main problems in your opinion in the implementation of the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola?
4. What would be your recommendations for future work of the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola?
5. How realistic were the project's intended outcomes?
6. Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context
7. To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?
8. Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?
9. Was adaptive management used and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?
10. To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?
11. In what way may the benefits from the project be maintained or increased in the future?
12. Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
13. Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?

ANNEX 4: SAMPLE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

<p>1. What has been your involvement with National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park?</p>
<p>2. What have been, in your opinion, the major achievements obtained in the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park?</p>
<p>3. What have been the main problems in your opinion in the implementation of the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola?</p>
<p>4. What would be your recommendations for future work of the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park in Angola?</p>
<p>5. Any other comments or issues you would like to add, please insert here.</p>

ANNEX 5: RATING SCALES

Rating scale for performance

Rating	Explanation
Highly satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

Rating Scale for Sustainability

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

ANNEX 6: PROJECT'S LOG FRAME

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP: Outcome 6 (Strengthen national capacities to mainstream environmental protection into national development plans and programmes through a pro-poor growth perspective); Output 6.1 (Effective implementation of biodiversity strategy and action plan)
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Output 6.1 - Number of programmes designed and implemented in accordance with the National Biodiversity Strategy
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: SO 1 (Catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems); SP 3 (Strengthening terrestrial protected area networks)
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Improved management of terrestrial protected areas
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Protected area management effectiveness as measured by individual protected area scorecards

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park	1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	>10%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">INBAC develops its organisational structure to meet its mandate for administering the protected area systemRevenues from protected areas are reinvested in the protected area systemModels of public-private partnerships are developed and implemented in protected areas Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBACThe government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development<ul style="list-style-type: none">INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	3. Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	>US\$8 million ⁴⁰	Audited financial reports of INBAC and MINAMB	
	4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>7	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB	
Outcome 1 Rehabilitation of Iona National Park	Outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1.1 Park staff are appointed, trained, adequately equipped and deployed in the park1.2 Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services1.3 Develop and integrated park management plan1.4 Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park				
	5. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	>45%	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">MINAMB recruits and funds the appointment of

⁴⁰ No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	6. Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	12	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB Project reports Park annual reports	<div>suitable permanent park personnel</div> <div><div>– The government of Namibe transfers the use of infrastructure at Espinheira and Charojamba to the park</div><div>– Adequately qualified contractors can be sourced to undertake the construction projects in the park</div><div>– The appointment of international/ regional consultants/contractors is not unduly delayed by bureaucratic processes</div><div>– Local communities in the park are amenable to employment and alternative livelihood opportunities created by park management</div></div> <div>Risks:</div> <div><div>– Local communities resident in the park conflict with the park authority over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource-use practices</div><div>– Climate change exacerbates habitat fragmentation in terrestrial ecosystems in the park</div><div>– The proposed Baynes Mountain Dam and hydro-power project results in severe negative impacts on the park during the construction and operational phases.</div></div>
	7. Percentage (%) of park visitors ⁴¹ obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	>80%	Park visitor survey data Record of permits issued Park monthly and annual reports	
	8. Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km ²) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	<20%	Livestock impact assessment data Park annual reports	
	9. Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann’s Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	>2000 >300 >3500 >500	Game count survey data Park annual reports	
	10. Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	4 (of 16)	Records of community meetings Formal community-park agreements Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park Park annual reports	
	11. Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	<12	Park monthly and annual reports	
	12. Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes.	0	>60%	Records of community meetings Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park	
	13. Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: >10 Indirect: >30	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	
	14. Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park	US\$155/annum	>US\$250/annum	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	
Outcome 2 Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network	Outputs: 2.1 Prepare a strategic plan for the protected area system 2.2 Develop the organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system 2.3 Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves 2.4 Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves				
	15. Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Yes	Government Decree	Assumptions: – The government formally approves and adopts equitable job descriptions

⁴¹ 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	16. Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Yes	Public Service Regulation	and remuneration levels for protected area staff – There is a pool of sufficiently qualified and experienced personnel who could be sourced, appointed and deployed to administer protected areas
	17. Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	>50%	Annual report of PA agency	– The knowledge about, and access to, individual protected areas is freely available
	18. Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	20	Annual report of PA agency	Risks: – Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBAC
	19. Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	3	Annual report of PA agency	– The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development
	20. Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	7	State of Parks/Reserves reports	– INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas
	21. Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	4	Annual report of PA agency	

ANNEX 7: : NEW LIST OF INDICATORS – AFTER INCEPTION WORKSHOP

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
Project Objective Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park	1. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	>10%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard
	2. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard
	3. Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	>US\$8 million ⁴²	Audited financial reports of INBAC and MINAMB OGE
	4. Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>7	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB No of METTs
Outcome 1 Rehabilitation of Iona National Park Outputs: Park staff are appointed, trained, adequately equipped and deployed in the park Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services Develop and integrated park management plan Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park				
	5. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	>45%	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)
	6. Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	12	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB Project reports Park annual reports
	7. Percentage (%) of park visitors ⁴³ obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	>80%	Park visitor survey data Record of permits issued Park monthly and annual reports
	8. Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km ²) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	<20%	Livestock impact assessment data Park annual reports
	9. Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	>2000 >300 >3500 >500	Game count survey data Park annual reports

⁴² No annual adjustment for CPI

⁴³ 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
	Add indicator: Decrease in estimated flight distance of large mammals (m)	500m	30m	Park reports
	10. Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	4 (of 16)	Records of community meetings Formal community-park agreements Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park Park annual reports
	11. Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum It should be noted that increase in recorded incidents in the first 2-3 years would be a positive indicator of increased enforcement and effective operation of the park staff. Only after 2-3 years of steady effective operation, decreased poaching records may actually indicate decreased poaching.	No data	Should be at least 20 records in first years 1 and 2 to indicate enforcement effectiveness, and then up to 15 in year 4	Park monthly and annual reports
	12. Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes.	0	>60%	Records of community meetings Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park
	13. Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: >10 Indirect: >30	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports
	14. Number of households benefiting in other ways from the park rehabilitation and services (e.g., water access)	0	100	
	14. Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park This is not necessarily an adequate indicator related to the project objectives. I suggest deleting this.	US\$155/annum	>US\$250/annum	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports
Outcome 2 Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network Outputs: 2.1 Prepare a strategic plan for the protected area system 2.2 Develop the organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system				
	15. Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government PLERNACA was approved already before the project initiated, as a strategic framework. Should be: Laws, decrees, regulations adopted, creating the legal basis for the PLERNACA's implementation	No	Yes	Government Decree
	16. Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Yes	Public Service Regulation

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
2.3 Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves 2.4 Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves)	0	>50%	Annual report of PA agency
	18. Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	20	Annual report of PA agency
	19. Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	3	Annual report of PA agency
	20. Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	7	State of Parks/Reserves reports
	21. Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	4	Annual report of PA agency

ANNEX 8: MTR MISSION ITINERARY

31 de outubro -13 de Novembro de 2015

Data	Hora	Actividade/Encontro/Pessoa	
31/ 1 Sabado	9:30	Saida Buenos Aires	
01/11 Domingo	12:20	Chegada a Luanda	
02/11 Segunda	09:00	Samuel Harbor	Director do PNUD
	10:00	Gabriela do Nascimento José Felix Olivia Pereira Tito Vilinga	Unidade de Desenvolvimento Sustentável do PNUD
	11:00	Paolo Balladelli	Coordenador do Sistema das Nações Unidas em Angola e Representante Residente do PNUD
03/11 Terça	09:00	Paula Cristina Coelho	Secretaria de Estado para o Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (Ministério do Ambiente)
	10:00	Joaquim Manuel	Director Nacional da Biodiversidade, Ministério do Ambiente
	12:30	Aristofanes Pontes Miguel Neto Gonçalves Xavier Sango do Anjos Gomes de Sá	Coordenador do Projecto Técnico senior Chefe de Departamentos de Gestão da Biodiversidade
04/11 Quarta	09:00	Vincent Van Halsema	ex Focal Point da União Europeia para o Projecto
		Partida para a Provincia do Namibe	
05/11 Quinta	12:00	José Chindongo António	Município Tombua
		Partida para Iona	
		Manuel Sebastião Afonso	Administrador Nacional do Parque

06/11 Sexta		Madalena Júlia Felismina	Administradora Comunal do Iona
		Chitengo Eputi	Soba Grande
		António Chingange	Membro da comunidade
		José João dos Espirito Santos	Membro da comunidade
		António Gaspar	Comandante da Policia do Iona
		José João dos Espirito Santos	Reunião focais con guardas do parque
		Francisco Ndeaunda	
07/11 Sábado		Partida para Namibe	
		Maria Eduarda Pombal	Directora Provincial do Ordenamento do Território Urbanismo e Ambiente
08/11 Domingo		Partida para Luanda	
09/11 Segunda	08:30	Samuel Harbor	PNUD
	09:30	Suzana Martins	União Europeia
		Danilo Barbero	União Europeia
10/11 Terça	11:00	Paolo Balladelli	Coordenador do Sistema das Nações Unidas em Angola e Representante Residente do PNUD
11/11 Quarta		Partida de Luanda	
12/11 Quinta		Partida de Johannesburgo	
13/11 Sexta		Llegada a Buenos Aires	

ANNEX 9: LISTS OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

LIST OF INTERVIEWED PERSONS (IN PERSON, FOCAL GROUPS, OR QUESTIONNAIRES)

Maria Eduarda Pombal	Directora Provincial do Ordenamento do Território Urbanismo e Ambiente, Namibe
Amaya Olivares	Ex assessora técnico do Projeto
Vincent Van Halsema	Ex Focal Point da União Europeia
Tamaro Ron	Ex Gestora do Projeto
Miguel Neto Gonçalves Xavier	INBAC
Sango do Anjos Gomes de Sá	INBAC
Madalena Júlia Felismina	Iona
António Chingange	Membro da comunidade
José João dos Espirito Santos	Membro da comunidade
Paula Cristina Coelho	Ministério do Ambiente
Joaquim Manuel	Ministério do Ambiente
Manuel Sebastião Afonso	Parque do Iona
José João dos Espirito Santos	Parque do Iona
Francisco Ndeaunda	Parque do Iona
Bruce Bennett	Parque do Iona
Samuel Harbor	PNUD
Gabriela do Nascimento	PNUD
José Felix	PNUD
Olivia Pereira	PNUD
Tito Vilinga	PNUD
Paolo Balladelli	PNUD
António Gaspar	Polícia do Iona

Aristofanes Pontes	Projecto Iona
Chitengo Eputi	Soba Grande
José Chindongo António	Tombua
Suzana Martins	União Europeia
Danilo Barbero	União Europeia

ANNEX 10: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- ✚ 2014. Project Implementation Review (PIR) of PIMS 4581. Preparatory Assistance: Preparation of a UNDP/GEF Project: National Biodiversity Project – “Iona Conservation”
- ✚ Grupo Milicia. Relatório final do Curso de Agentes da Comunidade / Fiscais do Parque Nacional do Iona – Angola. Vila Nova de Gaia – Portugal. 15 de Dezembro de 2014.
- ✚ PNUD - Programa das Nações Unidas para o desenvolvimento. País: ANGOLA. DOCUMENTO DE PROJECTO. Título do Projecto Projecto Nacional de Biodiversidade: Conservação do Parque Nacional de Iona.
- ✚ Relatório Inicial. UNDP GEF PIMS 4581 / GEF Secretariat Project ID 4082. Atlas Award 00064743 / Atlas Project ID 00081396. Projecto Nacional de Biodiversidade: Conservação do Parque Nacional de Iona.
- ✚ República de Angola. Ministério do Ambiente. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY PROJECT: CONSERVATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK . Atlas (UNDP) ID: 00081396. UNDP/GEF PIMS: 4581. GEF Secretariat ID: 4082. Reference number of the Contribution Agreement (CRIS): FED/2013/317-806. Annual Report for the European Union nº1: Reporting Period: 07/02/2013 – 31/12/2014. (Report submission date: 24/03/2015)
- ✚ República de Angola. MINISTÉRIO DO AMBIENTE. PROJECTO NACIONAL DE BIODIVERSIDADE: CONSERVAÇÃO DO PARQUE NACIONAL DE IONA. Projecto Nacional da Biodiversidade: Conservação do Parque Nacional de Iona. Um Programa de Cooperação técnica Angola-Namíbia no âmbito do Projecto. 2013.
- ✚ REPÚBLICA DE ANGOLA. MINISTÉRIO DO AMBIENTE. INSTITUTO NACIONAL DA BIODIVERSIDADE E ÁREAS DE CONSERVAÇÃO (INBAC). RELATÓRIO SOBRE O DIA INTERNACIONAL DA BIODIVERSIDADE . 22 DE MAIO DE 2015.
- ✚ REPÚBLICA DE ANGOLA. MINISTÉRIO DO AMBIENTE. PROJECTO NACIONAL DA BIODIVERSIDADE: CONSERVAÇÃO DO PARQUE NACIONAL DO IONA. FORMAÇÃO DOS AGENTES COMUNITÁRIOS. Dezembro de 2014.
- ✚ República de Angola. MINISTÉRIO DO AMBIENTE. PROJECTO NACIONAL DE BIODIVERSIDADE: CONSERVAÇÃO DO PARQUE NACIONAL DE IONA. National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park. Preparatory Technical Mission to Namibe and Iona NP (7-13.1.2013).
- ✚ UNDP. *Financial Sustainability Scorecard: for National Systems of Protected Areas*, 2nd Edition, 2010.-
- ✚ UNDP. Outcome Evaluation. UNDP Angola Environmental Portfolio – 2009 – 2013. Final Report. 18th July 2014.
- ✚ UNDP-GEF DIRECTORATE. *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, 2014.

- ✚ UNIÃO EUROPEIA. DELEGAÇÃO NA REPÚBLICA DE ANGOLA. RELATÓRIO DE EXECUÇÃO DO PROJECTO. Título: : National Biodiversity project: Conservation of Iona National Park. Data do Relatório: 22/06/2015
- ✚ UNIÃO EUROPEIA. DELEGAÇÃO NA REPÚBLICA DE ANGOLA. Visita de Monitoria – Relatório de Recomendações ao Projecto. 12 de Junho de 2015
- ✚ UNIÃO EUROPEIA. DELEGAÇÃO NA REPÚBLICA DE ANGOLA. Visita de Monitoria – Relatório de Recomendações ao Projecto. 12 de Junho de 2015
- ✚ United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), Angola, 2009 – 2013

ANNEX 11: SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants⁴⁴

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form


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

Name of Consultant: Maria ORESTINI

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 Buenos Aires, Argentina (*Place*) on October 1 2015 (*Date*)

Signature: 

⁴⁴ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct