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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1a:** *Strengthen the criteria for designation as the other effective conservation measure (OECM) to make these criteria stricter to enable greater correspondence with internationally recognized standards for OECMs. Some of the areas designated, as OECM under this project may not legitimately qualify as such if guidelines/criteria for designation were more rigorous and the application of those criteria were also more rigorously applied*. There are some newly designated OECMs for example where dagga (marijuana) is illegally being cultivated. | | | | |
| **Management response:[[1]](#footnote-1) Do not agree,** becauseOECM guidelines just like any gazette instrument does not disqualify areas that are effectively managed to curb illegal activities such as poaching and dagga growing amongst others. The newly designated OECMs have systematic processes and procedures they follow to curb marijuana which were acceptable to country’s context of land tenure under Chiefs controls. So, cow fines are imposed to people found guilty of any illegal activity done within community protected areas. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[2]](#footnote-2)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| * 1. Continue carrying out awareness campaigns of OECMs guidelines to stakeholders. | December2022 | Conservation Department at ENTC and Environmental Affairs Department in the Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs (MTEA)’s | Evaluations committee established  OECM evaluation committee was nominated by PS office. | Initiated |
| 1.2 Review Terms of References (ToR’s) of the OECM’s evaluation committee to guide their assignment after project closes. | May 2022 | Principal Secretary’s (PS) Office MTEA, Conservation Department at ENTC and Environmental Affairs Department in the MTEA’s | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1b:** *Strengthen the OECM committee (the committee responsible for deciding if a site should be designated as an OECM or not) with more relevant technical expertise in the field of biodiversity conservation.* At present, institutional representation is a primary consideration for inclusion on the committee whereas, this not being a political but rather a technical committee, the primary consideration should be technical background. | | | | |
| **Management response:[[4]](#footnote-4) *Do not agree*,** becauseinstitutions targeted are public, private, NGO’s and community oriented that have either experts or experienced technocrats on biodiversity conservation. In addition to biodiversity experts, OECM committee has experts in community development and planning to complement the environmentalists. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[5]](#footnote-5)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[6]](#footnote-6)** |
| * 1. Evaluation of OECM’s committee performance as guided by ToR’s. | December2022 | Principal Secretary’s (PS) Office MTEA and Chief Executive Officer ENTC. | Evaluations committee established | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1c:** *Put in place additional assurance that OECMs and other formal (but not gazetted) PAs will not be converted land to non-biodiversity compatible uses. Put in place a monitoring system for OECMs to monitor long-term compliance with non-conversion to non-biodiversity conservation compatible uses.* | | | | |
| **Management response:[[7]](#footnote-7) *Partially agree*,** becauseinvestments made in private PA’s are not a service type but solely to strengthen efforts done by PA’s and a condition was attached prior to support that PA’s must develop access benefit policies detailing how nearby communities can access services and natural resources for domestic and cultural purposes. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking[[8]](#footnote-8)** | |
| **Comments** | **Status[[9]](#footnote-9)** |
| * 1. Develop monitoring system for OECMS | December2022 | Conservation Department at ENTC and Environmental Affairs Department in the MTEA’s | Evaluations committee established | Initiated |
| 1.2 Undertake regular monitoring of OECMs to assure integrity of the land committed to conservation | Annually | Conservation Department at ENTC and Environmental Affairs Department in the MTEA’s | Initiated |
| 1.3 Sign agreements with communities, private landowners to secure land under effective conservation management | Dec 2022 | Conservation Department at ENTC and Environmental Affairs Department in the MTEA’s | Access benefit sharing developed by private land owners | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2a:** *The newly established Landscape Associations (LAs) need further assistance to become truly operational and meaningful*. Without such support, there is high risk that they will become forums without action. Assist each of the LAs to further refine the priority actions they will focus on (what specific collaborative efforts will they undertake; what agreements will they pursue between the various landowners in the landscape related to fence removal, encouraging free-ranging wildlife, Access-Benefit Sharing agreements between PLOs and adjacent communities, etc.). | | | | |
| **Management response: *Fully agree,*** Landscape association secretariat has been supported by the PMU and ENTC Senior Wardens in each landscape to develop draft plans for the landscape conservation work intended to be carried out. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 Encourage all LA to finish their work plans. | By end of March 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | Drafts have been developed by the three LA’s a following up is needed. | Initiated. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2b:** *Facilitate access to SGP funding for the landscape associations (LAs)*. Such funding should be to support actions, not meetings. It is good that the SGP is already in touch with the LAs to discuss sustainability. | | | | |
| **Management response: *Fully agree,*** the Small Grants Coordinator has been involved in the mobilization workshops of stakeholders in each landscape for the development of LAs and in the launches of the landscape management plans. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 Make follow-ups with the Small Grants Coordinator on how country strategy has integrated working with LA’s as it has been motivated for. | By end of February 2022 | Conservation department at ENTC and UNDP | SGP Coordinator was involved during LA establishments | Initiated. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2c:** *Wherever relevant, include activities in future donor-supported projects to support LAs in implementing their priority on-the-ground collaborative actions (e.g., IAPS control, re-introduction of wildlife, schemes to compensate landowners for losses incurred related to reducing livestock numbers that result in increasing wildlife numbers, etc.).* | | | | |
| **Management response: *Fully agree,*** ENTC and the department of Environmental affairs in the MTEA are working on a Mbuluzi catchment project that will work close with Malolotja and Lubombo LA’s. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 Approach UNDP on developing concept notes for possible projects. | By end of June 2022 | ENTC CEO and MTEA Environmental Department | Need to broaden resource mobilization strategies to approach more development agencies. | Not initiated. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3:** *The Lubombo Conservancy (LC) & the new Lubombo Landscape Association (LA) should meet with the assistance of a facilitator from the Project (such as the NPM) to discuss whether the LA is redundant/needed or not and a final decision in this regard should be taken to avoid confusion in future between the two entities*. Duplication with the existing Lubombo Conservancy (LC) should be avoided. If the main difference between the existing LC and the newly formed LA is that the later would have greater geographic coverage, this, in the opinion of the TE is not adequate justification to pursue the new LA. Creating a yet bigger umbrella when the existing umbrella is not fully functional does not seem to be the best solution. The approach adopted by the LC is a good model of a landscape approach to conservation which has struggled over the years to become more operational in part for lack of adequate funding. Establishing a new, larger entity may actually detract from the ability of the LC to strengthen its efforts as it may create both confusion and competition for limited funding. The TE recommends that careful consideration be given to whether further effort should be made to pursue the new LA for Lubombo or whether it should be dropped and effort made instead to further strengthen the existing LC. Such discussions should take place with the members of both the existing LC as well as the members of the new LA for Lubombo. | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree,*** since the project had a consultative workshop where LC was represented by its chairperson KaMsholo Resort, and the representatives from the communities made it clear that LC represented interests of a minority that were not inclusive and did not address community concerns adequately. An example was made where the LC chairperson who is Mbuluzi Game Reserve Manager, refused to hand over Impalas that Shewula Mountain Camp was promised under the TFCA project. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 3.1 Host meeting to clarify what is the role of the LC and that of the Lubombo LA and how these can collaborate. | By end of March 2022 | ENTC conservation |  | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4a:** *Encourage and support exchanges between women members of Wetland Management Committees from communities where wetlands management plans have been developed so that successful initiatives in some wetlands can be undertaken in others.* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree,*** capacity building through the use of peers has more impact when community members get to ask practical questions, networks for peers consultations are broadened and lessons learnt (success stories and challenges) get to be shared. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Organise learning exchanges between the women groups | By March 2022 | ENTC conservation | ENTC Senior ecologist has been focal in developing the management plans of the wetlands | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4b:** *Support in-school activities in communities where wetlands exist to increase awareness regarding the importance of wetlands and actions that can be taken to protect them (fencing, alternative watering and washing areas, reduction of livestock stocking rates, and other means).* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree,*** because wetlands committee has to play a pivotal role in implementing their strategies of the wetland management plan. ENTC support could include link the committees with potential funders or partners to deliver their awareness activities. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Facilitate linkages between wetlands committees and potential supporters for wetlands management. | By April 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | Environmental Fund at Eswatini Environmental Authority should be considered to further support wetlands protection initiatives. | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4c:** *Further support nascent entrepreneurial activities undertaken by women based on extraction of resources from wetlands so that this can be replicated in other communities for more women to benefit and for the economic benefit they derive to be more significant.* (A total of only approximately 30 women in only one community – Khalangilile -- are currently engaged in this activity which is harvesting of reeds to make into handicrafts and other products for sale. The economic benefit they currently derive from this is small. 30 women derived a total of E588 in 2020 and 22 women derived a total E491 in 2021, which is equivalent to approximately US$40/year. Local women pay a small levy (E5) to harvest reeds in the wetland and women from outside the community pay a higher levy (E20). The revenue generated from the fee is reinvested into maintaining fencing to protect the wetland and to control IAPS in the wetland area. | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree,*** because further support on entrepreneurial activities in wetlands is needed to role out wetlands protection to other sites. No levies are charged on the use of natural resources but financing mechanisms will be developed to support implementation of wetland management plans. However, it is not true that 30 women derived E588 in 2020 and this is supported by project PMU reports, SWIFT report on values of wetland flora bundles and other studies on value of wetland flora products. According to SWIFT report[[10]](#footnote-10) a bundle of wetland flora sells at E150 and the women harvest more than 80 bundles per season (May-September annually) which is equivalent to E12,000. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Request to SWIFT to continue supporting capacity building on handicraft entrepreneurs | By end May 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | Relationships were built between SWIFT and wetlands management committees | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4d:** Showcase nascent entrepreneurial activities undertaken by women based on deriving economic benefits from protected wetlands by including these in Environment Day and other national events | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree,*** because this creates a marketing platform for the women and that it can influence policy support to strengthen and multiply initiatives since they have potential to curb poverty. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Engage wetlands stakeholders to plan jointly for showcase of wetlands products during commemoration days related to biodiversity conservation | By end May 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | Ramsar national stakeholders can be engaged since a committee exists. | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 5**: *The reintroduction of some wildlife species for the purpose of trialing game ranching within communal Protected Areas (PAs) should be further considered.* Game ranching was described in the PRODOC as an alternative livelihood but was never pursued by the project. The legislative environment that exists in the country made this a difficult process to pursue. For example, the Game Act which could have facilitated for this is held by a private body that has complete control over how it is administered. The project anticipated the passing of the ENTC Amendment Bill to facilitate establishment of Communal PAs which did not materialize. The relevant entities should meet to discuss the possibility of providing the necessary support to trial game ranching on one communal PA. Trialing game ranching on communal lands will require a significant investment (in terms of community buy-in/commitment, financial subsidies, and technical support). It is not realistic to assume game ranching will be viable in the short term. Such an initiative will require long-term support and should be trialled on one communal PA to begin with. Criteria for deciding on the most appropriate place to do so should be developed as a first step. Such criteria may include, for example, communal land adjoining an existing conserved area, level of community interest/buy in, logistical considerations related to wildlife reintroductions, habitat condition, logistical considerations related to game processing possibilities, etc.. | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree***, because it is apparent that the legislative framework of the Game Act limits opportunities of game ranching. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 5.1 Organize a meeting with Big Game Parks and the King’s Office to discuss how they can support a trial to game ranching. | By end of May 2022 | ENTC Chief Executive Officer |  | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 6a:** *Three of the vehicles purchased by the Project should be kept fulltime in the 3 landscapes supported by the project and can either be attached to the Landscape Associations or to the ENTC-managed PAs for use by the Park Wardens to implement PA conservation activities within and around the PAs.* None of these vehicles should be kept at Lobamba (ENTC headquarters) where they are now being kept. | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree***, because vehicles when under ENTC PAs in all the landscapes, will enable the state agency to continue giving support to the landscape associations. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Facilitate transfer of the vehicles to each of the PAs to further advance conservation efforts in the landscapes. | By January 2021. | ENTC Conservation Department. | Project board has agreed that assets be transferred to ENTC | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 6b:** The project purchased a machine intended to produce fuel briquettes from Invasive Alien Plant Species (IAPS). This machine is not operational since it was purchased. The project committed to making a viable business from this investment that would benefit communities at landscape level. *The project should ensure the machine is operational before project closure and that follow up is ensured to put the business venture in place and to become operational (as was planned and budgeted for in this project).* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree***. The shredder component is functional and has been sent to Luzelweni Community under Ngwempisi Cluster. The maximum capacity machine (shredder and saw dust compressor) is being considered for a private, public partnership agreement to have it run and benefit the communities within the landscapes. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Facilitate partnership between Landscape Association with a private company to fully utilize the machine. | By January 2021. | ENTC Conservation Department. | Draft MOU available and end of January must be concluded | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 6c:** Water troughs were purchased for some ENTC PAs (e.g., Mlawula Nature Reserve) to encourage dispersion of wildlife during drought to prevent degradation of the environment around the few remaining water holes. These have not been used because the water tanker is not operational to take water to the troughs. Government of Eswatini should invest in repairing the water tanker. *Adequate funds for water tanker fuel should be included in budgets of each of the ENTC managed areas to ensure investment in troughs is not lost.* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree***. ENTC will make sure truck is running and has fuel to ensure water points are evenly distributed around the park, since this is a conservation priority and the relevant department has concluded budgets for operationalizing investment made by SNPAS project (water troughs). | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Develop a plan on how to operationalize use of water troughs. | By end of February 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | Borehole installed near Sara camp it could be explored how it can assist | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 7:** *Ensure the following activities are completed by project end: i) the Luzelweni eco-lodge rondavel, ii) Shewula beehives are set up and operational, iii) Shewula fencing is complete, iv) Mahamba bee hives (apiary) are set up and operational, iv) rabbits are acquired for Mhlumeni Ensure that ongoing activities not yet been fully completed are completed by project end:* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree.***  Some of the projects highlighted have been completed (Shewula beehive, Shewula fencing, Mahamba apiary and Mhlumeni rabbit production) mention those completed). | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 7.1 Building material delivered in Luzelweni and a notification meeting on project exit was held to prepare community to handle pressure. | By December 17 2021 | PMU (Ngwempisi Landscape Coordinator) | Conducted pending are builders fees and exit meeting held 08 December 2021 | Initiated |
| 7.2 Shewula bee hives material and builders costs advanced to Shewula after components are satisfactory completed. | By December 17 | PMU (Lubombo Landscape Coordinator) | Completed, and exit meeting held on 09 December 2021 and reports shared with beneficiary | Completed |
| 7.3 Shewula fencing scope revised and material and labour costs related paid. | By December 17 | PMU (Lubombo Landscape Coordinator) | Exit meeting held on 09 December 2021 and Trust was encouraged to utilize Regional Development Fund (RDF) to complete remaining portion of about 350m. | Completed |
| 7.4 Mahamba balcony rehabilitations material bought and work completed | By end of December | PMU (Ngwempisi Landscape Coordinator). | Six balconies completed. | Completed |
| 7.5 Mhlumeni rabbits, supplied after contracting service provider. | By end of November | PMU (Lubombo Landscape Coordinator) | Handed over to community on which date | Completed |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8a:** *The Ministry of Tinkhundla Administration and Development (MTAD) to facilitate the CDTs to access the funds of regional development fund (RDFs) to fortify/finalise the pending activities* (e.g. finalizing structures, purchasing required equipment or required inputs, and compiling needed business/management plans); | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree***. The RDF has its operational modalities that need to be followed by beneficiary communities before they could access the funds. The administration of the funds is independent per Inkhundla Centre and the MTAD administration has limited influence over it. Therefore, it is not guaranteed that communities can get support. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Facilitate meeting to encourage the Community Development Trust (CDT) to approach Tinkhundla Community Development Officers to assist in filling grant request forms. | By 17 December 2021 | PMU | Representatives from Chiefdom Authorities, Community Development Committee members and CDT members invited in project exit meeting that started 06-16 December 2021 | Completed |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8b:** Capacitate the same project communities (through skills development or reinforcement) in order to mobilize resources and forge partnerships to carry out successful income generating activities; | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree.*** The project has built capacity to benefitting communities on enterprise management and business plans development. Furthermore, partner NGO’s (Tenvelo, PELUM and Swaziland Homeopathy project) were requested to assist communities in resources mobilization for sustained and continued growth in community initiatives. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Facilitate that stakeholder NGO’s give support to mobilise resources from Environmental Fund | By end of December 2021 | PMU and ENTC Conservation Department | The NGO’s that implemented tree planting with communities were requested to assist communities to mobilize resources and Tenvelo, PELUM and Swaziland Homeopathy project. | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8c:** *Devise (in close consultation with the communities on the ground) more viable and sustainable alternative livelihood options that are long term oriented to counter the temptation to venture in the cultivation of illegal substances triggered by unemployment and poverty;* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree***. The project supported enterprises of honey, rabbit and free range chicken production which are sustainable livelihoods born out of engagements with communities (beneficiaries). What could be done, is to strengthen support so that communities effectively run the existing enterprises. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Engage UN development agencies to see if there are project proposals that can be developed to upscale support in the community enterprises currently strained by COVID-19 effects. | By 17 December 2021 | ENTC Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Department of Environmental Affairs | The CEO who is the GEF and UNCBD focal point can engage the UN agencies that are already working with government on this aspect and these are UNDP, UNEP and FAO. | Completed |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8d:** *Link the communities involved in ecotourism with national or international interested partners (e.g., NGOs who as in the case of the Mhlumeni Bush Camp can help to market and bring clients to the Eco lodges).* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree.***  The tourism sector is one that operates at marginal returns following restrictions on travels due to the COVID-19, so getting a fair share of the limited international and domestic market requires partnerships and collaborations. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Facilitate meeting of tourism agencies to negotiate collaborative MOU’s to support the Community Development Trust (CDT) to market their facilities. | By 17 June 2022 | ENTC Business Unit | Business Unit was requested to develop marketing packages for the communities | Initiated |
| 8.2 Facilitate site tours on recently rehabilitated ecotourism facilities with tourism agents. | By end of December 2021 | PMU | Swazi Trails and All Out Africa Directors toured preferred sites of Khopho, khelekhele and Luzelweni so that they know which clients would be interested in their facilities. | Completed |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 9:** *Provide the necessary training and technical support as well as the necessary financial support required to capacitate communities to conserve biodiversity on their communal PAs and to enable these communities to implement on-the-ground actions to conserve biodiversity within communal PAs*. This project was intended in part to enhance on-the-ground conservation, including on communal lands – i.e., to enhance conservation within community conservation areas/protected areas. In practice, however, other than the activities related to wetlands on communal lands and those related to fencing of CCAs, project activities on communal lands mostly focused on activities outside of PAs (i.e., enhancing infrastructure to enhance tourism opportunities, and on small-scale agricultural initiatives – erroneously termed CBNRM). | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree***. The project supported eco-tourism and conservation infrastructures as guided by the project document. It is not correct that tourism infrastructure was considered as Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM). Considerable work has been done under the community’s context where resources are a limiting factor, save for the recommendation it is worth noting that good initiatives have been implemented by the project, such as;   1. Native tree species planting activities done in Luzelweni, KaZulu, Shewula, Mvembili, Ntondozi, Mahamba and mhlumeni. 2. Chiefdoms have imposed heavy fines for perpetrators of illegal plant harvesting and hunting of game e.g. the Shewula and Luzelweni chiefdoms have imposed cattle fines for law breakers. 3. Rangelands restoration project undertaken by Luzelweni community. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 9.1 Initiate meeting where CDT has to consider applying for the Environmental Fund | By December 2021 | PMU | CDT were engaged during the project exit meetings held from 06-16 December 2021 | Completed |
| 9.2 Engage Department of Environmental Affairs and UNDP to mobilise more resources to support community conservation efforts | By June 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department | UNDP in collaboration with African Wildlife Foundation completed scoping of potential areas support on 03 December 2021 | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 10*:*** *Facilitate a meeting between Chiefs (from Chiefdoms for which the project supported the elaboration of CDPs and which have designated PAs) and private companies (national or multinational) with interest in supporting biodiversity conservation and raising their profile as “green” companies*. The purpose of the meeting would be to bring Chiefs and private sector together to facilitate the search for funding for the initiatives described in the recommendations related to communal lands. Consideration should be given to resuscitating partnerships that were already established but affected by the project suspension such as that with Montigny. There were also indications of interest from neighbouring PAs, at least in the Ngwempisi cluster to support community areas, i.e. Mantini Game Reserve was interested in supporting surrounding communities and communal PAs. | | | | |
| **Management response**: **Fully *Agree.*** The project has successfully facilitated partnerships. In the case of the Ngwempisi cluster, Montigny forest is supporting and partnering with communities to stimulate green economy (setting woodlots for Luzelweni Community for income generation). In the case of Lubombo cluster, Tabankulu Estate has pledged support for the Lubombo Landscape Association. Therefore, the is a need to upscale such initiatives addressing different conservation needs. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 10.1 Facilitate landscape meetings to resuscitate partnerships | By end of July 2022 | ENTC Conservation Department |  | Initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 11:** BGP withdrew from this project soon after project launch. This had major implications for the project. The project has now undergone a TE in which lessons are identified for future investments. The TE tried unsuccessfully to interview BGP as a key stakeholder in this project (as the originally planned primary RP and also as a key conservation player in the country). The TET understands that BGP and ENTC have recently begun to collaborate on another large biodiversity project which adopts a landscape approach. That project is being designed before the TE for this project is completed. *A meeting should be convened to ensure the findings and lessons emanating from this project are shared and discussed to ensure the new project builds on the experience of this project.* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully agree,*** ENTC and partners will explore mechanism lessons learnt are meant to inform best practices for future projects and help perform better in them. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 11.1 Make presentation during board meeting | By end of December | PMU and ENTC Executive | Board meeting scheduled for 20 December 2021 | Initiated |
| 11.2 Identify suitable platforms for sharing lessons at a national or international level | By end March 2022 | ENTC, MTEA and UNDP |  | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 12:** *In order to facilitate access to the knowledge base generated during the course of the Project, undertake the following: a) Upload all technical documents produced with project support onto the biodiversity portal; b) Support/equip the Landscape Associations to access the GIS Portal/platform, and to use available information; c) Explore partnerships with the Royal Swaziland Technology Park to ease the challenges of hosting the platform hence ensuring reliability, constant uptime (24/7); d). Promote and uphold institutional memory through documents digital archiving for transmitting the lessons learned for future programming. there is a**need to undertake actions in order to facilitate access to the knowledge base generated during the course of the Project.* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Partially agree.*** All stakeholders need to be capacitated to use the platform, through training and equipment. Internet connectivity in eco lodges and landscapes established with project support provide an opportunity for Landscape Associations to access information.  Continue to explore relationship with Royal Swazi Technology Park (RSTP), for maintenance after 4years. Advise is accepted and RSTP will be engaged for the maintenance on the GIS portal. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 12.1 Upload all technical documents produced with project support onto the biodiversity portal | By end of December | PMU and GIS unit (ENTC) | GIS coordinator given documents to upload and PMU members to have login credentials | Initiated |
| 12.2 Support/equip the Landscape Associations to access the GIS Portal/platform, and to use available information | By July 2022 | ENTC conservation Department and UNDP |  | Not initiated |
| 12.3 Promote and uphold institutional memory through documents digital archiving for transmitting the lessons learned for future programming | By May 2022 | ENTC GIS Coordination and UNDP |  | Not initiated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation recommendation 13.** The GEF Secretariat (GEFSEC) should be contacted to determine what if any course of action may be required as a result of deviations from the approved PRODOC which were pursued by the project as described in this report. Due to the early withdrawal from the Project of the primary “Responsible Party”, the project lost a very significant percent of the co-financing that had been committed (and in part on which the GEFSEC approved the project), and did not undertake as originally planned, numerous activities committed in the CEO endorsed document (activities 1.3.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 3.2.3, 3.3.2, 3.4.2). In addition to the change in co-financing and the change in scope of work resulting from the withdrawal of the planned primary RP from the project early on in the project, the project’s inappropriate pursuit of an alternative project strategy (which was not congruous with the CEO endorsed document) cost the project funds and time -- funds and time which should have been spent pursuing the activities described in the approved PRODOC. The GEFSEC was never approached for advice (as the TE believes it should have been), regarding such major changes from the GEF-approved PRODOC. *Even though this is now the end of this project, the GEFSEC should still be approached for advice on what, if anything, should now be done.* | | | | |
| **Management response**: ***Fully Agree.*** Major changes to approved projects will be brought to the attention of GEF in line with UNDP policies and procedures for GEF financed initiatives. | | | | |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 13.1 UNDP to write a letter to inform GEF-SEC. | End of March 2022 | UNDP | Board meeting recommended this action | Initiated |

1. Select one: Fully Accept, Partially Accept, Reject [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Select one: Not initiated, Initiated, Completed, Completed, No longer applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Select one: Fully Accept, Partially Accept, Reject [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
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8. Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
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