

FINAL EVALUATION

OF

THE PROJECT: CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONVENTIONS IN NAMIBIA

PIMS 3702 NAM 10 (Namibia) 00046421 (Proposal Number) 00055289
(Project Number) MU MSP: CEGEM

FINAL DRAFT

November 30th 2011

Prepared for the Ministry of Environment and Tourism by:

Harrison O. Kojwang

Consultant

Hakon Consultants, P.O. Box 98617, Pelican Square, Windhoek, Namibia

Mobile +264 855 631159, hokojwang@gmail.com or hokojwang@yahoo.com



CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation.....	11
1.2 Evaluation Methodology	12
1.2.1 The Approach Adopted for the Evaluation	12
1.2.2 The Rating System.....	13
1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report	13
2. THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	14
2.1 Project Chronology	14
2.2 Project Context.....	14
2.3 Problems to be addressed by the project.....	14
2.4 Objectives and outcomes of the project	15
2.5 Key Results	16
2.6 Main Stakeholders.....	17
3. FINDINGS	17
3.1 Programme Formulation	17
3.1.1 Conceptualization / Design.....	17
3.1.2 Project Planning	19
3.1.3 Project Ownership.....	20
3.1.4 Stakeholder participation at the Project Formulation	20
3.1.5 Linkages between the project and other interventions	20
3.2 Programme Implementation.....	21
3.2.1 Programme Governance	21
3.2.2 Programme Management and Administration	21
3.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	22
3.2.4 The management of risk.....	22
3.2.5. Management by the UNDP Country Office	23
3.2.6 Financial Management.....	23
3.3 Results and Impacts	24
3.3.1 Measuring progress and success.....	24
3.3.2 Results achieved (achievements, innovations, weaknesses)	24
3.3.3 Overall conclusion on project results and impacts	36
3.4 Relevance, effectiveness, sustainability.....	36
3.4.1 Relevance of the project to the needs of Namibia	36
3.4.2 Effectiveness of project execution	36
3.4.3 Sustainability.....	37
4. SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND LESSONS LEARNT	40
4.1 Key Achievements.....	40
4.2 Lessons learnt	41
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	42
6. ANNEXES	44
Annex I- Terms of Reference (TOR).....	44
Annex II. List of Respondents.....	51
Annex III Documents Reviewed.....	52

Annex IV. Questionnaire: Final Evaluation - Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environment Conventions in Namibia	52
Annex V. Evaluation consultant agreement form	55
Table 1 Summary of project outcomes and outputs	16
Table 2 Overall evaluation by the main project objective	27
Table 3 Project achievements at the output level	28
Table 4 Summary of ratings – formulation, implementation and results.....	38
Table 5 Summary of ratings at the output level	39

ACRONYMS

ABS	Access and Benefit Sharing
BLMSP	Biodiversity and Land Management Support Programme
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CEGEM	Project on 'Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environment Conventions in Namibia'
CITES	Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species
CPP	Country Pilot Partnership for Sustainable Land Management
COP	Conference of the Parties (to CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC)
DEA	Directorate of Environmental Affairs
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
DSS	Directorate of Scientific Services
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Information System Unit
EMIA	Environmental Management and Impact Assessment Bill
FIRM	Forum for Integrated Resource Management
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GRN	Government of Republic of Namibia
GIZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
ICEMA	Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MAWF	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEA	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MLR	Ministry of Land and Resettlement
MME	Ministry of Mines and Energy
MRLGHRD	Ministry of Regional, Local Government, Housing and Rural Development
NACOMA	Namib Coast Biodiversity and Management Project
NACSO	Namibian Association of CBRNM Support Organizations
NAPCOD	National Programme to Combat Desertification
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self-assessment
NDP	National Development Plan
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
NPC	The National Planning Commission of Namibia
PCC	Project Coordination Committee
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMU	Project Management Unit
RAMSAR	Convention on the Protection and Management of Wetlands
SAIEA	Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment
SPAN	Strengthening the Protected Area Network Project
UNAM	University of Namibia
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CEGEM Project originated from a National Capacity Self Assessment exercise conducted in 2005 to clarify issues and gaps in Namibia's capacity to implement Rio Conventions, namely UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD and related conventions such as CITES. In 2007 a project document elaborated a 3-year project, worth USD 735,000, of which USD 475,000 was the contribution from UNDP, to enhance Namibia's capacity to implement Rio Conventions and also to help mainstream the same conventions in national and regional (sub-national) plans.

The project was launched through an Inception Workshop in October 2009 and became operational in January 2010. However by June 2010 the first Project Coordinator left to take up an international appointment, so much of the responsibility for running the project was left in the hands of the Project Director, who is also the Director of the DEA, UNDP and Junior Staff of the Project Coordination Unit (PMU). It is not until February 2010 that a new Project Coordinator was recruited. It is evident that the speed of implementation picked up with the arrival of a substantive coordinator, particularly on training and liaison through collaborative arrangements with other MET Projects, which included those which are not funded by UNDP and GEF.

The key output areas included awareness creation and training in national and regional offices, exposure and training of members from the media, the development of an Environmental Education policy and Strategy, Capacity of MET staff on Rio Conventions and EIA. In addition, there was an outreach programme for non MET institutions, including the two tertiary education institutions of UNAM and the Polytechnic and the schools. The training offered to those in two ministries, namely MLR and MRLGHRD and staff of Regional Councils was aimed at raising awareness on Rio Convention and the incorporation of their objectives into National and Regional Development Plans.

By the time of this final evaluation, the project had been operational for 2 calendar years since the time of the inception workshop. The *main highlights of the achievements* of the project were that:

- It increased the understanding and appreciation of Rio Conventions in Namibia, despite the fact that some stakeholders such as the NPC and MAWF and Tertiary Institutions were not substantively involved
- The level of interest generated in the media on Rio Conventions appears to have been effective and is worthy of a more structured follow-up. A group of 20 journalists in Namibia have formed an organization, "Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development" (MEAD). The organisation has developed a constitution and is awaiting formal registration as a trust.
- It supported the development of an Environmental Education Policy / Strategy which was a first in Namibia and it is expected that the Environmental Information Unit in MET will begin its implementation in 2012. This is quite a worthwhile development that should also invite the participation of Namibia's tertiary institutions.

- It supported national consultations that eventually led to the preparation and publication of Namibia's second communication to the UNFCCC in October 2011 and in time for COP 17 in November and December of 2011.
- During its national and regional training workshops the project facilitated the presentation of the Draft ABS Bill, to stakeholders and particularly Traditional Authorities who were able to give their inputs into the draft bill. In fact the Draft ABS Bill demonstrated the linkages between the Convention on Biological Diversity, supported by the Nagoya Protocol and Namibia's CBNRM Programme, which emphasizes sustainable use
- The training offered to MET staff, particularly field staff, on the application of EIA procedures enhanced MET capacity in an area quite relevant to Rio Conventions and in any sustainable Development Agenda

Some of the *Key Lessons Learnt* are listed herein

- Once some level of awareness has been created, it is important to follow up on those who have been trained. Follow up can take many forms such as specific assignments on the subject matter and follow-up meetings with participants to share experiences and to build a 'peer group' that can help mainstream an idea into operational plans. MET would be well served to seek funds to further pursue the mainstreaming of Rio Conventions.
- In view of the fact that the project did not enjoy the services of an active steering committee, consideration should have been given to having its steering subsumed under an existing Steering Committee of other UNDP Funded Projects in MET. Examples are such as the Africa Adaptation Project, CPP Programme, NAMPLACE and others
- Capacity building projects need clearly set milestones, process targets and indicators some of which should demonstrate the application of acquired capacity. Without certified training, it is often difficult to ascertain capacity if no practical applications of that capacity can be demonstrated.
- In any project, if a key assumption is not met or realized, then a steering committee can discuss and recommend formal amendments to project logframes to reflect the reality of a project environment. CEGEM illustrates this since it was largely predicated on the creation of a Global Conventions Unit and the Office of a Commissioner of Environment in MET, but both of which are expected to be created in the first quarter of 2012.
- In a capacity building project of this nature, the involvement of tertiary teaching institutions to enrich existing teaching curricula, access new teaching materials and case studies; and help produce well informed future practitioners, is important.

- The timing of a project can be a very powerful success factor. In this particular case, the ending of the project before the NDP4 Process began can be considered a 'missed opportunity'.
- Engagement with the media can be an effective and yet inexpensive way of maintaining issues on Rio Conventions in the public domain. This project has demonstrated that.
- A small project can create synergies with bigger ones and achieve a lot more than would be possible in a stand alone project. This project despite its pitfalls was able to form partnerships with the Environmental Information Unit, used the ABS Bill in its national and regional workshops, partnered with African Adaptation, GIZ BSLM and CPP Projects and others, to achieve its outputs under outcome 1.
- The discussions on international conventions using a practical example such as the ABS Bill made it easier to demonstrate the advantages of Conventions such as that on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol.
- The proposal of outcomes should be realistic and fall within the scope of a project, its budget, partners and lifespan. The CEGEM project had good intentions but the nature of the objectives required a longer engagement to yield the desired outcome of mainstreaming Rio Conventions.

The key recommendations from the evaluation are:

- Ideally, the project should have commissioned a comprehensive study at its very beginning to critically assess the status of the implementation of Rio Conventions and use the results thereof, as a backdrop against which a more coordinated national approach would be built and thereby add value to existing efforts.
- Based on opinions expressed by those stakeholders who were interviewed, it is recommended that messages to other government agencies and to the general public, on important issues such as Rio Convention, should not be seen to be originating from a project but from official sources or platforms of MET. This gives the messages the necessary political clout they need to be taken seriously
- The interest in Rio Conventions that the project has helped to generate among stakeholders is more formidable than would be normally expected. More targeted follow-up on key stakeholders is clearly needed and can be implemented by other existing projects and by MET. Members of the Media should continue to be actively engaged by MET on Rio Matters, as should be case with the three ministries; MAWF, MLR and MRLGHRD
- There is sufficient interest in the Tertiary Institutions on environmental conventions and their implications on the management of natural systems. Efforts must be directed to the tertiary institutions, supply them with teaching materials, case studies and actually influence their curricula as much as is practical.

- The project should prepare a comprehensive synthesis report that can be used by the Commissioner of Environment, when the appointment is made, as the achievement of outcome 2 which still needs to be effectively followed up by MET.

The project recorded a number of impressive achievements, particularly under outcome 1. However outcome 2, which was handling the mainstreaming of Rio Conventions into national and regional plans was not fully realized as expected due to the time and budgetary limitations. As a result, the overall rating is **Moderately Satisfactory**. It is further recommended that MET pursues the objectives under outcome 2 during the planning processes for NDP4 which will begin in earnest in 2012.

1. INTRODUCTION

Viewed in the context of the global environmental conventions, Namibia is a country that exemplifies how climate change, biodiversity conservation and combatting desertification are central to sustainable development in the face of past and present human development activities and their interactions with the biological and physical environments. Being the driest country in sub-Saharan Africa with less than 10% of its land mass lying in the subcontinent's dry sub-humid region, it stands vulnerable to even slight shifts in climatic conditions, particularly those associated with increasing average temperatures and increasing frequencies of extreme weather events. Today, it already experiences extreme spatial and temporal variations in rainfall with high temperatures causing high levels of evapotranspiration and given that 70% of the population is dependent on subsistence agriculture and extensive grazing systems, land degradation is already a nationally recognized development challenge.

From a biological diversity perspective, the arid and semi-arid landscapes with its variations from south to north and from west to east have produced a country of unique areas of both floral and faunal endemism. These are represented by the rugged beauty of its arid landforms, the Namib and Kalahari Deserts, Acacia dominated savannahs and woodlands. The marine environment is characterized by an upwelling zone caused by the mix of cold ocean currents from cold Antarctic and the warm currents from West Africa; which causes plankton to rise from the deep to the surface, supporting *one of Africa's richest commercial fishing grounds*. The diversity of Namibia's biological and physical environments, including its unique arid coastal features with majestic sand dunes and mountains support a growing and *nationally important tourism industry*.

With a focus on conservation, Namibia's biological and physical diversity supports a national network of protected areas a few of which are global icons. The Namib-Naukluft Park and the Skeleton Coast, Etosha National Park, the Fish River Canyon and Dune Belt of Sossusvlei are world renowned. In recent years, starting from 1996, Namibia also through progressive policy changes, promoted the formation of Community Based Wildlife Conservancies which has now over 50 legally registered conservation and multiple use areas and the proceeds of tourism and sustainable use of wildlife accrue to communities and their partners. Later in 2001, the new Forest Act also provided a legislative framework that has facilitated the creation of 13 legally recognized Community Forests by 2010 and a further 39 that are in the process of registration.

Faced with the challenges and threats of climate change and biodiversity losses through land degradation, loss of habitats, overutilization of resources, the protected areas, community based conservancies and forests require sustained official support both nationally and globally since they provide both local and global benefits. In consistence with these developments in Namibia, it duly acceded to and ratified the Rio Conventions, namely the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in 1995 and the Convention on Combatting Desertification (UNCCD) in 1997. It also ratified a series of other conventions such as RAMSAR, CITES and others. In acceding to these conventions Namibia declared its commitment to global environmental policies. The challenge

that remained was to build the requisite national capacity to implement them in her national and also in the global interest. In this regard, Namibia in March 2005, completed the first phase of its *National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management Process*. The Government of Namibia and a wide range of stakeholders involved in the NCSA, identified the priority need to mainstream environmental management issues into national development programmes and address the Rio Convention provisions in an integrated manner. In Namibia, implementation of the Rio Conventions on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation occurs in the context of sustainable development and poverty reduction. The NCSA report provided a detailed action plan for addressing the priorities associated with global and national environmental management

The key constraints or barriers to the implementation of the global environmental Conventions, identified during the NCSA process were:

- Inadequate capacity for environmental management; in particular, Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)
- Inadequate harmony between and among policies and pieces of legislation related to natural resources such as those in environment, lands and agriculture
- Low levels of environmental awareness including awareness on Namibia's obligations on Rio Conventions
- Inadequate development and up-scaling of best management practices and lessons learnt in Namibia and other countries ;
- Insufficient recognition of environmental considerations and concerns in development planning, programming and also in addressing Namibia's socio-economic goals associated with poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS, gender equality and community empowerment
- The absence of initiatives to implement the NCSA Action Plan, to ensure sustainability of the process and allocation of funding.

In view of the above and to address some of the major constraints in the Rio Conventions implementations, the proposed project implementation approach was strategically geared to four directions: 1) to **strengthen the technical skills and knowledge** of key Government and non-governmental organizations involved in environmental management, to implement the global environmental objectives; 2) to improve **awareness** on the global environmental Conventions and synergies among them at the national level 3) to develop mechanisms (such as formal inter-sector and inter-institutional partners) for **mainstreaming** environmental issues in the national and regional planning; 4) and to ensure **sustainability** by institutionalizing the implementation process of the NCSA national objectives.

The goal of the project was to integrate global environmental objectives in national development programmes and projects.

The objective of the project was to increase institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation in context with national development.

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

Evaluations are intended to provide assessments of the design, management and implementation of programmes and projects. They also serve as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies used in the implementation of such initiatives. A final evaluation should particularly point out the key lessons learnt, reveal key existing and potential sustainability factors after the lifespan of a project or that of its phases and provide evidence supported recommendations on the way forward.

Generically, evaluations are conducted to provide answers to the following questions:

- Is the project achieving its objectives?
- How well is the project being executed?
- Are the results and impacts achieved by the project likely to be sustainable?

The final evaluation of CEGEM has the following objectives:

- i. To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- ii. To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- iii. To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the International Waters portfolio and need attention; and;
- iv. To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on the effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

Specifically, the Terms of Reference highlight the following as the purpose of the evaluation:

- To assess overall performance against the programme objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
- To critically analyse the implementation and management arrangements of the project
- To list and document initial lessons concerning project design, implementation and management
- To assess project outcomes to date and review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objectives of the project within the timeframe
- To assess project relevance to national priorities
- To provide guidance for the future project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements.

In conducting this evaluation, the evaluators were guided by the following principles as provided for by the GEF policy:

Independence: The Evaluator is independent and has not been engaged in the Project activities, nor was he responsible in the past for the design, implementation or supervision of the project.

Impartiality: The evaluation process has been impartial and has taken into account all the views received from stakeholders.

Transparency: In communicating with stakeholders contacted during the evaluation, the Evaluator conveyed in as open a manner as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria to be applied and the intended use of the findings.

Disclosure: This report serves as a mechanism through which the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation are disseminated to policymakers, operational staff, beneficiaries, the general public and other stakeholders.

1.2 Evaluation Methodology

1.2.1 The Approach Adopted for the Evaluation

The evaluation was composed of three main activities, namely:

- Literature Review,
- Interviews with main stakeholders who were either affiliated to the project or who might be expected to be impacted by the project.
- Report writing.

Document Review

This was conducted to facilitate the familiarisation of the evaluator with the project. The following documents were reviewed as part of this process:

- Project Document
- Project Logframe
- GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) for all the years of project implementation
- Progress reports
- Financial Reports
- Project outputs (technical reports, workshop proceedings, etc.)
- UNDP Handbook for Programme Managers: Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation

Interviews

Interviews of stakeholders who participated in the project in various capacities were conducted based on a questionnaire developed by the evaluator and guided by Terms of Reference for the evaluation exercise and the UNDP Handbook for Programme Managers: Results Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation.

The list of stakeholder respondents was largely suggested by the Project Coordinator, and is annexed to this report (Annex II)

1.2.2 The Rating System

GEF guidance requires the following project aspects to be addressed by an evaluation and a commentary, analysis and rating provided for each:

- Project concept and design;
- Stakeholder participation in project formulation;
- Implementation approach;
- Monitoring and evaluation;
- Stakeholder participation; and
- Attainment of Outcomes and achievement of Project Objectives

This report documents the outcomes of the assessment of these aspects.

As per the terms of reference (TOR) attached as Annex I, the standard GEF 6-point rating system for progress towards objectives, outcomes and outputs, below was applied.

- Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
- Satisfactory (S):** The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
- Unsatisfactory (U):** The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

In addition to the above, the TOR also directed rating categories such as Stakeholder Participation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Attainment of Objectives and Sustainability be rated on a 4-point system, namely, **Highly Satisfactory**, **Satisfactory**, **Marginally Satisfactory**, **Unsatisfactory**

1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report

The next part is the main substantive part of this report which presents the findings of the evaluation exercise in terms of the project formulation, its implementation, its administration and management, its achievements, results and impacts, and the relevance and effectiveness of the project as well as the potential sustainability of the products and results that are unfolding.

The final part is the conclusions section which collates the ratings given and conclusions that are reached throughout the report. This part of the report also contains a list of lessons that

have emerged from this project and concludes with a set of recommendations for improving programme management and implementation.

2. THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project Chronology

As stated in the introduction, the origins of this project began in 2005 when a national exercise known as the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) with respect to Rio Conventions was conducted. Thereafter, a process began to draft a proposal for funding to the GEF which ended in a medium-sized project proposal in 2007. The NCSA report provided a detailed action plan for addressing the priorities associated with global and national environmental management, highlighted the main problems to be addressed to improve Namibia's capacity to implement Rio Conventions and was the main input document for this project.

The project was approved for funding in 2008. The project effectively started with an Inception Workshop held October 2009 and a copy of the report which was made available to the evaluator. According to the inception report, it was supposed to end in 2012. By end of 2011, the project would have run for two full calendar years. The reason for its ending in 2011 is still not very clear, but technically it may be the case that the project was deemed to have started before the date of the inception meeting.

2.2 Project Context

Namibia as the most arid country in sub-Saharan Africa and whose majority population depends on natural resources recognizes the importance of environmental management and has recently begun to take the threats of climate change and adaptation to it more seriously than before. This is particularly true since 2005 when it declared among other things, that Land Degradation was a threat to its land productivity. The problems of land degradation manifest themselves in soil erosion, bush encroachment, deforestation, overgrazing and frequent rampant wildfires. This is also associated with habitat and biodiversity losses which together are a threat to local survival and to the tourism industry, in addition to aggravating or adding to Namibia's vulnerability to climate change.

Since Rio Conventions such as those on climate change (UNFCCC), biological diversity (CBD) and desertification (UNCCD) are relevant to the above issues, this project aimed to improve and increase capacity in Namibia to meet its own and also global sustainable development objectives.

2.3 Problems to be addressed by the project

At the time of the NCSA process and in elaborating the project document the institutional constraints associated with Namibia's capacity to implement Rio Conventions were identified. It was felt that in the face of prevailing environmental circumstances, GEF support was needed to enable Namibia to build sufficient capacity to advance environmental objectives within its development programmes. The project adopted a strategic approach to target the limiting factors that currently constrain the mainstreaming of global environmental conventions and that the proposed capacity strengthening would accelerate the internal organizational development within MET and improve the delivery services of the ministry

The key constraints or barriers to the implementation of the global environmental Conventions, identified during the NCSA process were:

- Inadequate capacity for environmental management; in particular, Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)
- Inadequate harmony between and among policies and pieces of legislation related to natural resources such as those in environment, lands and agriculture
- Low levels of environmental awareness including awareness on Namibia's obligations on Rio Conventions
- Inadequate development and up-scaling of best management practices and lessons learnt in Namibia and other countries
- ;
- Insufficient recognition of environmental considerations and concerns in development planning, programming and also in addressing Namibia's socio-economic goals associated with poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS, gender equality and community empowerment
- The absence of initiatives to implement the NCSA Action Plan, to ensure sustainability of the process and allocation of funding.

In view of the above and to address some of the major constraints in the implementation of Rio Conventions, the proposed project implementation approach was strategically geared to four directions:

- a. to strengthen the technical skills and knowledge of key Government and non-governmental organizations involved in environmental management, to implement the global environmental objectives;
- b. to improve awareness on the global environmental Conventions and synergies among them at the national level
- c. to develop mechanisms (such as formal inter-sector and inter-institutional partners) for mainstreaming environmental issues in the national and regional planning;
- d. and to ensure sustainability by institutionalizing the implementation process of the NCSA national objectives.

2.4 Objectives and outcomes of the project

The goal of the project is to integrate global environmental objectives in national development programmes and projects.

The objective of the project is *to increase institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation in context with national development*

A summary of the outcomes and the key outputs is provided in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Summary of project outcomes and outputs

Outcomes	Outputs
1. Increased capacity to meet Namibia's commitments to the Rio Conventions	Output 1.1 National capacity enhanced through a series of training workshops Output 1.2 Regional capacity enhanced through a series of Training Workshops Output 1.3 In-house training capacity of MET on Rio Conventions- related matters enhanced through the development of training courses and materials Output 1.4 MET junior staff capacity and motivation enhanced through mentoring arrangement. Output 1.5 MET Environmental Education and Awareness Strategy developed Output 1.6 Improved understanding of Rio Conventions and environmental management among general public through mass media campaign Output 1.7 Improved understanding on the Rio Conventions and environmental management through awareness sessions and mini-workshops tailored for different target groups Output 1.8 Outreach capacity of MET improved through the development of awareness materials tailor made for different target groups
2. Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national and regional development planning	Output 2.1 Partnership between MET, NPC, MLR Output 2.2 Environmental Management and Assessment Act regulations Output 2.3 NCSA team established and operational Output 2.4 Annual reports on NCSA Action Plan implementation status.

i) *Increased capacity to meet Namibia's commitments to the Rio Conventions*

ii) *Rio Conventions provisions mainstreamed into national development planning process.*

2.5 Key Results

The goal, objective and the two outcomes imply two main results or outcomes:

Improved environmental management of development activities in a variety of sectors; such as agriculture, mining, transport, that specifically addresses climate change, biodiversity and land degradation. This would be consistent with the findings and direction provided by the NCSA Report and Action Plan. This is expected to yield benefits both national and global with respect to reduced emissions from land degradation, biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction.

The second outcome will be that the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and the National Planning Commission (NPC) will thereafter, actively integrate global environmental Conventions into development programmes. The MET and NPC have a lead role to play in addressing many of the constraints on environmental management within development programmes through a collaborative process

2.6 Main Stakeholders

The project was designed in line with the findings under the NCSA process which involved personnel from the University of Namibia as the principal investigators in collaboration with MET staff. During the proposal preparation stage, interviews were held with Government and non-government stakeholders who participated in a national workshop sponsored by UNDP in March 2006 to review and refine the project logical framework analysis. The revised document was then circulated electronically to a broader range of stakeholders for comments. The comments were incorporated in the final project document.

At project formation, the main institutions included MET, MLR, MAWF, NNF, SAIEIA, UNAM, the Polytechnic of Namibia and UNDP-Namibia. .

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Programme Formulation

3.1.1 Conceptualization / Design

The CEGEM Project was conceptualised as a logical consequence of the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) exercise which was conducted in 2005 to assess the state of the adoption of Rio Conventions in Namibia; particularly existing capacities and programmes and the level of public awareness necessary to continue to give the conventions much needed political support in the context of sustainable development and by extension, the achievement of Millennium Development Goals. Going by Namibia's challenges in land management, its aridity and predicted threats from climate change, this project was set and conceptualised in an appropriate setting. It was also during this period that the MET was expecting a new Environmental Management Act, which was approved in 2007 and also at a time when MET was in the process of restructuring; a development which was expected to create a position of Commissioner for Environment and thereafter the creation of an NCSA Team to act on key recommendations.

The project was designed with a strategy which focussed on 1) strengthening the technical skills and knowledge of key government and non-governmental organisations involved in environment 2) improving awareness on the global environmental conventions and the synergies between them 3) develop mechanisms to help mainstream environmental concerns represented by the conventions into

national and sub-national plans and 4) ensure sustainability by institutionalising the implementation process of the NCSA national objectives. The key outcomes were 1) increased capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to Rio Conventions and 2) Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national and regional (sub-national) development planning.

Conceptually the 4 strategies and the two outcomes make sense and are logically connected. However the expectation is that the actions needed to achieve the two outcomes by the end of the project period are relevant and sufficient. Given the nature of the outcomes and the difficulty of judging whether sufficient capacity has been built the two outcomes could be expected to have a set of clear milestones or targets, with appropriate indicators. *Explanations given by MET on the challenges of increasing capacity and proving that it has been increased is that, the project was not meant to primarily build capacity, but rather to enhance existing capacity for planning and implementing Rio Conventions in Namibia. Within the MET where there are a number of projects and mainstream government programmes in managing protected areas and supporting community based conservation, this is mostly true. However the same may not apply to teaching institutions and other ministries such as MAWF, MRLGHRD and MLR.*

For outcome 1 (Increased capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to Rio Conventions) it is apparent that the project expected capacities to be sufficiently built through 8 outputs; mainly a series of training workshops for selected national staff (mainly from Ministerial Headquarters in Windhoek), Officials from Regional and Local Governments, Traditional Authorities and selected media practitioners.

For outcome 2, the project expected to mainstream Rio Conventions into national plans and programmes through partnerships (between MET, NPC and MLR), development of regulations to the Environmental Management Act, establishment of a NCSA team and annual reports of the NCSA Action Plan Status.

In view of the above comments, the desired results (increased capacity and Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national programmes) are sound. However some of the outputs as they are stated would not necessarily mean that capacity would have been sufficiently enhanced or built using just one-off workshops with no follow-up of those who have been trained.

For example output 1.2 could have been much improved if it stated; "Plans for adopting Rio Conventions for selected Regions in Namibia developed by 2011, following regional training and capacity building workshops". Similarly Output 2.1 could state that "By December 2011 the MET, NPC and MLR have an agreed framework for national and regional development programming with clear reference to appropriate Rio Conventions"

In summary, while the intended results are clear and all the activities are virtually relevant, they do not go far enough to achieving the outcomes as stated and

furthermore the outputs are not time-bound. The objectives, outcomes should have been clear, achievable and time bound, even if measurability would have been more difficult. The Evaluator has therefore rated this as **Moderately Satisfactory**

3.1.2 Project Planning

The project was planned for a 3-year lifespan, but in practice it would have been operational for little over two full calendar years by December 2011. The absence of a substantive Coordinator for much of 2010 and coming of the current Coordinator on in February 2011 seems to have slowed down its planned work. From the progress reports, it appears that project planning and the implementation of activities, mainly the training and information sharing workshops improved markedly with the arrival of the second Project Coordinator and for which commendations are due. This is supported by clear activity plans which the Evaluator has reviewed.

The Evaluator also understands that the project was planned with the assumption that the MET would have been restructured and that the Office of the Commissioner for Environment would be functional and would receive targeted training in the articulation, planning and implementation of Rio Conventions in Namibia. The fact that the MET restructuring was only approved in July 2011 has considerably affected the project plans.

The Inception Workshop and the report coming from it, was quite clear and impressive. It had quite good suggestions on outcome 2. However its actual execution was frustrated by the absence of a Coordinator and the fact that assumptions that MET restructuring would see the creation of an Environmental Conventions Unit and the appointment of an Environmental Commissioner, during the life of the project were not realised.

The project could have benefitted MET even more if it continued into 2012 and coincided with NDP4 process which will be active in 2012. Hence the early end of the CEGEM Project represents a 'big missed opportunity'. However, it is an issue that should still be promoted as an exit strategy or as further support, now that MET restructuring has been approved.

The absence of a Coordinator for about 9 months, and the project ending before NDP4 process represent a missed opportunity. The evaluator rates the achievement under this criterion as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

3.1.3 Project Ownership

Namibia despite the challenges it faces, has clearly identified environmental sustainability as a key component in her development programming. This project is one among many that are dealing with conservation of biological diversity, combating land degradation and climate change adaptation. This project CEGEM also evolved out of the NCSA process which was planned and executed by MET and UNAM, with support from UNDP.

One can confidently state that the, very origins of the project and subsequently, the involvement of government partners in its formulation and implementation and the close involvement of the Programme Director in the management of this project during its many months without a coordinator are evidence of substantive local ownership.

The evaluator rates this criterion as **Highly Satisfactory**.

3.1.4 Stakeholder participation at the Project Formulation

During the formulation of the project the most active stakeholders were UNAM, MET and UNDP, who were also involved in the NCSA process which originated the project concept and recommended that a NCSA team be formed and funded as reflected in outcome 2 of this project. As far as the evaluator could tell, the participation at the formulation stages appeared to have been dominated by MET and the UNAM. However, substantially more stakeholders were identified as collaborators or participants in the actual implementation of the programme. This includes the NPC, MLR, MRLGHRD, Media and Traditional Authorities. The evaluator has rated this as **Satisfactory**.

3.1.5 Linkages between the project and other interventions

The progress reports made available to the evaluator and the statements of a number of interview respondents indicate that the CEGEM Project deliberately created linkages with already existing projects within MET since virtually all of them have a contribution to make with respect to national sustainable development objectives as well as to the global environmental conventions. Specifically the project linked up with the Environmental Information Unit to develop and Environmental Education Strategy which is one of the major outputs of the project, and key in building local capacities at all levels, if implemented comprehensively. In addition the project organised and co-funded both national and regionals workshops in collaboration with the GIZ Funded Project under MET and the African Adaptation Project, and to some extent the CPP. In another interesting move, the project used national and regional meetings, to seek substantive inputs, particularly from Traditional Authorities, on the Access and Benefit Sharing Bill (ABS) which Namibia

recently developed as part of her ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. Viewed from its short lifespan this was a major but underrated innovation by the project. It is the considered opinion of the evaluator that this deserves a rating of **Highly Satisfactory**.

3.2 Programme Implementation

3.2.1 Programme Governance

CEGEM has been a joint project between UNDP-GEF and the Government of Namibia. Its function was predicated upon a new structure of MET, particularly the DEA which was specifically supposed to create an International Environmental Conventions Unit, and which should have been the National Executing Agency for this project. In this arrangement the former NCSA Steering Committee coordinated and chaired by both MET and the NPC was supposed to act as the Project Coordination or Steering Committee (PSC), with representation from the key stakeholders (and key beneficiaries). In practice, the MET constituted a Steering Committee in which MET, NPC, MLR, MOF, MRLGHRD and the tertiary institutions; University and Polytechnic of Namibia, were represented. Interviews by the evaluator however revealed that the Project Steering Committee was never effective and suffered from poor attendance by nominated Committee Members. It would seem that the small budget of under 1 million US Dollars for the project, with little to share, may have contributed to the lack of interest in committee meetings. However the Polytechnic appeared to have attended key meetings in the 12 months or so preceding the evaluation. In effect the Project Director, the Project Coordinator and UNDP took the responsibility for running and steering the project and have therefore been largely responsible for its achievements.

In comparison to what was planned and agreed, the steering committee hardly functioned as planned and in that respect, attracts a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. However the Project Director and the PMU must be commended for taking on the responsibility and running the project to its present status.

3.2.2 Programme Management and Administration

The day to day management of the project was through a Project Management Unit (PMU), which was instituted under (MET) located in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and headed by a Project Coordinator and support staff. As with other Projects in MET, the Director of the DEA was the Project Director, who together with the Coordinator would consult and make tactical decisions on implementation of work plans and budgets approved by a Steering Committee.

Since there was a period that there was no Project Co-ordinator, progress on the project slowed but it evidently picked up with the recruitment of a new Project

Coordinator; an observation that a number of respondents have stated and for which complements have been offered. The rating by the evaluator is **Satisfactory**.

3.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

The project was meant to comply with monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements, as spelled out in the UNDP User Guide and any other specific guidelines applicable to UNDP/GEF projects. Practically it was supposed to use the indicators in the logical framework as monitoring tools. Implementation was guided by annual work plans, the progress of which was supposed to be monitored on a quarterly basis by a functional PSC. In this regard, the PMU had to provide brief summaries of the status of activities and output delivery, explaining variations from the work plan, and presenting work plans for each successive quarter. Annual Project Reports (APR/PIR) were also prepared by the PMU and forwarded to the PSC and to UNDP to meet its own reporting obligations

Financial reporting was the responsibility of UNDP who provided reports for project financial management generated by Atlas. This enabled the monitoring of financial performance of the project.

In addition to the above, the project was also scheduled to have a mid-term evaluation, 18 months after its launch, followed by a final evaluation at the end. However there was no mid-term evaluation.

It is the opinion of the evaluator that the project logical framework did not have clear milestones and process indicators with which to adequately assess progress toward the achievements of the capacity building outcomes. The project reportedly revised its outputs and activities based on the fact that the restructuring of the DEA and the creation of an Environmental Conventions Unit and the appointment of a Commissioner for Environment did not materialize at the times the project expected them to. This was achieved through a tripartite meeting involving Project Director, PMU and UNDP. An official record of a tripartite meeting was eventually made available to the Evaluator. It is also presumed that in the absence of a mid-term evaluation, the PIR and the Tripartite Meeting served the purpose of giving direction in the face of a moribund steering committee. In view of these, Monitoring and Evaluation is rated as **Marginally Unsatisfactory**

3.2.4 The management of risk

In discussing risk with respect to this project, one has to recognize the fact that, the project was relatively small compared to other on going UNDP/GEF funded projects under MET. Also given its nature as a capacity building project with emphasis on training workshops, it was viewed as operating in a relatively low risk environment. However based on its experiences the main risk factor was that it was predicated on the assumption that there would be an Environmental Commissioner and an Environmental Conventions Unit, both of which did not materialize during its life. The project therefore concentrated on Outcome 1 and also revised some of its outputs as already discussed in the preceding sub-section. The rating for this was **Moderately Satisfactory**.

3.2.5. Management by the UNDP Country Office

The UNDP Country Office has been involved in the project formulation process, starting from the NSCA process that it supported. The support by UNDP to CEGEM and a number of bigger size projects such as CPP, AAP and NAMPLACE makes it the single largest partner of the DEA if not the entire MET.

The office is very conversant with the CEGEM project and sits on its Steering Committee during which key issues are discussed and key decisions are made. As explained next it has also rendered financial services to the project during its entire life. It would appear that because of a moribund steering committee the involvement and support of UNDP to the Project Director is what contributed to the achievements that were registered under CEGEM. The support given by UNDP is hereby rated as **Satisfactory**.

3.2.6 Financial Management

The project's financial management will follow the Request for Direct Payment modality; therefore, any requests for payment will be submitted with the form of either Request for Direct Payment or Service Request to UNDP for further processing. This will also be in accordance with the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) agreed upon by the Government of Namibia and UNDP. In this regard, all the payment requests have been authorized by the National Project Director. UNDP Namibia has provided the Project Management Unit with updates of financial reports generated by Atlas usually quarterly or when needed, to support the PMU's financial monitoring and planning efforts.

On the issue of co-financing, this project was quite successful in enjoying the support of the Environmental Information Unit, with which it developed an Environmental Education Policy and Strategy. It also co-financed a number of national and regional workshops with the GIZ-BSLM Project under MET and also collaborated with others such as the African Adaptation Project and CPP Programme. It was entirely housed and facilitated by MET since its beginning. In collaborating with other projects, it was able to leverage funding for its own objectives and created synergies with them; a fact which is one of the strengths and innovations of the project.

The Evaluator was informed that financial management; in terms of disbursements and reporting has been adequate, the occasional procedural delays from UNDP notwithstanding. By the time the evaluation process started at the beginning of October 2011, the project had spent a cumulative amount of approximately 87% of the total allocated budget. The Evaluator rates this as **Satisfactory**.

3.3 Results and Impacts

3.3.1 Measuring progress and success

The progress and successes of this project are supposed to be assessed using the project logical framework which has two outcomes; namely i) increased capacity to meet Namibia's commitments to the Rio Conventions and ii) Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national and regional (sub-national) development planning. The , eight and four outputs pertaining to these two outcomes respectively have indicators that were supposed to be used to monitor their achievements, with the assumptions that the achievement of the outputs, if put together, would produce the stated outcomes. In the next subsection a narrative of the highlights of what was achieved, followed by tabulated detailed information on the achievements pertaining to each of the outputs are provided.

3.3.2 Results achieved (achievements, innovations, weaknesses)

This section gives highlights of achievements of project outputs and a commentary on those outputs. A table detailing the achievements (or lack thereof) of outputs and the evaluators comments on the outputs are also provided.

Immediately below the evaluator has listed a few issues which in his opinion were key weaknesses and to provide a backdrop against which the achievements can be appreciated.

Highlights of achievements

Coming as a consequence of the NCSA process, the project clearly engaged an appropriate set of stakeholders in the national, regional, traditional governments and the media and in the process, it increased the understanding and appreciation of Rio Conventions in Namibia. Despite the fact that some stakeholders such as the NPC and MAWF and Tertiary Institutions were not actively involved, the interest generated on Rio Conventions was evident during the interviews conducted by the evaluator.

The level of interest generated in the media on Rio Conventions appears to have been effective and is worthy of a more structured follow-up. There is clear evidence that the project together with others generated significant interest. A group of 20 journalists in Namibia have formed an organization, Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development (MEAD). The organisation has developed a constitution and is awaiting formal registration as a trust. This development is motivated by fact that media editors have traditionally not put a high priority on environmental matters; a situation that the journalists and certainly MET need to urgently address.

Following an encouraging pattern that is followed by all projects under MET, the engagement of a professional intern on substantive matters of project implementation, with active mentoring by the project coordinator is highly commendable. This was indeed the case within CEGEM.

The project supported the development of an Environmental Education Policy / Strategy which was a first in Namibia and it is expected that the Environmental Information Unit in MET will begin implementation in 2012. This is quite a worthwhile development that should strongly involve tertiary institutions.

The project also supported national consultations that eventually led to the preparation and publication of Namibia's second communication to the UNFCCC in October 2011 and in time for COP 17 in November and December of 2011.

During its national and regional training workshops the project facilitated the presentation of the Draft ABS Bill, to stakeholders and particularly Traditional Authorities who were able to give their inputs into the draft bill. In fact the Draft ABS Bill demonstrated the link between the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Nagoya Protocol and a national issue of natural resources management and use.

The training offered to MET staff, particularly field staff, on the application of EIA procedures was well received and was highly relevant since field staff are often called upon to make informed comments on the likely environmental impacts of all manner of developments in their regions. These are usually to do with mining, roads, dams, tourism facilities and the like.

Innovations

While there was little room for innovation in a project of this kind, it is commendable that CEGEM was able to forge close partnerships with other projects under MET to achieve some of its outputs. Given the problems of staffing and a barely active steering committee this was a good and innovative strategy to adopt.

Summary of key weaknesses

The steering committee function was weak during the course of the project and explanations have been provided elsewhere. This left much of the decision making burden to the Project Director and PMU and narrowed the participation mostly to MET.

The project outcomes, particularly the one on capacity building, was not defined precisely to make it easier to judge whether a series of training workshops for information sharing and inspiration was sufficient to achieve the required levels of competence on Rio Matters. The second outcome of mainstreaming Rio Conventions into national programmes was far too ambitious and the stated outputs, and even if they were achieved, they may have only built capacity to mainstream, but not necessarily resulted in the actual mainstreaming of the conventions during the life of the project

The project should have formally revised its outputs and targets to reflect the fact that one of its main assumptions regarding MET restructuring had not been met as expected, since it was critical to the achievement of outcome 2 outputs. It is understood that a tripartite meeting called by the Project Director and in which UNDP was involved, discussed adjustments of project outputs but without a formal rewriting of the same.

In addition to the NCSA report, a consultancy devoted to strengthening MET capacity to implement global environmental conventions was commissioned in January 2011. However, the evaluator's opinion is that this consultancy should have started with a comprehensive report on the status of implementation of Rio Conventions in Namibia. This would have given a much better focus on where and what kind of capacity is needed and also given an opportunity for a fresh look at Namibia's management of terrestrial biodiversity through its protected area network, conservancies and its marine resources.

Given that agricultural activities form the dominant land use, the fact that MAWF was not actively engaged in this process should have been corrected. In addition, the involvement of tertiary institutions should have been more substantive and designed to influence the teaching of current and future students on key topical issues relevant to Rio Conventions and to Namibia as a country.

While the workshops were well appreciated by the participants, it was apparent that participants would have preferred more follow-ups to help them go beyond awareness and inspiration into taking action.

Table 2. Overall evaluation by the main project objective

Project Objectives	Baseline Situation	Progress at End Term	Evaluator's Comment
<p>Objective</p> <p>To increase the institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation in context with national development</p>	<p>Namibia has a network of formally protected areas both, terrestrial and marine. This is augmented by community based wildlife conservancies and forest areas. Collectively these contribute to national development and Rio Conventions. However the current pressures on land, marine and freshwater bodies requires a comprehensive planning at national and regional levels to implement Rio Conventions. To do this a self capacity assessment indicated a need for enhanced capacity outside protected and other conservation areas, supported by an increased public awareness to support it.</p> <p>At the end it was hoped that an enhanced appreciation on Rio Conventions would be followed by actual plans to implement them; that is mainstreaming.</p>	<p>. At the end of the project Media Interest on Rio Conventions had significantly increased and a group known as Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development has been created and awaiting formal legal registration. Within MET, an Environmental Conventions Unit has been created and skills in understanding and doing EIAs has been increased. However regulations to help implement the Environmental Management Act are still outstanding, and the formal mainstreaming of Rio Conventions in national plans was not realized</p>	<p>The project managed to increase interest, understanding and appreciation of Rio Conventions and Media Involvement is evident. However without the mainstreaming of Rio in national and regional plans, it is not possible to assess if the capacity enhancement was sufficient to meet the objective. In addition the project is ending just before NDP4 process begins. This would have given it even a much better opportunity with others to strategically influence the inclusion of Rio Conventions in plans. What is encouraging is that the recently approved post of Environmental Commissioner and Conventions Unit under MET will be well placed to carry on with the remaining work to be done.</p>
<p>Overall Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>The evaluator is of the opinion that capacity within MET and its interest to influence national plans has been increased, even though more could be achieved if it had to interact with and be part of the NDP4 process and if the Environmental Commissioner and the Environmental Conventions Unit had been activated. The evaluator has given an overall rating of Marginally Satisfactory</p>		

Table 3 Project achievements at the output level

Outcome 1: Increased capacity to meet Namibia's commitments to the Rio Conventions.			
Intended Outputs	Output Targets / Main Activities	Progress to Date	Evaluator's Comments
Output 1.1 National capacity enhanced through a series of training workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify relevant Stakeholders to be trained and questionnaire on their training needs Identify training institution as per the training needs identified Organise national training workshop on Environmental management 	<p>This target is achieved. A consultancy was commenced to identify the training needs and gaps to strengthen MET capacity to implement Global Environmental Conventions. The report was finished in June 2011 and is distributed to MET directorates and donor projects. A national capacity building workshop was held in June 2011. A total number of 35 government staffs were capacitated on the Integration of Rio Conventions into National and Regional Development Plans. The training was conducted in collaboration with other UNDP/GEF/MET supported projects i.e. Country Pilot Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management (CPP ISLM) and the Strengthening the Protected Areas Network of Namibia (SPAN); as well the Namibia Africa Adaptation Project (AAP) another UNDP/MET supported project funded by the Government of Japan. Seven (7) staffs from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) attended the workshop. Other key stakeholders that attended the training include the Regional Councils eight (8), Town Councils five (5), NACOMA two (2), Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resource one (1), Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) one (1), Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) two (2), Polytechnic of Namibia one (1), Ministry of Lands and Resettlement two (2) and the National Planning Commission (NPC) two (2). In addition three (3) media</p>	<p>It is accepted that training was offered and the few participants interviewed appreciated the technical competence of the presenters. However a one-off workshop may inform and inspire rather than spur people into action.</p> <p>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</p>

		practitioners also attended the training, as an effort by the project to build capacity of media practitioners on communicating issues under the Rio Conventions. The training workshop was fully covered by the Namibia Broadcasting Corporation TV (NBC) and an interview was conducted with NBC National Radio which is aired country-wide. Presentations, discussion and literature review was done during the workshop. Participants gave recommendations of environmental issues that need to be included in the NDP4.	
Output 1.2 Regional capacity enhanced through a series of Training Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify relevant Stakeholders to be trained and questionnaire on their training needs Identify training institution as per the training needs identified Organise A regional workshop 	In collaboration with GIZ BSLM project, the project conducted Four regional capacity building workshops on Rio Conventions and consultations on the Access and Benefit Sharing draft Bill in the 13 regions of Namibia. The 13 regions were demarcated into 4 groups. The 3 day workshops were aimed at creating awareness on Rio conventions and to solicit input for the ABS draft bill which is being revised to fits requirements of the Nagoya protocol. The workshops were attended by MET staffs, representatives from line ministries, regional and local Authorities, CBO, NGO, Civil society and traditional authorities and were covered by NBC TV and Radio. Briefings were also done after and before the workshops on the NBC good morning show.	<p>The combination of resources with GIZ BSLM was innovative and proper. The workshops were informative and provided a valuable opportunity for inputs into the Draft ABS Bill.</p> <p>Again the claim to capacity building beyond information could not be assured.</p> <p>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</p>
Output 1.3 In-house training capacity of MET on Rio Conventions-related matters enhanced through the development of training courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify relevant Stakeholders and conduct re-evaluate capacity needs assessment on Rio Conventions Identify and streamline key areas and cross- 	Consultations were done with heads of Directorates in MET. EIA was amongst others identified as an important area for all staffs in MET. A 3 day training course on Environmental Impact assessment was therefore organised. The training targeted mostly regional staffs and was aimed at enhancing MET's staffs to understand national EIA process including compliance and monitoring. The training was also	<p>The key focus was on EIA training and a one-off training on mainstreaming of Climate Change. However within MET one would expect an officially sanctioned action plan following such training.</p> <p>Rating: Satisfactory</p>

and materials	<p>cutting areas under the Rio Conventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop training tool kit and specific awareness material for Rio Conventions • Identify relevant stakeholders to be trained as per the identified needs: • Organise Training courses for MET staff 	<p>aimed at increasing MET's staffs capacities to link Rio Conventions key issues to the EIA process. The training was conducted in collaboration with the Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment (SAIEA). A total number of twenty three (23) staffs were trained i.e. regional staffs (1 female and 19 male) and 3 national staffs (1 female and 2 male).</p> <p>As part of the project's efforts to enhance technical guidance for MET to mainstream environment into national and regional development plans, the project has supported a training workshop on Environmental Mainstreaming and Climate Change Integration into National Development Frameworks. A total number of twenty-one participants attended (nine female and eleven male) from UNDP/MET supported projects attended training workshop and are expected to participate meaningfully in the formulation of the National Development Plan 4.</p>	
Output 1.4 MET junior staff capacity and motivation enhanced through mentoring arrangement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop formal mentoring program for MET • Support and coordinate internship programs for students from Polytechnic and UNAM in consultation with these institutions: 	<p>The CEGEM project facilitated field attachments opportunities for Agriculture and Environment. Six students from the University of Namibia did their internship with the Environmental impact assessment unit, and four with the environmental education and information unit at MET. The students were supervised by MET senior staff for 2-3 months. In collaboration with other funded projects, the directorate of Environmental affairs had 8 intern from the Country partnership project, 6 from the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management project and 7 from the Strengthening the Protected Area Network. Interns under donor funded projects are involved in projects activities, gain pertinent</p>	<p>The strategy to facilitate field attachments was sensible enough but the originally intended output was not fully realized. However other UNDP-GEF Funded Projects within MET are doing well in this regard</p> <p>Rating: Moderately satisfactory</p>

		<p>experience in Environmental management; many of them are now working for different ministries and private agencies. Information sessions on Rio Conventions were held with students who are members of the Environmental Club and students were encouraged to take up research topics on environmental issues in Namibia. In addition, the project has also supported other initiatives under the ministry particularly the Investment and Financial Flows (I&FF) to Address Climate Change assessment which was undertaken for the Agriculture and Energy Sector. The assessment is important for Namibia as it determines the country's current and future financial requirements to address the impacts of climate change and has identified adaptive measures needed to address the impact of climate change in the agriculture sector and mitigation factors in the energy sector. In 2010, the project has supported the University of Namibia to develop course outlines and materials for Environmental Biology and Environmental Science courses.</p>	
Output 1.5 MET Environmental Education and Awareness Strategy developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host regional consultation workshops on draft EE strategy • Organize national workshop on EE strategy: • Print and hand Policy to MET for endorsement and use 	<p>A consultancy was commissioned to develop the Environmental Education (EE)/ Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) Policy for Namibia. The policy includes a Namibian Environmental Education Programme and Action Plan. The policy is set to increase Namibia's institutional and human capacities on environmental education/ education for sustainable development. In the long-term, the policy is envisaged to support the MET in achieving its long-term objectives, outlined in MET Strategic Plan and will support the MET's current programmes and</p>	<p>This was one of the more successful outputs of the project even though its implementation will only begin in 2012.</p> <p>Rating: Satisfactory</p>

		<p>projects addressing the biodiversity, land degradation and climate change related issues.</p> <p>A National consultation workshop was organised in march 2011 to comment and give inputs on the draft EE strategy. About 40 participants attended the workshop. Participants were from key ministries, local authorities, institutions of high learning and two guests from Lesotho and South Africa SADC REEP. The policy and programme was finalised in June 2011 and was handed over to MET for endorsement.</p>	
<p>Output 1.6 Improved understanding of Rio Conventions and environmental management among general public through mass media campaign</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify appropriate content for regular airing for radio and TV talk shows Organise regular spot on radio stations for specific issues on cross-cutting environmental issues in various national languages 	<p>The Project supported the ministry to advertise (print) commemoration events for the most important world environmental days. The project also facilitated briefing sessions on the NBC good morning show before and after the Regional consultation and awareness regional workshops.</p> <p>Media houses were always invited to the projects events. No specific radio slot was organised specifically for CEGEM project but the ministry had radio slots where they give information on Rio conventions.</p>	<p>Outputs 1.6 to 1.8 could have been combined since there are no fundamental differences among them. There is no evidence that attempts were made to do opinion or other surveys to gauge improved understanding of the conventions. However media interest seems quite high.</p> <p>Rating: Satisfactory</p>
<p>Output 1.7 Improved understanding on the Rio Conventions and environmental management through awareness sessions and mini-workshops tailored for different target groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify specific sectoral stakeholder needs Develop awareness material as per identified decision-makers Organise a meeting and briefing with top management 	<p>The project has recorded a significant coverage of project events on Rio Conventions in terms of trainings, workshops, and awareness raising sessions by media both print, Radio and TV. A documentary on the 2011 world biodiversity day was produced and is now aired on One Africa TV. The documentary is also in the process of being screened on NBC TV. Two types of brochures were produced: senior management brochure and learner's brochure on Rio conventions. The Brochures were disseminated to key stakeholders, schools and institution of high learning. Senior management brochures were given to parliamentarians.</p>	<p>Again the interest of the media is well reflected but it is difficult to gauge to what extent public understanding was improved.</p> <p>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</p>

		<p>As part of its efforts to increase awareness of top management personnel on Rio Conventions, the project conducted a capacity building workshop for top management (Directors and Deputy Directors from MET, line ministries and; regional and local authorities on the integration of Rio conventions issues into national and regional development plans. The workshop proceedings were reported in the daily newspapers and an interview was done with NBC national radio. On invitation, the project also distributed awareness materials and presentation on Rio conventions to the Hardap regional council during their development coordination committee meeting. The project also produced Rio conventions Posters for high schools and primary schools.</p>	
<p>Output 1.8 Outreach capacity of MET improved through the development of awareness materials tailor made for different target groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop awareness material as per the best identified approach • Distribute awareness material during environmental days celebrations 	<p>The project supported the commemoration of Environment Calendar days: World Wetlands Day, World Water Day and the International Day of Biodiversity; awareness material were distributed during those days.</p> <p>In collaboration with other donor projects, CEGEM conducted Rio talks with schools, institutions of high learning and the public. Usually Presentations are done on the 3 Rio conventions and questions are asked after the sessions where participants win goodies such as pen, caps, water bottles, key holders with messages on Rio conventions. To increase awareness and proper reporting of Environmental news, the project conducted a Media Training Workshop on Climate Change and cross-cutting</p>	<p>The attempt was commendable even though more follow up was clearly needed with Tertiary Teaching Institutions.</p> <p>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</p>

		environmental issues. The objectives of the training was to enhance communication and reporting skills to raise awareness on climate change issues using the UNFCCC process with a special focus on COP 16	
--	--	--	--

Outcome 2: Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national and regional development planning

Intended Outputs	Output Targets / Main Activities	Progress to Date	Evaluator's Comments
.Output 2.1 Partnership between MET, NPC, MLR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake review / assessment of Rio +20 report 	The project supported the training for Climate Change Negotiators in preparation for COP 16. The training was attended by thirty-one (31) participants from Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Regional and Local Government, Housing and Rural Development, National Planning Commission, Parliament, Central Bureau of Statistics, media houses, institution of higher learning and non-governmental organizations. This target is partially achieved. During the reporting period, consultation meetings have been held with MET, NPC and MRLGHRD for information sharing and recommendations of mainstreaming Rio Conventions provision into national and regional development planning. The CEGEM project coordinator is participating in the drafting of the Rio +20 report which is being undertaken with financial assistance from GIZ-BSLM. Namibia will soon begin the process of formulating the National Development Plan 4 –	<p>The output was revised in a Steering Committee in 2010. Partnership would require more than a joint training workshop. Anything sort of an agreed action plan and the creation of a joint team for effective follow-up would fall short.</p> <p>(Need to be followed by recommendations for NDP4)</p> <p>Rating: Marginally Satisfactory</p>

		and consultations have been made with the National Planning Commission to ensure that Rio Conventions' provisions are integrated. However, Rio Conventions provisions are fully integrated into the Ministry of Environment and Tourism Strategic Plan (2007/8 – 2011/12).	
Output 2.2 Environmental Management and Assessment Act regulations		There has been major delays in the achieving this output. The Environmental management regulations are in place and await the endorsement by the minister as well as the appointment of the Environmental Commissioner.	This is not the fault of the project but the assumptions should have been amended accordingly. Unable to rate
Output 2.3 NCSA team established and operational		This target is not achieved. The NCSA Implementation Team is not operational as the Environmental Convention Unit is not yet in place. However, the ministry's restructuring plan was recently approved by the Public Service Commission and during the closure phase of the CEGEM project, a recommendation will be made to establish the NCSA Action Plan Implementation Team.	<i>This output was effectively scrapped by the Tripartite Meeting, hence it is not the fault of the project. However the formal revision of assumptions was required.</i> Rating Not Applicable
Output 2.4 Annual reports on NCSA Action Plan implementation status.		This target is not achieved. The NCSA Implementation Team is not operational as the Environmental Convention Unit is not yet in place. However, the ministry's restructuring plan was recently approved by the Public Service Commission and during the closure phase of the CEGEM project, a recommendation will be made to establish the NCSA Action Plan Implementation Team.	<i>In line with output 2.3, this was also scrapped.</i> This is not the fault of the project but the assumptions should have been amended accordingly Rating Not Applicable

3.3.3 Overall conclusion on project results and impacts

The CEGEM Project is ends in December 2011 after two full calendar years of implementation.. During that period it had no coordinator between June 2010 to February 2011. Nonetheless it managed to organize a series of national and regional workshops targeting various stakeholders and in the process it has helped make Namibia's Commitment to Rio Conventions more of a topical issue than it was before. The interest of the media appears to have been increased and staff in other Ministries associated with land use and development planning seem to have been sensitised to the relevance of Global Environmental Conventions to Namibia, particularly Climate Change and Biological Diversity. However the nature of the project and starting with its design and the fact that a key assumption regarding the restructuring of MET did not materialize in time to benefit the project and help it achieve the second outcome.

With the above considered and with full appreciation of the efforts that have been put in in the last year, the project's overall rating is **Moderately Satisfactory**.

3.4 Relevance, effectiveness, sustainability

3.4.1 Relevance of the project to the needs of Namibia

With regard to relevance, the CEGEM project came as a consequence of the NCSA process undertaken in Namibia and was not imposed from external quarters. In practical terms, the project appears to have added value to a number of existing programmes within MET. In fact it aspired to create awareness on Namibia's Commitments on Rio Conventions in a manner that other site based projects had not. Its second outcome to mainstream Rio Conventions into national and sub-national or regional development plans, though not achieved under the project, was in itself quite relevant and timely. In fact, the other projects programmes, such as the Climate Change Adaptation Project and CPP share the objectives to mainstream adaptation and sustainable land management policies and practices in national plans. The fact that the project also spawned the development of a national Environmental Education Strategy and popularised the ABS Bill during its national and regional consultative and information sharing workshops showed its overall relevance to the sustainable development agenda in Namibia. The evaluator rates this as **Satisfactory**.

3.4.2 Effectiveness of project execution

The criterion of effectiveness is meant to assess whether the implementation of the planned activities actually took place as planned and whether resources were deployed according to plan to facilitate implementation. Efficiency on the other hand would assess the achievements of results at costs that would be lower than normal for such activities. In this particular context the achievement of planned outputs and the financial burn rate of the project are good indicators of effectiveness

It is clear that the project suffered substantial 'downtime', when there was no coordinator and project activities were run by a finance and administration person, supported by a young professional intern. However there is evidence from expenditure and technical progress reports that when the project had a substantive coordinator, there was effective implementation of activities, particularly the achievement of outputs under outcome 1.. The evaluator has rated this as **Moderately Satisfactory**, even though the project lost time during the absence of a co-ordinator.

3.4.3 Sustainability

The question of sustainability is an important criterion for evaluation because it gives an indication as to whether a project has generated substantive 'momentum' through the impacts of its results or the promise of its usefulness, to enable it to perpetuate itself beyond its formal life. In this project the objectives were to increase capacity to understand and incorporate Rio Conventions by various stakeholders through a series of training workshop, and also to mainstream the Conventions into national plans. It seems that after the workshops there were no follow ups with stakeholders to concretise their awareness into plans and actions. In addition, the opportunity to mainstream Rio Conventions into national plans was not pursued by way of influencing NDP4. The only mechanisms for sustainability seem to be the production of the Environmental Education Strategy which will be implemented under the auspices of the Environmental Information Unit at MET and the formation of Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development. The two main outcomes were supposed to be steered by two multi-sector working groups; one on capacity building on Rio Conventions and the other on mainstreaming, but none of which were formed.

Other the Environmental Education Policy and Strategy and the Media Interest that has been generated, the evaluator found no other strong sustainability factors, particularly with respect to outcome 2. The evaluator has given a rating of **Marginally Unsatisfactory**.

Table 4 Summary of ratings – formulation, implementation and results

Rating on aspects of Project Formulation, Implementation and Results		
Main Criterion		Evaluator's Rating
Formulation	Concept / Design	Moderately Satisfactory
	Planning	Moderately unsatisfactory
	Ownerships	Highly satisfactory
	Stakeholder participation at formulation	Satisfactory
	Linkages with other interventions	Highly satisfactory
Implementation	Governance	Moderately unsatisfactory
	Management & Admin	Satisfactory
	M & E	Moderately unsatisfactory
	Management by UNDP	Satisfactory
	Financial Management	Satisfactory
Overall conclusion on results and impacts		Moderately satisfactory
Relevance		Satisfactory
Effectiveness of Execution		Moderately Satisfactory
Sustainability		Marginally unsatisfactory
Overall Rating		Moderately Satisfactory

Table 5 Summary of ratings at the output level

Ratings on Key Project Outputs		
Outcome 1 (capacity building, awareness creation)		Evaluator's Rating
Output 1.1	National capacity workshops	Moderately Satisfactory
Output 1.2	Regional capacity workshops	Moderately Satisfactory
Output 1.3	In-house training in MET	Satisfactory
Output 1.4	Mentoring of junior staff	Moderately Satisfactory
Output 1.5	EE Policy and Strategy	Satisfactory
Output 1.6	Improved understanding of Rio Conventions – mass media	Satisfactory
Output 1.7	Improved understanding of Rio Conventions – awareness sessions	Moderately Satisfactory
Output 1.8	Outreach capacity of MET	Highly Satisfactory
Outcome 2 (mainstreaming Rio Conventions)		
Output 2.1	Review of Rio + 20	Marginally Satisfactory
Output 2.2	EMA regulations	Unable to rate (no achievements)
Output 2.3	NCSA team established	Rating Not Applicable
Output 2.4	Annual NCSA reports	Rating Not Applicable

4. SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND LESSONS LEARNT

4.1 Key Achievements

The *main highlights of the achievements* includes the following points:

- It increased the understanding and appreciation of Rio Conventions in Namibia, despite the fact that some stakeholders such as the NPC and MAWF and Tertiary Institutions were not substantively involved
- The level of interest generated in the media on Rio Conventions appears to have been effective and is worthy of a more structured follow-up. A group of 20 journalists in Namibia have formed an organization, “Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development” (MEAD). The organisation has developed a constitution and is awaiting formal registration as a trust.
- It supported the development of an Environmental Education Policy / Strategy which was a first in Namibia and it is expected that the Environmental Information Unit in MET will begin its implementation in 2012. This is quite a worthwhile development that should also invite the participation of Namibia’s tertiary institutions.
- It supported national consultations that eventually led to the preparation and publication of Namibia’s second communication to the UNFCCC in October 2011 and in time for COP 17 in November and December of 2011.
- During its national and regional training workshops the project facilitated the presentation of the Draft ABS Bill, to stakeholders and particularly Traditional Authorities who were able to give their inputs into the draft bill. In fact the Draft ABS Bill demonstrated the linkages between the Convention on Biological Diversity, supported by the Nagoya Protocol and Namibia’s CBNRM Programme, which emphasizes sustainable use
- The training offered to MET staff, particularly field staff, on the application of EIA procedures enhanced MET capacity in an area quite relevant to Rio Conventions and in any sustainable Development Agenda

4.2 Lessons learnt

From the experiences of running this particular project, a few lessons listed herein can be learnt:

Once some level of awareness has been created, it is important to follow up on those who have been trained. Follow up can take many forms such as specific assignments on the subject matter and follow-up meetings with participants to share experiences, the building of peer groups and so on.

In view of the fact that the project did not enjoy the services of an active steering committee, consideration should have been given to having its steering subsumed under an existing Steering Committee of other UNDP Funded Projects in MET. Examples are such as the Africa Adaptation Project, CPP, NACOMA and others.

Capacity building projects need clearly set milestones, process targets and indicators some of which should demonstrate the application of acquired capacity. Without certified training, it is often difficult to ascertain the achievement of capacity if no practical applications of that capacity can be demonstrated.

In any project, if a key assumption is not met or realized, then a steering committee can discuss and recommend formal amendments to project logframes to reflect the reality of a project environment. CEGEM illustrates this since it was largely predicated on the creation of a Global Conventions Unit and the Office of a Commissioner of Environment in MET.

In a capacity building project of this nature, the involvement of tertiary teaching institutions to enrich existing teaching curricula, access new teaching materials and case studies; and develop well informed future practitioners is important.

The timing of a project can be a very powerful success factor. In this particular case, the ending of the project before the NDP4 Process starts in earnest can be described as a missed opportunity.

Engagement with the media in a structured manner can be an effective and yet inexpensive way of maintaining issues on Rio Conventions in the public domain.

A small project can create synergies with bigger ones and achieve a lot more than would be possible if it stands on its own. This project despite its pitfalls was able to form partnerships with the Environmental Information Unit, used the ABS Bill in its

national and regional workshops, partnered with African Adaptation, GIZ BSLM and CPP Projects and others, to achieve its outputs under outcome 1.

The discussions on international conventions using a nationally relevant process such as the ABS Bill, made it easier to demonstrate the advantages of Conventions such as that on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol.

The proposal of outcomes should be realistic and fall within the scope of a project, its budget, participating partners and its lifespan. The CEGEM project had good intentions but the nature of the objectives required a longer engagement to yield the desired outcome of mainstreaming Rio Conventions into national development plans.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Ideally, the project should have commissioned a comprehensive study, as part of its inception, to critically assess the status of implementation of Rio Conventions and use the findings of such an assessment thereof, as a backdrop against which an improved national approach would be built and thereby add value to existing efforts.. Such a study would then be quite specific on what is important for Namibia and propose a programme with specific components which the MET would use to influence the land and natural resource management programmes.
- ii. Based on opinions expressed by those stakeholders who were interviewed, it is recommended that messages to other government agencies and to the general public, should not be seen to be originating from a project but from official platforms of MET. This gives the messages the necessary political clout needed to mainstream Rio Conventions in government programmes.
- iii. The interest in Rio Conventions that the project has helped to generate among some stakeholders is stronger than would be normally expected of such a relatively small and short duration project. More targeted follow-up on key stakeholders is clearly needed and can be implemented by MET and its partners.

For example, the journalists who were engaged seemed to have developed immense interest on Rio Conventions and their practical implications to Namibia. This interest should have been capitalised upon and they should have been given assignments within CEGEM and also opportunities to comment on other projects within MET and other Government ISLM Programmes.

For government staff, such as planners in MRLGHRD and MLR, their longer-term linkages to projects and programmes of MET would help strengthen their interest and where possible other funding to offer them more training would be of strategic importance, as it would help to build a cross-sectoral team of planners and practitioners with an interest in Rio and ISLM.

- iv. In view of the level of interest from Tertiary Institutions on environmental conventions and their implications on the management of natural systems, effort should be placed on a more structured engagement with them. As much as possible MET should supply these institutions with teaching materials, share experiences from case studies, propose research topics and to the extent possible, influence their teaching curricula. Strategically the momentum that has been created by this project should encourage MET which sits on the Polytechnic's Board to call for a general curriculum review to deliberately include aspects of Rio Conventions and ISLM in general, in their teaching curricula. UNAM's Department of Geography, History and Environment is also a strategic partner that MET can use to influence their curriculum.
- v. The project should prepare a comprehensive synthesis report, on a way forward based on the current status of environmental conventions, the needed capacity, the key issues to be resolved in order to systematically mainstream Rio Conventions in a manner that is consistent with Namibia's Development Objectives.

Issues for possible further support by UNDP/ GEF

In view of the current productive relationship between UNDP-GEF and MET the evaluator recommends that UNDP and GEF consider following up on the achievements made under CEGEM with further support. These are listed herein.

- I. Commission a review on the status of implementation of Environmental conventions in Namibia and use that as an input in the formal mainstreaming of those conventions into Regional and National Development Plans
- II. Sponsor a systematic and structured engagement of MET with the NDP4 process which is currently underway. This could be done by way of :
 - Position paper on the merits of environmental sustainability in the context of Namibia's development.
 - Meetings of planners in the land and natural resource use sectors to seek agreements on joint programmes and actions.
- III. Support the office of the Environmental commissioner to chart a strategic direction for the country with a clear outcome based programme.
- IV. Support the media (Media for Environment, Agriculture and Sustainable Development) and the implementation of the Environmental Education Policy.

6. ANNEXES

Annex I- Terms of Reference (TOR)

MET/UNDP/GEF Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environmental Conventions in Namibia

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on behalf of the Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) seeks the services of an International Consultant (IC) and National Consultant (NC) to undertake a Final Evaluation for the Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environmental Conventions (CEGEM project) in Namibia as per the UNDP/Global Environmental Facility (GEF) policies and procedures for monitoring and evaluation.

1. Introduction:

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (M&E Policy) at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives to:

- a) Monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- b) Provide a basis for decision-making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- c) Promote accountability for resource use;
- d) Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project e.g., periodic monitoring of indicators through the annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Project Steering Committee meetings – or as specific and time-bound exercises such as Audit Reports and Final Evaluations (FE). In accordance with UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a Final Evaluation upon or nearing completion of implementation. A Final Evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is also required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the projects. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals and objectives. It will also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of other UNPD/GEF projects.

Evaluations are to be conducted by independent evaluators not associated with the project design or with the project implementation at any stage.

2. Background:

In 2005, Namibia completed the first phase of its *National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management Process*. The Government of Namibia and a wide range of stakeholders involved in the NCSA has identified the priority need to

mainstream environmental management issues into national development programmes and address the Rio Convention provisions in an integrated manner. In Namibia, implementation of the Rio Conventions on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation occurs in the context of sustainable development and poverty reduction. The NCSA Report provides a detailed action plan for addressing the priorities associated with global and national environmental management.

To address some of the major constraints in the Rio Conventions implementations, the Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environmental Conventions in Namibia (CEGEM project) implementation approach is strategically geared to four directions: 1) to strengthen the technical skills and knowledge of key Government and non-governmental organizations involved in environmental management, 2) to improve awareness on the global environmental Conventions provisions and synergies and on cross-cutting Conventions issues 3) to develop the mainstreaming mechanism to ensure that environmental concerns are adequately mainstreamed in the national and regional planning, and 4) to ensure sustainability by institutionalizing the implementation process of the NCSA national objectives.

The Project Development Goal:

CEGEM is directly linked to current national initiatives such as the NCSA Action Plan, the national decentralization initiative and the poverty reduction strategies. The goal of the project ***is to integrate the global environmental objectives in national development programmes and plans.***

The Project Objective:

The overall objectives of the (CEGEM Project) is ***to increase institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation, in the context of national development.***

The Project Outcomes:

The project has two outcomes, and associated outputs as listed below:

Outcomes	Outputs
1. Increased capacity to meet Namibia's commitments to the Rio Conventions	Output 1.1 National capacity enhanced through a series of training workshops
	Output 1.2 Regional capacity enhanced through a series of Training Workshops Output 1.3 In-house training capacity of MET on Rio Conventions- related matters enhanced through the development of training courses and materials Output 1.4 MET junior staff capacity and motivation enhanced through mentoring arrangement. Output 1.5 MET Environmental Education and Awareness Strategy developed Output 1.6 Improved understanding of Rio Conventions and environmental management among general public through mass media campaign Output 1.7 Improved understanding on the Rio Conventions and environmental management through awareness sessions and mini-workshops tailored for different target groups Output 1.8 Outreach capacity of MET improved through the

	development of awareness materials tailor made for different target groups
2. Rio Conventions mainstreamed into national and regional development planning	Output 2.1 Partnership between MET, NPC, MLR Output 2.2 Environmental Management and Assessment Act regulations Output 2.3 NCSA team established and operational Output 2.4 Annual reports on NCSA Action Plan implementation status.

3. General Objectives of the Evaluation:

The final evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project CEGEM is initiated by the UNDP Namibia and it is being undertaken in accordance with the UNDP/GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policy see (<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>). The principal purpose of the Final Evaluation is to assess the project results and impacts as required by the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. It is also mandatory to evaluate and review any UNDP programme of the magnitude of USD 1 million or more, at mid-term and when the assistance is about to phase out.

4. PROJECT PERFORMANCE:

4.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION:

A final evaluation is a mandatory requirement of UNDP/GEF programmes and projects of this magnitude. The evaluation will analyze and assess the achievements and progress made so far towards achieving the original objectives of the CEGEM project. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation will consider the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the CEGEM project. While a thorough assessment of the implementation to date is important, the evaluation is expected to produce recommendations and lessons learned to ensure the institutional sustainability of project outcomes, as well as to assist in defining future direction of similar projects.

The evaluation will in particular assess:

- (1) Project Design – review the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities, and assess the quality of the design and delivery of planned outcomes. The review should also assess the conceptualization, design, effectiveness, relevance, and implementation feasibility of the project. The review should include the updated logical framework matrix that was undertaken during early project inception.
- (2) Project Impact – assess the achievements of the CEGEM project to date against the original objectives, outcomes and activities using the indicators as defined in the project document. The indicators that were identified during the project inception should be also used as benchmark to measure the impacts of CEGEM. In addition to the logical framework in the signed project document, the independent evaluation expert will use the Capacity Development Scorecard and its 15 indicators to assess

capacity outcomes, per the *Monitoring Guidelines of Capacity Development in Global Environment Facility Projects (2010)*.

(3) Project Implementation – assess:

- a. Project management arrangements, i.e., effectiveness of UNDP/GEF, UNDP Country Office and the Project Management Unit (CEGEM PMU);
- b. Quality and timeliness of delivering outputs and activities;
- c. Financial situation (i.e., budget and expenditure status)¹, in particular cost-effectiveness in delivering global environmental benefits.
- d. Cooperation among partners including but not limited to: GEF-supported projects (ICEMA, CCA, CPP-ISLM SAM, SPAN, SGP), UNDP, Government counterparts Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF), Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR), Ministry of Regional and Local Government and Housing and Rural Development (MRLGHRD), Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME), and the National Planning Commission (NPC); as well as those listed in project document in the stakeholder participation plan as project co-financiers;
- e. Responsiveness of project management to adapt and implement changes in project execution, based on partner and stakeholder feedback.

Based on the above points, the evaluation should provide a document of approximately 50 pages indicating what project activities, outputs/outcomes and impacts have been achieved to date, and specifically:

- (1) Assess the extent of the progress that the CEGEM project has made to achieve its objectives and where gaps are evident;
- (2) Draw lessons from the experiences of the CEGEM project, in particular those elements that have worked well and those that have not, requiring adjustments and;
- (3) Provide recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, implementation, execution and sustainability of the CEGEM project.

4.2 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION:

While the specific issues of concern are listed in the following paragraphs, a reference to the UNDP programming manual and UNDP/GEF guidelines to conduct terminal or end-of-cycle evaluations should be made for addressing the issues not covered below.

The evaluation will include ratings on the following aspects:

1. Outcome and achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's immediate and development objectives were achieved);
2. Sustainability of the aforementioned outcomes;
3. Implementation Approach;
4. Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and
5. Monitoring and Evaluation.

The evaluation will use the following ratings: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory.

The evaluation will also assess the project's achievements and outcomes according to the type of capacities developed, i.e., individual, organizational, and systemic.

4.2a) Project Conceptualization/Design:

¹ In this regard, this evaluation is not a financial audit.

- a) Whether the problem the project addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
- b) Whether the target beneficiaries and end-users of the results of the project are clearly identified;
- c) Whether the objectives and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with observable success indicators;
- d) Whether the relationship between objectives, outputs, activities and inputs of the project are logically articulated and;
- e) Whether the project started with a well-prepared work-plan and reasons, if any, for deviations.

4.2b) Project Relevance:

- a) Whether the project remains relevant to the development priorities of the country and;
- b) Given the objectives of the project, the extent to which appropriate institutions have been assisted.

4.2c) Project Implementation:

The evaluation team will examine the quality and timeliness of project implementation:

- a) The delivery of inputs specified in the project document, including institutional arrangements, interest of beneficiaries, the scheduling and actual implementation;
- b) The fulfilling of the success criteria as outlined in the project document;
- c) The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (either facilitating or impeding project implementation). This refers to the project's adaptive collaborative management;
- d) Lessons from other relevant projects that were incorporated in the project implementation.
- e) The monitoring and backstopping of the project as expected by the Government and UNDP;
- f) The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of financing, personnel, premises and indigenous equipment and;
- g) Collaboration with industry associations, private sector and civil society.

4.2d) Project Performance:

- a) Whether the management arrangements of the project were appropriate;
- b) Whether the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality;
- c) Whether the project resources are used effectively to produce planned results;
- d) Whether the project is cost-effective compared to similar interventions;
- e) Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable;
- f) The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on the functioning of the project.

4.2e) Results/Success of the Project applied to each Specific Project (3 Areas):

The overall outputs and their meaning are as defined in the Project support documents and project documents that should form the main basis for this evaluation. In addition to the mid-term targets in the logical framework, the details of the specific project impact to be provided are:

- a) What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives.
- b) What are the potential areas for project's success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.

- c) What major issues and problems affected the implementation of the project and what factors could have resolved them? To what extent was project management effectively adaptive and collaborative?
- d) Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success?
- e) Level of institutional networking achieved and capacity development of key partners, if done in a structured manner at different stages – from inception to project operations.
- f) Social impacts, including impact on the lives of women.
- g) Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced project outcomes.

A table should be included in which progress against the project objectives and each outcome should be discussed and rated on the six-point UNDP scale (Highly Satisfactory HS, Satisfactory S, Marginally Satisfactory MS, Marginally Unsatisfactory MU, Unsatisfactory U, and Highly Unsatisfactory HU).

The consultants should also take steps to verify the realization of the co-financing committed in the project document.

2. A mission report, which should be provided as an annex to the FE Report.

The consultants should provide the general conclusions and recommendations on the;

- Implementation of the project
- Degree to which the project objective and outcome targets have been met
- Significant lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not (and reasons why) and
- Recommendations on further action upon completion of the current project and for the implementation of the subsequent adaptation interventions.

It is worth noting that as the report is the product of an independent evaluation, it is up to the evaluators to make use of the information provided during the mission. However, the evaluator is responsible for reflecting any factual corrections brought to their attention prior to the finalization of the report. Therefore, in order to ensure that the report considers the view of all parties concerned, is properly understood, and it is factually accurate, it is necessary for the evaluators to submit draft reports to the PMU, PCU, UNDP/GEF and MET.

1.1 Methodological and Evaluation Approach

The team should provide details in respect of:

- a) Documentation review (desk study);
 - 1. Project Document
 - 2. Project Implementation Reviews for all the years under project implementation
 - 3. Minutes of meetings
 - 4. Progress reports (Substantive & Financial)
 - 5. End of project baseline survey (for outcome 2)
 - 6. Project Outputs (Baseline report, technical reports etc)
- b) Interviews and/or consultations;
- c) Field visit;
- d) Questionnaires, if used; and
- e) Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

1.2 Timetable and Deliverables

The duration of the evaluation will be a total of 35 working days and will commence in 1 July 2011 with the following tentative schedule for the critical milestones:

- Acceptance and commencement of duties by 1 July 2011
- Inception meeting with the principal parties (UNDP, MET, PMU and PCU) by 9 July 2011, with a schedule and definite timetable for the overall evaluation
- Presentation of the draft report to the key stakeholders and incorporation of comments by 30 July 2011
- Draft Evaluation Report by end 8 August 2011
- Final comments on the draft evaluation report by 22 August 2011
- Final Evaluation/ Final Report by 5 September 2011, in 3 (2 hard) and 1 electronic copies

4.5 Outputs

The end result of this evaluation exercise should be a Final Evaluation Report with an executive summary, findings, assessment of performance, lessons learnt, recommendations and description of best practices. The Final Evaluation Report should provide an assessment of the project progress towards a) meeting the project objective and outcome targets(on the six point scale of; Highly Satisfactory HS, Satisfactory S, Marginally Satisfactory MS, Marginally Unsatisfactory MU, Unsatisfactory U, and Highly Unsatisfactory HU) and b) for project implementation.

The consultants should also take steps to verify the realization of the co-financing committed in the project document.

The consultants should provide the general conclusions and recommendations on the;

- Implementation of the project
- Degree to which the project objective and outcome targets have been met
- Significant lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not (and reasons why) and
- Recommendations on further action upon completion of the current project and for the implementation of the subsequent adaptation interventions.

It is worth noting that as the report is the product of an independent evaluation, it is up to the evaluators to make use of the information provided during the mission. However, the evaluator is responsible for reflecting any factual corrections brought to their attention prior to the finalization of the report. Therefore, in order to ensure that the report considers the view of all parties concerned is properly understood, and it is factually accurate, it is necessary for the evaluators to submit draft reports to the PMU, MET, UNDP. The final version of the evaluation report should be **submitted in both hard copy (2) and electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP and the MET no later than 5 September 2011.**

4.6 Consultations

The consultants are open to consult all reports, files, manuals, guidelines and resource people he/she feels are essential to the work at hand. The mission will maintain close liaison and consult with the UNDP Resident Representative and Deputy Resident Representative in Namibia, as well as other concerned officials and agencies in UNDP; the Project Steering Committee, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, among other key stakeholder organization and their representatives.

4.7 Reporting

The consultants will report directly to the Senior Management of UNDP Namibia, UNDP/GEF RCU, but mostly to the UNDP Resident Representative or the designated officials to act on their behalf. The consultants shall work in close collaboration with the CEGEM PMU. The consultants will prepare and submit the draft report of the final evaluation to UNDP. A presentation and debriefing of the report to UNDP and the project beneficiaries (Ministry of Environment and Tourism) and the Project Steering Committee will be made as part of the combined wrap-up workshop for the CEGEM Final Evaluation. The reporting schedule will be finalized during the inception meeting between the consultant and key stakeholders.

4.8 Education/Experience/Language

The consultants should:

- Masters Degree in Environmental sciences or other related field. Additional years of relevant work experience preferably in combination with a relevant Bachelor's Degree, may substitute for the requirement for a master's degree.
- At least five (5) years experience in natural resources and environmental management fields;
- Be experienced within the donors and preferably UNDP M&E framework and Result Based Management system, GEF projects and evaluations.
- Be conversant with administrative/financial/procurement UNDP procedures.
- Experience in conducting evaluations.
- Have proven ability to write technical reports.
- Possess excellent interpersonal skills and demonstrated ability to network and foster teamwork.
- Have strong foundation in climate change adaptation programming.
- Be computer literate.
- Experience working in the region is desirable.

DISCLOSURE

Although the team is free to discuss with the authorities on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the Governments of Namibia.

Annex II. List of Respondents

1. Theo Nghitila – Director, DEA – Ministry of Environment and Tourism
2. Dietlinde Nakwaya, Project Coordinator, CEGEM
3. Absalom Sigwedha, Free Lance Journalist
4. Jackie Hindjou, Journalist, NBC, Radio
5. Jonas Nghishidi, Namibia Nature Foundation
6. Dr. Willie Jankovitz, Head, Department of Nature Conservation Polytechnic of Namibia
7. Mr Fidelis Mwazi, Technical Adviser, Africa Adaptation Project, MET
8. Martha Mwandingi. Head, Energy and Environment, UNDP Country Office
9. Margaret Angula, Head, Department of Geography, History and Environmental Studies, UNAM

10. Ms.Toini Hasheela, Planner, Ministry of Regional, Local Government, Housing and Rural Development
11. Mr Sem Shikongo, Director of Tourism, MET
12. Mr Vekondja Tjikuzu, D-Director, National Planning Commission

Annex III Documents Reviewed

1. Project Document: – Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environment Conventions in Namibia. PIMS 3702 NAM 10 (Namibia) 00046421 (Proposal Number) 00055289 (Project Number) MU MSP: CEGEM
2. Proceedings of the Inception Workshop: Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environment Conventions in Namibia, October 13th 2009.
3. Standard Progress Reports;
 - a. January – December 2010,
 - b. January – March, 2011,
 - c. April – June, 2011
4. CEGEM 2011, Workplan
5. Latest PIR
6. Project Output Reports – ABS Workshop Report, Climate Change Media Workshop, EIA Workshop Report
7. UNDP Practitioners Guide. Web (1)
8. Capacity building monitoring guidelines in Global Environmental Facility projects. September 2010. UNDP, UNEP, GEF.

Annex IV. Questionnaire: Final Evaluation - Strengthening Capacity Enhancement to Implement the Global Environment Conventions in Namibia

1. Background and Introduction

Based on the project document and the terms of reference that were provided, the consultant hereby proposes an approach to conduct the evaluation exercise.

Project Goals, Objectives and Outputs

The consultant has taken note of the project goal, overall and specific objectives and the associated outcomes and outputs. The outcomes and the outputs have been used to draw up the set of questions attached that will be used to interview a number of respondents within government and a select few mainly within environmental NGOs available in the country..

Goal: To integrate the global environmental objectives in national development programmes and plans.

Overall Objective: The overall objectives of the (CEGEM Project) is to increase institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land degradation, in the context of national development

Specific objectives include:

- 1) to strengthen the technical skills and knowledge of key Government and non-governmental organizations involved in environmental management,
- 2) to improve awareness on the global environmental conventions, provisions and synergies and on cross-cutting conventions issues
- 3) to develop mechanisms to ensure that environmental concerns are adequately mainstreamed in the national and regional planning, and
- 4) to ensure sustainability by institutionalizing the implementation process of the NCSA national objectives.

Questionnaire Sheet - 2011

The questionnaire is divided into sections. Not all respondents will answer all the questions but the PCU and Steering Committee Members will need to go through the entire questionnaire.

1. Project design

- i. The project was designed with two key outcomes and a number of outputs associated with each outcome. From a project design viewpoint what are the main challenges associated with the outputs and the outcomes?.
- ii. What is your comment on the result-orientation of the outputs?
- iii. Were the objectives clear and SMART in your view?

2. Implementation Arrangements

- i. How were partners engaged in practical implementation?
- ii. What were the main implementation strategies adopted to achieve the two stated outcomes?
- iii. Were the strategies well thought out and adequate?
- iv. How was buy-in generated among collaborating partners?

3. Stakeholder participation

- i. Who were the most active or critical stakeholders?

4. Performance

- i. Was there sufficient backstopping from the Ministry
- ii. In what way did the steering committee facilitate the work? Give key examples.

5. Key Highlights of Achievement of outputs, milestones and outcomes

Can you provide a list of what you believe to be the key achievements of the project.

- i. Outcome 1.
- ii. Outcome 2.

6. Challenges to Implementation

What were the main challenges to the achievements of the planned outputs?

- i. Outcome 1 – Outputs
- ii. Outcome 2 – Outputs

7. Other questions on strategic and tactical aspects of the project.

- i. In terms of project delivery; the delivery of outputs and outcomes, what approaches would you consider to be innovative with respect to the implementation of Rio Conventions in Namibia?
- ii. For the outputs that were realized, what were the key success factors?
- iii. What in your opinion are the critical issues that would promote the adoption and implementation of Rio Conventions in Namibia? What needs to happen to facilitate this?
- iv. What key improvements could be made if the project were to continue in an additional phase?
- v. In hindsight what strategies would you adopt if you had to implement the project all over again?
- vi. What would be the key indicators to confirm that the two outcomes have been attained?

9. Any other suggestions and comments by the respondent

Annex V. Evaluation consultant agreement form

Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at (place)on

Signature: _____