



---

## **TERMINAL EVALUATION**

### **of the Project**

**Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational  
Sustainability of Protected Areas**

**[PIMS 3984, ATLAS 00050137]**

### **Final Report**

**Dr. Keith Lindsay  
Oxford, OX3 0DL  
United Kingdom**

***13 December, 2013***

## Table of contents

Table of contents .....	i
List of tables .....	iii
Summary details of the Evaluation .....	iv
Acronyms and abbreviations.....	v
Executive summary.....	vi
<b>1. Introduction - the evaluation process .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation .....	1
1.2 Scope and methodology of the evaluation.....	1
1.3 Structure of the evaluation .....	2
1.4 Evaluation Team Composition .....	3
<b>2. Project description and development context .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Project setting .....	4
2.2 Problems the project sought to address .....	4
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	5
2.4 Project start and duration.....	5
2.5 Main stakeholders.....	6
2.6 Baselines established.....	6
2.7 Results expected .....	6
<b>3. Findings: Project design/ formulation .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Conceptual model - the co-management approach .....	8
3.2 The logical framework .....	8
3.3 Assumptions and risks .....	10
3.4 Lessons from other projects .....	11
3.5 Stakeholder participation in project design .....	11
3.6 Country relevance and drivenness .....	12
3.7 Replication approach and sustainability .....	13
3.8 UNDP comparative advantage .....	14
3.9 Linkages with other initiatives in the sector .....	14
3.10 Implementation approach and management arrangements.....	15
3.11 Summary of Project formulation .....	16
<b>4. Findings: Project implementation and management .....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Implementation approach .....	17
4.1.1 Monitoring, reporting and management systems.....	17
4.1.2 Stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements .....	18
4.1.3 Information and communication management .....	19
4.2 Financial management .....	19
4.2.1 Financial planning and management .....	19
4.2.2 Co-financing .....	20
4.3 Monitoring and evaluation during implementation .....	22
4.3.1 Project monitoring, the LogFrame matrix and adaptive management .....	22
4.4 Project governance by Executing and Implementing Agencies .....	23
4.4.1 Performance of BirdLife Botswana as the Executing Agency .....	23
4.4.2 Performance of UNDP as the Implementing Agency .....	24
<b>5. Findings: Results and impacts .....</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1 Attainment of Objective .....	26

5.2	Achievement of Outcomes.....	27
5.3	Progress towards Impacts.....	30
<b>6.</b>	<b>Findings: Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability .....</b>	<b>32</b>
6.1	Outcome measures: Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.....	32
6.1.1	Relevance.....	32
6.1.2	Effectiveness.....	32
6.1.3	Efficiency .....	32
6.1.4	Summary of Outcome measures.....	33
6.2	Country ownership.....	33
6.3	Mainstreaming .....	33
6.4	Sustainability .....	33
6.4.1	Financial sustainability .....	33
6.4.2	Social sustainability .....	34
6.4.3	Institutional sustainability .....	34
6.4.4	Environmental sustainability .....	34
6.4.5	Summary of sustainability ratings .....	35
<b>7.</b>	<b>Conclusions and summary of findings .....</b>	<b>36</b>
7.1	Conclusions .....	36
7.1.1	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	36
7.1.2	Executing and Implementing Agencies Performance .....	36
7.1.3	Assessment of Outcomes .....	36
7.1.4	Sustainability.....	37
7.2	Assessment and summary of ratings .....	38
<b>8.</b>	<b>Lessons learned and recommendations .....</b>	<b>39</b>
8.1	Lessons learned .....	39
8.2	Recommendations .....	40
<b>9.</b>	<b>Annexes.....</b>	<b>41</b>

## List of tables

Table 1. Risk assessment and mitigation strategy.....	10
Table 2. Project Financing and Co-financing Summary.....	21
Table 3. Estimates of government in-kind co-financing.....	21
Table 4. Summary of Result and Effectiveness ratings .....	32
Table 5. Summary of Outcome measures .....	33
Table 6. Summary of sustainability ratings.....	35
Table 7. Summary of GEF criteria and ratings for the Project .....	38

## Summary details of the Evaluation

*Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:*

Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas

*UNDP and GEF project ID#s:*

PIMS 3984, ATLAS 00050137

*Evaluation time frame:*

25 October - 15 December 2013

*Date of evaluation report:*

29 November 2013

*Region and countries included in the project:*

Botswana

*GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program:*

GEF Focal Area: BIODIVERSITY SO1 - Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas

GEF-4 Strategic Program: SP1 Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems

*Implementing Partner and other project partners:*

Implementing Partner - UNDP Botswana

Executing Partners - BirdLife Botswana; Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism

*Evaluation team members:*

William Keith Lindsay

*Acknowledgements:*

The Evaluator would like to thank the staff of BirdLife Botswana, in particular Motshereganyi Virat Kootsositse and Kabelo Senyatso, for their logistical assistance and of UNDP-Botswana, in particular Phemo Karen Kgomotso, Tryphinah Majuta-Lunga and Lelanani Lenah Toteng, for their technical and administrative support during the evaluation mission and subsequent report-drafting period.

## Acronyms and abbreviations

BLB	BirdLife Botswana
BTO	Botswana Tourism Organisation
BWTI	Botswana Wildlife Training Institute
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CO	Country Office
DAP	Department of Animal Production
DC	District Commissioner
DDP	District Development Plan
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
DLUPU	District Land Use Planning Unit
DoT	Department of Tourism
DWNP	Department of Wildlife and National Parks
EA	Executing Agency
EoP	End of Project
GEB	Global Environmental Benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency
IMP	Integrated Management Plan
KCS	Kalahari Conservation Society
LACOM	Local Advisory Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEWT	Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism
MFMP	Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan
MOMS	Management Oriented Monitoring System
MSP	Medium-Sized Project
MWMC	Makgadikgadi Wetlands Management Committee
MWS	Makgadikgadi Pans Wetlands System
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NP	National Park
PA	Protected Area
PCG	Project Coordination Group
PIF	Project Identification Form
PMC	Park Management Committee
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SGP	Small Grants Programme
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WB	World Bank
WMA	Wildlife Management Area

## Executive summary

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF/Government of Botswana Project “Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas”. BirdLife Botswana served as Executing Agency on behalf of UNDP and the GEF, and the Project Steering Committee (PSC) was chaired by Mr Kealeboga Ntupu of Letlhakane Sub-district Land Board. Project activities were coordinated by the Project Coordination Group (PCG) based in Gaborone and chaired by the Head of Wildlife Estates Management/ Parks Division, Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### Project Summary Table

<b>Project Title:</b>	Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas			
<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	3984		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
<b>UNDP Project ID:</b>	00050137	GEF financing:	953,300	953,300.00
<b>Country:</b>	Botswana	IA/EA own:	0	100,000.00
<b>Region:</b>	Southern Africa	Government:	2,680,000.00	2,680,000.00
<b>Focal Area:</b>	Biodiversity	Other:	83,867.00	2,499,000.00
<b>FA Objectives, (OP/SP):</b>	Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas; Sustainable Financing of National Protected Area Systems	Total co-financing:	83,867.00	5,179,000.00
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	BirdLife Botswana	Total Project Cost:	6,132,300	6,132.300.00
<b>Other Partners involved:</b>	Department of Wildlife and National Parks, and the Department of Environmental Affairs	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		<b>January 2009</b>
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: <b>October 2012</b>	Actual: <b>September 2013</b>

### Project Description

The Project long-term Goal was:

*“To strengthen the sustainability and management effectiveness of Botswana’s system of protected areas (PAs).”*

The operational purpose or Project Objective of the project is described in the Project Document as:

*“Working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas in place”*

Work towards the Objective was pursued through three Outcomes:

- Outcome 1. Strengthened enabling environment for improved PA financial sustainability;
- Outcome 2. Effective Protected Area co-management systems demonstrated at site level and new revenue generation schemes field tested and replicated across the PA network.
- Outcome 3. Increased institutional capacity to effectively fulfil PA management functions.

The project had an initial total budget of US\$6,132,300 and the GEF provided input of US\$953,300. The original co-funding commitment was US\$5,179,000; despite withdrawal of some partners, co-financing was sustained to the end of the project, with a final commitment of US\$4,769,000, and an additional US\$405,830 lined up for the immediate post-project period.

## **The Evaluation**

Like all GEF Terminal Evaluations, this TE was carried out:

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

The approach to the evaluation was participatory which, while introductions were provided by the Project Coordinator, safeguarded the independence of the Evaluator. A GEF-approved rating system was applied to all elements of the Project, and the results are provided in the summary table below.

## **Key Findings and Conclusions**

### ***Monitoring and Evaluation***

#### **M&E design at entry**

The Monitoring and Evaluation approach, including the LogFrame, was considered **Satisfactory** in the design phase.

#### **M&E Plan Implementation**

Adaptive management during implementation, with only partial use of the LogFrame approach, was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

### ***Executing and Implementing Agencies' Performance***

#### **Executing Agency - BirdLife Botswana**

Project management by the Executing Agency had some shortcomings in the first two years, with absence of the BLB Director and turnover of Project Managers. However, from 2011, with the return of the Director to Botswana and recruitment of a new Project Manager, management and implementation took a dramatic improvement. Financial management was generally good throughout the length of the project. Overall, performance of BLB as the Executing Agency was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.



## **Implementing Agency - UNDP CO**

As with the Executing Agency, there were shortcomings in the early years of the Project in the support and technical oversight provided by the UNDP CO. Lack of security of tenure meant that the initial Programme Analyst became distant from project engagement, and there was drift in the supervision of the EA's implementation. However, vigilance by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor in 2010 identified the need for corrective action, and there was effectively a "re-launch" of project implementation; this reactivation was cited as the reason for the lack of a Mid-Term Evaluation in this Medium-Sized Project. A new Programme Analyst was recruited and this attention, as well as close engagement by the Resident Co-ordinator, helped improve the role played by the UNDP-CO. It should be noted that financial management was uniformly very good. Project coordination by the Implementing Agency over the life of the project was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

## **Assessment of Outcomes**

### ***Relevance***

In relation to international and national priorities, the Project design was considered **Relevant**. By staying true to the design, and adapting management when appropriate to re-direct activities back towards the intended Outcomes, this relevance continued in Project implementation.

### ***Effectiveness***

The project implementation had a slow start, but this was compensated by accelerated activity in the last years. For these reason, the overall rating for project Effectiveness is considered **Satisfactory**.

### ***Efficiency***

The financial management of the project was thorough and efficient throughout the course of implementation. Progress on delivery of and expenditure for Outputs was slow in the first two years of the project, but gained rapid momentum during 2011 and, particularly, 2012 and all GEF funds were disbursed by the EoP.

Thus, while the efficiency of project implementation was only Moderately Satisfactory, or even Moderately Unsatisfactory in the early years, in its latter stages and overall, it can be rated as **Satisfactory**.

## **Sustainability**

### ***Financial***

With government support probable to continue, but impossible to guarantee, a small number of private sector concerns showing interest in playing a corporate social responsibility role, and continued commitment by BLB, financial sustainability is rated as **Moderately Likely**.

### ***Socio-political***

The loss of the Nata Sanctuary, Nata Community Trust and the associated villages was initially a setback, but the addition of the Southern Sua villages to the constituency for conservation has expanded the scope of co-management in the MWS. The prospect now exists for a MWS-wide co-management approach to become established. Social sustainability is thus rated as **Likely**.

## ***Institutional***

As with financial sustainability, government institutional capacity is probable to continue, but impossible to guarantee. Enabling policy for co-management has been built and should be rolled out in DWNP at national level, District level, and PA levels across the country. Training has increased capacity of PA managers and ongoing training is now likely with the modules developed at BWTI. The modules' development needs consolidation for them to be firmly adopted. Partnerships have been built with some private sector partners, and the potential exists for growth in this area, either through community-run enterprises or Joint Venture Partnerships. Capacity has been improved in the Southern Sua community trusts, with the three-village trust nearing registration. Sustainability of them as institutions still requires support. For these reasons, institutional sustainability is rated **Moderately Likely**.

## ***Environmental***

Current threats from within Botswana to the ecological integrity of the MWS are low, and potential environmental impacts would be addressed by implementation of the SSMP. Advances made by the project in raising awareness of environmental/ biodiversity concerns at local, regional and international levels have improved the prospects for perpetuating the conservation values of the MWS. Environmental sustainability is rated **Likely**.

## **Overall rating of components**

A summary of ratings for all project components is provided in the following table.

Criterion	Rating
<b><i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i></b>	
M&E design at entry	Satisfactory
M&E Plan Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
<i>Overall quality of M&amp;E</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Implementing Agency &amp; Executing Agency Performance</i></b>	
Quality of UNDP Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	Moderately Satisfactory
<i>Overall quality of Implementation / Execution</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Assessment of Outcomes</i></b>	
Relevance	Relevant
Effectiveness	Satisfactory
Efficiency	Satisfactory
<i>Overall Project Outcome Rating</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Sustainability</i></b>	
Financial resources	Moderately Likely
Socio-political	Likely
Institutional framework and governance	Moderately Likely
Environmental	Likely
<i>Overall likelihood of sustainability</i>	<i>Moderately Likely</i>
<b><i>Overall project rating</i></b>	<b><i>Satisfactory</i></b>

## **Lessons learned**

1. A nationally-based NGO, with strong international linkages, is a good choice as the institution to act as Executing Agency for implementing a UNDP-GEF project of this type. There could have been a risk in working with a small NGO, with a fluid staff complement and potentially limited technical and administrative capacity. However, an NGO has the advantages of:

- Neutrality, in relation to government agencies and parastatals at national and local levels. No enforcement role, so readily trusted by communities and government players alike. But can play lobbying action, combined with support to government
  - Information base and dissemination capacity.
  - Long term commitment. Since they have a long term mission in the country, with established partnerships with donors and private sector, they contribute to institutional sustainability.
2. Capacity-building and change of culture in organisations has been effective to establish that co-management is now considered best practice. However, changes in staffing levels and deployment can reduce sustainability of outcomes; this effect of staff turnover could be helped by working with teams, not just individuals. The Project clearly recognised this problem, by having a component that “trained the trainers” with courses on co-management and biodiversity monitoring at BWTI.
  3. It is very effective to have a parallel government land use planning process (MFMP, MWMC) to align with project design and implementation. This lesson was also learned from the BioKavango Project.
  4. Co-management is a process, not a product and it is not realistic to expect an “end-point” in a Medium-Sized Project of only 4-5 years’ duration. Sustainability of Outcomes and longer-term Impact require continued commitment by government, both in terms of financial and staffing support and in providing the enabling environment for genuine partnerships within government at different levels and with external agencies, including both the civil society and private sectors. However, it is reasonable to expect a MSP to establish the basis for Impact Drivers and to catalyse the necessary changes in stakeholder capacities and mindset, so that mainstreaming of co-management can be encouraged.
  5. Pilot projects, especially in novel approaches to natural resource use, may need greater time to achieve sustainability than length of an MSP period. Pilot projects may or may not be suitable for “scaling-up”; they should be viewed as experiments.
  6. Coordination between government agencies is essential; lack of common direction can de-rail project outcomes.
  7. Expectations of local communities must also be managed.

## Recommendations

Terminal evaluations do not normally make many recommendations, especially for reasonably successful projects, such as this one. Recommendations made derive from and focus on sustainability of project benefits and on the lessons learned for future projects of this sort and in the region.

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project should note:

1. Staff in key positions, whose capacity and motivation for co-management has been built by the Project, should be maintained at current posts for longer periods. If this is not possible, then it is essential to ensure handover of skills and knowledge to successors. This applies to Government departments, such as DEA and DWNP. It also applies to the District Administration and to the Letlhakane Sub-land Board.
2. Government departments at national and local level should provide sufficient resources to stations and offices to sustain Outcomes.

Actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of future projects should note:

3. It is helpful, and perhaps essential, to have a preparatory, parallel land use planning process (like MFMP) in any projects involving processes of change in management of natural resources.
4. Monitoring and Evaluation should be a core function, with sufficient resources, and should be undertaken with a full LogFrame approach. The LogFrame should be reviewed at Project Inception and on an annual basis, and should play a full role in adaptive management.
5. There should be a formal sustainability plan as part of Project activities. It could be drafted in the Project design but should be finalised in the final year of implementation. Important aspects to include are mechanisms to promote sustainability of Outcomes, leading towards Impacts.
6. Although GEF projects aim to achieve Global Environmental Benefits, it is equally important to emphasize livelihoods targets.
7. In the project formulation process aiming at fundamental change, there is a strong need to examine the prospects for commitment, and coordination, by local/ national government and private sector sustain both financial and human resources.
8. Replication prospects need careful thought within Botswana and elsewhere; this project had many unique aspects which may not scale up directly, so appreciation of specific conditions is essential for modification of replication approaches.

# 1. Introduction - the evaluation process

## 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The Terms of Reference of this Terminal Evaluation (TE) require it “to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.”

Like all GEF Terminal Evaluations, this TE is being carried out:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities, including other projects considered in the region;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

A more specific list of tasks expected of the TE is in the ToRs in Annex 1.

The Terminal Evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and serves as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation sets about attempting to provide answers to the following questions:

- Was the project managed well? (= implementation process)
- Did the project achieve its objectives? (= results)
- Are the results likely to be sustainable? (= impacts and sustainability)

## 1.2 Scope and methodology of the evaluation

Work on this assignment commenced from home base in United Kingdom in late October 2013 with planning and documents review, and I travelled to Gaborone on 2-3 November. The first day, 4 November, was spent in initial briefings and mission planning at the UNDP Country Office and the BirdLife Botswana (BLB) office. A series of brief visits followed with stakeholders in Letlhakane, Maun, Nata and in project sites in the Makgadikgadi Pans area during 5-9 November.

Further consultations with stakeholders took place in Gaborone during 11-14 November, and a presentation of preliminary findings was made to the Project Coordination Group on 15 November, where initial feedback was provided. The in-country mission for the evaluation consultant ended on 16 November.

During the course of the assignment, three sources of primary data and information were examined:

**Firstly**, a wide variety of documents covering project design, implementation progress, monitoring and review, studies, policies on natural resource management, the Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan - among others. Documents reviewed are listed in Annex 2.

**Secondly**, face-to-face consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, using “semi-structured interviews” with a key set of questions in a conversational format. Stakeholders interviewed included members of the Project team (mainly BirdLife), District authorities and technical officers, members of the Project Steering Committee, government at national and local level, community based organizations and individuals, private-sector organizations and individuals. The stakeholders contacted are listed in Annex 3.

**Thirdly**, direct observations of project results and activities at field sites, such as the Flamingo Sanctuary area and Southern Sua villages.

Since it was not possible, in the limited time available for the Evaluation Mission, to meet all of the stakeholders involved in the wide range of Project activities, some sampling of the total was required. An itinerary of interviews in Letlhakane, Maun and Gaborone and visits to Project field sites was proposed by the Project Coordinator and was modified through discussion between the Consultant, Project Coordinator and UNDP Botswana Programme Analyst. The Project Coordinator, M Virat Kootsositse, provided logistical support for all the consultations and field visits. It is important to note that Mr Kootsositse was very careful to ensure that all interviews were conducted independently; he generally withdrew after introductions had been made, so that all discussions with stakeholders allowed for full and frank expressions of opinion. A copy of the itinerary for the consultations is attached in Annex 4.

The information collected, including documentary evidence, interviews and observations, was compiled and organized according to the questions asked in the assessment. Triangulation of results, i.e. comparing information from different sources, such as documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, was used to corroborate or check the reliability of evidence.

### 1.3 Structure of the evaluation

The TE must provide an assessment of the impacts that a project has achieved, but these may often occur in the longer term, especially in the case of a “process” type project such as this one, where change of attitudes and operating procedures (“sustainability”) is the objective. In such cases, it is reasonable to assess results (the “Outcomes”) that can be expected to lead to impacts.

The project should be evaluated for all phases of its cycle: a) project design/ formulation, b) project implementation and c) project results.

This report is composed of four parts. The first part provides the introduction and the background to the assignment. It starts with the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used and it then offers a brief context of the project.

The second part is the main substantive part of this report and comprises four inter-related sections. It presents the findings of the evaluation exercise in terms of (i) the basic project concept and design, (ii) its implementation, administration and management, (iii) its achievements and limitations, and the relevance of what it achieved, (iv) its degree of effectiveness and the potential for sustainability of the Outcomes that it produced.

The third part is the conclusions section which gathers together a summary of the ratings given and conclusions that had been reached throughout the report and augments them to create a cohesive ending arising from the investigation. The findings were rated in conformity with the GEF/UNDP guidelines<sup>1</sup> for final evaluations using six-point and four-point scales.

The final section provides lessons learned and recommendations. A number of annexes provide supplementary information.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects (2011)

#### **1.4 Evaluation Team Composition**

The evaluation team was composed of Dr. Keith Lindsay, an independent consultant based in Oxford, United Kingdom.

## 2. Project description and development context

### 2.1 Project setting

Botswana is a semi-arid and landlocked country with an area of 581,730 km<sup>2</sup>, and though much of the country (ca. 80%) is characterized by nutrient-poor sandy soils with low rainfall, it also hosts major wetlands and harbours significant biodiversity. Its protected area estate, including National Parks, Game Reserves, Sanctuaries and Wildlife Management Areas, incorporates some 40% of the total land territory or approximately 243,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The latter PA category is based on wildlife utilization by local communities, a Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) concept adopted to conserve biodiversity whilst involving communities in the management of natural resources within their vicinity.

The Makgadikgadi Wetland System (MWS, also abbreviated as Makgadikgadi Pans - the largest area of salt pans in the world) - comprises a seasonal wetland area of some 12, 000 km<sup>2</sup>. The area is of global biological significance, supporting the second largest flamingo population in Africa and Botswana's largest zebra and wildebeest migration route, and including uniquely scenic landscapes. The combination of an existing sanctuary (the 250 km<sup>2</sup> Nata Sanctuary) managed by a multi-village community trust in part of the area, other villages with adjacent critical flamingo habitat in the Southern Sua Pans area, and a national park (the 7,500 km<sup>2</sup> Makgadikadi/ Nxai Pans NP) in close proximity provided a rare opportunity to demonstrate synergies between the private sector, local communities and the national government.

### 2.2 Problems the project sought to address

A large proportion of Botswana's PA estate (ca 70%) lies in remote dryland areas with little human habitation and potential for conflict. However, a number of PAs (covering some 30,000 km<sup>2</sup>) are located in areas with growing human populations and accompanying economic activities, which place direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity. The main threats arise from the conversion of natural habitats into other "productive" land uses. The expansion of cattle into wildlife areas, and fencing for the control of livestock diseases, has led to habitat fragmentation leading to increasing pressure on adjacent protected areas.

Responsibilities for management of the PA system are vested in the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP). The State currently provides significant funds aimed at meeting the recurrent and development costs of DWNP, including for PA management, and it has leveraged sizable investments, notably from the European Union (US\$ 18 million over the past years) to strengthen PA infrastructure. However, while significant, this investment is inadequate in terms of assuring the management effectiveness of the PA system, as necessary to abate threats. The management paradigm is characterized by a statist approach with limited stakeholder involvement; opportunities for cultivating private sector, community and other stakeholder support for PA management have not been effectively tapped.

The conceptual basis for solutions to the sustainability of PA management, in particular in smaller sites and settled areas, is the development of partnerships between the government and other stakeholders, defined as a co-management or joint management. Joint management allows local communities and private interests to derive socio-economic benefits from the protected area, while striking trade-offs between the rights and interests of traditional owners and the rights and interests of government conservation agencies, the private sector and the wider community.



Barriers to this approach include:

1. **Weak systemic capacity.** Though Botswana has a Community Based Natural Resource Management framework which allows for community involvement in PA management, collaboration with the private sector and NGOs tends to occur on an ad hoc basis and is not codified in PA management strategies. Exclusionary PA management systems have led local communities to feel resentment against conservation initiatives that are developed and implemented without their participation. This inevitably implies that the costs of PA management are higher than they might otherwise be.
2. **Minimal or little local stakeholder engagement and action at site level.** An effective demonstration of PA co-management is currently lacking in Botswana.
3. **Insufficient national institutional capacity.** Effective co-management requires the development of technical and managerial skills in institutions mandated with PA management. However, the capacity of the DWNP to engage in effective partnerships with non-governmental actors remains weak. There is also inadequate capacity within the private sector and civil society to engage in and advance local conservation initiatives in PAs.

The project has been designed to address these challenges, with respective Outcome areas proposing solutions to each of the barriers.

### 2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project design follows a hierarchy of vision, goal, objective, outcomes and outputs, a structure which conforms to national planning frameworks followed by most governments around the world.

The Project long-term Goal, as described in the Project Document, was:

*“To strengthen the sustainability and management effectiveness of Botswana’s system of protected areas (PAs).”*

The operational purpose or Project Objective of the project was:

*“Working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas in place.”*

The Government has established a number of legislative acts and strategies that relate to biodiversity conservation. The PA estate constitutes the corner stone of the national conservation strategy. However, there is an unmet need to establish new management approaches to improve the financial and operational sustainability of the PA system, as necessary to improve its overall management effectiveness. This project is designed to address this need. This is in line with government plans outlined in relevant policies (e.g. The National Policy on Natural Resources Conservation and Development (NPNRCD) 1990), rural development programmes (e.g. Community Based Strategy for Rural Development 1997) and programming framework for biodiversity conservation (e.g. strategic objective #2 of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan).

### 2.4 Project start and duration

The Project Identification Form (PIF) of August 2007 indicates that the project was originally planned to start in April 2008. In practice, the Project Document was signed in January 2009, with implementation to start in early 2009. The first disbursement of funds occurred on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2009.

With a start in January 2009, the project was intended to conclude by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012. However, due to delays in the implementation of project activities, a no-cost 6-month extension was requested by the PSC and granted to 30 September 2013.

## 2.5 Main stakeholders

A strong emphasis was placed on participation and engagement between the various stakeholders, and building partnerships between government, private sector and rural communities.

The Project Document lists stakeholders to include:

- Central government - DWNP, DEA, DoT, Department of Forestry and Range Resources, Department of Animal Production (DAP).
- Local government - Central District Council, Central District Land Use Planning Unit (DLUPU), Central District Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Ngwato Land Board.
- Non-governmental organisations - BirdLife Botswana (the Executing Agency), Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS), World Conservation Union (IUCN).
- Community group - Nata Sanctuary Community Trust
- Private businesses - BotAsh (Pty) Ltd, Nata Lodge
- local and international technical experts
- International institutions - UNDP.

After project implementation began, there were changes to some of the stakeholder groups, including NGOs, community and private sector organisations.

## 2.6 Baselines established

The Baseline is composed of three parts: Presence, strengths and weakness of the policy and legislative frameworks within which the project will be implemented (enabling environment), PA co-management systems and environmental governance, and livelihoods. For all three parts, national, landscape (MWS) and site-level (Nata Sanctuary and Makgadikgadi/Nxai NP) activities (implemented by government and non-state actors) are discussed.

Under the baseline situation, the Government would continue to fund Protected Areas almost solely by itself. Opportunities for tapping private sector involvement in rendering management advice and funding support would remain unharnessed. The prevailing state-centred management paradigm would continue to isolate communities, increasing the costs of threat abatement. Protected Areas would, moreover, be managed in isolation to sub-regional national development plans and processes. The combined effect of these practices would result in the PA System operating at sub-optimal management effectiveness, a particular concern in smaller Protected Areas. At a minimum, the demonstration site (12,000km<sup>2</sup> in area) was to benefit directly from this intervention, while a further 58,000km<sup>2</sup> (comprising mainly community-run un-gazetted WMAs) would benefit indirectly from the outcomes.

## 2.7 Results expected

By the end of the project, a viable co-management paradigm would have been demonstrated. Working management partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders would be functioning and codified; and improvement in the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas measurably demonstrated.

The long-term project goal was to strengthen the sustainability and management effectiveness of Botswana's system of protected areas. The objective was to develop working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the

financial and operational sustainability of protected areas in place. By involving relevant stakeholders in PA management, it was anticipated that control over their resources would be democratized, costs to central government would decrease, motivation and opportunities for poaching and other destructive behaviour would be reduced, law enforcement improved, capacity expanded, a wide base of technical and traditional knowledge tapped, a more equitable distribution of benefits would be possible, and the service provision functions of PAs will be better recognized and protected.

Success in this endeavour would require a strategic mix of business planning, law enforcement and local capacity building with community, private sector and civil society participation based on incentives through the diversification of livelihood options. All of this needs to operate within a supportive enabling environment at local, District and Central level requiring an investment into policy support and institutional strengthening and awareness-raising so as to allow informed decision-making.

The results expected were spelt out in detail in the Logical Framework. Work towards the Objective (Section 2.3 above) was pursued through three Outcomes:

**Outcome 1.** Strengthened enabling environment for improved PA financial sustainability;

**Outcome 2.** Effective Protected Area co-management systems demonstrated at site level and new revenue generation schemes field tested and replicated across the PA network.

**Outcome 3.** Increased institutional capacity to effectively fulfil PA management functions.

The components each had a suite of specific and cross-cutting activities delivering measurable outputs. Objective, Outcomes and Activities were integrated within the Logical Framework provided in the Project Document.

The conceptual framework to the co-management approach, which was fundamental to the success of the project, is discussed below in Section 3.1. In summary, the project sought to deliver:

- strengthened institutions through policy development, effective partnerships and networks;
- improved biodiversity and land-use and natural resource management through pilot demonstration projects;
- improved human capacity through training and mentoring;
- heightened awareness of the value of biodiversity to human wellbeing;
- improved livelihoods through better small business activities.

The wide array of activities were intended to contribute to a central focus on improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods, needing effective integration of outputs to achieve the project goal.

### 3. Findings: Project design/ formulation

The Project Document was thoroughly produced, well-researched and comprehensive. It provides a clear situation analysis of the socio-economic context, challenges to biodiversity conservation and their underlying causes, stakeholder characteristics and the policy and legislative environment. Similarly, it responds fully to UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of strategy and project management arrangements.

#### 3.1 Conceptual model - the co-management approach

The co-management approach is appropriate in the context of protected area management in Botswana, with stakeholders already aware of the principles of CBNRM in Botswana and community involvement in wildlife management.

Co-management as a concept is important in its recognition of the essential role of involvement by stakeholders, beyond appointed government agencies, in the successful management of protected areas. This recognition stems from the emerging awareness by a range of conservation practitioners of the need to extend conservation beyond isolated protected areas to protected landscapes<sup>2</sup>. Biodiversity cannot survive if it is restricted to islands of “pristine” habitat surrounded by incompatible land use and, equally, the needed resources for conservation cannot be supplied by the necessarily limited funds and personnel of government agencies alone. The key challenge for the project was the paradigm shift in thinking required within the DWNP, the primary government agency with responsibility for PA management, regarding shared management of PAs. At the same time, stakeholders in the civil society and private sectors were encouraged to invest social and financial capital in partnerships for the co-operative management of natural areas and resources.

The project represents an innovative attempt to establish the basis for PA co-management that should lead to improved prospects for the sustainability of financial and social support, which is necessary for biodiversity conservation. In the design, there was the intention to test the hypothesis that such co-management could yield the desired sustainability benefits.

#### 3.2 The logical framework

The preparation of the Project Document included a thorough consultation process at all levels. As a general comment, it does appear that the Logical Framework (LogFrame) was developed in a somewhat top-down process, without significant LogFrame workshops at local levels (see Section 3.5 below). In addition, the full logical framework process has not been used for regular and participatory reviews of progress at the project or Country Office level, or for adaptive management except at the level of UNDP-GEF oversight - see Section 4.1.1 below.

There were three Indicators at Objective level:

1. Increase in extent (ha) of PA network practicing PA co-management as an approach to increase PA operational and financial sustainability
2. Decrease in the % financing gap for the PA network
3. Financial scorecard for national systems of protected areas

---

<sup>2</sup> Brown, J, Mitchell, N & Beresford, M (Ed.s) (2005) *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

These Indicators may have seemed to be appropriate during the design phase, but in fact they are difficult to quantify, not particularly SMART<sup>3</sup> and do not link clearly to the sustainability aspects of the Objective.

The first Indicator appears to include both small, community-run sanctuaries as well as the more formal protected areas under the jurisdiction of DWNP. An assumption appears to be made that if a protected area manager has simply set up a consultative structure, such as a Park Management Committee (PMC), then the entire area of land of the PA automatically falls under the total for “practicing co-management as an approach to increase PA operational and financial sustainability” of the protected area. This is a weak assumption, and the indicator is not Specific. In fact, at the outset of the project, a number of protected areas already had Local Area Committees (LACOMs) which included a number of stakeholders from the private sector and local communities; these were discontinued and then replaced by PMCs with more circumscribed membership. However, in the case of both PMCs and LACOMs, the formation of the committees is simply an early stage in the effective practicing of co-management; the effects of such practice should really be verified by decisions and actions taken that clearly lead to improved PA management. Another problem with this indicator is that while small co-managed PAs in the project pilot area could be considered to result from project activities, the setting-up of PMCs by DWNP at large, existing PAs cannot be Attributed to the project, except perhaps only indirectly.

The second Indicator refers to the funding (or financing) gap for Botswana’s protected area network. This Indicator is not well-defined (Specific and Measurable), in terms of the source and reliability of the data upon which it is based. Deriving an estimate for government subvention to the PA Estate at the national level is possible, but the question remains on whether this subvention is sufficient to meet the actual costs of running the PA network effectively. Interviews with various stakeholders indicate that it is difficult to derive an accurate estimate of the actual cost of maintaining Botswana’s PAs, since budget estimates are based on individual PA managers’ annual workplans/ cost estimates but allocations and expenditures are accounted for at District level, not that of the individual PAs. A second issue, as with the first Indicator, is that it is not clear how changes in the financing gap can be Attributed to the actions of the project.

The third Indicator is more Specific and Measurable, according to the GEF methodology. As with the other Outcome indicators, it is less clear how Attribution can be demonstrated.

In the interest of offering a positive alternative, an Indicator for the Objective of effective co-management, as a result of project actions, could have been:

“BY EoP, X% of PA management decisions are demonstrably based upon the outcomes of PMC and other stakeholder consultation mechanisms as recommended/ piloted by the project.”

At the Outcomes level, the choice of indicators was more appropriate, and more directly related to Attributable mechanisms leading to PA co-management and governance. Each Outcome was to be achieved through a group of Outputs and related Activities producing measurable outputs. The Outputs and Activities were not very well articulated in the Project Document.

The LogFrame was used as the basis for monitoring of Objective and Outcomes in Annual Project Implementation Reviews, while the Project Management Unit used Outcomes and a range of Outputs as the basis for annual workplans, and technical and financial reporting to the PSC and UNDP CO.

---

<sup>3</sup> SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable/ Attributable, Realistic and Time-bound, according to UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects (2011).

### 3.3 Assumptions and risks

There was clear attention to risk assessment during project formulation, and this attention continued during implementation. All quarterly and annual reports in the early years of the project made specific reference to risk issues, with mitigation measures proposed and, apparently, acted upon. A separate Risk Log and Issues Log was prepared every year by the PMU, with mitigation actions proposed and reported on.

Risks identified in the Project Document, with proposed mitigation measures are summarised in Table 1 below:

**Table 1. Risk assessment and mitigation strategy  
(from Project Document)**

Critical Risks (reflecting assumptions in the LogFrame)		
Risk	Rating	Risk mitigating measure
Conflicts between different stakeholder groups undermine project implementation activities	L	Existing policies and legal institutional arrangements will be reviewed and strengthened to facilitate greater civil society participation in PA management.
Failure of Government to implement recommended reforms	M	Advocacy and support for review and reform of regulatory framework for stakeholder participation will be undertaken. Mechanisms for coordination of stakeholders (NLCs) and joint training in PA co-management (within project's ability) will be promoted
Local communities are not willing to participate in policy and decision making and implementation	L	Awareness will be raised, information made available and community structures strengthened for effective participation in the decision-making process and implementation.
Private sector is capable (i.e. partner companies continue running profitably) and willing to invest in PA system	S	Technical & marketing skills will be enhanced to optimize the use of PAs for income generation. Policy reviews will be done to facilitate private sector participation and investment in PA management. Advocacy for policy change and private sector engagement and investment will be undertaken.
Overall Risk Rating	L	This project proposal was developed through a consultative process, involving the government, UNDP CO, private sector, civil society, and local authorities at the demonstration site and nationally, and each are willing to play their role to ensure the success of the project and the tools being piloted through it.

\*Risk rating - H (High Risk), S (Substantial Risk), M (Modest Risk), and L (Low Risk).

The choice of a small NGO such as BirdLife Botswana as the Executing Agency represented a potential risk, in terms of capacity for administrative and financial management for a Medium-Sized Project. However, it also brought the advantage of independence from government, with its somewhat rigid procedures, and its ability to act as a neutral agent, with no allegiance to any particular department or constituency.

### 3.4 Lessons from other projects

As noted in the Project Document, the project built on previous experience within Africa that was adapted to the context of Botswana e.g. BirdLife International's "African NGO-Government Partnerships for Sustainable Biodiversity Action project"<sup>4</sup> in piloting participatory natural resource conservation practices. It also set out to utilize local capacity in CBNRM and nature-based enterprises that has been built over the last decade in implementing projects at several locations in Botswana. It linked with ongoing conservation efforts at the Makgadikgadi Pans Wetland System (MPWS), especially the Integrated Management Plan (IMP). Beyond Botswana boundaries, it is part of BirdLife International's Important Bird Area Programme (ongoing since 1992), Site Support Group and Policy and Advocacy Working Group programmes, which cover 21 other African countries. These multiple vertical and horizontal linkages provide a strong supportive framework for the project strategy and augur well for sustainability.

In recent years, UNDP-Botswana has had a relatively small GEF portfolio, and hitherto there had never been a project specifically on enhancing PA management effectiveness, nor piloting innovative PA financing models. However, there were ongoing and recently completed projects that provided lessons for project conceptualization, design, management, and realization of conservation results. These included the UNDP/GEF project "Building Local Capacity for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Okavango Delta, BioKavango", which sought to mainstream conservation objectives into the tourism, water and fisheries sectors within the Okavango Delta. While the Okavango Wetlands include a PA (Moremi Game Reserve), BioKavango did not directly address issues pertaining to its management effectiveness nor financial sustainability, though the PA was able to benefit from improved biodiversity monitoring systems and training through that project.

One clear lesson from BioKavango was the fruitful coordination between the project design and implementation and the DEA-led development and implementation of the Okavango Delta Management Plan, a comprehensive framework for land use development and management that integrates the work of different sectors with District-level planning processes. The current Project has similarly benefitted from the development of the Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan, which has also been championed by DEA.

### 3.5 Stakeholder participation in project design

The Project Document states that "The project has been developed through an extensive consultation process that has involved key stakeholders involved with PA-related work in Botswana, including representatives from government institutions, NGOs and local communities." The consultation process started in 2004 during the development of the PDF B for a regional project Enhancing Local Capacities for Sustainable Biodiversity Action in Africa project (PIMS 3125), from which the current proposal evolved. In addition to bilateral discussions with the relevant institutions, national, regional and site-level consultative workshops were held in Gaborone (Botswana), Nata (Botswana) and Nairobi (Kenya) on 27th July 2006, 29-31st July 2006 and 3rd August 2006, respectively. At each of these meeting, site-level, national and regional stakeholders were identified. Additionally, to ensure conformity with national programmes and priorities, a tripartite working group (government, UNDP Botswana and BirdLife Botswana) was formed to guide the preparatory stages. This working group met on several occasions.

---

<sup>4</sup> A UNDP/ GEF project, implemented during the period 1998-2002 by the BirdLife Africa Partnership in 10 countries



It appears that the LogFrame was developed as part of the Project Document during this process, but it also appears that its formulation was developed primarily by the Executing Agency rather than through a fully participatory approach. There was an intention for a review of the LogFrame (indicators, means of verification, assumptions) with UNDP partners at a project inception meeting, but it is not clear that this was done.

### 3.6 Country relevance and drivenness

Botswana has ratified the CBD and is eligible for technical assistance through the United Nations System and thus for GEF funding. The project was highly relevant to the national vision of Botswana, its national policies and its strategies to protect biodiversity and wetland ecosystems, and was strongly supported by the authorities at national and local levels.

Ownership at national level was strengthened by the chairing of the Project Steering Committee by the Boteti Sub-District Land Board, by the strong representation of other national and local government departments on the PSC and its subsidiary committees, and by the key role played by BirdLife Botswana as the project Executing Agency. In addition, a Project Coordination Group, composed of representatives of government Ministries at the national level, provided guidance when needed.

At local levels, the active involvement of user and community groups, such as village representatives, provided direct access to and influence on project decisions by civil society.

Botswana has established an impressive PA estate, which is the primary locus for biodiversity conservation, incorporating some 40% of Botswana's total land area. The State currently provides a sum of ca. US\$ 10 million per annum to cover the recurrent costs of DWNP, a significant proportion of which is specifically for management of the PA system. However, while significant, this investment is inadequate in terms of assuring management effectiveness. Opportunities for cultivating private sector, community and other stakeholder support for PA management have not been effectively tapped.

There is a growing recognition that the role of non-state actors in the economy should be enhanced, as epitomized by the Privatization Policy for Botswana. In line with this policy, the Government has recognized that top-down PA management systems administered by the State have not been successful, and has acknowledged that participatory governance arrangements involving local communities and the private sector will be necessary to change the status quo, and in particular, give communities a utilitarian incentive for conservation.

The project addressed multiple national priorities for the PA system as contained in the 2007 DWNP Strategic Plan, with the entry point being to improve the financial and operational sustainability of the PA network through the promotion of co-management. A recent review of the Wildlife Conservation Policy, the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act and Associated Regulations proposed several options to increase local benefit and perceived resource value, including through improved implementation of CBNRM and promoting PA co-management. The CBNRM Policy (2007) has its main focus in WMAs, but its applicability in conventionally "strict" PAs needs to be explored. Additionally, there is a gap between policy intent and implementation—primarily caused by insufficiencies in institutional capacity and know-how.

The project also addressed multiple priorities of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2004), which emphasised the need for more links and cohesion between institutions; co-management of PAs would be in line with this broad objective. Another strategy that this project responds to is the Botswana National Strategy for Poverty Reduction, which emphasises the need to improve (rural community) participation in development programmes, and inclusion in decision-making such as in the CBNRM Programme. Vision 2016



provides the long-term development vision for the country, to be reached through implementation of successive National Development Plans (NDPs). NDP 9 (2003-2009) included a number of elements that were closely tied to the objectives of this project, including strengthening the capacity of local community groups.

NGOs have been identified as advocates for transparent and participatory decision making, capacity builders (especially for local communities), educators for all actors, facilitators of community-based community development, monitors of biodiversity, and networkers of and service providers to communities, Government, private sector, educational institutions and donors.

Botswana's MDG Status Report of 2004 aims to ensure environmental sustainability (Goal 7). The DEA is also currently leading government efforts to legislate an Environmental Management Act, which would provide an overarching legislative tool for the management of the environment and sustainable development in Botswana, and increase harmony within existing pieces of legislation that relate to environmental conservation (wildlife, water, waste management). This project was intended to contribute towards this process by ensuring that adequate measures for sustainable PA financing and opportunities for PA co-management are articulated in the Act.

### **3.7 Replication approach and sustainability**

The Project Document suggests that the design has good replication potential. At the district level, embedding of the project within a broader development agenda - the Makgadikgadi IMP, would promote regular contact with policy makers and district authorities, who will have oversight and or direct responsibility for some components of the IMP. Moreover, because the IMP will be mainstreamed into the District Development Plan - including components relating to PA co-management - experiences and tools developed through this project would contribute to parts of the DDP, ensuring replication of best practises from this project.

At a national level, the project planned to provide a demonstration site (MPWS) where good management practices could be tested. These good practices could then be replicated throughout the country drawing on the following key implementation tools: local ownership of the conservation process, targeted capacity building and knowledge management.

A detailed replication plan was to be developed during project implementation. A comprehensive communication and dissemination strategy would also be built into project design to ensure widespread dissemination and potential uptake. This would involve use of the existing institutional framework of district, national and regional levels, production of targeted information material; exchanges between BirdLife network countries and non-network countries, as well as regional and international mechanisms and information networks (e.g. CBD, CMS & AEWA, NEPAD, IUCN, SABONET, ECOWAS, SADC etc). At a national level, there will be a strong focus on communicating results to key decision-makers to abet replication.

The general components of replication process were to include:

- documenting and codifying all outcome processes in toolkits, reports, brochures and other communication materials,
- developing and implementing comprehensive communications plan to disseminate information on outcome processes widely e.g. through national and international workshops and meetings; Publication of material in peer reviewed and popular literature; use of print and audio-visual media, and
- Mainstreaming biodiversity and PA co-management principles and tools into cross-sectoral work.

### 3.8 UNDP comparative advantage

As noted in the Project Document, UNDP was the implementing agency of this project and has a comparative advantage in addressing the dual development challenges of environmental protection and poverty - the two key issues at the heart of the project. The project is nested within the joint Government of Botswana - UNDP Country Environmental Partnership Programme, which aims to strengthen environmental governance. Moreover, UNDP has a large global portfolio and extensive experience in developing the enabling environment (policy, governance, institutional capacity and management know-how) at the systems level to allow strategic expansion of PA networks.

This proposal also contributes to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework. The UNDAF of 2003-2007, based on a Common Country Assessment (CCA) of the needs and priorities of Botswana across various economic and social sectors requiring joint UN assistance, recognized that sustainable development and poverty reduction depend on successful management of natural resources. UNDP inter alia strengthened institutional capacity to manage the environment, and in particular strengthened CBNRM and NGO/ CBO driven processes for environmental management and improve environmental awareness.

### 3.9 Linkages with other initiatives in the sector

The project sought to use the opportunities provided by the new CBNRM Policy, the (draft) Environmental Management Act and the planned Makgadikgadi Integrated Management Plan (IMP) to implement participatory planning and PA co-management, using the Makgadikgadi Pans Wetlands System - MPWS (at landscape level) and Makgadikgadi/Nxai NP and Nata Sanctuary (for site-level action) as demonstration sites. Strong linkages were planned for project governance and implementation in parallel with the development of the MIMP.

Another related project was the WB-GEF Project, Northern Botswana Human Wildlife Coexistence, which aims to assist DWNP, in collaboration with local NGOs, Ngamiland and Chobe District governments, and key agencies, in strengthening conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming wildlife and biodiversity in Botswana's economic development, through work at several levels, focused on livelihood-enhancing community participation in wildlife management, conflict resolution, and monitoring and evaluation. However, the project does not address the issue of PA financing (and its mitigation at policy, institutional nor site level), nor PA co-management options. Links to the project, especially synergies between outputs relating to CBNRM tools and PA policy reforms, were intended through the replication component.

A Medium-Sized Project (MSP) was developed through UNDP under the International Waters Programme to assist Botswana prepare an Integrated Water Resource Management Plan, to provide a framework for balancing competing water demands from different economic sectors. The focus of this project was wetlands in general, but this project sought to explore synergies especially in mitigating water use conflicts and promotion of community and civil society involvement in water co-management models.

In addition, there are some ongoing regional PA-related projects that served as a source of lessons learned in terms of both project management and enhancing PA conservation results e.g. the African Protected Area Initiative (APAI). Surprisingly, just like the MSP and Full Size GEF programs, the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Botswana also does not have a PA project. However, during implementation of this MSP, BirdLife Botswana supported other community groups that they currently work with (in and outside the project area) to apply for GEF SGP grants to support further work on PA financing and co-financing models.

### 3.10 Implementation approach and management arrangements

UNDP acted as the Implementing Agency for the project, and the UNDP Country Office in Botswana was responsible for technical oversight, administrative support and financial monitoring and disbursement. The UNDP Regional Technical Adviser had a technical oversight role.

The Executing agency was the Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism (in particular the Department of Wildlife and National Parks), and BLB (as the collaborating agency); the latter were responsible for the day-to-day management of the project. Project activities were undertaken by relevant governmental, non-governmental, private sector organisations and CBOs.

A Project Manager was recruited, and an Administration Officer was seconded for part-time support, for the overall project coordination, implementation and routine reporting. DWNP nominated counterparts to work with the team: a senior officer at DWNP HQ (Head of Parks Division/ Wildlife Estates Management) to coordinate DWNP activities, and staff at district and Makgadikgadi/ Nxai National Park levels, to ensure there are responsible officers for site-based actions. Project staff were based in Gaborone and were to report to the BLB Director.

The Project Steering Committee would be based in Letlhakane, and chaired by the Letlhakane Sub-district Land Board, which was effectively the project's 'owner'. Members/ organizations would include:

- Letlhakane Sub-District Land Board, other Sub-District Land Boards
- Boteti Sub-District Council
- District Administration
- Government Departments (local representatives) - DEA, Water Affairs, Forestry and Range Resources, Wildlife and National Parks, Animal Production, Finance and Economic Planning, Environmental Health, Physical Planning
- Parastatals (local representatives) - Botswana Tourism Organisation (BTO), Citizen Entrepreneurial Development Agency (CEDA), Botswana Power Corporation (BPC)
- Community representatives - village and Community Trust representatives
- Private sector representatives (Botswana Ash)
- UNDP CO (observer)

The PSC was responsible for making executive decisions for the project and providing guidance (institutional, political, and operational) as required by the project management.

A Project Coordination Group at the national level chaired by the Permanent Secretary at the MEWT (or his/her nominee) included Heads of relevant government departments or their representatives. The main duties of the PSC were to receive project reports and documents, make recommendations and approve budgets and work plans. There was planned to be both Mid-Term and End-of-Project Reviews and Evaluations, as well as routine project M&E according to an M&E Plan.

The Project administration ran in coordination with the process for development of the Makgadikgadi Integrated Management Plan (IMP), which was funded by the Government of Botswana. The key institutional arrangements for the IMP were:

- the DEA, with overall project responsibility;
- a National Steering Committee (NSC);
- a Project Implementation and Management Unit (PIMU);
- a local (Makgadikgadi Pans) level steering committee composed of the "lead implementers" of 13 IMP components of the IMP and the District Land Use Planning Unit;
- sectoral sub-committees organized around the five IMP blocks (natural resources, economic sectors, livelihoods and participation-research-data).

For coordination, the Project was embedded within component 9 (wildlife resources and management), of which it was identified for partial implementation. The DWNP played the role of lead government department, providing day-to-day oversight over the work done by the collaborating partner, BLB. The project was to link with the IMP structures at several levels (national, district and sectoral sub-committees), and the BLB Director (also overall Project Coordinator) was invited to sit on the IMP NSC. The Project Manager was to sit on the district-level steering committee that comprises component leaders, and also work closely with the IMP PIMU, with whom (s)he would serve as secretariat to the IMP NSC. The National Project Manager would attend the sectoral (natural resources) sub-committee on behalf of the project, as and when required. In terms of technical backstopping, the IMP Technical Advisory Committee was called on to review the Project's work to promote uptake of tools and synergy with the IMP. In addition, oversight would be provided by a BLB scientific committee (comprising Botswana citizens with expertise in bird conservation, Botswana's environment policies and programmes etc.) and the BirdLife Africa Technical Advisory Committee, which reviews programmes undertaken by BirdLife partners in Africa for scientific soundness and facilitate sharing (south-south) of experiences.

### **3.11 Summary of Project formulation**

The concept/ design of the project is considered to be thorough and well-done; while stakeholder participation in project formulation was comprehensive but included a degree of top-down development.

## 4. Findings: Project implementation and management

### 4.1 Implementation approach

#### 4.1.1 Monitoring, reporting and management systems

From the outset in April 2009, the project had a regular quarterly reporting system, with a narrative Progress Report and Monitoring and Reporting Log, Risk Log and Issues Log in tabular form for each quarter. These reports and logs allowed for quick identification of developing problems in implementation. The reporting system changed at the start of 2012, when the separate reports were replaced by a single tabular “GoB/UN POP Quarterly Progress Report”. The latter appears to be a standardised reporting format for the UN agencies’ Programme Operational Plan of support to Botswana. The revised format may be more in line with other reporting mechanisms, but seems to have lost some of the detail regarding implementation issues and responses to resolving them.

Workplans were prepared on the basis of Activities under Outputs in the Log-Frame. The project reports and logs were not directed to the Log-Frame, and did not assess progress towards Targets, apart from at the Activity level.

A second, parallel form of reporting was the Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR), prepared by the UNDP Country Office, in consultation with the Project Team, and reviewed by the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser. These PIRs did report on progress made in Indicators of both Outcomes and Outputs, towards the Targets in the Log-Frame.

The project faced a variety of challenges during the course of implementation, some of which were more serious than others:

- Announcement by BTO that the Nata Sanctuary and Community Trust would no longer be available for the project
- Slow implementation of the Makgadikgadi IMP by the government and stakeholders, resulting in slow integration of the PSCs of the two projects
- Lack of engagement by DWNP in the process of mainstreaming co-management as a concept.
- Slower than anticipated progress by the project team on delivery of Outputs via Activities.

These issues were discussed by the project managers internally, and in meetings of the PSC and PCG, and between the Project Team and the UNDP CO and Regional Technical Adviser. Decisions on approaches for dealing with developing problems were taken and new workplans were developed. The Outputs and Outcomes were not altered.

#### ***Risk management***

As noted above in Section 3.3 , there was clear attention to risk assessment during project formulation, and this attention continued during implementation. All quarterly and annual reports in the early years (2009-2011) of the project made specific reference to risk issues, with mitigation measures proposed and, apparently, acted upon. A separate Risk Log and Issues Log was prepared every quarter by the Project Manager, with mitigation actions proposed and reported on.

Management responses were proposed for each of these risks. The control and mitigation of risks was in some cases outside the ability of the project team to address - e.g. the lack of an enabling systemic environment in the Botswana government to support co-management, the international economic recession which occurred in the middle of project implementation and resulting in a spending and recruitment freeze by the Government of Botswana, the

international tourism market experiencing a downturn - but these risks were acknowledged by the Project Management and consequences were identified.

The adaptive management approach will be discussed further in Section 4.3.1 below.

#### **4.1.2 Stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements**

As noted in Section 3.5, the Project was designed with a strong background of stakeholder participation developed during the design period, and it built on the process involved in developing and starting to implement the MFMP. Stakeholders at all levels were, in this way, involved in project implementation.

Many activities involved the mobilisation and empowerment of stakeholders in the PSC, in joint management committees at the District/ Sub-District level, and participation in activities. In the specific consultations in relation to the Southern Sua Management Plan, the Project Manager employed external, independent specialists to lead the development of plan and the associated Community Trust.

The Project Team recognized fully the need for repeated interaction, rather than one-off meetings or training courses. In the example of the Southern Sua Pan Community Trust, there were several workshops with documentation, plans and procedures adapted to participants with limited literacy skills. The approach was fully participatory at all stages. There was a challenge to include the involvement by a wide range of stakeholders on a regular basis; during the time of the project, the funding and project staff allowed meetings and workshops to be held but there remained a deeper problem of incentives for longer term attendance, particularly after the project term.

A risk with any stakeholder engagement is the development of high levels of expectation of the delivery of benefits. Failure to deliver can result in resistance or rejection of interventions later in the project, or in follow-up activities. The village headmen visited during the TE expressed satisfaction with the process and progress to date but some frustration with the short term nature, or in some cases incompleteness, of the results that had been achieved during the relatively short period of implementation. They were eager to move to the next stage of implementation of recommendations in the SSMP, a result which many considered to have long term potential, but will also require external facilitation and funding.

Another significant challenge to effective co-management in rural areas is the difficulty in transferring responsibilities to local stakeholders, who may lack basic literacy, organizational skills and, critically, the confidence to undertake new approaches to livelihoods. This lack of capacity is coupled with limiting social issues, such as traditional power structures, as well as the environmental challenges of subsistence livelihoods in marginal environments. Expectations of successful transfer of complex concepts (e.g. co-management of conservation areas) or commercial activities (e.g. sustainable, eco-tourism enterprises) are simply unrealistic if pursued in the short-term, such as the term of a four- or five-year project. The development and maintenance of effective stakeholder participation is a long term process.

There was considerable variation in the strength of local institutions that participated in the project. This strength appeared to derive, at least in part, from the personalities of the individuals who were in key positions. For example, the General Manager of Gaing-O Trust in Mmatshumo seemed to be optimistic and effective, while similar capacity did not yet exist in the other village trust in Mosu. Another factor affecting stakeholder participation in these institutions is the need for transport, food or accommodation, and a meeting venue; even Village Development Committees must apparently provide allowances to sustain



participation. This project provided such support, resulting in well-attended meetings with positive outcomes, but the sustainability of this process is not foreseen. There is a need for community groups to take ownership of responsibilities such as fund-raising to ensure continuity; the General Manager of Gaing-O Trust is aware of the processes to follow but in other villages this awareness is lacking, and is an important capacity to build.

#### **4.1.3 Information and communication management**

The project kept records of correspondence, meeting minutes, technical and financial project implementation reports, and consultants' reports but had no formal information cataloguing system or archiving plan.

As noted above in Section 3.7, a communication and dissemination strategy was built into project design. This strategy included:

- use of the existing institutional framework of district, national and regional levels;
- production of targeted information material;
- exchanges between BirdLife network countries and non-network countries, as well as regional and international information networks.

At a national level, there was a strong focus on communicating results to key decision-makers. The general components of information management and communication were to include:

- documenting and codifying all outcome processes in toolkits, reports, brochures and other communication materials,
- developing and implementing a comprehensive communications plan to disseminate information on outcome processes widely;
- Publication of material in peer reviewed and popular literature;
- use of print and audio-visual media;
- reports on bird surveys and status, but not other project information or specialist reports, were made available via the BLB website
- mainstreaming biodiversity and PA co-management principles and tools into cross-sectoral work.

In line with the plans noted above, a communication strategy was developed in June 2011, which involved the identification and assessment of stakeholders, the definition of communication media appropriate to the different stakeholder groups and a framework for monitoring the effectiveness of delivery.

## **4.2 Financial management**

### **4.2.1 Financial planning and management**

#### *Financial budgeting and expenditure*

At all stages of the project, financial planning and recording of expenditure were undertaken very clearly against Outputs in the project Log-Frame. In early stages of the project, implementation of expenditure fell short of the rate expected for the project period, with under-spending due to a number of factors. The Annual PIR of 2010 noted this under-spending and action was taken to ensure that implementation project activities towards Outputs and Outcomes were accelerated.

Following meetings between the Regional Technical Adviser, the UNDP CO and Project Management, it appears that the budget was adjusted to respond to an accelerated level of implementation, without deviating from the agreed Log-Frame.

### *Financial controls and audit*

Financial audits of project accounts and performance are required only when annual expenditure exceeds US\$ 300,000. The project finances were subject to independent audit only in the final year of implementation. In all other years, the accounts were monitored by the UNDP CO and were found to be sound and without error. The single exception occurred in September 2011, when a discrepancy in carry-forward balance was detected by the UNDP CO; this was immediately corrected.

The audit report for 2012, submitted by RSM Gurugroup in December 2012, indicated that the financial controls and administration by the Executing Agency complied with best practice. Their findings indicated that annual work plan showed no significant difference from Project Budget Balance, balances reconciled between Expenditure Detail Reports and the Combined Delivery Reports, and all salaries, consultancy charges and volunteers' payments were consistent with contracts. The Audit Report further noted that monitoring and evaluation was carried out effectively, in line with the Project Document. Overall, the financial controls and administration of UNDP funds allocated to the project were fully compliant with the standards required.

### *Cost effectiveness*

The use of funds by the Project appears to have been efficient and without wastage. Expenditure of funds on project activities was slow in the first two years of implementation, but accelerated in the third and fourth years.

### **4.2.2 Co-financing**

Co-financing commitments indicated in letters provided to BLB during the project design phase, including in-kind commitments from government departments and from bilateral and multilateral donors, were strong. As far as it is possible to estimate, the amounts contributed came close to meeting the level of original commitments made during project formulation (Table 2).



**Table 2. Project Financing and Co-financing Summary**

Financial sources	Type	Amount (US\$) committed in ProDoc	Additional committed after ProDoc finalization	Estimated total disbursement by EoP
GEF contribution	Grant	953,300	0	953,300
<b>Co-financing</b>				
National government (GoB)	Grant (In-kind)	2,680,000		2,684,000
NGO (BLB)	Grant	637,000		637,000
Bilateral donor (JICA volunteers)	Guarantee	350,000		175,000
Private sector (Botswana Ash)	Grant	46,000		20,000
Private sector (Nata Lodge)	Guarantee	135,000		0
CBO (Nata Sanctuary/ Community Trust)	Guarantee	11,000		0
UNDP CO	Guarantee	1,320,000		1,070,000
UNDAF direct investment - 2013			83,000	83,000
Scholarship BLB Director	Grant		100,000	100,000
Total Co-financing		5,179,000	183,000	4,769,000
Total for Project 2013		6,132,300	183,000	5,722,300
<b>Post-project commitments</b>				
Private sector (Debswana)	Grant		235,830	
Bilateral donor (JICA)	Guarantee		170,000	
Total co-financing post-project			405,830	

The strong national and international support for the project was demonstrated by the scale of co-financing commitments from all partners. The Project Document indicated co-financing of US\$ 5,179,000, against the GEF grant of US\$ 953,300: this was a ratio of 5.4:1. Some of the original commitments did not materialise, with the withdrawal of the Nata Sanctuary and its associated donors; commitments from private sector tourism operators, and other similar investments that could have developed, will also have fallen away. However, other funding sources came into play after finalization of the Project Document, so that by the time of the TE, estimated disbursement of co-financed funds stood at US\$ 4,769,000, with an additional US\$ 405,830 pledged for post-project follow-up efforts in the short- to medium-term from the private sector (Debswana) and a bilateral donor (JICA).

It is recognizably difficult to confirm that all the in-kind commitments, particularly by national governments, were in fact disbursed. Indeed, the latter point was noted in PIRs throughout the project term. Nevertheless, the scale of co-financing remains clear, and substantial. Estimates of government in-kind contribution from letters provided during project design are provided in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Estimates of government in-kind co-financing**

Agency	Activity (4 years - 2009-2012)	Amount US\$
DEA	MFMP development/ implementation	324,000
DWNP	MP/NP NP management	2,000,000
DWNP	HQ (Strategy Div, Estates Management Div), BWTI	360,000
Total		2,684,000
Other Departments, District Council	MFMP implementation (estimated but not supported in writing)	350,000

The above breakdown of estimates of in-kind co-financing suggests that the amounts suggested in the Project Document for DEA and DWMP disbursements were not far wrong and, if other Departments and District Councils are considered, may have been exceeded.

### 4.3 Monitoring and evaluation during implementation

#### 4.3.1 Project monitoring, the LogFrame matrix and adaptive management

##### *The LogFrame and project management*

The use of the Logical Framework Approach is a fundamental pillar of GEF/UNDP project management and performance monitoring. It is thus the first point of reference for any project assessment, such as PIR and TE. It is implicit, in using the LFA, that a high coherence exists not only between the log-frame elements - objective, outcomes, activities and outputs as described in the Project Document - but also in the day-to-day operations of the project.

The log-frame appears to have been a very useful structure for the design of workplans and budgets and for reporting on the activities completed. Financial reporting allocated expenditure to Log-Frame elements at Output level. However, project reporting on a technical level focussed on activities, and at the start of 2012 on Outputs, but there was no analysis of the contribution of Activities and Outputs to Outcomes, and of Outcomes to the Objective. Reporting to the PSC did not employ the Log-Frame.

These indicators formed the base on which the project's M&E system was built. Monitoring and evaluation was conducted according to established UNDP and GEF procedures. Quarterly progress and financial reports were prepared by the Project Management and submitted to the PSC.

Joint Annual Project Reviews were undertaken by the Project Management, UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser and the GEF Focal Point (in the DEA). Project Implementation Reviews were undertaken in all years. Outcome and Objective indicators were assessed, and there was no instituted process, such as annual or mid-term Log-Frame workshop, to examine or refine the Outputs or Indicators.

As noted above in Section 4.1.1, adaptive management in the project was undertaken by the Project Management at the PSC level, which approved changes in Activities and Workplans. The PIR process was used in 2010 to identify the slow pace of project implementation in 2009-2010, and served as a trigger for action to be taken: meetings of the main stakeholders were held, with improvements made to project staffing and implementation schedule.

One drawback of the project design was that there was no specific budget or staff provision allocated to M&E within the project itself. The Project Manager/ Coordinator was responsible for managing all M&E, with no specific project staff member assigned this role. In the case of this Medium-Sized Project, the duties for project monitoring, on top of the effort required for coordination of implementation, were not particularly demanding. Nevertheless, the project would have benefitted from the designation of a specifically-tasked officer with M&E duties, with a budget attached.

The Monitoring and Evaluation approach, including the LogFrame, was considered **Satisfactory** in the design phase (as described in Section 3.2 above). Its use in adaptive management during implementation (as described in this Section) was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

## 4.4 Project governance by Executing and Implementing Agencies

### 4.4.1 Performance of BirdLife Botswana as the Executing Agency

As noted in Section 4.1.1 above, the Project management structure comprised a Project Steering Committee (PSC), a Project Coordination Group (PCG), and Project Management at BLB.

The PSC provided oversight and communication to the project through the public and private sector networks in the Makgadikgadi region, particularly in relation to Outcome 2. There was some change of composition at an early stage, with the withdrawal of Nata Sanctuary/Community Trust and related villages after the intervention of BTO in mid-2009. The community representatives were replaced by representatives from the villages of Mmatshumo, Mosu, Mmeya and Mokubilo from the Southern Sua area. Private sector operators with connections to Nata Sanctuary, including Botswana Ash and Nata Lodge, also withdrew; they were replaced by Debswana, which had interests in the Letlhakane/ Orapa area and beyond. In 2011, the Department of Museums and Monuments were asked to join the PSC as observers.

The Project Coordination Group provided oversight and involvement at the national level, which was crucial for the implementation of Outcomes 1 and 3, which had broader mandates than some of the more site-based work of Outcome 2.

The PSC and PCG members had an opportunity, indeed a responsibility, to have influence on their parent organizations in furthering the mainstreaming aims of the Project. In a number of cases, PSC members did follow up this mandate. However, it was felt by some observers that this responsibility was not taken up sufficiently strongly, and that an opportunity was missed to spread the impact of the project in government and civil society bodies, and to achieve greater financial, logistical and staffing sustainability for project Outcomes. Participation in PSC meetings was generally good, but some members were less regular in their attendance than others, and missed the opportunity to make useful contribution.

The PSC and PCG achieved their aims through the National Project Manager. The Project Management Unit was based at BLB's head office in Gaborone, which provided administrative and accounting support from its office personnel, as well as linkage to the international BirdLife network. The financial management of the project appeared to operate smoothly, as noted above in Section 4.2.

The Project Management Unit faced two challenges within the first year of implementation. The first challenge was the need to drop its primary pilot site (Nata Sanctuary) just after inception. The site became unavailable after the newly established Botswana Tourism Board entered into a programme to develop a Joint Venture Partnership between the Sanctuary and a private sector development organisation, Hedgerow, to the exclusion of other development partners. This meant that the project had to look for an alternative site and enter into fresh stakeholder consultations. The original site (Nata Sanctuary) was a registered Community Trust with strong private sector interest and potential co-financing. The second challenge occurred when its first Project Manager resigned within the first year. Project Management showed resilience in identifying a new site (Sua Flamingo Sanctuary and the adjacent Southern Sua villages) was found and the Project Manager was replaced on an interim basis by an existing BirdLife staff member, the director of its Maun office.

A third challenge was the speed of implementation, and consequent under-spending of the budget, which was recognised as a problem by Project Management and UNDP oversight during 2010, and meetings were held to seek a remedy. The interim Project Manager withdrew and was replaced with a candidate who was recruited specifically. He brought new

approaches to implementation, which resulted in accelerated progress on Activities and disbursement.

BLB's Director was directly involved in the development of the Project Document. Unfortunately, the Director left for PhD studies not long before Project implementation. This absence, which continued for the first three years of the project, created a gap in the supervision and management of project implementation. Attempts were made to maintain regular communication by telephone and Skype conferences, but this level of contact was not sufficient to avoid a certain drift in technical oversight of implementation.

The frequency of contacts between the Project Management team and stakeholders was constrained by logistics, and by the difficulty of operating in both Letlhakane and Gaborone. There was a question of whether it would have been better for the Project Manager to be based in Letlhakane or in Gaborone; because there were important stakeholders in each, a presence was needed in both places. A second staff member had been considered but was limited by the need to control overheads in the budget of a Medium-Sized Project.

Attendance of meetings by some stakeholders was less than ideal, but was accounted for by the Project Management Unit as a consequence of 'participation fatigue' rather than lack of commitment. The National Project Coordinator and the Project Management team were successful in establishing an effective network of partners beyond the formal structures of the project, which played a key role in ensuring the effective implementation of the project.

Project management by the Executing Agency was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

#### 4.4.2 Performance of UNDP as the Implementing Agency

The UNDP Country office in Gaborone has administered a successful National Environmental Support Programme in Botswana for many years and has therefore built a strong network within government, NGO and private sector stakeholders in the country's biodiversity. It has had close involvement with the development of the MFMP, and as a committed party to its implementation, was an obvious choice as a funding partner. UNDP has extensive experience within the region in the successful implementation of GEF Biodiversity Focal Area projects, and has played a leading role in biodiversity conservation programmes in Botswana.

In general, the UNDP Country Office played a positive supporting and oversight role, particularly in the first year of project implementation. However, from early in 2010, the UNDP Programme Analyst became less and less engaged; in part at least, this growing distance may have been due to uncertainty over his employment status with UNDP. In 2011, his employment was discontinued and there was a gap before the present Programme Analyst was recruited. The Programme Analyst now in place is very active; however, given the size of the current GEF portfolio in UNDP-Botswana, her workload is very great.

The UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser played a very useful oversight role in her analysis of Annual PIRs, and recognition that action needed to be taken during 2010. The meetings and consultations that followed this recognition led to a significant improvement in project delivery.

One shortcoming in project Monitoring and Evaluation was the absence of a Mid-Term Evaluation. This had been anticipated in the Project Document, and the Project Management Unit had prepared for it. However, its timing was set for late 2010, which coincided with the recognition of implementation problems described above. With the consultations and meetings that followed, and the subsequent "re-launch" of the project with a new Project Manager, it was felt that a MTE was no longer necessary; in any case, MTEs are not mandatory for Medium Sized Projects. However, the absence of an MTE, with no

documentation of the project in its problematic early years or during the transition, has meant that a Terminal Evaluation finds it harder to get accurate information.

Project coordination by the Implementing Agency over the life of the project was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

## 5. Findings: Results and impacts

Brief summaries of the results for Objective and Outcomes are provided below, with an explanation of the ratings of success level.

### 5.1 Attainment of Objective

Despite a slow start, the gathering of momentum in the third year of the project has produced good progress towards the Objective by the end of the project.

**The Project Objective was**

*“To catalyze working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas”*

Since the Objective was to “catalyze” rather than “achieve” working partnerships, it could be said that this catalytic function was achieved by the Project. Certainly co-management is now firmly on the agenda in the protected area estate in Botswana, and the Project could take justifiable credit in encouraging its DWNP partner in making this move. However, when it comes to the specific Indicators, it is somewhat generous to suggest that these have been achieved, particularly as a result of the Project.

**The first Indicator** was “Increase in extent (ha) of PA network practicing PA co-management as an approach to increase PA operational and financial sustainability”, with a target of 5,800,000ha from a baseline of nil. The PIR of 2013 concluded that this target had been largely met, because of three large protected areas having established Park Management Committees. As noted in Section 3.2, a number of PAs had already established similar committees (LACOMs) in the past, and these were disbanded and replaced by PMCs in 2012/13. Since the PMCs, with slightly different composition and mandate from the preceding LACOMs, are relatively new, it is probably not entirely accurate to say that they are “practicing” co-management, in the sense of playing an active role in PA management decision-making; rather they are discussing it. In addition, the Southern Sua Management Plan has been accepted, but it has not yet been put into active practice. To say that co-management is in practice with some influence on operational and financial management, there should be some evidence of decisions taken that reflected genuine compromise and agreement on management actions or plans for actions. What it is safe to say is that the **prospects** for co-management, including in the PMCs, in these areas have increased due to actions of the Project in working with its partners in the Southern Sua communities, DWNP and Debswana.

It would appear that **the second Indicator** “% funding gap for PA network” has reached its target of <33%, although it is not clear whether this achievement was the result of action taken by DWNP (and as a result of co-management?) or simply a new analysis, provided by this Project in its assessment report in the year when the target was reportedly achieved.

**The third Indicator** “Financial scorecard for national systems of protected areas” was set a target of >55%. The value of the GEF Financial Scorecard in 2007 was 38.8% and in 2013 was 42.2%. Thus, the target was not achieved by the End of Project, but progress was made from the baseline and there are hopes that the reforms recommended by the assessment report will yield greater financing for PAs in the near future.

In summary, the achievement level of the Objective is rated as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

## 5.2 Achievement of Outcomes

### **Outcome 1**

*“Strengthened Enabling Environment: for PA co-management, revenue generation and benefit-sharing”*

**The first indicator** was: “National policies and strategies in place for cooperative PA governance; business and financial planning for PA management, revenue generation / retention and cost management”

At the national level, efforts have been made by the Project to assist with the review and revision of the Wildlife Policy to ensure that it includes provision for co-management. This revision has now been achieved, although the new version of the Policy remains a Draft, as it has still to be approved by Cabinet. It contains specific encouragement for co-management, which is a landmark in establishing the principle for stakeholder involvement in PA management decision-making; the importance of this achievement should not be understated. There are, however, no clear strategies yet in place for “business and financial planning, revenue generation/ retention and cost management”.

At the District level, the Project has promoted the development of MFMP as a basis for, among other things, co-management of different kinds of PA within the MWS. Implementation of aspects of the MFMP has begun, including the gazettement of the protected area, the Flamingo Sanctuary, and the participatory development of the Southern Sua Management Plan.

It would appear that the target for this indicator has been largely met, in particular since it represents a major shift in government thinking.

**The second indicator** was: “% of government financing as a total of investment to maintain PA estate”

The PA financial and management assessment completed in 2012 showed the average government funding of PAs to be 54%, which would appear to exceed the target, but it is not clear whether this an actual improvement over the baseline figure of <30%, or simply a more accurate baseline figure. The National Environmental Fund (NEF) has not yet started to operate, despite having been established some years ago. What is also not clear is whether the current level of funding is sufficient to “maintain [the] PA estate”.

It would appear that the target for this indicator has been met, but with some qualification.

**The third indicator** was: “Number of District Development Plans (DDPs) that articulate PA financing needs and provide for local government budgetary subvention for PAs”

The DDP review processes for Central and Ngamiland Districts, in parallel with the NDP review process, are not currently considering PA financing concerns. As noted in the PIR for 2013, “Working with the two districts to ensure their DDPs incorporate PA financing remains to be completed outside the life of this GEF-funded project”. There are, however, indications that the lobbying for such inclusion in future will continue.

The target for this indicator was not met by the end of the Project, although some prospects for future achievement.

**The fourth indicator** was: “Amount (\$millions) availed at the systemic level by the private sector to support PA management”



As noted above, the continuing delay in making the NEF operational has meant that there still does not yet exist a mechanism for direct private sector investment in PA management at the national, system-wide level. At the level of individual PAs, there appears to be a Willingness to Pay in the private sector (from the evidence of the Financing and Operational Effectiveness Report), and in the Makgadikgadi Wetland System, there have been commitments by Debswana and BotAsh. However, the necessary changes in the Wildlife Act, allowing PAs to retain funds from gate receipts or from private sector partners, are still some time in the future.

The target for this indicator has not been met, nor is it likely to be met in the near future. However, the private sector is certainly willing to invest in PA management, so the potential exists for this target to be met once the legislative and regulatory frameworks are changed to allow it.

In view of the significant achievements, balanced by some deficiencies, this Outcome is given an overall rating of **Moderately Satisfactory**.

### **Outcome 2**

*“Effective PA Co management Systems (Site Support Groups) and district oversight framework linked to IMP) demonstrated at site level and new revenue generation schemes tested”*

**The first indicator** was: “Number of protected areas with up-to-date and approved management and business plans”

The Management Plan for Southern Sua was completed and accepted in 2012, and it includes the protected area, the Flamingo Sanctuary in a core zone. Apparently a set of regulations for the Flamingo Sanctuary alone, which would outline permissible and prohibited activities, zoning, etc, is under development by DWNP, although it is not clear that these two plans should be considered as distinct PA plans. The PIRs for 2012 and 2013 indicate that the Management Plan for Makgadikgadi/ Nxai Pans National Parks was produced during 2011, presumably by DWNP, but apparently with support from the Project in terms of its co-management proposals.

The target for this indicator appears to have been met by the End of Project.

**The second indicator** is: “Total private sector contributions (including HR and capital budget) for protected area management within MPWS”

The target would have been realised easily if the Nata Sanctuary had remained within the project design. However, funds from BotAsh and Debswana, in excess of the target value, have been contributed via BLB towards conservation and biodiversity projects in the Makgadikgadi area and these donations are likely to continue in future. Partnership relationships in terms of tourism developments are likely to develop in future; although there was no sign of this investment during the Project period.

The target for this indicator was met by the End of Project.

**The third indicator** was: “Management effectiveness of PAs improved as a result of co-management”

The PA at the centre of Project design, with its Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score set as the Indicator baseline, was the Nata Sanctuary. With the withdrawal of this Sanctuary early in the first year, there was no alternative baseline established for the Flamingo Sanctuary which formed the core of the revised PA target area, so it was not possible to assess any improvement in status. However, the METT score for the nearby



Makgadikgadi/ Nxai Pans NP was assessed in April 2008 at a value of 59 and by April 2013 it had reached the target value of 73.

Overall, it could be said that the target for this indicator was partially met.

**The fourth indicator<sup>5</sup>** was: “Number of voluntary community level groups working collaboratively with PA authorities and effective co-management”

There is a level of ambiguity in this indicator in the definition of “community-level groups”. In the first two years, the community-level groups were considered to be trust associations composed of more than one village. However, in the last two years, a “village” was considered a community-level group, so that the involvement of the four villages in the Southern Sua area, three of which joined together to form a single community trust, were considered to satisfy the target.

Because of this ambiguity, the target for this indicator was partially achieved.

**The fifth indicator** was: “% increase in revenue (to communities and government) at PAs with co-management systems”

The target and baseline for this indicator were not defined in the Project Document. By the End of the Project, there was no revenue generated from PAs with co-management arrangements. The loss of the Nata Sanctuary early in Project implementation will have been a major setback for this Indicator. However, the prospects for revenue generation and investment in the Southern Sua area are now greatly improved, with the registration of the Community Trust to take place and the training of community members.

In view of the significant achievements after an initial slow start, Outcome 2 is given an overall rating of **Satisfactory**.

### **Outcome 3**

*“Increased institutional capacity to effectively fulfil PA management functions”*

**The first indicator** was: “% increase in competence levels of protected area institutions for PA -co-management”

There was considerable effort expended to increase the capacity of DWNP staff in co-management, with a number of PA managers sent to South Africa for training in park and project management. It was recognised that staff turnover and re-deployment could reduce the value of this training for the PA estate, so a more sustainable option was adopted, with the development of short-course modules in Management-Oriented Monitoring Systems (MOMS) and Co-management for inclusion in the curriculum at BWTI. While there was some difficulty in getting heavily-committed BWTI staff to “own” these modules, it appears that these issues are only temporary, and will be managed.

Unfortunately for the verification of this indicator against the target, there has been no evidence seen of a repeat application of the UNDP PA Scorecard to DWNP since the Project began, so it is not possible to say for certain the target has been met. However, it is likely that competence levels have increased, and it is possible to estimate that they have increased by the required 25%.

**The second indicator** was: “Number of reports produced synthesizing the Annual Status of the PA network (using the “State-Pressure-Response model”)”

---

<sup>5</sup> The fourth and fifth indicators were not included in the original project LogFrame but were included in the PIR reporting framework, presumably for their contribution towards GEF objectives.

Four Important Bird Area Status and Trends Reports have been produced since 2008, with the report for 2012 on the way. The target for this indicator was met by EoP.

**The third indicator** was: “Improved capacity assessment and indices for site support groups working collaboratively with PA authorities in effective co-management”

Although there was no baseline or target for this Indicator, Project work with communities in the Southern Sua area, including training in organisational skills and other awareness-raising (including “bench-marking” visits to Etosha NP, Namibia, and Moremi GR), has increased capacity measures from 2009 to 2013.

This Outcome is given an overall rating of **Satisfactory**.

### 5.3 Progress towards Impacts

An impact is defined by the GEF Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) Handbook<sup>6</sup> as “*A fundamental and durable change in the condition of people and their environment brought about by the project*”. The primary aim of the GEF, and of GEF projects, is to achieve a specific category of impacts that are often referred to as Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). GEBs are defined in the ROtI Handbook as: “*lasting improvements in the status of an aspect of the global environment that safeguards environmental functioning and integrity as well as benefiting human society*”.

The Project Document notes that the MWS has global biological significance, in terms of its important biodiversity - with animal and plant species on IUCN Red Lists - and its extensive salt pan landscapes. In addition, the prevalence of community and private sector interests in close proximity to national parks - Makgadikgadi/Nxai NP and the Nata Sanctuary in the specific MWS context but in Botswana more generally - “provides a rare opportunity to demonstrate synergies between the private sector, local communities and the national government in improving PA management effectiveness”. Thus, the GEB for this Project could be identified as the sustainable conservation of Botswana’s natural ecosystems, particularly that of the MWS.

The ROtI Handbook also notes that “*it is important to recognise that a GEF project can only expect to contribute to the achievement of impacts, and that they will usually only be realised many years after project completion*”.

There are some indicators available for assessing the ecological status of Botswana’s PA estate: the IBA Status and Trends Report (2011) shows a stable or slightly increasing status of biodiversity across 12 sites in Botswana, although threats are also increasing in some sites. To be confident of longer term Project impacts on the GEB, it will be necessary to continue this data collection over some years.

In the absence of additional, explicit Impact indicators, the likelihood of the Project achieving impacts on the GEB can be estimated by developing a Theory of Change, through examining the projects’ logical flow from Activities via Outputs to Outcomes. The path between Outcomes to Impact can then be mapped out, by identifying Intermediate States - transitional conditions between the Outcomes and the Impact that must be achieved to carry the process forward.

The Project had a clearly articulated conceptual framework (Section 3.1) from which a Theory of Change for this Project can be derived; examination of the Project logic suggests

---

<sup>6</sup> GEF (2009) The ROtI Handbook. *Towards Enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects*. Methodological Paper #2, OPS4 - Progress Towards Impacts, GEF Evaluation Office.

that it had two strategic approaches that were aimed at progress towards the GEB. These two strategies are:

1. The policy framework and capacity of DWNP is enhanced to support co-management on a system-wide basis. Effective partnerships with communities (reducing costs) and the private sector (increasing revenue) will promote sustainable improvement in PA management - Outcomes 1 and 3.
2. The co-management model is developed in a Project site in the MWS. The approach can then be replicated and mainstreamed in other parts of Botswana and Africa - Outcome 2.

An Intermediate State for this Project could be encapsulated by the Objective: *“Working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas in place.”* As noted above (Section 5.1), the achievement of this Objective was considered Moderately Satisfactory; this Intermediate State could thus be considered Partially Achieved. Impact Drivers supporting this Intermediate State would include Sustainability measures, discussed in Section 6.5 below; these are considered as Moderately Likely. Assumptions on this Intermediate State relate to the mainstreaming of senior government support for co-management and continuing capacity; given that momentum is building for co-management in Botswana, and lobbying by NGOs such as BLB is ongoing, this is Assumption considered Moderately Likely.

Overall, it is considered that the likelihood of positive Impact is **Moderately Likely**.

## 6. Findings: Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

### 6.1 Outcome measures: Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

#### 6.1.1 Relevance

“Relevance” is defined by UNDP<sup>7</sup> as *“The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time”*. For GEF projects<sup>8</sup>, the scope of Relevance must also extend to *“environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated”*.

In other words, does the project design address the identified threats and their root causes in a way that is consistent with national and international priorities on environmental conservation? And, did project implementation stay true to the project design?

As noted in Section 3.6 above, in relation to international and national priorities, the Project design was considered **Relevant**. By staying true to the design, and adapting management when appropriate to re-direct activities back towards the intended Outcomes, this relevance continued in Project implementation.

#### 6.1.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the project’s intended results (Outputs or Outcomes) and progress towards Impact have been achieved or are likely to be achieved.

Section 5 above records the comprehensive achievement of Objective and Outcomes, with some results often exceeding the original targets. The ratings for these achievements are summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Summary of Result and Effectiveness ratings

Results measure	Rating
Objective	Satisfactory
Outcome 1	Moderately Satisfactory
Outcome 2	Moderately Satisfactory
Outcome 3	Satisfactory
Impact	Moderately Likely
<b>Overall Effectiveness</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

The project implementation had a slow start, but this was compensated by accelerated activity in the last years. For these reason, the overall rating for project Effectiveness is considered **Satisfactory**.

#### 6.1.3 Efficiency

As noted in Section 4.2 above, the financial management of the project was thorough and efficient throughout the course of implementation. Progress on delivery of and expenditure for Outputs was slow in the first two years of the project, but gained rapid momentum during 2011 and, particularly, 2012 and all GEF funds were disbursed by the EoP.

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects (2011)

<sup>8</sup> The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010

Thus, while the efficiency of project implementation was only Moderately Satisfactory, or even Moderately Unsatisfactory in the early years, in its latter stages and overall, it can be rated as **Satisfactory**.

#### 6.1.4 Summary of Outcome measures

The Project Outcome measures - relevance, effectiveness and efficiency - are summarised in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Summary of Outcome measures

Outcome measure	Rating
Relevance	Relevant
Effectiveness	Satisfactory
Efficiency	Satisfactory
<b>Overall Outcome</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

## 6.2 Country ownership

As noted in Sections 3.5 and 4.1.2 above, there was strong ownership of the project in both its design and implementation.

## 6.3 Mainstreaming

The project achieved a good degree of mainstreaming of its key conceptual approach, co-financing at both national, District and community levels.

## 6.4 Sustainability

### 6.4.1 Financial sustainability

The financial commitment by the Botswana government to the environmental conservation/ utilisation sector, compared to other countries in Africa, has been relatively strong and looks likely to continue. In the more narrowly defined wildlife sector, it has been less strong, and support to PAs is less than adequate to maintain key conservation functions.

Funding to all sectors was possibly postponed by the global recent economic recession. The implementation of the MFMP was intended to be a broader process but was scaled back. More generally, it is not clear when, or indeed whether, the commitment will pick up again when economic conditions improve.

There was an early setback with the loss of Nata Sanctuary and the great potential for investment by private sector tourism partners. Private sector partners are prepared to provide support for their respective contributions, but investment of funds still some distance in the future. The mobilisation of communities in Southern Sua, and the completion of the SSMP and economic studies have laid a strong foundation for partnerships and enterprises. There is good potential for financial sustainability in future, but will need some external support in the short to medium term.

NGO donors are available for follow-up; BLB in particular is committed to supporting many of the approaches developed during the Project. The “species champions” approach has been developed by BLB, targeting IUCN Red Listed birds in Botswana, with BotAsh committing to support the conservation of Lesser Flamingoes in the Southern Sua area, and Hoisting

Solutions committing to conserving Botswana's crane species, some of which have their strongholds in the Makgadikgadi.

Financial sustainability is rated as **Moderately Likely**.

#### 6.4.2 Social sustainability

The Project has clearly raised awareness of co-management in relation to biodiversity conservation in stakeholder groups at different levels: at the national and systemic level, with DWNP decision-makers and PA practitioners, at District level with District Administration and District Council officials and at community level with village members and land users in the Southern Sua area.

The interest in and capacity of Southern Sua villagers to participate in PA management and income generation has been raised and is now ready to move onto the next stage, that of direct involvement in eco-tourism and land management. At a broader scale, this process has begun with the formation of PMCs at a number of PAs in the country.

The loss of the Nata Sanctuary, Nata Community Trust and the associated villages was initially a setback, but the addition of the Southern Sua villages to the constituency for conservation has expanded the scope of co-management in the MWS. The prospect now exists for a MWS-wide co-management approach to become established.

Social sustainability is rated as **Likely**.

#### 6.4.3 Institutional sustainability

The enabling policy for co-management has been built in DWNP at national level, which will encourage the roll-out at District level, and at PAs across the country.

This enabling framework has been coupled with increased capacity of PA managers via training in management skills. To mitigate the risk of a "brain-drain" through staff turnover, the Project created the prospect of sustained, ongoing training with the modules developed at BWTI. The modules development needs consolidation for them to be firmly adopted, but this confirmation is in hand.

Partnerships have been built with some private sector partners, mainly in the area of corporate social responsibility in the mineral extraction sector, such as BotAsh and Debswana. The latter are developing their own form of protected area. The project missed the opportunity to work with private sector tourism partners in the Nata area, and links are yet to develop in Southern Sua. The potential exists for considerable growth in this area, either through community-run enterprises or Joint Venture Partnerships.

Capacity has been improved in the Southern Sua community trusts, with the three-village trust nearing registration. Sustainability of them as institutions still requires support.

Institutional sustainability is rated **Moderately Likely**.

#### 6.4.4 Environmental sustainability

Current threats from within Botswana to the ecological integrity of the MWS are low, with although incompatible forms of land use (including livestock ranching and veterinary fencing) and uncontrolled tourism facilities are a possible source of growing impact. Such environmental impacts would be addressed by implementation of the SSMP.

Advances made by the project in raising awareness of environmental/ biodiversity concerns at local, regional and international levels have improved the prospects for perpetuating the conservation values of the MWS.

Environmental sustainability is rated **Likely**.

#### 6.4.5 Summary of sustainability ratings

The different aspects of sustainability are summarised in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Summary of sustainability ratings

Sustainability measure	Rating
Financial	Moderately Likely
Social	Likely
Institutional	Moderately Likely
Environmental	Likely
<b>Overall Sustainability</b>	<b>Moderately Likely</b>

The overall, aggregate rating for Project sustainability was **Moderately Likely**.

## 7. Conclusions and summary of findings

### 7.1 Conclusions

#### 7.1.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

##### *M&E design at entry*

The Monitoring and Evaluation approach, including the LogFrame, was considered **Satisfactory** in the design phase.

##### *M&E Plan Implementation*

Adaptive management during implementation, with only partial use of the LogFrame approach, was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

#### 7.1.2 Executing and Implementing Agencies Performance

##### *Executing Agency - BirdLife Botswana*

Project management by the Executing Agency had some shortcomings in the first two years, with absence of the BLB Director and turnover of Project Managers. However, from 2011, with the return of the Director to Botswana and recruitment of a new Project Manager, management and implementation took a dramatic improvement. Financial management was generally good throughout the length of the project. Overall, performance of BLB as the Executing Agency was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

##### *Implementing Agency - UNDP CO*

As with the Executing Agency, there were shortcomings in the early years of the Project in the support and technical oversight provided by the UNDP CO. Lack of security of tenure meant that the initial Programme Analyst became distant from project engagement, and there was drift in the supervision of the EA's implementation. However, vigilance by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor in 2010 identified the need for corrective action, and there was effectively a "re-launch" of project implementation; this reactivation was cited as the reason for the lack of a Mid-Term Evaluation in this Medium-Sized Project. A new Programme Analyst was recruited and this attention, as well as close engagement by the Resident Co-ordinator, helped improve the role played by the UNDP-CO. It should be noted that financial management was uniformly very good.

Project coordination by the Implementing Agency over the life of the project was considered **Moderately Satisfactory**.

#### 7.1.3 Assessment of Outcomes

##### *Relevance*

In relation to international and national priorities, the Project design was considered Relevant. By staying true to the design, and adapting management when appropriate to re-direct activities back towards the intended Outcomes, this relevance continued in Project implementation.

##### *Effectiveness*

The project implementation had a slow start, but this was compensated by accelerated activity in the last years. For these reason, the overall rating for project Effectiveness is considered **Satisfactory**.



### ***Efficiency***

The financial management of the project was thorough and efficient throughout the course of implementation. Progress on delivery of and expenditure for Outputs was slow in the first two years of the project, but gained rapid momentum during 2011 and, particularly, 2012 and all GEF funds were disbursed by the EoP.

Thus, while the efficiency of project implementation was only Moderately Satisfactory, or even Moderately Unsatisfactory in the early years, in its latter stages and overall, it can be rated as **Satisfactory**.

### **7.1.4 Sustainability**

#### ***Financial***

With government support probable to continue, but impossible to guarantee, a small number of private sector concerns showing interest in playing a corporate social responsibility role, and continued commitment by BLB, financial sustainability is rated as **Moderately Likely**.

#### ***Socio-political***

The loss of the Nata Sanctuary, Nata Community Trust and the associated villages was initially a setback, but the addition of the Southern Sua villages to the constituency for conservation has expanded the scope co-management in the MWS. The prospect now exists for a MWS-wide co-management approach to become established. Social sustainability is thus rated as **Likely**.

#### ***Institutional***

As with financial sustainability, government institutional capacity is probable to continue, but impossible to guarantee. Enabling policy for co-management has been built and should be rolled out in DWNP at national level, District level, and PA levels across the country. Training has increased capacity of PA managers and ongoing training is now likely with the modules developed at BWTI. The modules development needs consolidation for them to be firmly adopted.

Partnerships have been built with some private sector partners, and the potential exists for growth in this area, either through community-run enterprises or Joint Venture Partnerships. Capacity has been improved in the Southern Sua community trusts, with the three-village trust nearing registration. Sustainability of them as institutions still requires support.

For these reasons, institutional sustainability is rated **Moderately Likely**.

#### ***Environmental***

Current threats from within Botswana to the ecological integrity of the MWS are low, and potential environmental impacts would be addressed by implementation of the SSMP. Advances made by the project in raising awareness of environmental/ biodiversity concerns at local, regional and international levels have improved the prospects for perpetuating the conservation values of the MWS.

Environmental sustainability is rated **Likely**.

## 7.2 Assessment and summary of ratings

A summary of GEF criteria and ratings is provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of GEF criteria and ratings for the Project

Criterion	Rating
<b><i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i></b>	
M&E design at entry	Satisfactory
M&E Plan Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
<i>Overall quality of M&amp;E</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Implementing Agency &amp; Executing Agency Performance</i></b>	
Quality of UNDP Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	Moderately Satisfactory
<i>Overall quality of Implementation / Execution</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Assessment of Outcomes</i></b>	
Relevance	Relevant
Effectiveness	Satisfactory
Efficiency	Satisfactory
<i>Overall Project Outcome Rating</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b><i>Sustainability</i></b>	
Financial resources	Moderately Likely
Socio-political	Likely
Institutional framework and governance	Moderately Likely
Environmental	Likely
<i>Overall likelihood of sustainability</i>	<i>Moderately Likely</i>
<b><i>Overall project rating</i></b>	<b><i>Satisfactory</i></b>

Setting the project within the wider MFMP context, which was being implemented by an existing organization (DEA), was an important factor in its success. The partnerships which had already been forged, the consultative and governance processes which were already in place, the technical support which was available, all stood the project in good stead and allowed it to benefit from on-going complementary initiatives. This approach was efficient and cost-effective.

As evidenced by the regular reports from the project and from the supervision missions by the Implementing Agencies, project implementation proceeded comparatively smoothly - after an initial slow start - especially for a complex, multi-faceted project such as this one.

Stakeholders were meaningfully involved in project implementation; many have benefited from capacity building exercises while others participated in various governance groups such as steering committees, forums, etc. Information has been reasonably well-managed. It has been shared with partners and beyond and it has served as a key mechanism holding the partnership together. Information was the basis for the project's outreach to the wider MWS region and beyond.

## 8. Lessons learned and recommendations

### 8.1 Lessons learned

1. A nationally-based NGO, with strong international linkages, is a good choice as the institution to act as Executing Agency for implementing a UNDP-GEF project of this type. There could have been a risk in working with a small NGO, with a fluid staff complement and potentially limited technical and administrative capacity. However, an NGO has the advantages of:
  - Neutrality, in relation to government agencies and parastatals at national and local levels. No enforcement role, so readily trusted by communities and government players alike. But can play lobbying action, combined with support to government
  - Information base and dissemination capacity.
  - Long term commitment. Since they have a long term mission in the country, with established partnerships with donors and private sector, they contribute to institutional sustainability.
2. Capacity-building and change of culture in organisations has been effective to establish that co-management is now considered best practice. However, changes in staffing levels and deployment can reduce sustainability of outcomes; this effect of staff turnover could be helped working with teams, not just individuals. The Project clearly recognised this problem, by having a component that “trained the trainers” with courses on co-management and monitoring at BWTI.
3. It is very effective to have a parallel government land use planning process (MFMP, MWMC) to align with project design and implementation. This lesson was also learned from the Biokavango Project.
4. Co-management is a process, not a product and it is not realistic to expect an “end-point” in a Medium-Sized Project of only 4-5 years’ duration. Sustainability of Outcomes and longer-term Impact require continued commitment by government, both in terms of financial and staffing support and in providing the enabling environment for genuine partnerships within government at different levels and with external agencies, including both the civil society and private sectors. However, it is reasonable to expect a MSP to establish the basis for Impact Drivers and to catalyse the necessary changes in stakeholder capacities and mindset, so that mainstreaming of co-management can be encouraged.
5. Pilot projects, especially in novel approaches to natural resource use, may need greater time to achieve sustainability than length of an MSP period. Pilot projects may or may not be suitable for “scaling-up”; they should be viewed as experiments.
6. Coordination between government agencies is essential; lack of common direction can de-rail project outcomes.
7. Expectations of local communities must also be managed.

## 8.2 Recommendations

Terminal evaluations do not normally make many recommendations, especially for reasonably successful projects, such as this one. Recommendations made derive from and focus on sustainability of project benefits and on the lessons learned for future projects of this sort and in the region.

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project should note:

1. Staff in key positions, whose capacity and motivation for co-management has been built by the Project, should be maintained at current posts for longer periods. If this is not possible, then it is essential to ensure handover of skills and knowledge to successors. This applies to Government departments, such as DEA and DWNP. It also applies to the District Administration and to the Letlhakane Land Board.
2. Government departments at national and local level should provide sufficient resources to stations and offices to sustain Outcomes.

Actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of future projects should note:

3. It is helpful, and perhaps essential, to have a preparatory, parallel land use planning process (like MFMP) in any projects involving processes of change in management of natural resources.
4. Monitoring and Evaluation should be a core function, with sufficient resources, and should be undertaken with a full LogFrame approach. The LogFrame should be reviewed at Project Inception and on an annual basis, and should play a full role in adaptive management.
5. There should be a formal sustainability plan as part of Project activities. It could be drafted in the Project design but should be finalised in the final year of implementation. Important aspects to include are mechanisms to promote sustainability of Outcomes, leading towards Impacts.
6. Although GEF projects aim to achieve Global Environmental Benefits, it is equally important to emphasize livelihoods targets.
7. In the project formulation process aiming at fundamental change, there is a strong need to examine the prospects for commitment, and coordination, by local/ national government and private sector to sustain both financial and human resources.
8. Replication prospects need careful thought within Botswana and elsewhere; this project had many unique aspects which may not scale up directly, so appreciation of specific conditions is essential for modification of replication approaches.

## 9. Annexes

1. Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation
2. List of documents consulted
3. List of persons consulted
4. Itinerary of meetings and field visits
5. Evaluation question matrix
6. Questionnaire used
7. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## Annex 1. Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation

### Introduction

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project on Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected areas (PIMS 3984).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas			
GEF Project ID:	3984		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00050137	GEF financing:	953,300	953,300.00
Country:	Botswana	IA/EA own:	0	100,000.00
Region:	Southern Africa	Government:	2,680,000.00	2,680,000.00
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	83,867.00	2,499,000.00
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas; Sustainable Financing of National Protected Area Systems	Total co-financing:	83,867.00	5,179,000.00
Executing Agency:	BirdLife Botswana	Total Project Cost:	6,132,300	6,132,300.00
Other Partners involved:	Department of Wildlife and National Parks, and the Department of Environmental Affairs	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		<b>January 2009</b>
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: <b>October 2012</b>	Actual: <b>September 2013</b>

### Objective and Scope

1. The project was designed to catalyze working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of PAs. Environmental governance has been improved through pilot co-management strategies in PAs covering 12528 km<sup>2</sup> (Makgadikgadi/Nxai National Park, 4780 km<sup>2</sup> and Southern Sua Pan 5050 km<sup>2</sup>). The project was implemented as a component of the Makgadikgadi Pans Integrated Management Plan, which covers an area of ca. 12, 000 km<sup>2</sup>. The government/non-state PA co-management paradigm to be tested has replication potential in some 58,000 km<sup>2</sup> of small PAs and Wildlife Management Areas in other parts of Botswana. The project goal was to strengthen the sustainability and management effectiveness of Botswana's system of protected areas (PAs). It sought to instigate a paradigm shift that will improve the capacity of civil society and government to work in partnership to manage PAs in Botswana, particularly small sites currently receiving sub-optimal conservation management attention. The project objective was expected to be achieved through:

- a) Strengthening the enabling environment for PA co-management

- b) Effective PA co-management systems demonstrated at site level
- c) Increased institutional capacity to effectively fulfill PA management functions

2. The key indicators for the project objective/outcome are as follows<sup>9</sup>:

Objective/Outcome	Key indicators
<b>Objective:</b> Working partnerships between public, private, NGO and community stakeholders to improve the financial and operational sustainability of protected areas in place	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in extent (ha) of PA network practicing PA co-management as an approach to increase PA operational and financial sustainability</li> <li>2. Decrease in the % financing gap for the PA network</li> <li>3. % financial performance from the Financial scorecard for national systems of protected areas</li> </ol>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened Enabling Environment: for PA co-management, revenue generation and benefit-sharing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. % of government financing as a total of investment to maintain PA estate</li> <li>2. Number of District Development Plans (DDPs) that articulate PA financing needs and provide for local government budgetary subvention for PAs</li> <li>3. Amount (\$millions) availed at the systemic level by the private sector to support PA management</li> </ol>
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Effective PA Co management Systems (Site Support Groups) and district oversight framework linked to IMP demonstrated at site level and new revenue generation schemes tested	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of protected areas with up-to-date and approved management and business plans</li> <li>2. Total private sector contributions (including HR and capital budget) for protected area management within MPWS</li> <li>3. Management effectiveness of PAs improved as a result of co-management</li> </ol>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Increased institutional capacity to effectively fulfill PA management functions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. % increase in competence levels of protected area institutions for PA –co-management</li> <li>2. Number of reports produced synthesizing the Annual Status</li> </ol>

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

### Evaluation Approach and Method

An overall approach and method<sup>10</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF

<sup>9</sup> The GEF Biodiversity Programme outcome indicators, and the associated CBD 2010 targets, have been integrated into the table.

<sup>10</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#).

operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to **Nata Sanctuary, Letlhakane and Makgadikgadi Pans** including the following project sites, **Flamingo Sanctuary, Mosu, Mmatshumo, Mokubilo and Mmeya** village. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Mr. **Kealeboga Ntapu** of Letlhakane Sub-district Land Board (Project Steering Committee Chairman), Mr. **Nsumikili Toitso** of Boteti Sub-district Council, the Chiefs of Mmatshumo (Mr. **Keletshwaretse Phetsogang**), Mosu (Mr. **Phillip Kopano**), Mmeya (Mr. **Paulson Keithaganetse**) and Mokubilo (Mr. **Badigeng Resetse**) in Letlhakane and Mr. **Botshabelo Othusitse** of Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Mrs. **Ingrid Otukile** of the Department of Environment Affairs, Ms **Keddy Mooketsa** (BirdLife Botswana - Bird Population Monitoring Coordinator), **Lesego Ratsie** (BirdLife Botswana - Important Bird Area program manager), **Dr. Kabelo Senyatso** (BirdLife Botswana - Director) and Mr **Motshereganyi Virat Kootsositse** (BirdLife Botswana - Project manager), Mrs **Boitumelo Sekhute-Batungamile** (former project manager (with BirdLife Botswana)), **Pete Hancock** (former project manager (with BirdLife Botswana), Mr. **Leonard Dikobe** (former program manager at UNDP), Ms. **Phemo Kgomotso** (UNDP program manager) in Gaborone. Mr. **Balakidzi Nduna** from Department of Environment Affairs in Serowe. Ms **Tshegofatso Ramontsho** (Nata Sanctuary Manager), Mr **Hisso Sebina** (Debswana Mining Company).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports - including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

### Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

### Project Finance / Co-Finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available,



should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
•In-kind support								
•Other								
Totals								

### Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

### Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements<sup>11</sup>.

### Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

### Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Botswana. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

### Evaluation Timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	<i>3 days</i>	<i>28 September 2013</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	<i>10 days</i>	<i>7 October-18 October 2013</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	<i>10 days</i>	<i>1 November 2013</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	<i>2 days</i>	<i>3 November 2013</i>

<sup>11</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of (1 evaluator). The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Natural Resource Management skills and experience more preferably on Protected Area Management
- Be familiar with multi-stakeholder approaches and the facilitation of change processes
- Exhibit multi-disciplinary skills relating to 'sustainable development' especially from a Natural Resources Management and development perspective.

## Evaluator Ethics

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

## Payment Modalities and Specifications

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission, presentation and approval of the 1st draft Terminal Evaluation report
50%	Following Submission and Approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Terminal Evaluation report

**Application Process**

Applicants are requested to apply online at ([procurement.bw@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bw@undp.org)) or by courier to United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Building, Government Enclave, Cnr. Khama Crescent and President's Drive, P. O. Box 54, Gaborone, Botswana by (20 September 2013). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## **Annex 2. Documents reviewed**

### ***Project design and implementation***

- UNDP/ Government of Botswana. Project Document: *Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas*. PIMS 3984, Proposal No.: 00050137, Project No.: 00061784.
- UNDP Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of submission: 9 August 2007
- Project co-financing letters (pdf copies) - May 2008
- Final Inception Report - May 2009
- Project Implementation Plan

### ***Project implementation reports/ reviews***

- Annual Project Implementation Review reports (2010, 2012, 2013)
- Project Quarterly Technical reports (January 2009 to March 2013)
- Project Quarterly Financial reports (January 2009 to March 2013)
- GEF Financial Scorecards (2007, 2013)
- UNDP Combined Delivery Reports (2010, 2011)
- Audit report for the Year Ended 31 December 2012 - RSM Gurugroup

### ***Project Steering Committee and Coordination Group reports***

- Minutes of the PSC Quarterly meetings since 2009 to 2013.
- Minutes of some PCG meetings

### ***Project reports and products***

- Trip reports
  - Community support on a trip to Namibia
  - Park managers training in Southern African Wildlife Training College, South Africa
  - Park authority support to participate in the CDB conference 2012, Cape Town
- *Enhancing the Value of Protected Areas of the Makgadikgadi Wetland System through Co-management and Sustainable Financing*. J. Turpie, J. Barnes & G. Wilson, February 2011.
- *Appraisal on Optimising Financial and Operational Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas in Botswana*. El Mondo (Pty) Ltd, July 2012.
- Co-management module, produced for the Botswana Wildlife Training Institute, DWNP
- Biodiversity Monitoring (MOMS) Module, produced for the Botswana Wildlife Training Institute
- *Adaptive Co-management/ Joint Management of Natural Resources in Botswana (with specific reference to Makgadikgadi Pans)*. J.E. Mbaiwa & N.M. Moleele, June 2011.
- Co-management concept document, June 2013.
- Communication strategy, June 2011.
- Communications, outreach and advocacy materials produced by the project

### ***Policies, strategies, management plans***

- Government of Botswana - United Nations. *Programme Operational Plan (2010-2014)*
- Draft Wildlife Conservation Policy 2012
- DEA. 2009. *Makgadikgadi Framework Management Plan*.
- *Management Plan of Southern Sua Pan*. Ecotars (Pty) Ltd., March 2012.
- *Management and Business Plan of the Nata Bird Sanctuary*. August 2008.
- Management Plan of Makgadikgadi / Nxai Pans National Parks
- Management Plan of Chobe National Park
- Management Plan of Central Kalahari Game Reserve
- Management Plan of Moremi Game Reserve

### ***BirdLife documents***

- *Avitourism. Birding Tourism. A Guide to Starting a Community-based Birding Tourism Business* (2009)
- Bird Population Monitoring reports (2009-2011)
- Important Bird Area (IBAs) training reports; and Status reports (2009-2012)
- BirdLife Council for Africa Partnerships meeting 2012; session re GEF funding sponsored by Project
- BirdLife International Secretariat annual reports for project support to BLB
- Lessons Learnt in Partnerships for Nature Conservation Programs. A case study of the *Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas in Botswana* project.

### ***UNDP and GEF documents***

- GEF Evaluation Office. 2010. *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010*.
- GEF Evaluation Office. 2009. *The ROtI Handbook. Towards Enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects*. Methodological Paper #2, OPS4 Progress Towards Impacts.
- UNDP. 2011. *UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects*. Version for external evaluators (Final Draft, March 17th 2011)
- UNDP/ Government of Botswana. 2013. Project Document: *Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas (BioChobe)*. PIMS 4624.

### Annex 3. List of persons consulted

Name	Organisation	Position
<b>UNDP-GEF</b>		
Alice Ruhweza	UNDP-GEF	Regional Team Leader & Regional Technical Adviser - Africa
Anders Pedersen	UNDP Botswana	Resident Coordinator
Phemo Karen Kgomotso	UNDP Botswana	Programme Analyst - Energy & Environment
Tryphinah Majuta-Lunga	UNDP Botswana	Programme Associate (PMSU/Finance Unit a.i)
Lelanani Lenah Toteng	UNDP Botswana	Programme Assistant- Environment & HIV/AIDS
<b>BirdLife Botswana</b>		
Kabelo Senyatso	BirdLife Botswana	Director
Motshereganyi Virat Kootsositse	BirdLife Botswana	Project Coordinator
Harold Hester	BirdLife Botswana	Chairman
Pete Hancock	Independent consultant	former Project Manager
Boitumelo Sekhute-Batungamile	Department of Research, Science & Technology	former Project Manager
<b>Government of Botswana</b>		
Khulekane Mpofo	Department of Environmental Affairs	GEF Operational Focal Point
Balakidzi Nduna	DEA	Central District Environmental Coordinator, Serowe
Sekgowa Motsumi	DEA	
Cyril Taolo	Department of Wildlife and National Parks	Deputy Director, Strategy & Research
Botshabelo Othusitse	DWNP	Head of Wildlife Estates Management
Rex B Mokandla	DWNP	Chief Wildlife Officer, Community Support & Outreach/ former Principal BWTI
Dimpho L Sebotho	DWNP	Deputy Principal, Botswana Wildlife Training Institute
Spencer Moamogwe	DWNP	Head of Department, Wildlife Management, BWTI
Catherine S Nzehengwa	DWNP	Park Manager, Moremi Game Reserve
Obert Gwapela	DWNP	Park Manager, Makgadikgadi/ Nxai Pan National Park
Mokwaledi Mafa	DWNP	Wildlife Officer I, Head of Station, Sedudu Gate, Chobe National Park
Abel K Bogosi	DWNP	Wildlife Officer I, Letlhakane
Nonofo E. Mosesane	Department of National Museums and Monuments	Chief Curator
Segametsi Ratsie	DNMM	
Abel Mabuse	DNMM	Archaeologist
<b>Project Steering Committee</b>		
David K Seabe	Mosu village (Gumakutshaa Community Trust)	Acting PSC Chairman

Nsumikili Toitoti	Boteti Sub-District Council	Physical Planner
Maikgodiso Simane	Central District Administration	M & E Officer
Abel K Bogosi	Department of Wildlife & National Parks, Letlhakane	Wildlife Officer I
Bayame Dikgopolo	Mokubilo village	PSC Representative
Olesetise Bautule	Mokubilo village	PSC Representative
Onkagetse Moreetseng	Mmeya village	PSC Representative
<b><i>Southern Sua Pan Villages</i></b>		
Keletshwaretse Phetsogang	Mmatshumo village	Headman
Phillip Kopano	Mosu village	Headman
Paulson Keithaganetse	Mmeya village	Headman
Badigeng Resetse	Mokubilo village	Headman
<b><i>Community Trusts</i></b>		
Goagaone B Bolesitswe	Gaing-O Community Trust, Mmatshumo	General Manager
Tshegofatso Ramontsho	Nata Conservation Trust	Manager
<b><i>Private sector</i></b>		
Mkabiso (Hisso) Sebina	Debswana Mining Company	Community & Mine Closure Planning Coordinator
Graham McCulloch	Eco-Stars (Pty) Ltd	Director

#### Annex 4. Itinerary of meetings and field visits

Date	Time	Activity	Venue
Sunday 03.11.13	1300hrs	Consultant Evaluator arrives in Botswana	Gaborone
Monday 04.11.13	0900hrs - 1030hrs	Meetings with UNDP Programme Analyst, Resident Coordinator; briefing, initial contacts	Gaborone
	1400hrs - 1600hrs	Briefing by the BirdLife Botswana Board Chair (Harold Hester); prepare for field visit	Gaborone
Tuesday 05.11.13	0630hrs	Leave Gaborone for Letlhakane	Travelling
	1030hrs - 1200hrs	Meet with Balakidzi Nduna (DEA)	Serowe
	1400hrs - 1600hrs	Meet with the Project Steering Committee	Letlhakane
Wednesday 06.11.13	0700hrs - 1600hrs	Travel to Mmatshumo, Mosu, Mmeya and Mokubilo villages. Pass Flamingo Sanctuary Meet with the village headmen, General Manager of Gaing-O Trust (Mmatshumo)	Letlhakane/ Project site villages
	1800hrs - 1900hrs	Meet with Hisso Sebina (Debswana)	Letlhakane
Thursday 07.11.13	0800hrs- 1000hrs	Meet Abel Mabuse (Botswana National Museum)	Letlhakane
	1030hrs - 1300hrs	Travel from Orapa to Maun	Travelling
	1700hrs- 1900hrs	Briefing by Pete Hancock, former Project Manager	Maun
Friday 08.11.13	1000hrs - 1200 hrs	Briefing by the BWTI Deputy Principal and Head of Division, Wildlife Management	Maun
	1400hrs - 1600hrs	Meet with Makgadikgadi/Nxai and Moremi Park Managers, DWNP conference room	
Saturday 09.11.13	0530hrs	Travel to Gaborone via Nata	Travelling
	0900hrs - 1000hrs	Meet with Nata Conservation Trust Manager	Nata
	1015hrs - 1130hrs	Visit Nata Sanctuary	Nata Sanctuary
	1130hrs	Proceed to Gaborone	Travelling
Sunday 10.11.13	----	Report writing and document review	Gaborone
Monday 11.11.13	0830hrs - 1000hrs	Meet with DWNP Wildlife Officer, Sedudu Gate, Chobe NP	Gaborone
	1030hrs - 1200hrs	Meet with Boitumelo Sekhute-Batungamile (former Project Manager)	
	1400hrs - 1530hrs	Meet with DWNP, Head Wildlife Estates Management	
	1530hrs - 1730hrs	Briefing by BLB Director	
Tuesday 12.11.13	0830hrs - 1030hrs	Briefing by GEF Operational Focal Point, DEA	Gaborone
	1030hrs - 1230hrs	Meeting with DWNP Chief Wildlife Officer, former Principal BWTI	
	1400hrs - 1600hrs	Meeting with DWNP, Deputy Director for Strategy and Research	
Wednesday 13.11.13	----	Document review	Gaborone
Thursday 14.11.13	0900hrs - 1030hrs	Meet with UNDP Programme Associate (PMSU/Finance Unit)	Gaborone



	1700hrs-1900hrs	Meet with UNDP Programme Analyst - Energy and Environment	
Friday 15.11.13	0900hrs - 1030hrs	Presentation of initial draft findings to the Project Coordination Group	Gaborone
Saturday 16.11.13	1700hrs	Consultant Evaluator departs from Botswana	Travelling

## Annex 5. Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>				
1. Is the project relevant to GEF Strategic Objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support GEF Strategic Objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GFF priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>GEF websites</li> <li>Key stakeholders, inc. GEF Focal Point</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other project partners</li> </ul>
2. Is the project relevant to national objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support environment and sustainable development objectives of Botswana?</li> <li>What is level of stakeholder participation in design and ownership in implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies</li> <li>Key project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP, DWNP, DEA and project partners</li> </ul>
3. Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project and the project design (components, partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> <li>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program and project documents</li> <li>Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>

4. How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> <li>• How do GEF funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents from other donor supported activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
5. Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of all data</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>				
1. Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> <li>• Are there <b>unanticipated</b> results achieved or contributed to by the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicators in project document results framework and logframe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> <li>• PIRs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with project team</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
2. How was risk and risk mitigation managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>• What was the quality of risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>• Quality of risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

	mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?	mitigations strategies developed and followed		
3. What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of all data</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>				
1. Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was adaptive management used to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>• Were the accounting and financial systems adequate for project management and reporting?</li> <li>• Were progress reports accurate and timely, with adaptive management changes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of reporting</li> <li>• Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>• Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Were financial resources utilized efficiently?</li> </ul>			
2. How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent were partnerships between organizations encouraged and supported?</li> <li>Which partnerships were facilitated? Which can be considered sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
3. What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of all data</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>				
1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
2. Financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end</li> </ul>		
3. Institutional and governance sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were results of project implementation well assimilated by organizations?</li> <li>• Is there evidence that partners will continue activities beyond project support?</li> <li>• What is the degree of local ownership of results?</li> <li>• Were laws, policies and frameworks developed, for sustainability of initiatives?</li> <li>• What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the project?</li> <li>• Are there policies or practices with perverse incentives negatively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>• Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

	affecting long-term benefits?			
4. Social-economic sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project contribute to key building blocks for socio-economic sustainability?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example of contributions to sustainable socio-economic changes in support of national development goals and strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
5. Environmental sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What long-term environmental threats have/ have not been addressed by the project?</li> <li>• Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of potential threats</li> <li>• Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Threat assessments</li> <li>• UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
6. Challenges to sustainability of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main challenges to sustainability?</li> <li>• How have these been addressed through project management?</li> <li>• What possible additional measures could contribute to sustainability?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above</li> <li>• Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> <li>• UNEP and project personnel and project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>				
1. How was the project effective in contributing to conservation of key wetlands and related	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent will the co-management achieved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in capacity</li> <li>• To pool/mobilize resources</li> <li>• For related policy making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Key stakeholders</li> <li>• Monitoring data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analysis</li> <li>• Meetings with UNDP, project team and project partners</li> <li>• Interviews with project</li> </ul>

biodiversity?	<p>contribute to improved biodiversity conservation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What barriers/ necessary steps remain to achieving long-term impacts?</li> <li>• Are there <b>unanticipated</b> results achieved or contributed to by the project?</li> </ul>	<p>and strategic planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance</li> <li>• Evidence of biodiversity improvements</li> </ul>		beneficiaries and other stakeholders
---------------	---	--	--	--------------------------------------



## Annex 6. Questionnaire used

Questions were asked, in analyzing the Project documentation and during the stakeholder interviews, along the following lines, adjusted appropriately for the particular context:

1. How effective was the process of Project Formulation in the following areas?
  - Conceptualization/design
  - Stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - Linkages with other projects/ programmes
2. How was the project managed?
  - Adaptive management/ Monitoring and evaluation processes
  - Performance of Implementing agency (UNDP CO) and Executing Agency (BLB)
  - Stakeholder involvement
  - Financial planning and management
3. What Results were achieved?
  - Attainment of outcomes/ achievement of objectives
4. What does the future hold?
  - Sustainability of results
  - Prospects for replication/ scaling

## Annex 7. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: William Keith Lindsay

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant): N/A

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

Signed at: Oxford on 25-10-2013

Signature: 