



NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY PROJECT: CONSERVATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK

Annual Report to the European Union 2015

Reporting Period: 01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015

Reference number of the Contribution Agreement (CRIS): FED/2013/317-806

Atlas (UNDP) ID: 00081396

UNDP/GEF PIMS: 4581

GEF Secretariat ID: 4082

Henrik Fredborg Larsen
UNDP Country Director

Götz Schroth
UNDP Program Specialist GEF/Climate Change

Location: Luanda, Angola

Date report sent: 21/07/2016

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	3
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CONTEXT OF THE ACTION	5
RESULTS BY ACTIVITIES	7
OUTCOME 1: REHABILITATION OF IONA NATIONAL PARK	7
<i>Output 1.1: Appoint, train, equip and deploy park staff.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Output 1.2: Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Output 1.3: Develop an integrated park management plan.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Output 1.4: Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park</i>	<i>15</i>
OUTCOME 2: STRENGTHEN INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO MANAGE THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM.....	18
<i>Output 2.1: Prepare a Strategic Plan for the protected area system</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Output 2.2: Develop the organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Output 2.3: Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Output 2.4: Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves.....</i>	<i>22</i>
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	24
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED AND MEASURES TAKEN TO OVERCOME PROBLEMS.....	32
CHANGES INTRODUCED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION	36
VISIBILITY	37
ANNEXES	38
ANNEX 1: INVENTORY	38
ANNEX 2: PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX.....	38
ANNEX 3: FINANCE REPORT 2015	38
ANNEX 4: ANNUAL WORK PLAN 2016	38
ANNEX 5: COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY	38
ANNEX 6: LIST OF CONTRACTS ABOVE € 60,000.....	38
ANNEX 7: MINUTES OF THE PROJECT BOARD MEETING IN 2015	38

List of acronyms

CA	Contribution Agreement
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna
CO	(UNDP) Country Office
CPAP	UNDP Country Programme Action Plan
DPWM	Namibian Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management
EDF	European Development Fund
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIS	Geographical Information System
GoA	Government of Angola
HWC	Human-Wildlife Conflict
INBAC	<i>Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação</i> (National Institute of Biodiversity and Protected Areas)
IP	Implementing Partner
ISCED	<i>Instituto Superior de Ciências de Educação</i> (High Institute of Educational Science)
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Namibia)
METT	Management Efficiency Tracking Tool
MINAMB	<i>Ministério do Ambiente</i> (Ministry of Environment)
MINDEN	<i>Ministério da Defesa Nacional</i> (Ministry of National Defense)
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NP	National Park
PA	Protected Area
PIR	Project Implementation Review (GEF report)
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PLERNACA	<i>Plano de Expansão da Rede de Áreas de Conservação</i> (Strategic Plan for a National Network of Conservation Areas)
PMS	Project Management Specialist
PRODOC	Project Document
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SNR	Strict Nature Reserve
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States Dollar
WPC	World Park Congress

Project description

Title of the Action: National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park

Implementing agency: UNDP Country Office Angola

Executing agency: Ministry of Environment (MINAMB)

Target country: Angola

Starting date: 07 Feb 2013

End date: 06 Feb 2017

Reporting period: 01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015

Brief Description: The Project has been designed as the first phase of a more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. For this phase of the national program, the project focuses outputs and activities - over a period of four years - at two levels of intervention. At a national level, the project supports the government in the establishment and operationalization of *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC). At a local level, the project seeks to assist the government in rehabilitating Iona National Park (15,150 km²).

Project Objective: Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of Angola's protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park.

In order to achieve the project objectives and address the barriers, the project's intervention has been organized into two outcomes: **Outcome 1:** Rehabilitation of Iona National Park; **Outcome 2:** Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network.

Project resources as budgeted (PRODOC)¹:

<i>Total resources required (total project funds) [A+B+C]</i>	<i>US\$ 10,705,000</i>
[A] Total resources allocated to UNDP in this PRODOC	US\$ 8,405,000
- Regular (UNDP TRAC) - GEF - EU	US\$ 1,140,000 US\$ 2,000,000 US\$ 5,265,000 ²
[B] Total resources allocated to other related UNDP PRODOCs	US\$ 300,000
[C] Other (partner managed resources)	
Government	US\$ 2,000,000

¹ For real expenses see Financial Report (Annex 3)

² Equivalent to € 3.900.000. Exchange rate applied for this period was 1.35, which is the official exchange rate established by the United Nations.

Executive summary and context of the action

This second annual narrative report covers the implementation period from January to December 2015 for the “National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park”. At the request of the EU, it also provides a review of project implementation in previous years in order to explain delays in project initiation and implementation that affect the current state of the project. The project is under National Implementation Modality (NIM), and the Ministry of Environment (MINAMB) is the executing entity. The modality of the implementation is in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA of 18th February, 1977) and the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP 2009-2013 of 14th May, 2009) signed between UNDP and the Government of Angola (GoA).

As indicated in the Project Document (PRODOC)³, Angola’s protected area system was created during the colonial era (i.e. prior to 1975). Due to prolonged periods of instability in the country (1975-2002), many of the protected areas have been almost completely abandoned, without adequate funding, equipment or staff. Angola’s protected areas are served by a weak administrative system, with extremely limited resources. The rehabilitation of the existing network of protected areas, and the creation of new protected areas, are considered important interventions required for the effective conservation of Angola’s globally significant biodiversity.

Therefore, the Project seeks to catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park.

In order to achieve the project objectives and address the barriers, the project’s interventions have been organized into two outcomes:

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

At a local level (Outcome 1), the project seeks to assist the national government in rehabilitating what was the largest National Park in Angola at the time of project formulation, Iona National Park of 15 150 square kilometers. At the broader national level (Outcome 2), the project supports the Angolan Government in the establishment and operationalization of the ‘Department of Conservation Areas’ within *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC).

This document first presents the status of implementation of the two outcomes by highlighting the results of each output, activity and the changes that were made to the PRODOC throughout its implementation phase. Several expected outputs of the project have been achieved or are close to being achieved, principally those which are related to infrastructure and equipment as well as to park staffing. However, there are delays which need to be addressed in order to successfully perform (i) the rehabilitation of Iona National Park and (ii) to strengthen the institutional capacity of INBAC so as to manage the protected areas network.

³ Following the standard terminology of UNDP and the GEF, the term “PRODOC” is used in this report as a synonym of “Description of the Action”.

Secondly, the report points out the project management activities that have been implemented during 2015 as well as in the previous years in order to better contextualize the implementation and explain delays in the project. In this section, key actions taken in terms of project management are highlighted.

Thirdly, difficulties encountered during the implementation phase and mitigation measures taken to overcome problems are stressed. Actions undertaken to address ROM recommendations are emphasized.

After that, changes introduced in the implementation phase and reasons for these changes are presented. The progress in implementation of the two outcomes, as well as the consequences of the non-accomplishment or delay of specific outputs in the project schedule, are discussed.

Then, actions to implement the visibility component are described. A number of visibility and communication materials that have been prepared as well as actions that have been undertaken in order to communicate the project to a wider audience are listed.

Lastly, an annex section includes all key documents for the reporting period. Amongst them are the achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets assessed by the Midterm Review (MTR) Report, the Finance Report 2015 and the Annual Work Plan (AWP) 2016. The latter is preliminary in the sense that the project has submitted an extension request to the EU that, if approved, would alter the work plan and budget for 2016.

Results by activities

Activities described below are for the entire action, independently of the source of funds (EU, GEF or UNDP).

Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park

Work under this outcome focuses on the establishment of a simple, but effective, administration to manage Iona National Park, as well as the necessary infrastructure.

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

Work under this output focuses on supporting the appointment, training, equipping and deployment of an operational staff complement for the park.

The specific activities being undertaking for this output include:

- (i) *Advertising, selecting and appointing a park manager to lead and mentor the park team.*

This activity was completed in January 2015 with the hiring of the National Park Administrator⁴ by the project as a full time staff under the project budget, as explained below.

According to the PRODOC, a highly qualified and experienced professional park manager had to be appointed to lead the park team. If a suitably qualified park administrator could not be found in Angola, an international park manager would be hired during the first two years in order to be a mentor and train the National Park Administrator and the local park staff.

An International Park Manager (Mr. Bruce Bennett) was recruited in September 2013. The recruitment process started under UNDP procedures, but upon request from the MINAMB, the Ministry itself then conducted it directly. The principal reasons for the Ministry to request this were the better integration of the position with the national structures and the lower cost.

The project assessed that giving the complex tasks of training the National Park Administrator, other park staff and supporting the design and implementation of the park management plan, 2 years of mentoring from the International Park Manager would not be enough. Besides, the other two main reasons that justified the continuation of this position are (i) delays in the contracting of other park staff and therefore the continued need for training and guidance of the new staff members; (ii) available funds in this budget line. With the extension of the International Park Manager until the end of the

⁴ Following the terminology used daily by the project implementers and partners, the terms “National Park Administrator” and “International Park Manager” are used for the national and international park management positions, respectively.

scheduled project duration in February 2017, the level of training of the other park staff would hopefully allow for efficient park management after the closure of the project.

The National Park Administrator (Mr. Manuel Afonso) was appointed in 2014 and was hired by the project as a full time staff in January 2015, in line with the original project design where this position would have taken over the park management from the international park manager in years 3 and 4 of project implementation. His training is being provided by the International Park Manager through daily guidance, knowledge transfer and capacity development. The National Park Administrator position would continue after the conclusion of the project, since this position is already part of INBAC's staffing structure.

- (ii) *Supporting the preparation of job descriptions, and detailed terms of reference, for each of the park staff positions.*

This activity was completed in 2014. As explained under activity (iv), the staffing structure of the park has been simplified to fit into the national context and increase the chance that INBAC will absorb their costs after project closure. Therefore, the need for elaborating various job descriptions has been reduced. The International Park Manager is in charge of training the other park staff, as explained above. For INBAC as a whole, the development of a staffing structure (output 2.2.) has been integrated as an activity into output 2.1 (protected areas strategy).

- (iii) *In liaison with the Ministry of National Defense (MINDEN), supporting the selection of prospective military ex-combatants for appointment as park staff.*

This activity was completed in 2014. As described in the last year's annual report 2014 to the EU, 20 park rangers (18 male and 2 female) have been recruited by the Government in 2014, of which 8 are ex-combatants. Their on-the-job training by the park management is an ongoing activity.

- (iv) *Supporting the advertising, selection and appointment of the remaining park staff positions (i.e. those posts not taken up by military ex-combatants).*

This activity was completed in January 2015. The other park staff positions not taken up by military ex-combatants are the remaining 12 park rangers. They are all from local communities and thus help to create linkages between the park administration and the communities, and to provide local employment. Delays in the recruitment of park rangers resulted mostly from the Ministry's concern regarding sustainability, since their long-term employment by the Government could not be guaranteed in the current situation of financial crisis. As a temporary mitigation measure, the park staff positions were not recruited as Park rangers (*fiscais*), but as "Community Agents", with a contract valid only for the duration of the project. The full integration of the park staff in the Ministry's payroll as "*fiscais*" is an important discussion point for the remaining period of the project.

Furthermore, according to the PRODOC, the park staff position would initially comprise of 1 park manager; 1 senior conservator; 1 senior ranger; 3 rangers; 1 mechanic; 2 gate guards; 1 administrative assistant; and 2 general assistants. However, the PRODOC states that the formal designation of the park

staff position may change once INBAC is functional. Hence, during the inception workshop, the need to update the initial staff structure was pointed out, especially because there were no staff to ensure the security of the Iona Park. The priority to hire 20 park rangers, 1 International Park Manager and 1 National Park Administrator was agreed on during the inception workshop. This simpler staffing structure may also help improve financial sustainability of the park by eliminating more expensive staff positions, leaving a minimum structure and key positions for the daily work of the park once the project has ended (one administrator and a number of guards).

- (v) *Implementing a pre-field deployment orientation and up-skilling short-course training program (over a period of ~ 3-6 months) for newly appointed park staff.*

This activity was completed in 2015. As described in the annual report 2014 to the EU, the 20 park rangers received a training, in 2014, which covered park enforcement; first aid; tropical diseases; basic health treatments; basic conservation management; patrol. The National Police provided weapons training. The training, which lasted one week, was held in the Iona NP in August 2015. Besides, as pointed out under activity (iii), the International Park Manager is holding regular on the job training for the park staff. One of the main subjects in this continuous training is interaction with communities and biodiversity and socio-economic monitoring and data collection techniques. At the same time, the National Park Administrator provides guidance and oversight to the park staff in policing and control practices.

Specialized training of the park rangers in computer literacy and basic bookkeeping and accounting practice are not currently envisaged because most park rangers do not have completed their primary education and would not be qualified for such tasks. The National Park Administrator who has previously worked for the Iona Community Administration has basic knowledge in computer literacy, bookkeeping and accounting.

- (vi) *Procuring all staff uniforms and staff safety and camping equipment (as required), including: protective clothing; tents; sleeping bags; backpacks; water bottles; first aid supplies; GPS; utensils and torches.*

This activity has been completed in 2014. For the inventory of purchased items see Annex 1.

- (vii) *Sourcing park vehicles, including: four 4x4 diesel pickup trucks (single or double cabine) equipped with lockable tonneau covers, bedbar, bullbar, winch, tow bar and spotlights; one 4x4 5-ton flatbed truck; and 2 motor/quad bikes.*

This activity was completed in 2015 with the purchasing of one 4x4 5-ton truck, registration LD-64-86-GK, Renault brand. Purchasing of other items and vehicles in this activity had been completed in previous years, as described in the last year's annual report to the EU. For the inventory of purchased items see Annex 1.

- (viii) *Liaising with the Namibian Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) in the Ministry of Tourism (MET) to formalize and implement a program of staff exchange,*

mentoring, training, technical and professional assistance in the ongoing rehabilitation of Iona National Park.

As reported in the 2014 annual report, a high level initiative to implement a cooperation agreement between Angola and Namibia has been initiated, seeking to create a transfrontier protected area Iona – Skeleton Coast. The National Biodiversity Directorate and INBAC are working with other parts of the Government to move forward with this South-South cooperation. However, the progress in these bilateral relationships is not under the direct control of the Ministry of the Environment, and therefore also partly outside the control of the project.

At technical level, the Iona park staff has started to liaise with the Skeleton Coast's Park staff and the Namibian NGO *Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation* during 2015. This discussion aims at creating a structured exchange of experience on the rehabilitation and conservation of national parks and the engagement of local communities in conservation activities. An exchange visit of project staff to Namibia is planned for the first half of 2016.

Output 1.2: Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services

Work under this output is focused on renovating and constructing key park infrastructure; installing basic utilities for park accommodation and administration facilities; and procuring and installing critical park management equipment.

The specific activities being undertaken under this output include:

- (i) *Securing the services of an architectural/civil engineering firm to act as a project coordinator for this activity in the design of the works, preparation of specifications, production of construction drawings, preparation of EIA's, administration of contracts, tendering of works and management of works from inception to completion for infrastructure activities.*

As indicated in the PRODOC, Espinheira post has been chosen to be the central administrative base for the Iona NP. Salondjamba and Iona posts were chosen to be peripheral network of control points in an initial phase. However, it was then decided to prioritize the construction of infrastructure in Pediva post in this phase, instead of Iona, since Pediva is at the border of the park, is a strategic point to control access and there was no infrastructure in this area, whereas Iona is in the interior of the park. In addition, there is already an infrastructure in Iona where the communal administrative office is located.

A consulting company was hired by MINAMB and concluded in 2015 the preparation of a building plan (*plano de construções*) and a construction specification (*caderno de encargos*) for Espinheira, Salondjamba and Pediva. The original idea to prepare an environmental impact assessment (EIA) was not pursued, since all infrastructure built in the park already existed before the war and significant environmental, social and economic impacts were not expected from their renovation and enhancement.

All administrative posts⁵ in the Iona NP were furnished with tables, chairs, beds, mattresses, cupboards, shelves and desks during 2015. Espinheira is the only post that has access to water supply, power (diesel generator) and waste treatment facilities. The Salondjamba post has a water tank which is supplied with water from the river near Pediva. The water is transported with the 5-ton truck. There are no power or water supplies in Pediva, and park staff have to use the nearby river.

In 2015 several energy consulting companies submitted work plans and budgets to install a photovoltaic system in the three posts. However, the company to provide the service has not been selected yet by MINAMB. The National Project Coordinator is working with the Ministry to reach a decision about the company to be contracted. Proposals have also been requested from local construction companies for constructing an office building at Espinheira, and for drilling water holes at Salondjamba and Pediva. However, there is a scarcity of companies interested in providing services in the relatively remote location in the park, and so far proposals received have been too expensive. Currently the park staff is trying to identify interested construction companies in Lubango where more companies are located than in Namibe.

Progress on the infrastructure set up of the Iona NP:

ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS	TYPE OF INFRASTRUCTURE	PROGRESS ACHIEVED
Salondjamba	1 gate complex and 1 lodging	Built (concluded in 2015)
	2 lodgings	Renovated (concluded in 2015)
Espinheira	1 kitchen and 3 lodgings	Renovated (concluded in 2014)
Pediva	1 gate complex	Under construction in 2015
	1 lodging	Built (concluded in 2015)

- (ii) *Procuring and installing a high capacity heavy-duty bunded bulk diesel (>5000l) steel tank, with a fuel management system, at Salondjamba and static bunded galvanised steel diesel tanks (>500l) at Espinheira and Iona.*

The installation of fuel tanks will take place once the appropriate storage space has been created in all three posts through activity 1.2. (i). As indicated in the PRODOC, storage space should be constructed in the three posts. Particularly important is that the place where fuel tanks are located are sufficiently protected against fuel spills and environmental contamination. This activity will be addressed during 2016 (see Annual Work Plan 2016 in Annex 4).

- (iii) *Developing, procuring and maintaining a ‘turnkey’ voice and data radio and satellite communication system for the park (e.g. TETRA private mobile radio system; PMR trunking using MPT 1327; broadband VSAT or BGA + satphones; UHF two-way radio + broadband VSAT/BGA).*

⁵ Espinheira, Salondjamba and Pediva posts.

A system of radio and satellite communication has been installed within Iona NP: 6 antennas⁶ and 20 portable communication radios, 10 mobile radios with GPS and 6 fixed radios are operating in the Park. The installation of the seventh antenna in the municipal administrative office of Tômbua is underway. These installations follow the specifications of the PRODOC.

Currently, the communication equipment can only be charged in Espinheira or the municipal capital Tômbua, since there is no power in the other posts (Salondjamba and Pediva). The installation of a photovoltaic system at these posts is therefore crucial to avoid unnecessary dislocations of park staff from one post to another just to charge the equipment. As indicated above, this activity is planned for 2016 (Annex 4).

- (iv) *Procuring and installing 4 computers, and linked peripherals (e.g. printer, external HDD) as required.*

This activity has been completed in 2014. The equipment has been purchased and is working properly (See Annex 1 – Inventory).

Output 1.3: Develop an integrated park management plan

Work under this output is focused on the preparation of an ‘integrated park management plan’ for Iona NP, as a key measure for restoring the basic functionality of the park. Lessons learnt from this planning exercise will help to refine and standardize park management planning processes across the protected area system.

As indicated in the PRODOC, the integrated park management plan will comprise four elements: State of knowledge (SoK); Strategic plan (SP); Detailed subsidiary plan, as required; and Annual operational plan (AOP).

In 2014, MINAMB conducted a competitive selection and contracted a company (SAAMA) to develop the integrated park management plan. The contract was signed on September 30th, 2014 with duration of 24 months from the signing date. As listed above, the four complementary elements are developed within the integrated park management plan report (report name: *“Estudo do Estado do Parque Nacional do Iona e Elaboração de Plano de Gestão Integrada do Parque Nacional do Iona – Plano de Gestão Integrada do Parque Nacional do Iona”*). A draft of this report was delivered in 2015 with the four elements as well as the activities listed below. The state of knowledge is developed within chapter 1 and 2; the strategic plan and subsidiary plan within chapter 3 and 4; the annual operational plan within chapter 5 to 8. Especially the zoning plan proposed by the company was considered insufficient by the project team and has to be redone. The consulting company is currently revising the report which is planned to be delivered in June 2016.

⁶ Pediva, (16° 17, 882”S e 12° 33, 446”E); Salondjamba, (16° 20, 594”S e 12° 26, 919”); Espinheira (16° 43, 179”S e 12° 14, 903”E); Sede comunal do Iona, (16° 52, 485” e 12° 33, 519”E); Muhende, (16° 30, 641”S e 12° 33, 273”); Mbú, (15° 33, 456”S e 12° 29, 606”E)

The specific activities being undertaken in this output include:

(i) *Implementing survey/mapping work*

As explained before, MINAMB hired a company (SAAMA) which delivered the following maps in the first semester of 2015: habitats; hydrology; spatial distribution of non-resident park users; land use; livestock; wild animals; physical environment; relief; ecosystems; geology; geoclimate. These maps provide ingredients to the development of the park's strategic plan element, including the zoning of the park.

This activity also includes an aerial survey of wildlife species numbers in the park⁷, which has not yet been carried out. A service provider to conduct the aerial survey has been identified and the details of the contract are currently being negotiated.

(ii) *Collating all park information (electronic and/or hard copy data, reports, maps, images, etc.) into a park State of Knowledge Report.*

This activity is ongoing. Since the beginning of the contract, SAAMA is collecting, evaluating and consolidating all significant information that exists in the integrated park management plan report (report name: "*Estudo do Estado do Parque Nacional do Iona e Elaboração de Plano de Gestão Integrada do Parque Nacional do Iona*" – *Plano de Gestão Integrada do Parque Nacional do Iona*). Up to this moment, the following components have been gathered:

- Ground survey of livestock and wild animals: the park staff has mapped 20,000 animals in 108 routes, a total of 7,832 km, since 2013. There is a greater presence of livestock in the (wetter) east and of wild animals in the (drier) center and west of the park. There is a significant amount of livestock coming from Namibia into the Iona Park.
- Livestock and human - wildlife conflicts: an international NGO (Panthera) is developing a study about this topic without financial contribution from the project. Government is funding and leading this work. The results of this study will be taken into account in the final report of SAAMA;
- Inventory of water sources: existing data for the park, presumably from early 2000s, identified 86 points of water, excluding rock pools and depressions collecting runoff water. The Cunene River has water permanently while The Curoca River is seasonal. There are 40 natural springs, 31 waterholes (*cacimbas*) and 15 wells mapped.
- Welwitschia monitoring: the park staff conducts a periodical monitoring of more than 200 individual, marked *Welwitschia mirabilis* plants by using photos of individual plants with the aim of obtaining information on growth and mortality. The monitoring process takes place in three different areas in the park and there are currently more than 3,343 pictures in a database. The plants are catalogued with GPS references.

⁷ The aerial survey is listed as an activity in the PRODOC (page 35 – English version; budget note 4). The activity will be funded with GEF funds.

- (iii) *Preparing a comprehensive medium-term (5 years) strategic management plan (SP) for the park. The SP may include a: management objectives framework (e.g. vision, goals, objectives for key result areas); use zoning framework (e.g. grazing/browsing zone, wilderness zone, low intensity use zone, etc.); strategic implementation framework (e.g. strategic actions with priorities, responsibilities and deliverables/indicators); institutional framework (e.g. staff organogram, roles and responsibilities of staff; cooperative governance arrangements); and a monitoring and evaluation framework.*

SAAMA has already delivered a first draft of the strategic management plan, which was presented during a workshop held in Namibe in November 2015. This workshop had the objective of strengthening the interaction with the Provincial Government and get feedback on products from partners. The zoning proposed by the consultants was found inadequate by park and project staff and it was concluded that it needs to be revised with the help of the park management. A meeting in Namibe between consultants and park management has taken place in early May 2016 for this purpose, and the revised plan is expected for June-July 2016.

- (iv) *Preparing the requisite subsidiary plans for the park, including subsidiary plans for: game management and reintroductions; livestock management; water supply management; and tourism and recreational development.*

The same consulting company has started developing subsidiary plans for the park, which are included in the draft strategic plan (within the integrated park management plan report). Completion of these subsidiary plans is expected for June-July 2016.

- (v) *Supporting the process of preparing a detailed Annual Plan of Operation (AOP), and associated budget, for the park that operationalizes and costs the implementation of the park SP and subsidiary plans for the fiscal year.*

The afore-mentioned consulting company has delivered a first draft of the AOP and associated budget, which are included in the integrated park management plan.

- (vi) *Facilitating a review and evaluation of park performance in implementing the AOP. Where targets are not being met, seeking to understand why, and initiating appropriate responses. As part of this review and evaluation process, assessing the effectiveness of management actions, new knowledge and technology, changing conditions, and any previously unforeseen circumstances.*

This product has not been delivered yet. The completion of this activity is awaiting the completion of the integrated park management plan, which is expected for June-July 2016.

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

Work under this output is focused on initiating a long-term process of working with the communities living in the park and with local government, in order to collaboratively seek solutions for improving the balance between the livelihoods, public services and cultural needs of communities and the biodiversity conservation needs of the park.

This output is delayed. The main reasons are weak coordination and communication amongst project partners. The consulting company received detailed guidance for the completion of the studies including necessary field work only in late 2015. As a result, this output was re-launched at the end of 2015. Further information about the status of each activity is provided below.

The specific activities being undertaken in this output include:

- (i) *Mapping and profiling the people currently living in (and immediately adjacent to) the park within the Angolan territory.*

This is an ongoing activity. In 2014, MINAMB conducted a competitive selection and contracted a consulting company (SOAPRO). The contract was signed on September 30, 2014 with duration of 6 months from the signing date. The company delivered a draft profile of the communities living in the Iona Park in the first semester of 2015. This study was also presented at a workshop in Namibe in November 2015. This workshop had the objective of strengthening the interaction with the Provincial Government and get feedback on products from partners. Following the presentation of the draft report, the project management requested SOAPRO to revise and improve the document. The consultants are currently working on the revisions and have scheduled a new visit to the park with interviews of local residents for May 2016. The final report is expected for July-August 2016. The project team, including the park management, are working closely with the consultants on guiding the revisions.

- (ii) *Identifying the current governance structures and their functioning (i.e. assessing the power relationships of the various interest groups to determine patterns of resource use) in the local communities living in the park.*

The same consulting company delivered a draft of this activity in the first semester of 2015. The draft identified the current governance structures and functions within the traditional communities. However, no proposals for the governance structure of the park have yet been presented. Revision of the document and adding of the missing components including the proposed governance structure was requested by the project management. The final document is expected for July-August 2016, following a new field visit of SOAPRO with the project team in May 2016.

- (iii) *Surveying the numbers, spatial/temporal distribution and ownership of all livestock (cattle, goats, sheep) living in and/or using the park for grazing/browsing.*

This activity is in the same situation as the previous one. The consulting company delivered a draft in the first semester of 2015 which did not include comprehensive, quantitative information about livestock in

the park. This survey will help to identify the livestock number per family, type of livestock and purpose. These empirical data will contribute to building a more comprehensive view of the impact of this activity in the Iona NP and the possible measures to be undertaken to minimize them. A field visit was scheduled for May 2016 by SOAPRO, accompanied by park staff, to collect information about livestock in the park.

- (iv) *Qualifying and quantifying the extent and impacts of livestock on park species, habitats and ecosystem functioning.*

This activity is in the same situation as the previous one. SOAPRO concentrated the development of this activity in literature reviews and annotated bibliographies. They were requested to improve this part of their report. The final document is expected for July-August 2016, after the field visit of SOAPRO. During this field visit, the consultants will work intensively with the park staff to collect and systematize information from their daily observations in the park and include it in the report. In parallel to the project activities, the Government, without financial and technical contribution of the project, also hired an NGO (Panthera) to provide additional information about carnivorous animals. Furthermore, a German botanist has done a mapping of the park vegetation during April 2016 where significant overgrazing was observed, and their expected report (vegetation map) will also inform the SOAPRO study. This latter activity had no cost to the project.

- (v) *Developing appropriate attitudes of park staff towards local people, replacing the traditional 'police' role with a more cooperative and collaborative role.*

This is an ongoing activity. The Iona NP staff has been working on a daily basis with local communities as part of their duties in patrolling the park. This also included a role of the park rangers in community education about the park and its rules. However, given the size of the park, the fact that most of the rangers are located at the park entrances⁸ and therefore not available for engaging with the majority of the park's human population, and the lack of specific capacity of the rangers in community education, an additional more comprehensive and specialized communications program is needed. During 2015, MINAMB has proposed to contract a local NGO to help improve and strengthen the relationship with the communities. Engaging a local NGO in the task of communicating with the communities about the park's management plan and related environmental education can also have the positive side-benefit of this NGO then helping in the future to fundraise for work with the communities in the park. This activity is planned to start as soon as the zoning plan of the park, which will be the basis for the community communication and education program, is available, presumably in July 2016.

- (vi) *Initiating genuine and open dialogue with the community, and community representatives (i.e. sobas and municipal administrators) to reduce stereotypes, increase understanding and arrive at mutually acceptable ways forward.*

⁸ The rangers work in a rotation system. When this report was being revised in May 2016, the rotation system was distributed as follows: Pediva entrance – 2 rangers; Salondjamba entrance – 4 rangers; Espinheira entrance – 3 rangers; Ponte Albino entrance – 3 rangers.

Although the Iona NP staff is in regular contact with the communities, very little has as yet been done in terms of systematic engagement of the communities in park management. This activity is planned to be greatly expanded during 2016 by the contracting of a local NGO, as mentioned in the previous section. This NGO would develop and implement a systematic communications program about the rules of the park under the park management plan and zoning.

- (vii) *Establishing formal structures that can inter alia: facilitate community and local government participation in the park management decision-making affecting local communities; agree on regulations required to control community access to park natural resources; enforce tenure and natural resource use agreements between the community and park management; and provide an accessible and transparent dispute-resolution mechanism.*

Very little has so far been done under this activity, partly because of the delays in finalizing the community and park management studies, and partly because the park staff was too busy with setting up the basic management infrastructure of the park. SOAPRO, which is working on the community profile, is also responsible for the task of suggesting a formal structure to facilitate the participation of the community and local government in the park management decision-making. This activity has not been completed and final results are expected after the field visit by the company scheduled for May 2016, during which SOAPRO will work intensively with the park administration to discuss and propose possible ways of engaging the communities more comprehensively in the management of the park.

- (viii) *Identifying and facilitating conservation - and tourism- related employment opportunities for members of local communities living in, and adjacent to, the park.*

The consulting company preparing the integrated park management plan (SAAMA) delivered a draft report about conservation and employment opportunities for local communities in the first semester of 2015. The report proposed some options for tourism development. However, the Project management requested SAAMA to revise the report to include more detailed information about employment opportunities for members of local communities living in Iona NP. In parallel, the park management has developed a concept for nature and community based tourism in the park. This will involve the demarcation of camp sites – presumably one in the area belonging to each soba in the park – which will be the only permitted camping sites in the park. These sites will be managed by the local communities which will benefit from the revenues (fees and employment opportunities as tourism guides). The basic idea is for these sites to be complementary to each other in the sense that each site has a slightly different focus, such as wildlife, communities, hiking in the mountains, perhaps certain local products, etc. The detailed plan will be developed and implemented as soon as the zoning of the park (which specifies which activities are permitted where in the park) has been finalized.

- (ix) *Identifying and developing opportunities for alternative livelihoods in local communities living in the park as a means of offsetting the impacts of any resource use restrictions and improving diversification of household income.*

This activity has not yet been implemented, partly because of afore-mentioned delays in the development of the park management plan and community studies, and partly because the park staff

was focused on establishing a basic infrastructure for the park. The idea now is to focus on developing community based tourism as a main alternative income activity in the park (see previous section). While additional income-generating activities are possible (e.g. certain extractive products), the risk of attracting more people from the surrounding areas into the park is significant.

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

The establishment, organization and roles of the *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC) were approved by the government of Angola in 2011 (Decree 10/11 of 2011). However, the resources in terms of staff, funding, equipment, and infrastructure available to INBAC to properly administer the protected area system are still insufficient. Moreover, there has been a certain tendency to spend conservation funds on lodgings and other relatively expensive infrastructure, rather than securing first the basic management structure of the protected areas system. Work under this outcome focuses on supporting the development of INBAC's capacity for managing and expanding the protected areas network in Angola.

This component is delayed, in part because the project team left it to INBAC to design these activities to ensure that they meet the institution's needs and increase ownership by INBAC. During 2015 the terms of reference for all outputs of the component 2 were elaborated by INBAC with UNDP guidance and a competitive selection of consulting companies has been completed by the Institution. The contracts to produce the outputs listed below were signed by the end of 2015 with all consulting companies selected. Outputs are planned to be addressed by the companies by the end of 2016. A timeframe for each output is specified below.

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

Work under this output is focused on preparing a medium-term strategic planning framework for INBAC that will effectively integrate strategic planning with budgeting and spending plans for the protected area system.

The specific activities are being undertaken in this output include:

- (i) *Defining an overall purpose or result that INBAC is trying to achieve (the 'Mission').*
- (ii) *Identifying the various driving forces, or major influences, that might affect INBAC.*
- (iii) *Analyzing the institution's strengths and weaknesses, and the opportunities and threats faced by the institution.*
- (iv) *Establishing goals that build on strengths to take advantage of opportunities, while building up weaknesses and warding off threats.*

- (v) *Depending on affordability, practicality and efficiency, establishing strategies to reach these goals and measurable strategic objectives.*
- (vi) *Developing a programmatic approach to achieving the strategic goals and objectives.*
- (vii) *Within the framework of the programmatic approach, establishing credible outcomes and the related outputs, performance measures or indicators that demonstrate progress toward the strategic objectives and goals.*
- (viii) *Determining Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) budget allocations for the programmes and sub-programmes.*
- (ix) *Consolidating the above information into a Strategic Plan for INBAC that is linked to the government's MTEF cycle.*
- (x) *Preparing policies for the planning and operational management of protected areas. This may include policies addressing: management planning; responses to common biological management issues such as fire, invasive alien species control, rehabilitation/restoration and wildlife management; applied research and monitoring; enforcement and compliance; community relations; tourism/recreational facilities and services; natural resource use; stakeholder engagement; and co-operative governance.*

MINAMB contracted a consulting company (Fundação Kissama) to prepare a strategic plan for the protected areas system for the coming 10-15 years as well as to elaborate an Action Plan for implementing the INBAC's Strategic Plan for a National Network of Conservation Areas (PLERNACA). The contract was signed on December 3, 2015 with duration of 6 months from the signing date.

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

Work under this output is focused on developing an organizational staffing structure for INBAC; identifying the specific protected area positions within the organizational structure, and their technical competence requirements; preparing job descriptions and conditions of service for each protected area position; assessing the training and skills development needs for each of the protected area position; and developing and delivering in-service training.

The specific activities in this output include:

- (i) *Based on a review of regional best practice, and in line with the Public Service regulations, developing recommendations on an organizational staffing structure and staffing complement for INBAC (with a specific emphasis on the protected area planning and management functions of INBAC).*
- (ii) *Based on a review of regional best practice, and in line with the Public Service regulations, preparing recommendations on job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for each protected area job in the organizational structure.*

- (iii) *Supporting the submission of the organizational structure, job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service to the government for review, approval and adoption.*
- (iv) *Facilitate the advertising, selection, appointment and deployment of the government-approved protected area staff complement.*
- (v) *Developing an in-service skills development and training program for protected area staff.*
- (vi) *Implementing in-service training and skills development programs for at least 20 protected area staff, including inter alia: general personal and work skills; conservation management; equipment maintenance; administration; field techniques; enforcement; recreation and tourism; public relations; natural resources assessment; etc.*
- (vii) *Developing and implementing a mentoring and career-pathing program for at least three senior protected area management staff.*
- (viii) *Collaborating with other regional counterpart conservation agencies (e.g. Namibia's Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Botswana's Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Zambia Wildlife Authority and South African National Parks) to share expertise and skills on inter alia: park infrastructure development; operations logistics planning; park communications systems; wildlife management; park planning; incident management; etc.*

The action taken during 2015 to develop the activities under this output was to elaborate the terms of reference and select a consulting company, which however later turned down the offer. In addition, UNDP TRAC funds were planned to fund this activity. However, due to UNDP budget cuts, currently there is no funding available from the project for this activity. Some key activities under this output have been integrated into the study led by Fundação Kissama under output 2.1., specifically to propose a minimum staffing structure for managing the protected areas system.

In order to address the activities (v), (vi) and (vii), listed above, the project has supported the following activities:

- From June 8th to the 24th 2015, in the Quiçama National Park, a training on "GIS - Geographic Information System ArcGIS 10.3 - GPS" was held for INBAC's heads of department, park directors and the supervisory heads, the number of participants was 18. The project purchased materials such as computers and 10.3 ArcGIS program GPS in order to ensure continuing technical training.
- From September 2nd to 4th 2015, the International Conference on poaching and adverse effects on the African continent was held in Menongue (Cuando-Cubango province). The conference was organized by the Office of the Attorney General of Angola, in partnership with UNDP and MINAMB. The project supported the attendance of 3 technicians from INBAC, 9 national park administrators, and the Iona project coordinator.
- A meeting of all park administrators was held in Bicular National Park in early 2016 of which details will be reported in the next annual report.

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

This output is focused on supporting INBAC to: (i) collect and collate historical information on the following protected areas: Cangandala National Park (NP); Bicular NP; Luando Strict Nature Reserve; Mupa NP; Caméia NP; and Quiçama NP; (ii) undertake comprehensive field surveys of the biodiversity, park boundaries, socio-economic characteristics and the condition of infrastructure in these parks/reserves; (iii) profile the risks facing each of the parks/reserves; and (iv) make explicit recommendations on the rationalisation and rehabilitation needs of each of the parks/reserves.

The specific activities in this output include:

- (i) *Synthesizing all available sources of information for each of the parks/reserves.*
- (ii) *Locating and demarcating each of the park/reserve boundaries (as proclaimed).*
- (iii) *Describing and mapping the habitats, vegetation and hydrology of each park/reserve.*
- (iv) *Surveying (aerial survey) the number, spatial distribution and population dynamics of medium-sized and large mammals in each park/reserve.*
- (v) *Collecting data on the biodiversity characteristics, status and dynamics of each park/reserve.*
- (vi) *Preparing species inventories and updating 'red lists' for each park/reserve.*
- (vii) *Assessing and evaluating the risks (e.g. wildfire, invasive species, encroachment, erosion, poaching) that are adversely affecting the conservation value of each park/reserve.*
- (viii) *Mapping and profiling the people currently living in each park/reserve.*
- (ix) *Surveying the numbers and distribution of all livestock living in and/or using each park/reserve for grazing/browsing.*
- (x) *Mapping the extent - by type - of agricultural activities (including forestry) being undertaken in each park/reserve.*
- (xi) *Mapping the park infrastructure, and assessing its condition, for each park/reserve.*
- (xii) *Making explicit recommendations on the rationalization (park boundaries/ conservation status) and rehabilitation interventions (e.g. staffing, infrastructure, enforcement, governance and species conservation) required for each park/reserve.*
- (xiii) *Consolidating the baseline information and recommendations into a 'State of Park/ State of Reserve' report for each park/reserve.*

As mentioned in last year's annual report to the EU, a rapid evaluation of the nine protected areas has been done for preparing the more detailed studies and implementation/management plans for a subset of these areas. Based on this evaluation by the international consultant Tamar Ron, INBAC has decided to contract the detailed studies for the following six protected areas: Luando SNR, Mupa NP, Mavinga NP; Luengue-Luiana NP; Maiombe NP and Cameia NP. These areas were selected because they were considered to have the greatest need for intervention by new projects.

During 2015 the terms of reference for the six park studies were prepared and a competitive selection was conducted. MINAMB contracted consulting companies or consortia to carry out the activities listed above for each park. The actual work on the studies has been initiated in early 2016. Listed below are the consulting companies or consortia that will develop the activities:

- Mavinga NP and Luengue-Luiana NP: Consortium SAREP and Geração Verde Integração Ecológica. The contract was signed on December 3rd, 2015 with duration of 6 months from the signing date;
- Luando SNR and Mupa NP: Consortium Eucaliptus-Tall and Agri-Pro Ambiente Consultores SA. The contract was signed on December 3rd, 2015 with duration of 6 months from the signing date;
- Maiombe NP and Cameia NP: Consulting company Eucaliptus-Tall, LTDA. The contract was signed on December 3rd, 2015 with duration of 6 months from the signing date.

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

This output seeks to facilitate the preparation of detailed implementation plans that will operationalize the rehabilitation recommendations contained in the State of Park/Reserve reports prepared in Output 2.3. These implementation plans will then be integrated into, and fully aligned with, the broader institutional Strategic Plan developed in Output 2.1.

The specific activities are being undertaking in this output include:

- (i) *Developing an implementation schedule as a framework to guide the rehabilitation of each park/reserve. The Implementation Schedule will determine and define the major phases of work that will be undertaken, and document a logical sequence of activities over time.*
- (ii) *Preparing a work breakdown structure (WBS) that provides the detail behind each activity in the implementation schedule, showing key tasks and deliverables.*
- (iii) *Allocating available funds against key tasks and deliverables to enable tracking of expenditure over time.*
- (iv) *Scoping the actual resource requirements (staff, offices, equipment, transport, IT, contractual services, etc.) for key tasks and deliverables.*
- (v) *Where resources are purchased externally, identifying the contracting and procurement strategy and requirements.*
- (vi) *Designing a risk management strategy that defines risks and identifies risk management measures.*
- (vii) *Preparing a stakeholder engagement strategy that ensures that the main stakeholders and their interests are identified, and strategies developed to engage them.*
- (viii) *Developing an evaluation strategy that defines performance targets and identifies mechanisms to measure the progress in achieving these performance targets.*
- (ix) *For each national park/strict nature reserve, consolidating the information contained developed in (i) – (viii) above into an 'Implementation Plan' for incorporation into the INBAC Strategic Plan.*
- (x) *Approaching donors and other prospective funding agencies (including government) to secure financing for the respective park rehabilitation Implementation Plans.*

Considering the proximity of the work in this output with that in output 2.3, the same consulting companies were contracted to carry out these activities as those for output 2.3. In other words, outputs 2.3 and 2.4 were merged and combined in the same contracts.

Project management

One meeting of the Project Board (political Steering Committee), chaired by the Minister of the Environment, was held in the year of reporting. It took place in Namibe province in August 2015, chaired by the Minister of the Environment, with the presence of the UNDP Resident Representative; Secretary of State of the Ministry of Environment; Director General of INBAC; Provincial Governor; and Municipal Administrator of Tômbua⁹. One of the key recommendations was the need to hold the Steering Committee meetings in Namibe Province for greater opportunity of participation of the provincial authorities. The need to conduct the aerial survey of wildlife numbers in the park, already budgeted in the PRODOC with GEF resources, was also emphasized. Furthermore, the committee emphasized the need to improve park access through a bridge at Salondjamba, for which only a design study has been budgeted in this project. The minutes of the Board Meeting have been included in the Annex to the present report.

Further to the Project Board meeting, 3 meetings of the Technical Committee, chaired by the Director General of INBAC, were held in March, July and October 2015 to discuss and approve the quarterly reports, monitor and assess the project's implementation. Other thematic meetings, at the technical level, were held throughout the year 2015.

Two monitoring visits were made to the Iona Park to assess first hand project progress. These visits were held from June 7th to 12th and from November 25th to December 2nd 2015.

The mid-term review of the project was also contracted by UNDP in end 2015 and the final report was presented in March 2016. It came to the conclusion that the project has achieved several expected outputs while others are still in development. One of the main achievements was deploying and training the park staff for Iona NP, as well as providing the equipment needed. On the other hand, there are still some key activities which must be addressed.

Regarding Outcome 1, there are important activities that should urgently be completed, such as outputs 1.3 (Develop an integrated park management plan) and 1.4 (Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park). These outputs present serious delays that are affecting the performance of the project. The main reasons for the significant delays are weak coordination and communication amongst project partners on one hand and the consulting companies on the other. As a result, the consulting companies were over significant time periods not fully clear about the nature of revisions that were expected from them, and consequently the revisions did not happen as quickly as would have been necessary. In order to improve communications among project partners, more frequent face-to-face meetings at the technical level are required as well as more intensive and regular interactions by scheduling work meetings and field visits with consultants. These issues have already been addressed in late 2015 and early 2016. As a result, work on the key studies of

⁹ Minister of the Environment (Dra. Fátima Jardim), UNDP Resident Representative (Dr. Pier Paolo Balladelli); Secretary of State of the Ministry of Environment (Dra. Paula Francisco Coelho); Director General of INBAC (Dr. Abias Moma Huongo); Provincial Governo (Dr. Rui Falcão); and Municipal Administrator of Tômbua (Dr. José Chindongo António)

Outcome 1 has been relaunched, and work with the consulting companies that were contracted for Outcome 2 has been organized from the beginning such that regular meetings at INBAC have been programmed to accompany the progress of the work.

Also within outcome 1, improved interaction and engagement with the local communities is extremely important and strengthening the work that the park staff has initiated with the communities is very urgent. A way of doing this is to encourage regular attendance of park administrators in meetings by Iona traditional chiefs (*sobas*). Also, once a park zoning has been finalized and approved, contracting a local NGO to communicate and obtain support for the plan from the communities is necessary. Furthermore, promoting and implementing an effective ecotourism strategy with the government by directly involving local communities is intended. For the successful performance of these actions, the engagement of other key stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Tourism and local and national tour operators, would be desirable.

All outputs related to outcome 2 are seriously delayed, in part because the project team left it to INBAC to design these activities to ensure that they met the institution's needs and increase ownership by INBAC. Only at the end of 2015, consulting companies were selected and contracted to develop the planned studies to improve the overall management of the protected areas network. However, these activities can still be implemented within the scheduled project time frame.

As described in the PRODOC, working groups or partnership structures will be established, as required, to facilitate the active participation of affected institutions, organizations and individuals in the implementation of the respective project activities. In this sense, it has been recognized that frequent meetings are required to involve partners and appropriately design and guide project activities, and ultimately guarantee a satisfactory delivery of products. At the national level, regular meetings (quarterly) of the technical committee of the steering committee are being conducted. The Project Board meetings, chaired by the Minister, have been realized since the start of the project where overall policy and key issues have been discussed. These Board meetings should have been more frequent, and it is hoped that two meetings per year could be held in the future. As regards to the local level, the project management identified the need to intensify the formal interaction of park administrators in meetings held by local communities. Hiring a local NGO in this formal approach process will be helpful. The NGO will have the role of arbitrating and strengthening the dialogue between the actors and enhancing the daily work on conservation which has been developed by park staff as well as communicating and guiding the communities in the process of adapting behavior to the new terms of the integrated park management plan.

The table below reviews the project risks and risk mitigation measures described in the PRODOC:

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
STRATEGIC Local communities resident in the Park conflict with the park	As provided in the PRODOC	High	Likely	High	The population of humans and their domestic livestock (i.e. cattle, goats, sheep and donkeys) has

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
authorities over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource use practices in Iona					expanded substantially over the past few decades and previously nomadic pastoralists have now become sedentary over most of the eastern half of the Park. Conflicts over access to land, grazing and water will certainly arise once restrictions are placed by Park Management on such resource uses. Component 1 includes an urgent focus on an evaluation on resource use conflicts and effective communication with local communities to resolve immediate problems and to plan longer-term mitigation measures. These might have to include re-design of Park boundaries, provision of community development facilities along the eastern buffer zone of the Park, and other incentives to reduce pressure on water and grazing resources that have to be shared by domestic animals and wildlife species.
	Reassessment of the risk mitigation measures for the current implementation period	Medium	Moderately likely	Medium	While there is a potential conflict between the use of the park resources by the communities and wildlife conservation, this is mitigated by the division of the park into a montane, dry forest zone with higher rainfall and relevant pasture resources where the communities are now

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
					concentrated, and a very dry plain with minimal pasture value that is most critical for wildlife. The principal challenge now is to establish clear rules about zones with different uses (i.e. restrictions on the digging of artificial waterholes in the arid plains) to reserve these extremely marginal pasture resources of the plains to the natural grazers of the park. This will require a well-designed communications program, but not necessarily lead to conflict with the communities.
<u>POLITICAL</u> Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of the new National Institute for Biodiversity and Conservation Areas (INBAC)	As provided in the PRODOC	High	Moderately likely	Medium	The project intervention can proceed through its planning and resource development stage under the leadership and administration of MINAMB. Project outputs under Component 1 provide for a contracted Park Administrator who will lead the implementation of the project <i>in situ</i> and who will mentor national counterparts. Project outputs under Component 2 have been designed to support the financial planning and technical management capacities of INBAC (and MINAMB) at the national and PA levels, should INBAC not be established in the short to medium-term.

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
	Reassessment of the risk mitigation measures for the current implementation period		None	None	INBAC has been established and is functional, despite the current restrictions on hiring for all government agencies. Initial difficulties in dividing tasks and competencies between INBAC and MINAMB seem to have been overcome.
STRATEGIC The Government of Angola assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development <u>New formulation:</u> Despite high priority assigned to PAs by the Government, financial crisis restricts its ability to provide necessary financial support to individual PAs	As provided in the PRODOC	High	Moderately likely	Medium	During project preparation, national and provincial governments have expressed strong political and institutional support for the project proposal. During project implementation, extensive consultations with all stakeholders with a sound communications strategy will develop a strong supportive community and continued high-level political support for the project. Furthermore, the development and effective implementation of co-management models with local stakeholders (local communities, local authorities and the tourism sector) will strengthen compliance with the management plans and also oblige INBAC to constructively engage with the relevant sectors and communities in order to achieve PA management effectiveness. Through this project INBAC will pilot and strengthen its communications capabilities and improve its

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
					enforcement capacities through community participation and NGO and local government engagement.
	Reassessment of the risk mitigation measures for the current implementation period	High	Moderately likely	Medium	The risk as originally formulated is not relevant anymore; it is clear that the Government of Angola values its PAs and considers them a priority. However, the current financial crisis implies less availability of funds. The key challenge thus is to make the best use of the available funds, and the project can contribute to this objective, including through strengthening INBAC.
<u>FINANCIAL</u> INBAC's financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as Government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in the protected area system	As provided in the PRODOC	High	Unlikely	Low	Securing complementary financial resources to support the ongoing rehabilitation and development of Iona National Park is critical for its recovery and longer-term financial sustainability. INBAC will prioritize work during project implementation to secure increased financial resources from Government and donors using an effective fund raising and communication strategy. Government co-financing for this project is \$2 million with a further 2 million Euros from the EU. Additional co-financing resources for conservation may be made available in the near future from other

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
					bilateral donors. Furthermore, Component 2 activities (e.g. PA business planning implementation) will focus on improving the revenue generation and management of financing for the protected area system.
	Reassessment of the risk mitigation measures for the current implementation period	Medium	Moderately likely	Medium	The financial crisis has a negative effect on the availability of finance for INBAC and PAs, and presumably also on the availability of private sector finance that could benefit the park (e.g. tourism investments). On the other hand, the crisis has increased the political interest in diversification of national revenue sources and economic activities, and this should benefit tourism and indirectly the PA system. The project will invest in community based tourism in the park, being aware that full financial sustainability of the park out of tourism revenues may not be achievable in the short term.
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u> Climate change will exacerbate habitat fragmentation in the terrestrial ecosystems in and around Iona NP	As provided in the PRODOC	Low	Moderately likely	Low	This project will focus on defining potential buffer zones and establishing and monitoring corridors between Iona and the adjoining Namibe Partial Reserve, and south of the Cunene, the Skeleton Coast National Park which may eventually serve as trans-border wildlife corridors.

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY		IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
					These buffer zones and corridors can act as a safeguard for PAs against the undesired effects of climate change by allowing biodiversity to alter distribution patterns and even migrate in response to climate change effects. Engagement with local communities to encourage the adoption of mitigation measures to reduce demands on firewood and charcoal will form part of the communication strategy of Component 1.
	Reassessment of the risk mitigation measures for the current implementation period				No change

Difficulties encountered and measures taken to overcome problems

In the 2nd semester of 2015, the EU conducted an independent review, entitled Results-Oriented-Monitoring (ROM). This activity aims at providing a brief picture of the state of implementation, reporting project performance and highlighting lessons learned. Findings were presented as recommendations in order to improve the performance of the project. The table below lists actions undertaken to address all ROM recommendations:

Nº	ROM recommendations	Actions undertaken
R1	To seriously improve the communication between the park and the local administrations (Provincial government in Namibe, administrations of Tômbua and Iona) and the communication with the local populations; these actions have to be done seriously by the park Administrator.	The communication with the provincial government has been intensified through the Board meeting, with presence of the Provincial Governor, in August 2015 in Namibe, which is also the preferred location for future board meetings. It was also decided that the Park Administrator should regularly attend meetings in Iona with the <i>Sobas</i> of the communities. Community outreach will be intensified in 2016 in the course of the public discussions of the park management plan and the alternative livelihood activities of the project. It is clear that so far the local stakeholder involvement has not been adequate, and this is a point that needs special focus during 2016.
R2	To improve seriously the skills of the park administrator through different trainings: park and staff management, environmental education, conflicts resolution, capacitation in English, local communities development.	This is the primary function of the International Park Manager and is an ongoing activity through daily guidance, knowledge transfer and capacity development on conservation. The Park Administrator is also fully involved in the planning of infrastructure work in the park and the obtaining of offers, i.e. the normal administrative functions of park management.
R3	To increase the number of rangers; this will have an involvement at the government level (budget to be planned), so it will take some time; it is an issue that has to be raised regularly by the highest levels (INBAC DG, Minister)	It is probably not advisable to increase the number of rangers beyond the current number of 20 because doing so would reduce the chance that they could be absorbed into INBAC's structure at the end or the final phase of the project. On the other hand, the inclusion of the staff into the government payroll is an issue that will be discussed regularly and at various levels with the government, despite being a difficult point in the current financial situation of the country.
R4	To develop as soon as possible the training of the rangers (international consultant has to	So far, an on-the-job training of the park rangers has been applied by the International Park

	discuss the more adequate programme with SAWC (South African wildlife college in Hoedspruit) and adapt some modules to the IONA staff level	Manager. The possibility of adapting existing training modules will be discussed, considering the specific conditions and constraints of Iona NP.
R5	To speed up the building of the rangers houses and the procurement of the motorbikes for the same staff	There have been some delays in completing the work on the buildings that are currently being addressed, as the installation of a photovoltaic system in the three posts and providing water access and treatment for Salondjamba and Pediva posts. The fleet of vehicles for the park staff has been purchased by the project and is in use in the field. The permission to use remaining funds for purchasing motorbikes has been obtained from the EU.
R6	To simplify the financial system so there should not be any financial gap. This improvement should be done with the opening of the two bank accounts which will have to be supplied as required without, if possible, no delay from the part of UNDP.	This problem has been resolved. In order to improve the performance of the park's activities, an exclusive bank account for the project in Namibe was opened. This bank account is administrated by the National Park Administrator and the Head of Department of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism in Namibe Province (Mr. José Ngola). The payment of salaries of the park staff is made directly by UNDP to the bank account of each park staff.
R7	To organize at least one visit to a park well managed in the neighboring countries with similar environment (Zambia, Namibia, south Africa,) for the Park administrator, the project coordinator, the INBAC DG and some other who could be interested. The Gorongosa National Park in Mozambique would be a very good example as it was also stopped and destroyed by a civil war and is in reconstruction.	The exchange with agencies involved in community conservation in Namibia will be initiated through a visit by a group from the project to northern Namibia during which further steps will be discussed and planned. A visit to Mozambique would be interesting and will be discussed for 2016.
R8	To increase drastically the visibility: to post big signs in many places: in the airport of Luanda, in town, on the way to Namibe, in the city of Namibe, at the entrances of the park; to post smaller signs/pictures in the different travel agencies, big shopping malls. To advertise in different newspapers, magazines. A presentation of the park should be done with pictures. To inform the EU Delegation in advance on the visibility actions. To produce press releases and send to the national press	During 2014 and 2015, a number of visibility activities have been implemented, including 9 billboards (dimensions: 3m x 6m), designing and printing leaflets and posters and producing a movie about Iona park that is being finalized. The remaining funds will be used for further visibility activities in 2016, including the finalization of the movie and a stakeholder event (public workshop) in Namibe.
R9	To urge the Minister to regularly inform the	Interaction between UNDP and the Minister of

officials involved in the park (provincial, municipal and communal levels) of their responsibility vis-à-vis the park and their commitment which is required. To call a meeting under the Minister responsibility to give the official point of view so that all officials actors speak the same language regarding the park	Environment is relatively frequent and close and includes topics relevant to the Iona project, which is a high priority in the Ministry.
--	--

In the 4th quarter of 2015, UNDP initiated the Mid-term review (MTR) of the project. As indicated in the monitoring and evaluation plan of the PRODOC, the project was subject to an independent assessment. The MTR is a monitoring tool to identify challenges and map out corrective actions to ensure that the project is on track to achieve maximum results in its conclusion. Thus, the evaluation concentrated on effectiveness, efficiency and improvement opportunities. The first draft of the report has been circulated among project partners in December 2015. The final report has been received in late March 2016 and been accepted.

In addition, the project management has taken measures to strengthen the implementation and successfully perform the project, as follows:

Difficulties	Measures taken
Steering committee (Board) chaired by Minister meets too infrequently	Conduct regular meetings (quarterly) of the technical committee of the steering committee (chaired by INBAC Director) to discuss and resolve technical issues, including quarterly reports. These can also help prepare the high-level Project Board meetings (chaired by Minister) where overall policy and key issues can then be discussed and decided based on the recommendations of the Technical Committee. In addition it will be attempted to hold at least 2 Board meetings during 2016, although this is always difficult due to the tight schedule of the high-level politicians involved.
Insufficient coordination and communication among institutions and with consultants	Weekly meetings between INBAC and UNDP are being held in order to improve the interaction with consultants and contribute to a better overall management of the project
Park management has not been sufficiently involved in some project activities	Field visits and work meetings by consulting companies doing community study and park management plan have directly involved park staff in the field
Too little engagement with communities in the park	Strengthening the work with the communities is clearly a priority for the remaining time of the project and the time that this work will require for lasting impact is a key reason for the intended no-cost extension request. Already park staff are

	interacting with the communities frequently, but this does not happen within a strategic engagement plan. In order to improve interaction and engagement with local communities, the National Park Administrator will attend the regular meetings of the traditional chiefs (sobas) in Iona Commune. Once the major use (and non-use) zones of the park have been defined (about July 2016), a program for communicating and discussing this plan with the communities will be implemented by the park staff (rangers) and a local NGO that will be contracted for this purpose. The project team is also preparing an ecotourism strategy whose implementation will involve the communities.
Transboundary relationship with Namibia evolving slowly at political level	The project decided to initiate the exchange at technical level, with advances at political level following later. An exchange visit of project staff to Namibia is planned for the first half of 2016.
Some budgeted activities, especially with regard to community engagement, will not be completed by the time of scheduled project closure	Request no-cost extension

Changes introduced in the implementation

During the implementation phase some changes were introduced to the original project design to better address important national conditions that were not taken into account or were underestimated during the design process. The table below points out the modifications introduced:

As provided in the PRODOC	Changes introduced
Output 1.1: The park staff position would initially comprise of 1 park administrator; 1 senior conservator; 1 senior ranger; 3 rangers; 1 mechanic; 2 gate guards; 1 administrative assistant; and 2 general assistants. However, it is important to highlight that as also provided in the PRODOC, the formal designation of the park staff position may change once INBAC is functional.	During the inception workshop, the need to update the initial staff structure was pointed out, especially because there were no staff to carry out the security in the Iona Park. Thereby, the priority to hire 20 park rangers, 1 International Park Manager and 1 National Park Administrator was presented and agreed on during the inception workshop.
Output 1.1 (i): A highly qualified and experienced professional park administrator has to be appointed to lead the park team. If a suitably qualified park administrator cannot be found in Angola, an International Park Manager will be hired during the first two years in order to be a mentor and train the National Park Administrator and the local park staff.	MINAMB has recruited an International Park Manager in September 2013. The project assessed that two years for the duration of this position would not have been ideal given the complex tasks of training the other park staff and supporting the design and implementation of the park management plan. The continued availability of funds in this budget line justified the continuation of the duties of the International Park Manager. All project partners have accepted this change.
Output 1.2: Espinheira post has been chosen to be the central administrative base for the Iona NP. Salondjamba and Iona posts were chosen to be peripheral network of control points in an initial phase.	MINAMB decided to prioritize the construction of infrastructure in Pediva post in this phase, instead of Iona, since Pediva post is at the border of the park, is a strategic point to control access and there were no infrastructure in this area, whereas Iona is at the center of the park.
Output 1.2 (i): Prepare an environmental impact assessment (EIA) to all infrastructure within the Iona Park	MINAMB decided to not pursue this idea, since all infrastructure built in the park already existed before the war period and significant environmental, social and economic impacts were therefore not expected.
Output 2.3: Assess the current state of the following protected areas: Cangandala NP; Bicular NP; Luando SNR; Mupa NP; Caméia NP; and Quiçama NP	Based on a rapid evaluation of the 9 Protected areas in Angola, INBAC has decided to change the areas that have been prioritized in this output, as follow: Mavinga NP; Luengue-Luina NP; Maiombe NP and Cameia NP. As planned earlier in PRODOC, Luando SNR and Mupa NP were kept. The reason was that Cangandala, Bicular and Quiçama NPs are all parts of the upcoming GEF-5 biodiversity project were more detailed studies can be implemented.

Visibility

As agreed in the communication and visibility plan, the objective of this component is to (i) communicate to the public the positive results of the partnership between the EU, UNDP, GEF and the Government of Angola within this project; (ii) to promote MINAMB's work in this area; and (iii) to promote the EU and UNDP's work in Angola in rehabilitating Iona Park and improve the management of the protected areas.

During the year 2015, the following communication materials were produced and distributed at national and international events:

Communication material	Objective / Distribution	Target audience	Copies issued	Issue date
Information leaflets	Basic information about the project and donors / Seminars and fairs	General public	6,100	August 2015
Booklets	Basic information about the project and donors / Booklets' event and seminars	General public	3,000	October 2015
Posters (80cm x 2m)	Project's communication / events	General public	2	July 2015
Caps & T-shirts	Project's communication/ events	General public; donors; stakeholders	100 caps 100 t-shirts	August 2015
Banners (4m x 2m)	Project's communication/ events	General public	2	July 2015
Stickers	Project's communication/ project's equipment and vehicles	General public	500	July 2015
Billboards (3m x 6m)	Project's communication/ Luanda: Av. Hoji-ya- Henda, Revolução de Outubro, Domestic airport; Namibe and Huila provinces	General public	9	December 2015
Signs through Namibe – Iona Park	Park's signaling / Namibe – Iona Park	General public	6	July 2015

MINAMB and INBAC approved the project's logotype with Iona's flora and fauna:



Interviews with implementing partners' representatives have increased the visibility for the project by publishing articles in national newspapers (Annex 5).

Annexes

Annex 1: Inventory

Provided as a separate file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 2: Progress towards results matrix

Provided as a separate file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 3: Finance report 2015

Provided as a separate file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 4: Annual work plan 2016

Provided as a separate file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 5: Communication and visibility

Provided as a separate file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 6: List of contracts above € 60,000

Provided as a separated file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].

Annex 7: Minutes of the Project Board meeting in 2015

Provided as a separated file [EU_Annual Report 2015_Annexes].