



TERMINAL EVALUATION of the Project

**Building Local Capacity for Conservation and Sustainable Use of
Biodiversity in the Okavango Delta (BioKavango)**

[PIMS 2028, ATLAS 00050134]

Inception Report

*Dr. Keith Lindsay
The Environment and Development Group
41 Walton Crescent
Oxford, OX1 2JQ
United Kingdom*

July 10, 2011

Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	ii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Brief description of the project.....	1
3. Context and purpose of the evaluation.....	2
4. Methodology of data collection	2
5. Assessment of evidence	3
6. Evaluation Report Format and Annexes	6
7. Evaluation Time Frame	6
8. Evaluation Team Composition.....	6
Annexes.....	7

Acronyms and abbreviations

AVCU	Aquatic Vegetation Control Unit
BD	Biodiversity
BDC	Biodiversity Coordinator
BECS	Botswana Ecotourism Certification System
BOGA	Botswana Guides Association
BPMC	Biokavango Project Management Committee
BTO	Botswana Tourism Organization
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DC	District Commissioner
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
DoT	Department of Tourism
DVCAA	Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
DWNP	Department of Wildlife and National Parks
GEF	Global Environment Facility
FC	Fisheries Coordinator
HATAB	Hotel and Tourism Association of Botswana
IFMS	Improved Fisheries Management System
ITRS	Identification of Tourism Related Sites
IWRM	Integrated Resources Water Management
JMC	Joint Management Committee
KCS	Kalahari Conservation Society
MOMS	Management Oriented Monitoring System
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
ODIS	Okavango Delta Information System
ODMP	Okavango Delta Management Plan
OFA	Okavango Fishers Association
OFMC	Okavango Fishers Management Committee
OKACOM	Permanent Okavango River Commission
ORI	Okavango Research Institute (former HOORC)
OWMC	Okavango Wetland Management Committee
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SAP	Strategic Action/ Program/Plan
SAREP	Southern Africa Regional Environment Program
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis

TE	Terminal Evaluation
TLB	Tawana Land Board
TS	Tourism Specialist
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WCM	Water Component Manager
WQM	Water Quality Monitoring Program

1. Introduction

This Inception Report covers the initial period of the Terminal Evaluation (TE), including the arrival of the Consultant in the region (3 July), meetings with officials in the UNDP Regional Office in Pretoria (4-5 July) and the Botswana national office in Gaborone (6 July), and the meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) in Maun on 7 July. The methodology proposed for the TE was discussed and critiqued at the PSC meeting, where attendees were asked to submit any further comments by close of business on 8 July. The feedback period is now completed and the proposed methodology is considered as accepted.

This report outlines the Consultant's understanding of the objectives of the TE, the basic details of the BioKavango project and the elements of the methodology that will be employed during the remainder of the mission.

2. Brief description of the project

The Okavango Delta, the largest Ramsar Site in the world, is a globally important wetland ecosystem situated in northern Botswana. While the ecological integrity of this wetland remains largely intact, there are signs it is being slowly eroded in the face of gradually rising anthropogenic pressures. There is an urgent need across Botswana's wetland environments to balance competing uses of water and other wetland resources by production sectors, while providing for biodiversity conservation objectives. This need has led the Government of Botswana to develop a National Wetlands Policy and Strategy (now in the process of enactment). A Management Plan for the Okavango Delta (ODMP) was developed and is being implemented as a schema for sustainable development in the area. This Plan is the first of a series of Plans that will be written for wetlands.

The Project is designed to support the elaboration and implementation of the ODMP. The GEF has financed the incremental costs of lifting barriers to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives into three production sectors: water, tourism and fisheries, all dependent on ecological services and goods provided by the Okavango River. These barriers include: a systemic and institutional capacity deficit for wetland management, conflicts over access to wetland resources between user groups, weak management of knowledge needed to guide decision making from the local user level to regulatory authorities, and absence of voluntary mechanisms and incentives, to cultivate private industry involvement in conservation. The Project was intended to remove the barriers through a two-tiered set of interventions: i) that build capacity within the regulatory authorities and service providers to assimilate and supply biodiversity management objectives in decision making; and ii) that demonstrate how best to incorporate biodiversity management into day-to-day production practices through pilot projects. A strong emphasis was placed on participation and engagement between the various stakeholders, and building partnerships between government, private sector and rural communities. While focused on the Okavango, it is anticipated that the conservation methods that will be piloted have application in other wetlands within Botswana. To this end, the Project maintained a strong focus on replication.

3. Context and purpose of the evaluation

As stated in the Terms of Reference (Annex 6), the purpose of this evaluation is to provide the project partners i.e. GEF, UNDP and the Government of Botswana with an independent assessment of the impacts and key achievements of the project as compared to the project document for the five years implementation of the project. Assess the expected outcomes and their sustainability and identify and discuss the lessons learned, through measurements of the changes in the set indicators, summarize the experiences gained and recommend for future policy dialogues and changes to the implementation structure.

UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies for regular and medium-sized projects require that a final evaluation be performed upon completion of project implementation. An evaluation at the end of a project's cycle is needed to assess the project's design, scope, relevance, performance and success, to look for early signs of potential impact and sustainability, to promote accountability and transparency, and to provide lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP/GEF activities. It may also contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on the quality of monitoring and evaluation across the broader GEF system.

4. Methodology of data collection

Three sources of primary data and information will be examined:

- Firstly, a wide variety of documents covering project design, implementation progress, monitoring and review (including the Mid-Term Review), studies, District and National Development Plans, policies/legislation/regulations on land and natural resource management, the Okavango Delta Management Plan and products from the EPSMO and OKACOM initiatives – among others.
- 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. The questions asked will aim to provide answers to the points described in the following section. Triangulation of results, i.e. comparing information from different sources, such as documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, will be used to corroborate or check the reliability of evidence.
- Thirdly, direct observations of project results and activities at a selection of field sites, such as Salvinia control operations, waste management facilities, fishing areas and community joint management projects.

Stakeholders interviewed will include:

- Project team, UB and UNDP staff who have project responsibilities
- Regional and District authorities and technical officers

- The Director of DEA, Chair of the Steering Committee
- Project stakeholders
- Government at national and local level
- Community based organisations
- Private-sector individuals and organisations
- NGOs

Since it is not possible, in the limited time available for this Evaluation, to meet all of the stakeholders involved in the wide range of Project activities, some sampling of the total is required. An itinerary of interviews in Maun and Gaborone and visits to Project field sites was proposed by the UNDP Botswana office and the Implementing Agency team and was modified through discussion by the Consultant and members of the PSC. A copy of the provisional itinerary for the consultations, which may still be subject to alteration as the TE proceeds, is attached in Annex 1.

The information collected, including documentary evidence, interviews and observations, will be compiled and organized according to the questions asked in the assessment. The areas covered by the questions are outlined in Annex 2.

5. Assessment of evidence

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 BioKavango, where change of attitudes and operating procedures (“mainstreaming”) is the objective. In such cases, it is reasonable to assess results that can be expected to lead to impacts, namely the Outcomes.

The findings will be rated in conformity with the GEF/UNDP guidelines for final evaluations using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory. Annex 23 is a guide for the use of the scales for rating.

5.1 Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design

This should assess whether the approach used in design and selection of project interventions addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Drivenness

Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation

Assess information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design stages.

Replication approach

Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this is also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Linkages

between the project and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage. This element should also address the question of to what extent the project addresses UNDP priorities; gender, south-south cooperation, poverty-environment linkages (sustainable livelihoods) and disaster prevention and recovery. The linkages between the project and the UNDAF for the particular country/countries and the

5.2 Project Implementation

Implementation Approach

This should include assessments of the following aspects:

1. The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.
2. Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
3. The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
4. The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
5. Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation

Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation

This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

1. The production and dissemination of information and lessons generated by the project.
2. Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.
3. The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
4. Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning

Including an assessment of:

1. The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
2. The cost-effectiveness of achievements
3. Financial management (including disbursement issues)
4. Co-financing

Procurement Management

Including an assessment of:

1. Technical and human resource capacity for procurement management
2. Linkage between work programming, procurement planning, budgeting, and disbursement planning
3. Effectiveness of procurement management, as indicated by results of audits (internal and/or external), and reports of review and supervision missions by IAs.

Sustainability

Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: Development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

5.3 Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives

A description and rating of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) ratings.

This section would also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability, including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff
- Summary table of ratings.

5.4 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the project objectives.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Changes to project strategy, including the log frame indicators and targets

5.5 Lessons learned

This would highlight the ‘best’ and ‘worst’ practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

6. Evaluation Report Format and Annexes

The evaluation report outline in Annex 4 will be followed to the extent practicable. Following annexes are expected to be appended to the main report:

- Evaluation TORs
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, , issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

7. Evaluation Time Frame

The Consultant will conclude the field visit and will complete final discussions with the Project team on 22 July, the final day in Maun. He will then prepare a draft evaluation report and make a presentation of its findings, for additional feedback, at a meeting of the PSC in Maun on 29 July, the final day of the mission in Botswana. The draft evaluation report will be circulated for stakeholder comments and returned with comments after one week to the Consultant, who will have one week to prepare the revision of the final draft of TE report and return it by 12 August.

8. Evaluation Team Composition

The evaluation team is composed of Dr. Keith Lindsay, The Environment & Development Group, based in Oxford, United Kingdom.

Annexes

Annex 1. Programme of meetings for the Terminal Evaluation

Date	Time	Activity	Venue
Thursday 07.07.11	AM	-Inception Meeting for the Terminal Evaluation -PSC Meeting	Maun, Maun Lodge
	PM	-Meeting with OKACOM CEO– Discussions about TDAs and E-flows, SAP/NAP	OKACOM office
Friday 08.07.11	AM	-Courtesy call/visit to the ORI Directorate (Acting Director & Deputy Directors)	Director's Office
	AM	-Meeting with Project Coordinator: Overview of project implementation progress: Achievements, Challenges etc	BIOKAVANGO offices
	PM	- Meeting with Derrick Flatt: Discussions on co-financing role played by the private sector in the project and participation in project reference groups representing both the private sector and HATAB	DDS Office
	PM	-Meeting with the PSC Chair (DEA Director)	DEA Office
	PM	-Meeting with DEA District Coordinator (Mr. S. Motsumi): BIOKAVANGO Project contribution to the implementation of the ODMP	DEA Office
Monday 11.07.11	AM	-Demonstrations and Discussions of <i>Salvinia molesta</i> control and monitoring (pilot sites: Xakanaxa camp, moremi safaris and camp moremi) -Meeting with Dr Naidu Kurugundla, Head of Aquatic Vegetation Control Unit, DWA to discuss partnership with the project in <i>Salvinia molesta</i> control & monitoring/and capacity building for tour operators	Moremi Game Reserve-Xakanaxa
	PM	-Visit to Thuso Lutheran Rehabilitation Centre (TLRC) – to view an operational constructed wetland polishing system	TLRC
	PM	-Meeting with DoT Regional Tourism Officer (Ms L. Karanja): Discuss Guidelines for Licensing House Boats and Motor Boats	DoT
Tuesday 12.07.11	AM	-Meeting with Tawana Land Board: Role of BIOKAVANGO Project in BD mainstreaming within the TLB– Achievements and challenges	TLB office
	AM	-Demonstrations on Identification of Tourism Related Sites (ITRS) by TLB Land Surveyor -Maps showing zones and tourism sites	TLB Office
	AM	-Meeting with S. Mosojane, former Biodiversity Coordinator (seconded to Tawana Land Board): Discuss biodiversity mainstreaming at the TLB	Maun
	PM	Meeting with Map Ives : Discussions on co-financing role played by the OWS	OWS Office
	PM	-Meeting with I. Magole, Livelihoods Specialist for SAREP (former Tourism Specialist for Biokavango): Discuss joint management planning at Tubu/JMC -Meeting with Geoffrey Khwarae, Belda Mosepele: Former BIOKAVANGO project Managers (Water and Fisheries), currently working for SAREP	SAREP office
Wednesday 13.07.11	AM	-Meeting with David Kays (Ngamiland Adventure Safaris): View of the private sector on the Tubu/NG25 Joint Management System/Monitoring of indicator species within NG25 and NG26/Liquid waste management in NG25 & NG26 lodges	David's office
	AM	-Visit GIS lab and meet with Prof Vander Post/Mr Dhliwayo – Explanation of ODIS and how it works	ORI GIS Lab

Date	Time	Activity	Venue
	PM	-Visit to Environmental Laboratory and Meeting with Prof Masamba: Explanation/Demonstration of Water Quality Monitoring Program Results	ORI Environmental Laboratory
	PM	-Visit to ORI library and meeting with Ms Zanele– Demonstration of the Knowledge Management System	ORI Library
	PM	-Visit to ORI Pete Smith Natural/Herbarium facility and meet with Dr Demel Fanta and Mr Madome– Discussion on its role and how the project supported the facility	ORI Pete Smith Herbarium
Thursday 14.07.11	AM	-Meeting with Communication Specialist at OKACOM (Ms Monica Morrison), the former UB-ORI Librarian who worked with the project on setting up knowledge management initiatives at ORI	OKACOM Office
	AM	-Visits to Shorobe Pilot site: JMC focused activities on Shorobe Basketry Multi-Purpose Cooperative Society (Basketry and Agro-forestry)	Shorobe
	PM	-Mike Murray-Hudson (head of Environmental Monitoring: meeting to discuss general project formulation and environmental monitoring Unit at ORI	ORI
Friday 15.07.11	AM	-Thabang Dikatholo (DOD-Maun): meeting to discuss District Development Planning processes with regards to ODMP/BIOKAVANGO mainstreaming into DDP7	DA
	AM/PM	-Meeting with Project Coordinator to discuss project implementation processes	ORI
	PM	-Meeting with Belda Mosepele, former Fisheries Coordinator	Maun
Saturday 16.07.11	AM	-Meeting with Pete Hancock, Birdlife Maun -Meeting with Chandida Monyadzwe, SAREP	Maun Lodge
Monday 18.07.11	AM/PM	-Meeting with DWNP (O Setswalo), OFMC and OFA members: Discussions on the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries Regulations, • conflict resolution • Improved Fisheries Management System (OFMC business) • the Code of Conduct for sustainable Fishing • Set Asides/fishing free zones • Channel Blockages Visits to set asides and observation of how code of conduct is complied with.	Shakawe
Tuesday 19.07.11	AM/PM	-Visits to Pilot sites in Shakawe and meet with Boiteko Trust, Teemachane Trusts, and Tourism Lodges (Drotsky, Xaro, Okavango Fishing Camp): discuss about their fishing activities and how they have partnered with the BioKavango/DWNP in improved fisheries management	Shakawe
Wednesday 20.07.11	AM	-Visits to pilot Sites in Ngarange to meet with Itekeng Trust: To discuss aspects of their proposed recreational fishing/cultural fishing activities	Ngarange
	PM	-Visits to pilot sites in Seronga (Mbiroba Lodge): To see the constructed wetland polishing system, and discuss inundation problems resulting from the extra-ordinary high floods of 2009/10/11.	Seronga
	PM	-Meeting with Mrs. Price (Okavango Fishing Camp): discuss about their fishing activities and how they have partnered with the Biokavango/DWNP in improved fisheries management.	Shakawe

Date	Time	Activity	Venue
Thursday 21.07.11	AM/PM	-Visits to Pilot sites in Tubu/Gumare and meeting with JMC and Tubu headman: Discuss MOMs/Tubu multi-purpose fishing cooperative/management planning etc	Tubu/Gumare
Friday 22.07.11	AM/PM	-Meetings with Project Coordinator on Mainstreaming Tracking Tool -Meetings with other stakeholders missed earlier	ORI ORI/Maun
Monday 25.07.11	0830-0930	-Meeting/Courtesy call to the UB Vice Chancellor/DVCAA	UB, Gaborone
	11:00 – 12:30	-Meeting with Chief of Party for SAREP (Mr. Steve Johnson): How their environment programme is up-scaling Biokavango initiatives to the basin level?	SAREP, Gaborone
	14:30-16:00	-Meeting with Botswana Tourism Organization (S. Ramalepa/Sekgororoane/Malesu): An overview of BECS formulation and implementation progress	BTO, Gaborone
Tuesday 26.07.11	0830-1030	-Meeting with KCS CEO/IWRM Project Coordinator: Partnerships with the Biokavango in water/biodiversity related initiatives	KCS, Gaborone
	11:00 - 12:30	-Meeting with DWNP (Assistant Director Fisheries Shaft Nengu)	DWNP. Gaborone
Wednesday 27.07.11	0830-1030	-Meeting with DEA (Deputy-director Mrs. Segomelo and GEF focal point Mrs. I. Otukile)	DEA, Gaborone
	11:00-12:30	-Meeting with DWNP (Acting Director of Wildlife & National Parks) discuss the review of the WMA Regulations and WMA Guidelines	DWNP. Gaborone
Friday 29.07.11	AM	-Presentation of draft report to PSC meeting	Maun

Annex 1. Terminal Evaluation sample interview questions

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

1. Project Formulation

- Conceptualization/design
- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- Linkages

2. Project Implementation

- Implementation approach
 - Adaptive management
 - Use of electronic/ IT approaches
 - Operational relationships between groups within the Project team
 - Technical capacities of the project
- Monitoring and evaluation processes
- Stakeholder participation
- Financial planning and procurement management
- Sustainability

3. Results

- Attainment of outcomes/ achievement of objectives
- Sustainability of results
- Prospects for scaling

Annex 2. Guidelines for Rating Performance of UNDP Projects

1. Progress toward achieving project objectives

Taking into account the cumulative level of progress compared to the target level across all of the objective indicators, the progress of the project towards meeting its objective, according to the following scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

2. Progress in project implementation

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Annex 4. Terminal Evaluation Sample Report Outline (revised April 2011).

Table of contents

Acronyms

1. Executive summary (including an overall rating of the project)
2. Introduction
3. The project(s) and its development context
4. Findings and Conclusions
 - 4.1 Project Formulation
 - Conceptualization/Design
 - Country-ownership/Drivenness.
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach.
 - Linkages
 - 4.2. Project Implementation
 - Implementation Approach
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Financial Planning
 - Procurement Management
 - Sustainability
 - 4.3. Results
 - Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives
 - Sustainability
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff
 - Summary Table of ratings.
5. Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Changes to project strategy, including the log frame indicators and targets
6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the ‘best’ and ‘worst’ practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.
7. Evaluation report Annexes
 - Evaluation TORs
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits, , issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

Annex 5. Terms of Reference - Terminal Evaluation

Building Local Capacity for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Okavango Delta (BioKavango)

[PIMS 2028, ATLAS 00050134]

1. Introduction

a) UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

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

b) The Project Objectives and Context Within the Country

The Okavango Delta, one of the largest Ramsar Sites in the world, is a globally important wetland ecosystem situated in northern Botswana. While the ecological integrity of this wetland remains largely intact, there are signs that it is being slowly eroded in the face of gradually rising anthropogenic pressures. This places an urgent need across Botswana's wetland environments to balance competing uses

of water and other wetland resources by production sectors, while providing for biodiversity conservation objectives. This need has led the Government of Botswana to develop a National Wetlands Policy and Strategy (2001) which is now in the process of being revised, while at site level a Management Plan for the Okavango Delta (ODMP) has been developed and is currently being implemented as a schema for sustainable development in the area. This Plan is the first of a series of Plans that will be written for wetlands.

The GEF-funded project “Building Local Capacity for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Okavango Delta” (hereinafter referred to as “BIOKAVANGO”) has been designed to support the elaboration and implementation of the ODMP. More in detail, the project aims at lifting barriers to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives into three production sectors: water, tourism and fisheries, all dependent on ecological services and goods provided by the Okavango River. These barriers include: a systemic and institutional capacity deficit for wetland management, conflicts over access to wetland resources between user groups, weak management of knowledge needed to guide decision making from the local user level to regulatory authorities, and absence of voluntary mechanisms and incentives, to cultivate private industry involvement in conservation. The Project will remove the barriers through a two-tiered set of interventions: i) that build capacity within the regulatory authorities and service providers to assimilate and supply biodiversity management objectives in decision making; and ii) that demonstrate how best to incorporate biodiversity management into day-to-day production practices through pilot projects. A strong emphasis is placed on participation and engagement between the various stakeholders, and building partnerships between government, private sector and rural communities. While focused on the Okavango, it is anticipated that the conservation methods that were piloted would have application in other wetlands within Botswana and the basin at large.

The long-term goal of the BIOKAVANGO Project is: “**The natural integrity and ecological services provided by Botswana’s wetlands are sustained**”. The Project Objective is: “**Biodiversity management objectives are mainstreamed into the main production sectors of the Okavango Delta**”. The Okavango Delta provided a testing ground for new conservation approaches. While the ecological landscape of the Okavango Delta is unique, and the Project was designed to address the specific threats facing the area, the planned approaches to integrating conservation objectives into the production sectors are adaptable for replication elsewhere in Botswana and in other wetlands within Southern Africa.

The Project focused on three production sectors that dominate resource uses within the Okavango Delta: water harvesting, tourism and artisanal and recreational fisheries, all potential threats to biodiversity, but which also provided good opportunities for the successful integration of biodiversity objectives within production systems. Project design was founded on the recognition that command-and-control approaches alone would be inadequate to ensure effective and sustainable mainstreaming of biodiversity management objectives in these sectors. A two-pronged strategy to mainstreaming biodiversity in these sectors was

adopted, namely: i) transferring certain key responsibilities for biodiversity management to land users ensuring that land use activities are undertaken with due diligence to conservation objectives, and ii) building capacity within the regulatory authorities responsible for resource use allocation and management to assimilate and apply biodiversity management objectives in decision-making. The strategy was achieved by developing and implementing user-friendly conservation management models, centralising and making data accessible for decision making and providing technical assistance to users to understand the data and make informed management decisions.

Activities were implemented by local and national government agencies in partnership with resource users, including communities, fishermen, and the tourism industry:

- *Government level* – with the aim of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives into District land use planning and management decision making systems and accompanying regulations (such as lease holds); ensuring biodiversity is fully addressed within the Okavango Delta Management Plan including water harvesting plans; building the capacity of government agencies, particularly Land Boards, to address biodiversity conservation issues within their activities and to improve management and enforcement as a driver for transforming production practices.
- *Land resource user level* – with the aim of empowering land users in the target sectors to manage resources sustainably, measuring the impacts of their activities on biodiversity and associated ecosystem processes, and introducing new management approaches, that assure the simultaneous attainment of conservation objectives in the regular course of doing business.

Interventions were designed to contribute to four complementary Outcomes, namely:

Outcome 1: Enabling environment strengthened at both systemic and institutional levels.

Outcome 2: Biodiversity management objectives integrated into the water sector.

Outcome 3: The tourism sector is directly contributing to biodiversity conservation objectives in the Okavango Delta.

Outcome 4: Biodiversity friendly management methods are inducted into fisheries production systems

The UNDP/GEF project document was approved in March 2006, and activities started in June 2006 when the first disbursement was made.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) served as a body for policy recommendations related to enhancement of programme implementation and attainment of objectives. The PSC comprised of members as recommended in the Project Document.

Further details on the partners, resources and geographical context are available in the Project Document (see list of documents and associated links on page 28).

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation of the BioKavango project is commissioned by the Government of Botswana's Ministry of Environment, Wildlife & Tourism, University of Botswana's Okavango Research Institute, UNDP-Botswana and the GEF in accordance with the project's M&E Plan. It is intended to assess the performance of the project against planned results. The results of the evaluation will also inform the partners in the project, on the need for further support in complementary areas to achieve sustainable development.

This evaluation will provide a professional assessment of the project design, scope, status of implementation and capacity to achieve the set objectives. The evaluation will also collate and analyze lessons learned and best practices obtained during the period of implementation of the project for the development and implementation of future environment programmes in Botswana.

3. Products Expected from the Evaluation

The key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing are:

Evaluation inception report— An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The consultant will prepare a brief inception note within 3 days of commencement of the TE reflecting in it all substantive and logistical issues that would have to be addressed in order to complete the review successfully

Draft evaluation report— The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

Presentation of the findings to key stakeholders in a joint UNDP/GEF Govt-UB and Steering Committee (Possibly Power point slides) covering key findings of the TE and obtain participatory comments from relevant stakeholders.

Final evaluation report - Stand alone document approximately 45-50 pages that substantiate its recommendations and conclusions. The report shall be structured along the outline indicated in Annex 1., i.e.:

- Include a detailed record of consultations with stakeholders (to be provided as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
- If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.
- An updated METT (Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool), with Evaluators comments. (See METT sample in List Document on page 28).

Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, as appropriate.

The following structure is proposed for the Evaluation Report:

1.	Executive summary
2.	Introduction
3.	The project(s) and its development context
4.	Findings and Conclusions
	4.1 Project formulation
	4.2 Implementation
	4.3 Results
5.	Recommendations
6.	Lessons learned
7.	Annexes

The evaluation will last for 6 weeks and the final report to be concluded within 1 week of completion of the in-country part of the mission and sent to UNDP-Botswana. As part of the evaluation the consultant is expected to consult with a broad range of stakeholders within government, private sector, civil society organization, media, academia and local communities.

4. Methodology and Evaluation Approach

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of processes. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to improve the project; for this to happen all stakeholders must fully understand and identify with the evaluation report, even if they might disagree with some of the contents. The evaluation will start with a review of the key project documentation including key reports and correspondence. It will include visits to UNDP Country Office, Project Executing Offices of Government as well as selected national partners and stakeholders, including interviews (by phone if necessary) with

key individuals both within the project, the government, and independent observers of the project and its activities. Field visits to project sites will be conducted to view activities first hand and to meet with site partners, local leaders, and local government officials. Note: not ALL project sites need be visited. It is suggested that the Evaluation Team discuss the optimum number and duration of site visits with the Project team at the start

A review of partners and appreciation of their linkage and interest in the project and the relevance of the project to their current situation is essential. The evaluation is expected to obtain the views of both the project implementing parties, the project governance structure and the project beneficiaries. The final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will be concluded at inception.

The evaluation will also reflect on whether and how monitoring and evaluation were considered in the project design and undertaken during implementation. In addition to a descriptive assessment, a rating following the six-point rating scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) should be applied to the following parts of the evaluation findings:

- Executive Summary: Progress towards project goal and outcome
- Project Implementation
- Results: Attainment of Objectives, and Progress towards Outcomes
- Monitoring & Evaluation System

For each Outcome, sustainability will be assessed using the 4 point-scale of Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability; Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability; Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability, and Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. The following elements of sustainability will be considered:

- Financial resources: Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- Socio-political: Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

- Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.
- Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

The evaluation will cover all project activities from Inception to the time of evaluation; include all private sector, civil society and government entities involved in the project. Although the project had listed individuals as target, due to the duration and scale of the programme, the sampling will need to systematically select those individuals that have interacted most with the project. The BioKavango project was aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity management objectives into the main production sectors.

It is anticipated that the methodology to be used for the TE will include the following:

- a) Review of documentation including but not limited to:-
 - i) Project Document
 - ii) Project implementation reports (APR/PIR's);
 - iii) Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
 - iv) Audit reports
 - v) Mid Term Evaluation report
 - vi) M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
 - vii) Baselines and other study reports produced during the project implementation
 - viii) District Development Plans
 - ix) Policies, Legislations and Regulations regarding land and natural resources management
 - x) The Okavango Delta Management Plan
 - xi) Transboundary Diagnostic Assessment (OKACOM)
 - xii) Strategic Action Plan (OKACOM)

- b) Review of supplementary documentation as follows (non-exhaustive):
 - xiii) Minutes of the project Steering Committee and Technical Committee meetings;
 - xiv) MAPs
 - xv) MoU between the UNDP and UB on project implementation
 - xvi) MoU between the Tawana Land Board (TLB) and the University of Botswana on cooperation for biodiversity mainstreaming
 - xvii) The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

- xviii) Technical reports and publications
- xix) Documents on project website: www.orc.ub/biokavango

- c) Interviews in the field with stakeholders shall include, among others:
 - xx) Project team, UB and UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
 - xxi) Regional and District authorities and technical officers
 - xxii) The Director of DEA, Chair of the Steering Committee.
 - xxiii) Project stakeholders
 - xxiv) Community based organisations

- d) Presentation of the findings

The initial conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the Project team, Technical Steering Committee and UNDP/GEF for their comments. Once these are integrated, a final draft will be presented to UNDP for comments by wider group of stakeholders. Written comments will be submitted to the team leader for finalization of the TE report within a period of two weeks

5. Implementation Arrangements

The Evaluation is to generate the following information that will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge:

- a) Management Arrangements

The role of UNDP-Botswana is to contract the consultant, oversee the implementation of the agreed schedule of consultation activities, wide stakeholder consultation and verification of all facts in the report and oversee the production of the final Report and follow-up actions.

The Country Office is the main operational point for the evaluation. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, co-ordinate with the Government and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP/GEF/Regional Coordinating Unit, UNDP Country Office and the Government. These three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion.

- b) Time Frame

The evaluation will be undertaken in 20 working days. The following table depicts tasks, timelines and deliverables, for which the consultant will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office (UNDP-Botswana), indicating for each, who is responsible for its completion.

In addition, the evaluators are expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge sharing and dissemination. Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables are included in the annexes of the ToR for the evaluation being commissioned. The consultant shall allocated 20 working days over a 30-day during which s/he will be engaged in the evaluation.

Table 1: Indicative Evaluation Work plan.

Task	Time Frame (weeks)				Responsible Entity
	1	2	3	4	
Desk review					Evaluation Team
Briefings of evaluators					UNDP Mgnt
Finalizing evaluation design & methods, and preparing detailed inception report					Evaluation Team
Reference Group Meets to Review Inception Report					UNDP PM
Field Visits & Interviews					UNDP PM
Analysis					Evaluation Team
Preparing the draft report					Evaluation Team
Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance)					UNDP PM
Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report					Evaluation Team
Debriefing Session					Evaluation Team

6. Consultant Competencies & Selection Procedures

The TE will be conducted by an independent International Consultant. The BOKAVANGO project management (Manager) will provide support in the field as may be required including making appointments with regional, district and village stakeholders. The International consultant will be responsible for the delivery, content, technical quality and accuracy of the evaluation, as well as the recommendations. He/She will have a wide range of skills, as follows:

- Evaluation specialist with at least a Master’s degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resources Management, Development Studies, Sustainable Development or other relevant field;

- A minimum of ten (10) years of relevant work experience in the field of biodiversity conservation and related activities. Relevant experience in Southern Africa will be added advantage;
- Proven expertise in evaluating multifaceted programmes/projects and results-oriented monitoring and evaluation;
- Previous experience in evaluating programmes/project for UNDP or other UN/multilateral agencies is essential; previous experience evaluating GEF projects will be a distinctive advantage;
- Excellent analytical and reporting skills and fluency in written and spoken English are essential;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.
- Knowledge of international comparative policy, legislation and their application to deliver conservation of biodiversity will be a requirement distinctive advantage.
- Knowledge of the national policy and legislation in the field of biodiversity will be a distinctive advantage.

Some prior knowledge of the following would be ideal:

- GEF, UNDP reporting frameworks
- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
- Okavango Delta Management Plan
- Knowledge to assess fit with CBD work programs and post 2010 targets
- Millennium Development Goals

Evidence of previous relevant work will also be required in the form of resumes, work samples, references, etc. to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience. These ToRs demand that the evaluator be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation.

The consultants are invited to submit CVs and a Price Schedule which will be evaluated according to the Criteria below,

Stage 1: Technical Capability of the Consultant to deliver the required consultancy outputs evaluated on a scale of 0-50 points wherein the qualifying mark is 70%. The criteria to be used are shown below:

Name of Consultant	Education Master or Equivalent (Yes/No)	Years of Experience >=10 (Yes/No)	Relevance of Educ. Background (Energy & Environment) [20]	Evaluation Experience [20]	Work Experience in Conservation & Development [10]	English Language (Yes/No)	Total 50	Comments
							0	
							0	
							0	
							0	
							0	
Name, Date and Signature of Evaluator:								

Stage 2: Financial Offer of all submissions meeting the 70% mark are considered based on the Price Structure below and the lowest quote selected.

Name of Consultancy:

.....

Price Schedule Breakdown Structure (in US\$ or BWP)				
Item	Unit Cost	Description of Unit	# of Units	Total Cost
Daily Consulting Fee		day		0
Insurance		unit		0
Risks & Inconvenience		unit		0
Hardship Conditions		unit		0
Accommodation and Meals		unit		0
Transport (including air and local)		unit		0
Communication (tel & internet)		unit		0
Stationery		unit		0
Other Costs (specify)		unit		0
Grand Total				0

Submitted by (Name & Signature):

Date:

7. Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation for this project reflects the diverse range of activities as defined in the Log-Frame and Results Matrix. Three main elements to be evaluated are Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness. The Annex on the structure of the Evaluation Report outlines the content and depth of the analysis.

a) Outcomes

Assess progress towards attaining the project's environmental objectives and outcomes. This should include the extent to which the project contributed to: (a) an enabling environment strengthened at both systemic and institutional levels; (b) integration of biodiversity management objectives into the water sector; (c) enhancing biodiversity conservation through the tourism sector; and (d) inducting biodiversity-friendly management methods into fisheries production systems.

b) Implementation approach

- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various individuals, agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. Assess the level to which the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) and performance indicators were used as project management tools;
- Evaluate any partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the countries/region;
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP in support of the implementing agencies, regional and national institutions;
- Make recommendations as to how to improve future projects' performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency in achieving impact on institutional and capacity development and the targeted environmental concerns.

c) Country Ownership/drivenness

Assess the extent to which the representatives of the participating countries (including governmental officials, civil society, etc.) were actively involved in project implementation.

d) Co-financing

Assess whether the governments and other partners have maintained financial commitments to the project and undertake a reconciliation of the co-financing pledged and realised.

e) Stakeholder Participation and benefits accrued

Assess the level of public involvement in the project and comment as to whether the scope of public involvement has been appropriate given the broader goals and objectives of the project;

Review and evaluate the extent to which project benefits have reached the intended beneficiaries.

f) Sustainability

Assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes/benefits after completion of GEF funding; and describe the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes. Factors of sustainability that should be considered include; institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) social sustainability, policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives, financial sustainability.

g) Replication Approach

Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of: strengthening country ownership/drivenness; strengthening stakeholder participation; institutional structure and capacity building; application of adaptive management strategies; efforts to secure sustainability; knowledge transfer; and the role of M&E in project implementation. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly.

Make recommendations on how the lessons and experience can be incorporated into the design of similar initiatives in the future.

h) Financial Planning

Assess the financial control systems, including reporting and planning, that allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget;

Assess the extent to which the flow of funds had been proper and timely both from UNDP and from the project management unit to the field;

Evaluate the extent of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

i) Cost effectiveness

Assess compliance with the incremental cost criteria (GEF funds used to finance a component of the project that would not take place without GEF funding and securing co-funding and associated funding); and

Assess the extent to which the project has completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes according to schedule and as cost effectively as initially planned.

j) Monitoring and Evaluation

Review the project's reporting systems and their efficiency; and the implementation of the project's monitoring and evaluation plans including any adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management) – and specifically, assess whether the lessons, insights and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation were applied successfully to re-direct the project.

8. Evaluation ethics

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' document, attached as Annex IV. The document outlines evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers. These include measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly interviewing or obtaining information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

9. ToR annexes

- I. Norms for Evaluation in the UN System (<http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqnorms>)
- II. Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (<http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqstandards>)
- III. UNDP Evaluation Policy (<http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>)
- IV. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>)

- V. Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System
(http://www.unevaluation.org/documentdownload?doc_id=100&file_id=547)
- VI. Project Document
(<http://dl.dropbox.com/u/20548449/BioKavango%20Terminal%20Evaluation/FSP%20Signed%20ProDoc.pdf>)
- VII. Terminology in GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations
(http://www.undp.org/gef/05/documents/me/GEF_ME_Policies_and_Precedures_06.pdf)
- VIII. Terminal Evaluation Report – Sample outline
(<http://dl.dropbox.com/u/20548449/BioKavango%20Terminal%20Evaluation/Terminal%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Sample%20Outline.pdf>)
- IX. Explanation on Terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations
(<http://dl.dropbox.com/u/20548449/BioKavango%20Terminal%20Evaluation/Explanation%20on%20Terminology%20-%20GEF%20Evaluations.pdf>)
- X. Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool
(<http://dl.dropbox.com/u/20548449/BioKavango%20Terminal%20Evaluation/Monitoring%20Effectiveness%20Tracking%20Tool%202009%20%28BW%29.pdf>)
- XI. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources Table
(<http://dl.dropbox.com/u/20548449/NMT/Cofinancing%20and%20Leveraged%20Resources%20Table.pdf>)