



**UNDP ID PIMS 5590 / GEF ID 9154**

## **Management Response to the Mid-Term Review Report**

### **1. General Project Information**

**Project Title: Managing the human-wildlife interface to sustain the flow of agro-ecosystem services and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands (KGDEP)**

**Project PIMS #: 5590**

**Project ID: 00103617**

**Atlas Award ID #:00100918**

**Start Date: 1 October 2017**

**End Date: 31 December 2023**

**Midterm Review Mission Completion Date: 30<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

**Date of Issue of Management Response: 21 September 2021**

**Prepared by:** UNDP Botswana Country Office, with contributions from s *UNDP BPPS-NCE RTA, the RVCC Project Manager and Project team; Project Board; the Chief Technical Advisor*

**Cleared by:** *The Commissioning Unit RR a.i.; Chair: Project Board; UNDP RTA*

### **2. Context, background and findings**

This GEF-financed, GEF 6 Child Project under the Global Wildlife Programme seeks to improve the management of the human-wildlife interface in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands of Botswana, in order to sustain the flow of agro-ecosystem services and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking. The project outcomes are structured under four impact pathways: (i) Increasing national capacity to tackle wildlife crime, including poaching, wildlife poisoning and illegal trafficking and trade (Component 1);(ii) creating incentives and building systems for wildlife protection by communities, including improved benefits from natural resource use/wildlife management, reduced human wildlife conflict, and diversified, non-consumptive alternative livelihoods (Component 2); (iii) Integrated landscape planning and sustainable land management (SLM) to secure wildlife migratory corridors and improve productivity in communal lands (Component 3); and (iv) gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation. Component 1 has national reach, with some sub-regional and district-focused activities. Components 2 and 3 operate in the expansive domain between the

Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, including both Wildlife Management Areas and surrounding communal lands. Component 4 is cross-cutting.

The mid-term review was carried out between May and July 2021. It was led by an international consultant, Mr Francis Hurst, and a national consultant, Dr Gaseisitswe Masunga. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the team leader was unable to travel in-country, but one field mission was undertaken by the national member of the evaluation team, as documented in the MTR Report.

**The ratings awarded by the MTR are summarized below:**

Element evaluated	MTR Rating awarded (MU)
Objective	MU
	MU
OUTCOME 2	U
OUTCOME 3	MS
OUTCOME 4	MS
Implementation and Adaptive Management	MU
Sustainability	MU

### **3. Management Response to the MTR findings:**

This Management Response to the MTR Report was developed in an iterative manner, including several small-group discussions (convened virtually) involving mainly the UNDP CO, the Project Management Unit, the project's Chief Technical Advisor, and the UNDP RTA, followed by a one-day workshop involving representatives of the Implementing Partner (MENT, DWNP, DEA, DFRR and MLWS) and other key members of the Project Steering Committee (including representatives of the participating Community Trusts). In preparation for the process, the project undertook a critical self-evaluation in order to better understand the current level of achievement, identify key implementation challenges, and develop practicable solutions in response to the MTR recommendations. The UNDP CO senior management also discussed some of the performance, operational and risk management challenges the project faces with the UNDP BPPS Directorate in New York (including the BPPS-NCE Executive Director, and the director of Results Based Management) and the UNDP RTA and identified short-term remedial actions that will be required to ensure full compliance with UNDP and GEF policies and requirements, and measures to be included in a longer-term action plan.

The Midterm Review Report provides useful insights which, in general, are helpful in shaping the approach to be adopted by the project going forward, with a view to maximizing cost-effective delivery of intended end-of-project results, deepening impact and strengthening sustainability. This said, it is noted that there are some differing interpretations of possible causal links between key drivers and enablers in the project landscape and current project performance, but these differences do not detract from the overall value of the MTR Report. It is acknowledged that the project achievement at midterm is off-track, and that it must overcome obstacles that are affecting performance (generation of results), delivery (use of funds), operational and governance arrangements, stakeholder and partner engagement, risk management and sustainability. This acknowledgement precedes the MTR as the UNDP CO took a decision at the start of 2021 to halt some of the activities under the project to better identify and manage the emerging risks and obstacles affecting its performance.

The evaluators have made 11 individual recommendations, with further suggestions for adaptive management embedded in the narrative of the Report. The recommendations fall into a number of categories or clusters (see Table 1 below) and the responses under each cluster must be linked in order to ensure coherence and appropriate sequencing, and to minimise the potential for triggering unintended knock-on effects and risks. Further, responding effectively to some of the risks requires actions that are not explicitly captured in the MTR recommendations - for example, budgetary revisions that may be required to implement the actions identified. These actions have been included under the relevant response clusters.

Table 1: Clustering of MTR recommendations (wording of recommendations paraphrased for convenience)

Category	Recommendations included
Governance and Implementation Arrangements	#1 - Implementation modality (transition to full NIM)
	#3 -Appointment and reporting line of Project Manager
	# 7 - Engagement of NGOs/Partners
	# 11 - Composition and TOR of PSC
	# 2 Formation of Partner’s Land Use Forum
Technical re-set/design	#4 - Revision of SRF (outcome-level) indicators
	#5 - Re-assessment of Component 2 projects and activities
	# 6 - Additional activity and indicators to implement training for Community Trusts
	#8 - Develop output-level indicator framework and M&E dashboard
Risks and safeguards management	# 9 - Implement ESMP and safeguards management instruments
Sustainability	#10 - Develop a legacy (sustainability) plan

As per the Prodoc, this is a **NIM project**, with the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Tourism (MENT) designated as the government Implementing Partner. In practice, however, it is recognized that the UNDP CO has been leading most execution functions; no funds are transferred to the IP; the PMU staff are appointed on UNDP service contracts; the PMU and the project have a strong UNDP institutional identity; and, the PMU staff are managed directly by UNDP CO staff, with a reporting line to the PSC. This is in part a legacy issue in Botswana, in which, over the past decade, UNDP has taken on responsibility for leading on GEF projects with Government IPs interfacing with projects mainly through the PSC and technical working groups.

At GEF CEO endorsement of this project, an LOA was approved for the UNDP CO to provide limited execution-support services (total value of DPCs: \$14,000), relating to procurement, setting up the PMU and securing services of other service providers under the project. However, the macro-assessment of IP capacity undertaken during PPG indicated LOW RISK, and no HACT micro-assessment was undertaken; there are, therefore, no strong grounds for UNDP to provide execution-support services.

It is understood that the current implementation arrangements are not fully consistent with GEF or UNDP policy. Currently, the level of day-to-day involvement of the UNDP CO in running the project extends beyond execution-support and the firewall between oversight and execution services has become blurred. This impacts the UNDP CO capacity to perform its oversight roles and full Government ownership of the project.

#### **4. An integrated response**

Addressing these recommendations effectively requires an integrated, whole-of-project approach, including identification of both short-term, actions to address immediate operational and risk management issues, and longer-term, activity-specific and cross-Component adaptive management solutions to enable the project to cost-effectively deliver the anticipated results in its remaining lifespan.

**1. Mid Term Review Recommendation 1**

**The KGDEP is put under NIM within the MENT and coordinated from DEA** in line with the arrangements outlined in the Project Document to be compliant with the Grant Agreement and UNDP’s policies for NIM projects. This will ensure national ownership and ensure that the UNDP CO can better perform its oversight and quality assurance functions as the GEF Agency and thereby reduce potential conflicts of interest and confused lines of responsibility and accountability. By returning to an oversight role, UNDP will be able to more effectively ensure that the project is implemented in full compliance with the terms of the UNDP SES Policy.

**Management Response:**

**The recommendation is accepted.**

Senior management in the MENT, the Department of Environment Affairs (DEA) and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) - as representatives of the MENT - have expressed willingness to take over the lead in executing the project and managing the PMU, though there are some concerns about existing levels of capacity to do this effectively. The UNDP CO is ready to transition full accountability for project execution to the IP in a phased process, releasing UNDP CO to play a strong oversight and capacity development role as is consistent with the functions that can be charged to the GEF Agency Fee. This process has already begun: (i) the DWNP has taken a lead role for execution under Component 1 (wildlife crime law enforcement); (ii) the TORs and contract of the new Project Manager (PM), appointed by UNDP CO with effect from 16 June 2021, states the following dual reporting line: “The PM will report to the Director of the DEA at the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources Conservation and Tourism (MENT) in close collaboration with DWNP (Dept. of Wildlife and National Parks) and UNDP RR (or duly designated UNDP officer) for all of the project’s substantive and administrative issues. From the strategic point of view of the project, the PM will report on a periodic basis to the Project Steering Committee (PSC).”

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking <sup>1</sup>	
			Comments	Status <sup>2</sup>
1.1. UNDP CO to discuss the implementation arrangements for the project bilaterally with	Dec-January <sup>3</sup>	UNDP (RR a.i. & MENT - PS, DPS, Director Environment Affairs and Director of Wildlife and National Parks)		

<sup>1</sup> If the MTR report is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).

<sup>2</sup> Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.

<sup>3</sup> This will be done as part of the overall re-set process

<p>MENT and agree on a well-managed, documented process, with clear timeframes, for phased transitioning to full NIM. This will include:</p> <p>1.1.1 As a priority, UNDP CO (with guidance from the BPPS-NCE Directorate where required) and MENT will clarify the dual reporting line of the PM and PMU to UNDP (which has issued the service contract), the IP (which will be responsible for day-to-day execution of the project) and the PSC (which is responsible for overall guidance, direction and decision-making relating to the project) - See also response to Recommendation 3</p> <p>1.1.2 UNDP CO to capture these joint accountability arrangements in a letter of agreement to be signed jointly by the RR and a designated official in the MENT (tbd)</p>		<p>Guidance to be provided by UNDP RTA and BPPS- NCE Directorate, as appropriate</p>		
<p>1.2. A new HACT assessment of the IP to be undertaken and an appropriate capacity development plan put in place to address any risks that are flagged; performance against this plan will be regularly monitored. Should the HACT indicate substantial or high risks, then options for providing execution support</p>	<p>November to December</p>	<p>UNDP CO to appraise MENT and commission HACT assessment using accredited service provider listed in ATLAS</p> <p>RTA and RBA desk officer to advise</p>		

will be explored and, negotiated with the GEF.				
1.3. UNDP CO to conduct objective assessment of internal capacity needs to provide oversight service to the project - through voluntary application of the PNAT tool.	November to December	UNDP CO, with support of RTA, BPPS MPSU and RBA desk officer		

## **2. Mid Term Review Recommendation 2**

The MENT/DEA established a forum for state and non-state actors involved in land use in the KGDE. The purpose of the forum is to openly discuss land use issues – land use planning, CBNRM, regulatory enforcement, resource-based enterprises, hunting, private sector involvement and JVPs. It should cut across all 4 components and inform the ILMP process. It should be separate from the TAC and TRG. NGOs and academics involved in wildlife, livelihoods and land use planning should be included in the “membership”. The purpose of the forum is to provide a platform for land users to discuss land use and land use planning in the broadest sense. A selection of experts from academic institutions with strong applied social studies departments should be invited to attend the meetings. Meetings should be held quarterly and in the project domain.

A highly qualified facilitator should be engaged on a Contractual basis to:

- I. develop the participatory methodology,
- II. facilitate the meetings, and
- III. provide workshop reports/proceedings and communications for distribution to project stakeholders and high-level advocacy and general publication.

The facilitator should be tasked with deciding on the appropriate methodology, participatory tools and approaches.

### ***Management Response:***

**The recommendation is not accepted.**

Noting that this forum could potentially be established within government as a long-term entity to ensure the sustainability of the project, therefore it is potentially a major part of the project’s legacy/sustainability Plan. There is currently an ongoing process of the development of the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi District Integrated Land Use Management Plan (ILUMP), which involves the stakeholders outlined in the recommendation. This is a long-term multi-stakeholder development plan that requires a similar forum in its development and implementation. The development of the

ILUMP should include a legacy/sustainability plan which should address institutional arrangement for continued dialog and adaptive management. The ILUMP should therefore recommend establishment of the recommended forum with clear advice on:

- The composition and level of participation.
- Roles and responsibilities.
- Resource requirement for the operationalization.
- Rules of procedure.
- etc

The rules and procedures, institutional arrangements; and roles and responsibilities should be outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Forum as would be recommended by the ILUMP. These would provide direction on discussions by the forum thus ensuring that discussions are well-aligned with the project or the ILUMP objectives, and not derailed into themes that are not particularly relevant to the project and the ILUMP. The establishment of the Forum is therefore proposed to be deferred until the completion of the ILUMP.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1. Facilitate and support the development of the ILUMP and ensure the implementation plan clearly outlines the establishment of the recommended forum with clear ToRs.	September 2021 to March 2022	MENT, DEA, & PMU. <u>Priority:</u> Medium		
2.2. Establish the forum and provide requisite resources for the Forum activities as recommended in the ILUMP	Immediately following the completion of the ILUMP	MENT, DEA, & PMU. <u>Priority:</u> Urgent		

### 3. Mid Term Review Recommendation 3

Engage through a competitive process, a substantive Project Manager to the PMU. The PM has to have a considerable and high-level advocacy and technical role. The position should be a managerial role, and not be an administrative one. A senior person with experience in planning and



CBNRM is required to fill this position. They should report through the Project Director (MENT/DEA) to the PSC/PB. They should be engaged as soon as possible in order to drive through the restructuring of the project.

**Management Response:**

Noting that:

- For the Project Manager to be effective, he must be supported by a well-capacitated PMU. Since the inception of the project, variable capacity of the PMU and high staff turnover have represented a significant challenge that has contributed to low delivery and performance. In addition to turnover in project managers, there has been high turnover in other staff for a variety of reasons, and the PMU has never operated with the full complement of staff envisaged in the PRODOC. There is also a lack of clarity and correspondence between the configuration of the PMU in the PRODOC narrative and Annexes and in the corresponding budget and budget notes - this is addressed in the Management response actions described below.
- To bolster technical capacity of the PMU, in early 2019 UNDP CO contracted the services of a Chief Technical Advisor to the project. The project management arrangements outlined in the PRODOC provide for appointment of NGOs, or other qualified experts/agencies, to serve as Component Managers - or Component Technical Advisors - in support of the PM/PMU, but this arrangement has never been fully implemented. As part of the whole-of-project response to the MTR, the provision of technical support to the PMU will be revisited, as described below.

This recommendation is **partially accepted** and **already partially implemented**.

With the departure of the former Project Manager 6 June 2021, the UNDP CO, in consultation with the IP, advertised the position of substantive Project Manager, the TORs for which include technical, managerial and advocacy roles. After an open, competitive process, Mr Mbiganyi Frederick Dipotso, was appointed to the position with effect from 16 June 2021. The Project Manager has been appointed on a UNDP NPSA, but with contractual provision for a dual reporting line into both UNDP CO and the DEA, the mechanics for which have yet to be worked out, through actions described below.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1. Reporting lines of Project Manager to be clarified and captured in relevant TORs and performance agreements: 3.1.1. Following signing of the LOA regarding dual reporting lines of PM	September	UNDP RR, MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		

<p>and PMU (see 1.1.1 above), performance management agreement of the PM to be drawn up, reflecting joint arrangement between DEA and UNDP and reporting line into PSC</p> <p>3.1.2. Performance agreements of PM and PMU staff to be regularly monitored, with corrective actions put in place as needed</p>				
<p><b>3.2.</b> Undertake assessment of the capacity needs of the PMU and capacity-development measures must be put in place and actively monitored.</p>	November to December	UNDP RR, MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		
<p><b>3.3.</b> The configuration of the PMU, and its associated budget, must be clarified.</p>	November to December	UNDP RR, MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		
<p><b>3.4.</b> Costed-out options for the provision of expert technical support/advice to the PMU must be explored, including the composition and scope of work of the TRG (government and other partners), appointment of appropriately skilled and experienced technical advisor (or advisors), capacity development activities to be implemented by the UNDP CO, and support of the RTA (for technical</p>	November to December	UNDP RR, MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		

guidance and quality assurance), government partners or other agencies (e.g. NGOs).				
---	--	--	--	--

**4. Mid Term Review Recommendation 4**

Review the project SRF/LF indicators and targets. Consider:

Component 2 – transfer indicator 8 to Component 1 and rephrase according to ESIA. Use historical and disaggregated data collected from DWNP to retrofit baseline.

Component 2 - Indicator 6: Number of value chains and ecotourism ventures operationalized. Consider maintaining the indicator and use against the remaining livelihood projects to be supported by the project and add an additional indicator to measure the capacity building with the Trusts to be defined through the ESIA -see below Recommendation 6 & 7.

Component 2 - Indicator 7: Percentage increase in incomes derived from ecotourism and value chains. Remove this indicator and replace with an indicator that reflects the project’s impact on increased social capital and empowerment of Trusts which can be derived from the ESIA and ESRM. Retrofit the baseline.

Component 4 – include an additional indicator(s) to reflect the findings and recommendations of the ESIA, in particular the effectiveness of the GRM (separate indicator)

**Management Response:**

**This recommendation is partially accepted.** The need to revise project indicators and targets is acknowledged. However, the adjustment of the indicators and the targets requires a whole-of-project reset/redesign, seeking the necessary approvals where applicable. It is currently unclear how the indicators and targets will be adjusted until the project reset/redesign has taken place. The project reset/redesign will provide an opportunity to review the KPIs at both the outcome and output level and take into consideration the change in the country context since the time of project design. Considering the project lifetime and the level of implementation at MTR, this review will contribute towards the conceptualization of the project re-set process which will additionally be guided by what is actually allowable by the GEF, the timeframes involved to secure approvals (if any), what happens while we wait, and the consequences thereof. The recommendation is therefore partially accepted but the details of which indicators will be adjusted and how will be fleshed out during the project reset, and informed by the ESIA, and ESP, which will be finalized as part of the re-set process.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
4.1. Draft TOR for scope of work to be carried out to achieve the project reset, including technical, financial and institutional aspects and completion of safeguards due diligence.	October and November	UNDP RR, under guidance of UNDP BPPS NCE team and with inputs from MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		
4.2. Engage an expert to lead the process of project reset/redesign.	November to December			

#### 5. *Mid Term Review Recommendation 5*

Review all the Component 2 proposed projects and reject those that do not contribute to the KGDEP objective (see Annex 20) and are spatially aligned with the ILMP. Urgently communicate the decisions to the local communities and explain why. Select those projects that still fit the criteria of the project or engage the community members again on the project rural appraisal exercise and be guided by the project objectives, to build project ownership; and move quickly to implement them (see recommendation 7).

#### **Management Response:**

**Recommendation is partially accepted.** UNDP and the Implementing Partner MENT recognized challenges in the viability of some of the proposed projects under Component 2. There are currently on-going discussions with between the UNDP and the MENT Executive on four proposed community livelihood activities which are “low risk and high impact” projects. These four (4) initiatives that present an opportunity for KGDEP include the following:

- a) Establishing veld product/crafts centre south of the village of Kacgae;
- b) Conducting camel-back patrols of WMAs to collect data on wildlife populations, poaching activities, rangeland management and problem animals.
- c) Implementing performance-based payments for adhering to agreed local land use plans; and
- d) Developing self-drive wilderness ecotourism trails.

Component 2 remains relevant and contributes to the objective of KGDEP, however the re-assessment of Component 2 activities, including how the project engages with Community Trusts, will take place during the project reset/redesign process. The specific project activities will be identified during the project reset/redesign process and the ongoing SES and development of the ESIA and ESMP. After securing FPIC from relevant communities the projects will be further developed, depending on the investment requirements, project viability, and the capacity of the communities to manage such projects or business ventures.

Following project redesign, the PMU will undertake community consultations to provide feedback of the projects that have been endorsed and will be supported by the KGDEP. This will be followed by support towards the business development aspects of the respective activities and support capacity development of the community Trusts.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
5.1. Ensure that re-assessment of initiatives are included in the scope of work for the reset process	October and November	UNDP RR, MENT – PS or DPS, Director Environment Affairs		
5.2. On completion of safeguards due diligence, including securing FPIC where required, provide feedback to the communities on the final decision	September – October 2021	PMU, DEA,		
5.3. Engage community members on business plan design and development (infrastructure development), and training (capacity building)	November 2021	DEA, PMU, DWNP, LEA, BTO		

## 6. Mid Term Review Recommendation 6

Component 2 should be reviewed against the ESIA findings and an Output added to reflect support to capacity building with Trust. There is a reputational risk associated with this and related to the trophy hunting. The project should prepare a brief outlining the risks and explaining that the principal involvement of the KGDEP with the Trusts is to build their internal capacities and social capital. There are considerable weaknesses in the hunting sector in Botswana, many of them are associated with the poor capacities of the Trusts to negotiate with external interests and markets and to capture the economic benefits. This output, in part, will address these weaknesses although not necessarily with the view to the Trust obtaining its Head Lease. That is an internal and independent decision for the Trust. Lifting the hunting ban represents a fundamental change in the regulatory context for the project and the Project Document would need to be reformulated through this output if it were to specifically link capacity building with the Head Lease/hunting. Neither is it ethically right for the project to ignore support to the Trusts to build their internal capacities and build social capital, especially as it relates to negotiating with external interests such as the private sector as well as government agencies. The output should clearly demonstrate how it addresses the existing weaknesses and strengthens the Trusts capacities, especially in relation to illegal hunting and their relationship with the DWNP by linking this to the GRM. On the surface, the changes in legislation creates a conundrum for the KGDEP. Support to the communities is absolutely in line with the Project Document and with the recommendations of the ESIA, arguably it is in line with the national policy framework and is, inevitably, just the right thing to do. However, that support, if successful, will enable the Trusts to access certain rights over resources on their land and they are then legally, and morally entitled to use those resources within the Law. However, there are considerable and justified concerns relating to the trophy hunting sector *per se*. However, it helps if the argument is not framed in a binary manner - between “consumptive” and “non-consumptive” uses. The argument should be framed in terms of:

- **Protection:** Given that the particular circumstances of a resource – such as scarcity, level of threat, historic events etc. – result in a precarious situation where utilization of the resource is considered too risky, protection – through legislation, protected area, etc. – is a valuable tool to ensure sustainability of the resource. However, this is a costly option and these costs – prohibition, enforcement, management, opportunity costs etc. – are both definable and measurable and, therefore, sustainability can be measured against the ability of society/national governments to meet these costs. This already takes place in the KTP and CKGR
- **Utilization:** Given that a resource can withstand a level of utilization that is biologically sustainable it is possible to establish a management regime, which maintains the resource at an acceptable level providing that those who incur the management or opportunity costs are able to benefit from its utilization.
- **Abandonment:** Given that a resource cannot be utilized sustainably, and society is either unable or unwilling to incur the costs of protecting the resource, then the resource must be “abandoned”. That is; there is a high risk of extirpation or biological or economic extinction. While it is unlikely that any society would knowingly advocate abandoning a resource – species, population or ecosystem – when protective measures are applied without the material resources or capacity to effectively carry this out, there is a high risk of abandonment by default.

If wildlife passing through the WMAs is not given a focused value to those communities who share the land, then it is likely that they will abandon the resource in favour of other legitimate land uses. Neither will they collaborate with the state, on whom the responsibility for protecting wildlife

will fall in its entirety. Accepting the concerns about the hunting sector in Botswana, regardless of whether use is “consumptive” or “non-consumptive”; community utilisation by an empowered community with strong internal governance and cohesion and a willingness to collaborate to safeguard their resources carries less risk to the wildlife resources.

**Management Response:**

**The recommendation is partially accepted.** The Partners recognize that before the hunting ban, hunting in the KGDEP landscape was a key component contributing to local livelihoods, and that since the ban has been lifted, hunting will continue to be a key component of the Trusts' activities in terms of quick revenue streams, and possible immediate benefits to the communities. However, the sustainability of consumptive utilization (hunting) of wildlife resources, amid other pressures on wildlife resources such as: climate change; loss of ecosystem functions and connectivity; IWT; HWC; and habitat degradation and fragmentation, is a well-known global concern in sustainable management and conservation of wildlife resources. Hunting cannot and should not be the only revenue stream for Trusts. Since Government initiatives are in place to support consumptive utilization, this gives an opportunity for other players to explore and build capacity for non-consumptive ventures as a means of income stream diversification.

As outlined in recommendation 5 above, the re-assessment of Component 2 activities, including capacity development of the respective Trusts, will take place during the project reset/redesign process. The specific livelihood diversification activities to be supported by the project will be identified during the project reset/redesign process and will take into account compliance with UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards Policy and project-specific safeguards risks, and the stipulation in the Global Wildlife Programme (GWP) Project Framework Document (PFD) that projects should explore non-consumptive use options (which is the basis on which the KGDEP was designed).

The PMU and MENT, potentially with support from other responsible parties, following the project reset, and completion of the ESIA and the respective ESMPs, will engage communities to develop viable (low-investment, low-risk and high-return) value chains and/or ecotourism ventures, to promote wildlife value through non-consumptive utilization. There are already NGOs in the landscape that are assisting communities with integrated sustainable land use practices and piloting of performance-based conservation payments and so the opportunity exists to engage such partners to build on or scale up the already-existing initiatives using project resources.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
6.1. Review Component 2 against the project's indicators and targets, and the ESIA findings, and support capacity development of the Trusts aligned to identified project activities	Immediately following the approval of the ESIA and the ESMP. January 2022.	PMU & CTA, RTA		



## **7. Mid Term Review Recommendation 7**

Under Component 2 identify and engage NGO partners to implement Component 2 activities (Recommendations 6 & 7). Some of these NGOs have been working in the two districts and their knowledge and experience will be vital. This move will necessitate the UNDP CO carrying out a HACT on each NGO and the PMU negotiating Contracts. The PSC/PB to set a milestone date for completion of administrative procedures and include in Recommendation 9).

### ***Management Response:***

**Recommendation is accepted.** The project Partners recognize the experience, capacity and established track record of several NGOs/CSOs which are active in the project landscape and which have been identified as potential partners to be engaged in project execution, mainly under Component 2 but also under Component 3 (SLM and management planning). It is further recognized that engaging these NGOs would enable effective and efficient delivery of project results, which will contribute significantly to accelerated performance.

The project implementation arrangements in the PRODOC make provision for engaging NGOs/CSOs to deliver specific outputs, or to serve as Component Managers or Technical Advisors under Component 2 (and 3 & 4), but these arrangements have not yet been implemented, partly due to ambiguity in the project management arrangements in the narrative of the PRODOC, and the associated budget and budget notes Clarity is required to identify available budget lines for the engagement of NGOs/CSOs under each component. Therefore, to facilitate faster project implementation, UNDP CO, and MENT will explore the modalities for engaging NGOs/CSOs active in the land scape, as Responsible Parties for project activities under component 2. As per UNDP policy, before an entity can be engaged as a Responsible Party a capacity assessment of that entity should be undertaken to determine:

- Technical capacity;
- Managerial capacity;
- Administrative capacity; and
- Financial capacity.

UNDP CO and PMU will undertake the capacity assessment of the prospective NGOs/CSOs through the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) process. Compliant CSOs will then be contracted either through a competitive bid process or through setting up relevant contractual arrangements for Responsible Parties (see below).

**It should be noted that there are two (2) options for engagement of NGOs/CSOs**, and these are through either the Responsible Party (RP) or contractual service modality.

Where the RP modality is selected, the project must ensure that due diligence for appointment of RPs is followed (see Guidance in POPP) and that HACT Assessments are carried out where annual budget to be managed by the RP exceeds \$150 000. Only Low or Moderate Risk RPs to be appointed. Where Contractual Services modalities are indicated, the project must develop TORs, conduct open procurement process and invite technical and financial proposals, to be evaluated following relevant procedures.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
7.1. Conduct a rapid assessment of available NGO/CSO capacity, to determine best fit with project requirements, based on: technical, managerial, administrative and financial capacity and experience and availability to take on project activities within the required timeframes	November to December 2021	UNDP CO, DEA, PMU, & RTA		
7.2. Determine optimal modalities for engagement of NGOs/CSOs, including as: Responsible Parties; Contractual Service Providers (Companies) and implement appropriate processes to secure the services of the selected NGOs	November to December 2021	UNDP CO, DEA, PMU		

### **8. Mid Term Review Recommendation 8**

Develop time-bound Output Indicators (linked to the outcome-level indicators) with a “traffic lights” colour coding system for the remaining part of the project implementation. Output indicators to be reviewed bi-monthly by UNDP CO and reported by the PMU to the PSC/PB quarterly or on an ad hoc basis as needed in order to ensure that things get done.

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted.** The project Partners recognize that most of the project activities are behind schedule and the fact that the indicators were not time bound may have contributed to delays in the commencement of the implementation of project activities. Considering the remaining project lifespan, all indicators will be time bound, taking into consideration implementation process such as procurement, development, operationalization and time for yielding results.

As part of the project reset process, the PMU and UNDP CO in consultation with the project partners and under guidance of the project design expert, will review the indicators to ensure they are SMART to attach binding accountability and uptake by all implementing partners. These will be monitored for compliance with the ESIA and ESMP.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
8.1. review progress against the indicators bi-monthly and report any challenges	Oct 30 <sup>th</sup> Dec 30 Feb 28 April 30	PMU & CTA, PSC		
8.2. PMU to report progress to PSC quarterly	Quarterly	PMU & DEA		

**9. Mid Term Review Recommendation 9**

Implement the findings of the ESIA and the ESMP including operationalizing the GRM for the project. All Component activities to demonstrate Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) under the ESMP. ESIA and ESMP to be posted on the UNDP CO website once internally reviewed by UNDP safeguards focal point.

**Management Response:**

**The recommendation is accepted.** Following the completion of the ESIA, securing of FPIC, and development of the ESMP including the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), all documents will all be approved and made public as per requirements of UNDP policy. Completion of the safeguards work will take place during the project reset process, once the project activities – especially under Components 2 and 3 (SLM) – have been clarified. FPIC can only be secured once it is clear which activities trigger the need for FPIC and this will be determined during the reset.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status

9.1. Implement the findings of the ESIA and the ESMP	Immediately following the approval of the ESIA and ESMP. January 2022	MENT, PMU & IPs		
9.2. Post ESIA and ESMP on UNDP CO website once finalized and monitor implementation on an ongoing basis	Immediately following the approval of the ESIA and ESMP. January 2022.	UNDP CO		

<b>10. Mid Term Review Recommendation 10</b>				
<p>The PMU should, following the management response to the MTR begin to develop a legacy plan with the project's partners and in line with the upcoming Green Climate Fund project on rangeland management (developed by Conservation International). There is very little time left and many of the outputs will likely need longer term support beyond the end of the KGDEP. Starting a legacy plan will ensure that there is a smooth transition.</p>				
<b>Management Response:</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation accepted.</b> The Kgalagadi and Ghanzi ILUMP will form part of the long-term management or legacy plan of the project area, therefore the legacy plan will be largely based on the ILUMP, which will serve as the foundation for sustainability of most project activities. To avoid duplication of effort to produce a separate legacy plan, the ILUMP will include a legacy or sustainability plan that incorporates all project activities.</p>				
<p>During the development process of the ILUMP, particularly where there is need to discuss tradeoffs between land use options, high-level decision-makers, not only technical officers (which is currently the case), will be brought into the process, and they will also contribute to development of the legacy plan. Currently the ILUMP process involves technical staff. Without the active involvement of high-level decision-makers, the outputs of the ILUMP, including the legacy plan, are unlikely to gain traction and ownership.</p>				
<b>Key action(s)</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Responsible unit(s)</b>	<b>Tracking</b>	
			<b>Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>

10.1. Develop project legacy plan	December 2022	UNDP CO, PMU, DEA/MENT, CTA, & PSC to approve		
10.2. Implement the project legacy plan- Implementation should start towards the end of the project lifespan and will be monitored by MENT and all the partners into the future	Immediately following the completion of the ILUMP,	UNDP CO, PMU, DEA/MENT, CTA, & RTA, & PSC to monitor progress		

<b>11. Mid Term Review Recommendation 11</b>				
<p>The PSC/PB should be reduced to a small executive group according to the Project Document - <i>The Project Board is comprised of representatives from the following institutions: Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources Conservation and Tourism (MENT), Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Department of Forestry and Range Resources (DFRR), Ministry of Agriculture, Land Boards from Ghanzi and Kgalagadi, Botswana Tourism Organization, University of Botswana, Livestock/Game Ranchers, Community Groups, NGOs.</i> In addition to this the PSC/PB should include representation from <i>the Trusts</i></p>				
<b>Management Response:</b>				
<p>Management accepted the recommendation but advised that more emphasise be put on level of participation and not numbers as the committee is for strategic decision making. The management noted that the membership structure proposed by DTCP, should not be the PSC this could be applied at the TRG level or at a special purpose structure. The recommendation was accepted, and IPs were advised to limit their representation at PSC to Director or Deputy Director level as it is a strategic decision body and not a technical discussion committee.</p>				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
11.1. Reduce membership of the PSC as per the PRODOC and ensure representation of CBOs	Immediately	To be implemented by: PMU – MENT/DEA to approve		

