

## Terminal Evaluation Audit Trail of Nafola project (PIMS#4626)

| Author*  | # | Comment location                   | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report  | TE response   |
|----------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| UNDP /CO | 1 | General                            | The name of the project has been spelt as Nafola throughout the document. Kindly change to NAFOLA  | Nafola is an abbreviation of the project title, and as such is treated as a name, i.e. as a proper noun starting with a capital letter  |
| UNDP     |   | 23/3/20                            | NAFOLA is an acronym, and it will read better if it is spelt that way.   | <p>Nafola is an abbreviation of the project title, which is the name of the project. As such it is treated as a 'name', i.e. as a proper noun starting with a capital letter, which is correct in English grammar.</p> <p>Secondly, capitalising all letters just makes the abbreviation (which was also a made-up word) stand out too much on a page, so the readers just see the word 'NAFOLA', which over exposes its importance to the discussion on the page. Thus, it doesn't warrant such prominence. [another example would be 'Oxfam are a development NGO' as opposed to 'OXFAM are...']</p> <p>Nafola is mentioned by name 245 times in the report and 'the project' is mentioned 325 times. Thus 'Nafola' could actually be written as 'NAFOLA' 568 times, which would look somewhat ridiculous. It is also the quite old-fashioned style of presentation. Lastly, as an independent report, it is the authors choice, in view of the readership, which is international.</p> |
| RTA      | 2 | Overall                            | As a general comment, please note that the GEF IEO guidance for carrying out terminal evaluations of FSPs, dated 2017, should have also been consulted (not only the UNDP IEO guidance)  | The GEF 2017 guidance was consulted and followed. It was mentioned in the TE Inception report with respect to project locations and Theory of Change. It is mentioned specifically in the report with regard to section 5.2 Catalytic Effect and Theory of Change, which was constructed by the TE  |
| RTA      | 3 | Overall                            | Throughout the report, there is a need to clarify the exact number of community forests were the project worked as there seem to be inconsistencies in the numbers: is it 13 or 15 community forests (CFs)? For instance, text on page 2 (C. project location and map) mentions that the project worked in 15 CFs and the table on page 20 lists 15 CF; while the text on page 21 says the project worked in 13 CFs. From the text on page 3, it looks like maybe the original target was 13 CFs, but the project ended up working in 15 CF? If the project design called for 13 CF to be supported but the project ended up supporting more, then it would be helpful if that was clearly noted and described including a note on why/how the decision was made to add two more CFs. Please clarify and amend as appropriate. | There are no inconsistencies re. the number of CFs, as the project interventions varied for different CFs. Your statement is correct – overall 15 CFs were supported. The text is clear.  |
| UNDP /CO | 4 | Cover page                         | The focal area is Land degradation and not biodiversity  | Of course. This was just a mistake  |
| UNDP     | 5 | Page 2: Executive Summary: Purpose | Change "...for future UNDP-GEF projects,..." to "...for future UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects,..."". This change is consistent with  | 'UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects' is written twice on this page, thereafter it is referred to as UNDP-GEF in order to avoid being verbose  |

|          |    |   |   |   |
|----------|----|---|---|---|
|          |    | and Methodology   | how the UNDP-GEF unit refers to projects in its portfolio.  |   |
| UNDP /CO | 6  | Page 2, in the table  | The name 'Omahya village' in Oshikoto Region does not sound right. Perhaps find out whether you can get the correct name.   | This table was provided by the PMU Project Manager  |
| UNDP     |    | 23/3/20   | Confirmed as correct by the PMU   |   |
| PMU      | 7  | Page 3: Exhibit 3 under Outcome/Results under Justification | The prodoc does not prescribe when gazettelement is supposed to take place and gazettelement was done a year before the project closure.  | Correct, but gazettelement was the 1 <sup>st</sup> activity of the project, and leaving it to the end of the project effectively stifled many other activities  |
| UNDP     | 8  | Page 3: Executive Summary: Evaluation Ratings Summary       | Change "GEF-UNDP projects..." to "UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects..."  | See #5  |
| PMU      | 9  | Page 4: Effectiveness – 2                                   | Forest issues reflected in regional land use plans: The role of the project was to ensure that forestry issues are reflected in land use planning processes and not to directly support the development of the plans. Ministry of Lands have projects supporting the development of land use plans and this was not the project role to develop such plans  | The TE wrote p4-5 'The meaning of the 'integrated resource plans' was to integrate CF sustainable management requirements into the wider land use planning process, or for the wider process regarding SLM (land tenure, livestock management etc), to be incorporated into three enhanced CF plans'  |
| RTA      | 10 | Page 4, Effectiveness Outcome 1 Achievement                 | Inconsistent rating for Outcome 1 - the rating given in this section for the effectiveness of outcome 1 is 'moderately unsatisfactory' while the rating for the same outcome 1 is given as 'unsatisfactory' in the summary table on page 3. On page 32, the rating for outcome 1 is also 'moderately unsatisfactory'. Please review and correct to ensure consistency of this rating across the document, as appropriate. | Corrected the summary table to 'MU'   |
| PMU      | 11 | Page 6: 4/ DoF organisational capacity                      | There were dedicated staffs on the project from DoF since the inception of the project titled Community Forest Programme Officer.   | The TE wrote – 'The DoF struggled to dedicate a central staff member to the CF programme, and only did so after the MTR with a senior forester then tasked to the work.'<br>The TE is referring to DoF staff, and not staff from DoF seconded to the project PMU.<br>A CF Programme Officer, apart from the above-mentioned position post-MTR was not identified by the TE. |
| UNDP /CO | 12 | Page 8  | Section 4 reads: The project developed a national strategy for fire management, kindly change to: National forest and veld fire management policy and strategy<br>Where it says 'fire control plan for one CF', kindly change to Ehirovipuka CF in the Kunene Region  | The wording in the executive summary is 'summarised' for non-technical / simplified reading. The wording of the strategy and plan are referred to in full in the main text  |
| PMU      | 13 | Page 9: Coordination &                                      | The only land use plans that the Ministry of Lands are mandated to produce are the Regional Land Use Plans and not local level specific   | TE wrote – 'The prodoc expectation was that the MLR would take the lead in preparing three land use plans that incorporated the management of three   |

|          |    |   |  |   |
|----------|----|---|--|---|
|          |    | Operation Management                        | plans. The Forest Management Plans incorporates other land uses in that specific area and may be the issue that was not done as part of the exercise was a detailed incorporation.   | CFs (or vice-versa), with land tenure, livestock, agriculture and forestry etc. This was bearing in mind, much of the project design was centred on SLM actions, and this was the main activity to link SLM with forestry.’<br>Yes, the project-produced forestry plans only included forestry aspects, and did not consider or incorporate other land uses.                    |
| UNDP /CO | 14 | Page 9                                      | Kindly change Nacso to NACSO   | Nasco is an abbreviation of the title of an NGO, and as such is treated as a name, i.e. as a proper noun starting with a capital letter.<br>Plus, capitalising all letters just makes the abbreviation stand out too much on a page, when its importance to the discussion doesn’t warrant such prominence.   |
| UNDP     |    |   | NACSO is an acronym, and it will read better if it is spelt that way   | See above comment and earlier comments re. the reasons for not capitalizing ‘Nafola’  |
| UNDP /CO | 15 | Page 9, Under the 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph | The Section that reads: Coordination and operational management, it says: In February 2018, the PM (of the PMU) resigned, but a new PM was not appointed until July 2018. This meant that nobody was running the project for six months, with decision-making affected. This could have been avoided (by UNDP) with the M&E officer being given the role of ‘Acting PM’, until the actual appointment.<br>Instead of M&E Officer, kindly change to Regional Project Implementation and M&E Officer.  | Changed in the Executive Summary and main text.   |
| UNDP /CO | 16 | Page 9                                      | Based on the TE observations, the roles and purposes of the members of the PSC was never defined. However, the roles of the PSC are clearly defined on page 53 of the Project Document. Kindly refer to the Pro doc.   | The TE wrote – ‘The roles and purposes of the members of the PSC was never defined. The PSC was never formally established except as a members list in the prodoc, and then only by invitation to the 1st PSC meeting, which was held 10 months after the project start.’<br>The TE means the formalisation of the PSC roles via letter of appointment with TOR, signed by MAWF |
| UNDP /CO | 17 | Page 10, paragraph 2                        | It reads: The PSC was to be chaired by a senior MAWF representative. The position taken by the DoF Director, who was also the National Project Director. This meant a conflict of interest, and a natural bias towards forestry, and away from other parts of the project design, such as land use planning, rangeland / livestock grazing management, and dryland agriculture.<br>The Project Document says: The NAFOLA Management Committee will adopt the CPP Management Committee model. It will be chaired by an agreed senior MAWF representative, who will also take the role of National Project Director and shall be responsible for supervising project implementation, in particular providing the policy/practice inter-phase that will guide project policies.<br>It does not seem to be a conflict of interest for the DoF director to be | This is the view of the TE, that for a wide-ranging cross-sector project, that MAWF maybe should not have designated the DoF as the NPD to also be the chair of the PSC. As it turned out, the focus of the project was biased against any intervention that was not directly forestry-based.   |

|          |    |   |  |  |
|----------|----|---|--|--|
|          |    |   | the NPD. Generally, the role of the NPD is to ensure that the project is focused throughout its life cycle on achieving its objectives and delivering outputs that will contribute to high level outcomes.   |  |
| UNDP /CO | 18 | Page 10, paragraph 4  | It reads: DoF (and the PMU and PSC) couldn't cope with managing funds effectively and lost financial control to UNDP after three years. Thereafter, payments for activities slowed down. Thus, the project had changed to UNDP-assisted NIM for the last two years. There was no mention in the PSC minutes of the change in financial control of Nafola by UNDP in October 2017. DoF under UNDP pressure at mid-term, assigned one staff member to coordinate CF activities.<br><br>The management of funds by the project was terminated due to a huge amount of funds that was made towards the auction kraal.  | Yes, this is mentioned in the report   |
| UNDP     |    | 23/3/20   | Kindly correct the sentence. Instead of saying DoF couldn't cope with managing funds and lost financial control to UNDP, it will be good to state what happened, which led to the closure of the project account.  | Amended to say – 'DoF (and the PMU and PSC) couldn't cope with managing funds effectively (due to the kraal costs) and lost financial control to UNDP after three years' More detail is provided in other parts of the report.   |
| UNDP /CO | 19 | Page 12, under Catalytic effect, scaling up and replication | It reads: Nafola supported CFMCs to prepare proposals to access the wider donor-funded sector.<br><br>It would be good to clarify as to which CFs were supported   | The TE provides further detail in the main text – 'Nafola supported CFMCs to prepare proposals for funding, not just from Nafola, but to also learn to access the wider donor-funded sector. This was facilitated by CF gazettement, under which the CFs / CFMCs became legal entities (with an entity bank account), and thus were able to apply for and receive funds. This was successful in two instances: Oshaampula CF were awarded funds from the Environmental Investment Fund (GCF); and African Wild Dog CF were awarded funds from the Regional Universities Agriculture Forum Fund.' |
| UNDP /CO | 20 | Page 13, paragraph 3 of the conclusion                      | It reads: The capacity of, and funding to DoF is very low. Training support is needed, especially in how to work across sectors with DAPEES, DARD and the Land Reform office. Regional and District Forest Offices also lack capacity and resources. District forest offices are often without electricity, with lines cut due to non-payment of bills. They also lack access to the internet on computers as they are without mobile wifi dongles. Decision-making is not devolved from central to regional level, with forestry is not really involved in regional council decision-making. The offices usually only have one vehicle running.<br><br>It will be a good to make a link of the paragraph to the NAFOLA Project. | In section 3.3.2 – Achievement of Outcomes 1-2 - Change in capacity scorecards for ministry technical staff and CFMCs, the TE wrote – 'The results indicate an improvement on the (capacity) baseline for the CFMCs . However, the TE evidence of improved capacity at DoF level was scant.'<br><br>This is also re-iterated in the relevant part of the Exec. Summary.  |
| UNDP /CO | 21 | Page 13, under livestock section, sentence 2                | It reads: 'What is doesn't need is to be tendered into the private sector or be given to a party with vested interests, such as the regional famers union.' Kindly replace 'is' with 'it'  | done   |
| UNDP     | 22 | Page 13-14: Exec. Summary:                                  | Include aspects of gender equality in the TE findings, conclusions and recommendations.  | TE added section to the Lessons Learned in the Exec. Summary and the main text – 'The project should have been more proactive with respect to gender.'   |

|          |    | Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Recommendations         |  |   |
|----------|----|---|--|---|
|          |    |   |  | The prodoc was vague concerning benefits to women. It didn't stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the community forest management committees (CFMCs). Whilst a 50 / 50 gender balance was stipulated in the CF Toolbox, the TE figures indicated that an equal balance had not been achieved. A gender sensitivity training was only held in the project's last year and with only 12 participants (8 women), which was too little too late.'   |
| UNDP /CO | 23 | Page 14, second recommendation                        | The three tractors designated for: Otjombinde CF and Epukiro CF - managed by DAPEES Gobabis office, Omaheke; and Okango CF - managed by DAPEES Eenhana office, Ohangwena. These offices need to prioritize seed for climate-smart farmers (sorghum / millet with cow pea / green gram) together with their CA tractor services. [DAPEES in Gobabis and Eenhana]<br><br>Kindly rephrase the sentence to read: Three tractors were designated for Otjombinde CF.....To ensure implementation of CA, these offices need.... | Rephrased to 'The three tractors were designated for: Otjombinde and Epukiro CFs, and managed by DAPEES Gobabis office, Omaheke; and Okango CF, and managed by DAPEES Eenhana office, Ohangwena. To ensure implementation of CA, these offices need to prioritize seed for climate-smart farmers (sorghum / millet with cow pea / green gram) together with their CA tractor services. [DAPEES in Gobabis and Eenhana]'   |
| UNDP /CO | 24 | Page 14, recommendation three                         | It reads: Lots should be drawn by the nine gazetted CFMCs for the six Nafola vehicles to be distributed to them [UNDP / MAWF]<br>It is not clear as to what is being referred to here. Kindly make the recommendation a bit clearer.   | Rephrased to – 'The six Nafola vehicles should be distributed to six of the nine gazetted CFMCs for [UNDP / MAWF]. The 13 quad bikes should be auctioned and the proceeds divided between the six CFMCs, who are provided with a project vehicle, for maintenance costs of the vehicles [MAWF / UNDP]'  |
| UNDP     | 25 | Page 15: section 1.3: Scope and Methodology           | Were gender-responsive methodologies and/or data analysis techniques used? Include details on how gender was to be assessed and the tools/techniques used.<br><br>Did the TE team face any limitations during the TE process? If so, provide details. If not, state that none were encountered.  | This section includes the sentence 'Pro-forma questions on key themes such as those provided by the UNDP-GEF guideline were updated by the TE (Annex 14).' – these pro-forma questions include gender aspects.<br><br>See also note 22 on including gender, which is now in the lessons learned section – which is a summary of the report's findings into gender. But in brief, gender was assessed in terms of: project design; disaggregation of training data; interviews / focus group discussions where women were encouraged to speak; assessment of gender during meetings held by the project – PSC etc – and women's selection for positions on the PSC.<br><br>The TE mission risks and assumption were outlined in the TE Inception Report. There were no significant limitations during the mission, which would have been reported if the case. |
| UNDP /CO | 26 | Page 15, Main partners and Stakeholder feedback       | The first sentences starts with: The TE interacted with...<br>Kindly change to: The TE team interacted with...   | done  |
| UNDP /CO | 27 | Page 17, under the section: Linkage to other projects | GEF Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (SLM) - focused on intuitional ....change to institutional<br>GCF Climate resilience agriculture in three of the vulnerable extreme   | Done; done  |

|          |    |  |   |  |
|----------|----|--|---|--|
|          |    |  | northern crop-growing regions. (RAVE) (2016-22)... Change from RAVE to CRAVE  |  |
| RTA      | 28 | Page 20, box listing project- supported interventions              | Should the 13 quad bikes mentioned on page 14 (recommendation 4) be included in this list?  | Only main equipment is mentioned, not all  |
| UNDP     | 29 | Page 20-21: subsection 3.1.1: Project Design, Objective & Approach | Were the project's objectives and components clear and feasible within its time frame? Discuss whether the project aimed to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socio-economic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant? | The objectives / components are discussed later under Section - 3.1.3 - Results Framework Indicators & Targets, and under Section 3.1.2 - Design Assumptions & Risks<br>E.g. 1. Project risk - Participation by women is limited by cultural norms. TE response – 'Gender – project could have been more proactive – only 1 gender training at end of project'<br>E.g. 2 Section 3.1.4 Gender – 'The prodoc mentioned the word gender 40 times, but was vague concerning actual benefits to women. These were mainly in relation to forest resources management, including harvesting and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). It didn't stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the community forest management committees (CFMCs).' |
| UNDP /CO | 30 | Page 21, Outcome 1   | Under the TE comments, it reads: Nafola PSC and UNDP lacked the political will to draw DAPEES and DARD into the project and lacked interest in cross-sectoral forums.<br>It is not clear as to what it means by saying 'lacked political will' ....kindly clarify, or replace, perhaps with, ...no authority etc.   | The lack of 'political will' or 'political willpower' means that these key project managers (UNDP and the PSC members) were not interested in directing the project more towards its design. They were content to allow the DoF to direct all matters towards forest-only interventions. They had the power (authority) but did not use it effectively to draw DAPEES and DARD into the project as per the project need  |
| UNDP     |    | 23/3/20  | It will still be good to rephrase it, because it is actually not the projects that lacked political will. Somehow it does not sound right.  | The TE still agrees with its view re. 'lack of political will' by the PSC and UNDP. 'Political will' can exist when: there are sufficient decision-makers - i.e. PSC, including UNDP as the responsible agency for GEF; brought together for a common purpose for a common good – i.e. to formally manage a government / donor project; and to find solutions – i.e. how to deliver a design approved by government.   |
| UNDP /CO | 31 | Page 22  | It reads: The target of 2.84m ha is for area of CF (gazetted and under CFMPs), thus the wording 'land use plans' was inappropriate here.<br>The wording is correct, since each of the CFs was supposed to have an Integrated Forest Management Plan   | Under Section 3.1.3 - Results Framework Indicators & Targets - The TE wrote – 'Objective level indicator - 2,840,153 ha under approved land use plans' ...Issue – 'The target of 2.84m ha is for area of CF (gazetted and under CFMPs), thus the wording 'land use plans' was inappropriate here.'<br>The TE describes very carefully in the report how the open language of the prodoc and its interpretation during implementation caused difficulties. But when reading the prodoc carefully it is clear that integrating land use planning and forestry was required. The project did not manage to do this.<br>In the same table, two boxes under Outcome 1 describe this:  |

|          |    |                              |   |  |  |
|----------|----|------------------------------|---|--|--|
|          |    |                              |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 land use plans developed (1<sup>st</sup> indicator)</li> <li>- Output 1.1 was '10 communities assisted to legalize their CFs'</li> </ul>   | <p>The use of the term 'land use plan' was not consistent in the prodoc which made understanding by UNDP / IP difficult. For the 1<sup>st</sup> Objective level and 1<sup>st</sup> Outcome 1 indicators, it just refers to the land gazetted as CFs with CFMPs.</p> <p>The IP took 'land use plan' it to mean the forest inventories that were produced for the CFMPs. They called them 'integrated forest resource management plans'</p>  |
|          |    |                              |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans (LUPs) and regional programs of sectors (2<sup>nd</sup> indicator)</li> <li>- Output 1.2 was 'Three CFs to formulate &amp; implement integrated forest resources management plans'</li> </ul>   | <p>Nafola / DoF never understood or agreed to prepare land use plans, however two LUPs were produced / being developed by MLR, for Omaheke and Otjozondjupa, but these were not effectively utilized by Nafola</p> <p>Output 1.2 refers to the preparation of 3 'demonstration' land use plans that integrate SLM with agriculture, livestock and forestry with land tenure and management activities such as bush removal, stock rotation, grazing control etc. Nafola took this again to mean the forest inventories that were produced for the CFMPs.</p> |
| UNDP /CO | 32 | Page 23, Gender design       | <p>It reads: The prodoc mentioned the word gender 40 times, but was vague concerning actual benefits to women.</p> <p>The NAFOLA Project was rated as Gen 1 Marker, meaning it meant to make limited contribution to Gender Equality.</p>   | Nafola only made a limited contribution to gender equality   |  |
| UNDP     |    | 23/3/20                      | It will be good to rephrase the sentence.   | Done – added the sentence 'To note, the project's gender rating was GEN-1, which indicated that the project was expected to only make a limited contribution to gender equality.'  |  |
| UNDP /CO | 33 | Page 24, Section: Management | <p>It reads: The MTR (August 2017) was used as a blunt instrument to control the project, having recommended UNDP to not pay for the kraal's rising costs (and footnoted - UNDP 'pressured' to undertake a 'spot check' to establish if there was financial impropriety, but in the end, just took financial control back.</p> <p>The MAWF letter to UNDP (September 2017), stated that the Nafola contribution to Tallismanus Kraal would remain at NAD6.3m, with MAWF to contribute the added costs of NAD2.5m from its capital projects fund</p> <p>Based on the findings of the MTR, it was clearly indicated at 1<sup>st</sup> PSC</p> | <p>Yes, the TE explains this further (p25) – 'In seven PSC meetings, UNDP attended with different staff on every occasion except once (6th and 7th meeting), thus their continuity in implementing the project could be construed as low. A concern regarding building an auction kraal was raised by UNDP during the 1st meeting (Q2, 2015), however when the PSC approved the kraal construction during the 2nd meeting (Q4, 2015), there was no comment by UNDP, nor later during 3rd meeting (Q3, 2016) when the kraal cost was revealed (US\$457,000 at the time).'</p> |  |

|          |    |  |   |   |
|----------|----|--|---|---|
|          |    |  | meeting that such an infrastructure cannot go ahead with the GEF funds  |   |
| RTA      | 34 | Page 24, Section 3.1.4 Gender Design                                     | This section and the discussion of the gender design could have been more detailed, if information is available?  | TE wrote – ‘Gender Design - The prodoc mentioned the word gender 40 times, but was vague concerning actual benefits to women. These were mainly in relation to forest resources management, including harvesting and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). It didn’t stipulate a gender balance in project institutional structures, such as within the PSC and the community forest management committees (CFMCs).’<br><br>The TE could find no further information on the gender design. This is it in total.  |
| RTA      | 35 | Page 24, Section 3.2.1 IA and EA Coordination and Operational Management | In the first sentence of this section there is a reference to UNDP being “the GEF Implementing Agency”. Please note that the correct terms for UNDP’s role is a “GEF Agency”. Any other references throughout the report should be amended accordingly.   | The TE’s understanding is that UNDP is accredited by GEF as an ‘Implementing Agency’ for GEF projects. See UNDP-GEF guidance for TEs – it states (at the time) – UNDP is one of 10 GEF Implementing Agencies  |
| RTA      | 36 | Page 27, Section 3.2.3. Gender Analysis                                  | Is there any other information that could be included in this analysis for a deeper assessment of this issue?   | The TE entered almost every available piece of gender information. There was no more and no further analysis could be undertaken  |
| UNDP /CO | 37 | Page 27, under co-financing  | It reads: Co-financing contributions, either as direct support funds (grant or in-kind) or as complementary funds (e.g. linking up with similar project in a neighbouring area), are not formally accounted for under GEF methods, with only the GEF funds audited, and UNDP funds self-audited.<br><br>This statement is not clear, especially the highlighted part. Kindly clarify.   | The TE believes that this statement is clear  |
| UNDP     |    | 23/3/20  | It will still be good to rephrase it. For example, it should be clear to know what is meant by saying UNDP funds "self audited"...  | Altered the report to say GEF and UNDP are audited  |
| UNDP     | 38 | Page 27: section 3.2.4 Finance & Co-finance                              | Comment on the effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of co-financing.   | TE added a sentence – ‘Whilst the co-financing added an estimated US\$4.5m to the GEF US\$3.5m spent, it was not considered to have had a significant effect on project outcomes or sustainability.’  |
| UNDP     | 39 | Page 27: subsection 3.2.5 M&E Systems – Design & Implementation          | For M&E Design: Was the M&E plan budget in the prodoc sufficient? Were roles & responsibilities well-articulated?<br><br>For M&E Implementation: Comment on the extent of the Project Board’s role in M&E activities. Was the GEF OFP kept informed of M&E activities? Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening procedure and in line with any safeguards management plan’s M&E section? Were PIR self-evaluation ratings consistent with MTR and TE findings? | TE wrote – ‘Section 3.2.5 M&E Systems – Design & Implementation - The main issue with the M&E, was a lack of any tracking (spreadsheet) system, indicating progress against outputs, indicators, or inputs (service contracts for example), thus monitoring project progress would have been difficult. The standard M&E framework for these UNDP-GEF projects, is report-based, with PIRs, which unlike most annual reports, run from July to June each year.’<br><br>The issue as mentioned was that the ‘standard UNDP-GEF format for M&E – i.e. report based, is inadequate, as a tracking or evaluating tool / system for these projects. Thus the issue is not one of roles or budget, but one of |



|     |    |  |  |   |
|-----|----|--|--|---|
|     |    |  |  | <p>design.</p> <p>The PSC actions are described in detail in Section 3.2.1 - IA and EA Coordination &amp; Operational Management. Thus, to put under M&amp;E as well would be repetitious. The PSC actions are also detailed in annex 5 – with a review of each PSC meeting. The lack of PSC attendance of the GEF OFP in Namibia is also mentioned in this section.</p> <p>The ESS plan was accessed, but not considered to add any further useful information for this report.</p> <p>The MTR ratings are provided in this M&amp;E section for comparison.</p> <p>The PIRs are considered under Section 3.2.6 - Adaptive Management (Work planning, Reporting &amp; Communications) with the statement – ‘Only one PIR was presented to the TE, with its date difficult to determine, although stated as of July 2018. No critical risks were entered.’ Further comment was not seen as useful to adding value to this TE report</p>  |
| RTA | 40 | Page 28, Section 3.2.4. Finance and Co-finance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of assets (October 2019) does not include the 13 quad bikes mentioned elsewhere. Is there any explanation that could be provided as to why this is the case?</li> <li>• Based on the information in Annex 3 it seems that the GEF project grant at project start was \$4,460,000 while at the time of the TE only \$3,489,000 were used up. What explains this discrepancy?</li> <li>• Co-financing: Please assess and explain any variances between planned and actual expenditures and co-financing. The reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing and the effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of (non) materialization of pledged co-financing. What were the causal linkages of these effects? What are the reasons behind the co-financing not materializing or falling short of targets? Please also describe what the co-financing amounts were actually used for (some of this information is in the Annex 5, but should be summarised as relevant in the co-finance section including the extent to which project components supported by external funders were integrated into the overall project).</li> </ul> | <p>The statement of assets does include – ‘13 quad bikes @ \$5,000 each’</p> <p>Yes, at the time of the TE mission, the project had underspent. The reasons are many and compounded. They include: Lack of understanding of the project design; lack of willpower to implement the project design; lack of capacity (and / or willpower) to gazette the CFs until right at the end of the project, thus negating the opportunity to undertake other project activities; lack of UNDP oversight – e.g. sending different staff to each PSC meeting; lack of drawing in the most appropriate directorates to support implementation, especially DARD and DAPEES; and lack of ‘sharing’ the project funding with any directorate outside DoF; lack of ability of PMU to engage freely with other directorates; and lack of checks and balances on the NPD, who was also the chair of the PSC.</p> <p>Re. cofinancing – see #38 regarding the estimated level of co-financing. The prodoc estimated levels of co-financing were considered to be significantly inflated, and hence not realised.</p> <p>The added information regarding the CF activities of KfW is not considered important enough to be placed in the main text of the report, hence it positioning in an annex. The co-financing of KfW and GIZ is also described in Annex 3. The extra co-financing brought in through Nafola support to CFs is described in this section 3.2.4 – ‘Financing - The DoF government budget contribution is under their CF programme, within their capital projects and operational budget. The KfW CF Programme (2013-16) was operating within the DoF and in Otjozondjupa. The GIZ Bush control &amp; biomass utilization project (formerly GIZ Support to de-bushing) was operating in African Wild</p> |

|          |    |   |  |  |
|----------|----|---|--|--|
|          |    |   |  | Dog CF. Oshaampula CF were awarded funds from the Environmental Investment Fund (GCF), with support from Nafola / Namibia Development Trust (NDT). African Wild Dog CF were awarded funds from the Regional Universities Agriculture Forum, for 'bush to feed' research, with support from Nafola.' There was little further information on these schemes with the impact to the project considered as marginal.   |
| UNDP /CO | 41 | Page 28, under overall work plan and budget                   | Output 1.1. Reads 10 CFs gazetted, and the TE comment says achieved.<br>Only 9 CFs have been gazetted, and not 10  | See section 3.2.2 – Achievement of Outcome 1, the TE wrote – 'The project supported 15 CFs, of which nine CFs were gazetted during the project. Four CFs were gazetted prior to the project, and two were surveyed and delineated by map, but were not gazetted, due to lack of Traditional Authority (TA) agreement.' Thus, the TE considered the output as 'Achieved'  |
| UNDP /CO | 42 | Page 32, under Analysis                                       | It reads: Create awareness for CBNRM / wildlife conservation, particularly for IUCN Red-list species – e.g. Wild Dog. Kindly replace IUCN with IUCN  | done   |
| UNDP     | 43 | Page 41: subsection 3.3.4 Efficiency, Relevance and Ownership | Expand on the assessment of efficiency, perhaps linking back to elements discussed in the Finance section. Also, was the project management structure as outlined in the prodoc efficient for generating expected results?<br>For relevance, comment on how the project is relevant to national priorities, UNDP strategic programming and GEF strategic programming. (These were discussed earlier the report, but are appropriate for mentioning in this section as well). Also, include linkages between the project and relevant SDG targets/indicators.<br>For country ownership: have outcomes or potential outcomes from the project been incorporated into development plans? Were relevant country representatives involved in the project board?   | In Section 3.3.4, the TE wrote – 'Efficiency was graded as Unsatisfactory. Nafola was not efficiently implemented, as it spent its funds on a much reduced number of outputs, that directly concerned forestry only. All other outputs which would have meant working with partners, were left out, apart from some nominal work with DAPEES for a limited period. The only work conducted outside forestry was the construction of a livestock auction facility, for which there was very limited engagement on its purpose, achieving profitability and its management mode.'<br>This is considered concise.<br>Under Section 3.2.1 – the TE wrote 'DoF (and the PMU and PSC) couldn't cope with managing funds effectively and lost financial control to UNDP after three years. Thereafter, payments for activities slowed down. Thus, the project changed to UNDP-assisted NIM for the last two years.' |
| UNDP     | 44 | 3. Findings<br><br>(missing section)                          | The standard structure of a TE report for GEF-financed projects includes a section on 'Mainstreaming' which covers cross-cutting issues. This section would cover how/if the project successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities including but not limited to: gender equality and empowerment of women, poverty alleviation, improved governance, CC mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, etc. As per quality ratings provided by the UNDP IEO, the assessment of cross-cutting issues is the weakest area of UNDP decentralized evaluations (for both GEF-financed and non-GEF projects). While some of these issues are discussed in other parts of the TE report, it would be beneficial to have a dedicated section. The following points | Whilst, the TE appreciates and is aware of the issue of mainstreaming, it is important to understand what was required to be mainstreamed under the project.<br>The primary reference in the project design was to mainstream forestry production into other sector planning documents – and in particular, to directly link with land use planning. The TE devoted some detailed discussions on how this could and should have developed, and didn't. Also, the project was very cross-sector with livestock, agriculture and grassland research, but the project failed to integrate their design activities with the relevant Directorates, let alone integrate or mainstream such planning. Again, the TE went to great lengths to explain this, as a severe failing of the project.   |

|     |    |  |   |   |
|-----|----|--|---|---|
|     |    |  | <p>could be used to help frame the assessment/discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How effective the project was in contributing to gender equality and the empowerment of women</li> <li>• How gender results advanced or contributed to the project's environment, climate and/or resilient outcomes.</li> <li>• Indicate whether gender results achieved are short-term or long-term</li> <li>• Did the project contribute to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources</li> <li>• Was there an improvement in the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance</li> <li>• positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability);</li> <li>• extent to which the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents;</li> <li>• whether project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk;</li> <li>• extent to which poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, women and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups benefited from the project;</li> <li>• the poverty-environment nexus: how the environmental conservation activities of the project contributed to poverty reduction.</li> </ul> | <p>Governance, capacity, and climate change are also presented in the report in relevant sections. For example, there is a page devoted to Institutional Mechanisms (Section 3.2.2). Gender has previously been discussed, and the TE has no further information that it can add. This is a common problem with such UNDP-GEF projects, that the reporting of gender is weak, and the TE can only allocate proportional time to the subject.</p> <p>The TE also does not wish to be repetitious in the report, for obvious reasons. Lastly, for all the bullet points, the TE has incorporated all relevant or accessible information.</p>                  |
| RTA | 45 | Page 43, Section 4.1. Financial Sustainability | <p>It would be helpful here to include any information relevant to the financial sustainability of the auction house mentioned earlier in the report. There is relevant information on this elsewhere in the report that could be included in this section.</p>   | <p>The livestock auction is considered in the Conclusions Section – ‘Livestock - the operational model for Tallimanus Livestock Auction Facility needs to be ‘cooperative’. It needs direct support from the Directorate of Planning &amp; Business Development (MAWF) to establish: a legal set-up, a ‘Board of Trustees’, a set of Guiding Principles’, separate facilities management and auctioneering contracts; a facilities manager and an accountant; and a 5-year funding stream from MAWF. What it doesn’t need is to be tendered into the private sector, nor be given to a party with vested interests, such as the regional famers union.’</p> |
| RTA | 46 | Page 43, Section 4.2. Socio-Economic           | <p>Is it possible to provide a more in-depth analysis in this section? Currently only two sentences are included.</p>   | <p>The evidence on improved livelihoods was scant, mainly because the CFs were only gazetted at the end of the project, thus the expected support to the CFMCs didn’t really materialise</p>  |

|      |    | Sustainability  |  |   |
|------|----|---|--|---|
| RTA  | 47 | Page 43, Section 4.2. Institutional and Governance Sustainability | Is it possible to include here any information relevant to sustainability of the CFMCs? There is relevant information on this elsewhere in the report that could be included in this section.  | See Conclusions Section – ‘The CFMCs vary in strength / experience, from being highly organised in Uukolonkadhi CF to ‘just starting out’ in Otjombinde CF. Many of the CFMCs are being undermined by the slow national response to illegal settlement. The CFMCs have the ability to generate income, which over these mostly very large CF estates, should have a high potential, not least because many of them are also wildlife conservancies. The project was expected to support the CFs in implementation of their CFMPs and other CF capacity-building actions, however it only got to the stage of supporting CF designation and planning, but not implementation.’<br>Also, the TE does not want to be repetitious.  |
| UNDP | 48 | Page 44-46: section 6. Conclusions, Lessons etc                   | Integrate aspects of gender equality in the TE findings, conclusions and recommendations.  | Yes done - See note #22   |
| RTA  | 49 | Page 46, Section 6.2. Lessons learned                             | The way in which the lessons learned are presented in this section read more like conclusions or findings. Is it possible to slightly re-write this to make this section read more like lessons learned that could be applicable to any future projects/portfolio of projects?   | When ‘Conclusions’ are split up between ‘Conclusions’ and ‘Lessons Learned’, it is important not to be repetitive. The TE has thus avoided this. If you read again, you will find the difference, in that the ‘conclusions’ focus on what the project did, whereas the ‘lessons’ provide an avenue for future actions.  |
| RTA  | 50 | Annex 3, Co-financing Table                                       | The information presented in this table mixes the GEF funding and co-financing, and then presents all of this information under the table titled ‘co-financing’. GEF is listed as co-financier, which is incorrect. This Annex should be either titled as the ‘total project budget’, if all financing is to be outlined, or the ‘project co-financing’ but then the GEF and co-financing should be accurately separated and labelled. Has the information presented in column titled ‘expected by project closure’ been independently verified? Is this the actual co-financing realised? For the types of financing, please classify the types based on the new GEF policy on co-financing, which applies to this TE. Please also correct the heading of the penultimate column from “new investment” to investment mobilised (if this is what is meant by this column?). Please also make sure that all other funding is correctly identified, for instance based on the co-financing letter form UNDP at project start the US\$ 500,000 was to be split between in-kind and cash contribution, so it is not accurate to say that the entire sum was a grant as currently shown in this Table.<br>Please also check, verify and correct all data in this table. | Yes, both GEF and co-financing are in the table separately, for clarity in adding up and presenting the figures.<br>The figures are all provided by the PMU and UNDP jointly according to their financial systems.<br>The co-financing figures for government were calculated by the PMU. The co-financing figure of GIZ (bush to fodder) was provided by GIZ after discussion with the TE. The KfW figure was reduced by the TE based on the estimated direct support of KfW to the project regions and national office, with further details provided in an annex – note much of their funding was outside the UNDP-GEF project years.<br>I have added ‘In-kind’ to the UNDP budget line.<br>All data is correct to the knowledge of the TE – the figures were carefully collated by the PMU and checked by UNDP. |
| RTA  | 51 | Annex 8: Stakeholder  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annex 8 does present a listing of key stakeholders; however, the TE report does not have a detailed analysis of the stakeholder engagement as a separate section. Much of this</li> </ul>   | The TE does not wish to be repetitious. As previously mentioned, there is a detailed analysis of ‘institutional mechanisms’ in Section 3.2.2. Annex 8 was redesigned during Inception, because the PMU / UNDP required information  |

|     |    |                |  |  |
|-----|----|----------------|--|--|
|     |    | Engagement     | <p>information is presented elsewhere in the report; but it would be useful to have a specific section with the evaluator’s summary analysis, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the stakeholder interactions as outlined in the ProDoc?</li> <li>• Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?</li> <li>• Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability. Have local and national government stakeholders supported the objectives of the project?</li> <li>• Participation and public awareness: How have stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?</li> <li>• Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities?</li> </ul> <p>Is there invested interest of stakeholders in the project’s long-term success and sustainability</p> | <p>on why the TE wished to meet each of the stakeholders.</p> <p>The stakeholders are discussed in the report in the relevant sections, including the Findings Chapter 3 – p21-42</p>  |
| RTA | 52 | Annex 11, Maps | <p>As per the GEF IEO TE guidance, the TE reports should include geo-referenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. To facilitate tracking and verification, where feasible, the terminal evaluations should also include geo-referenced pictures of the sites where GEF supported interventions were undertaken. If this is feasible and appropriate, please include this information in the final TE report. The maps given in this Annex are helpful but does not provide the adequate level of details required for future impact tracking and verification.</p>  | <p>TE wrote – p20 – ‘Project Location – ‘Notes: Geo-coordinates as per government gazette.’ This was the only information provided by the PMU to the TE.</p> <p>The TE during the pre-mission phased produced a CF location table to be completed, but the geo-coordinates were not forthcoming.</p> |

\* Comments received on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2020. TE responded 9<sup>th</sup> March.

Additional comments were received 23/3/20 – these are responded in the audit trail with the date given. The report was updated to reflect the changes. – 30/03/2020

Note – the TE Team specifically requested UNDP to garner comment from MAWF / DoF, but none was forthcoming