



**Project Board meeting minutes for the UNDP/GEF Project: PIMS 4932-
Strengthening National Protected Area Systems in Eswatini**

Held on 17th November 2020 at Magadzavane Conference

Present

1. Hlobisile Sikhosana – ENTC Acting CEO, GEF Operational Focal Point
2. Lindani Mavimbela –Secretariat (National Project Manager-ENTC SNPAS)
3. Majahodvwa Nkonde – MTAD
4. Thembinkosi Ndzimandze – MNRE
5. Lindiwe Mavuso – MoF
6. Siphos Shiba - MoA
7. Sandra Mansoor – MEPD
8. Onesimus Muhwezi – UNDP
9. Sanele Dlamini –Secretariat (ENTC SNPAS)

Agenda

1. **Opening Prayer**
2. **Chairperson’s welcome remarks**
3. **Adoption of Agenda**
4. **Review and adoption of minutes**
5. **Matters arising**
6. **Reflection on Board Tour**
7. **2021 AWP**
8. **Any other business**
9. **Closure**

The Chairperson who then requested Siphos Shiba to lead the house in prayer officially opened the meeting.

Item		
Agenda Items	Comments/Discussion	Decisions, Resolutions/Project impacts

<p>1. Opening Prayer</p>	<p>1. Sipho Shiba</p>	
<p>2. Chairpersons Remarks</p>	<p>The chairperson welcomed everyone who attended the meeting. She reported that the chairperson of the board would not be part of the meeting due to other important commitments.</p>	
<p>3. Adoption of Agenda</p>	<p>The Chairperson requested to the meeting that they go through the agenda with a purpose of adopting it.</p> <p>Item 7 of the agenda was corrected to be progress report and 2021 AWP.</p>	<p>Resolution 1: Agenda was adopted.</p>
<p>4. Adoption of minutes</p>	<p>Minutes were reviewed and there were few corrections.</p>	<p>Resolution 2: Minutes were adopted.</p>
<p>5. Matters Arising.</p>	<p>1. A question was posed if the number of meetings were adequate to enable the board carry its project implementation oversight function. Also concern was raised on the daily subsistence allowance (DSA) offered to board members.</p> <p>Response: UNDP advised that the frequency of board meetings was fine to monitor progress. More so, since procedurally UNDP Boards normally have two sittings a year (once in every six months). Instead it is the Project steering committee that should meet more often. The current quarterly meetings of the board are acceptable because it has to address concerns raised in the MTR. Board DSA needs to be assessed if it is aligned with current times.</p> <p>What positives have been achieved post MTR.</p> <p>Response: The project has revised its indicators to align with MTR recommendations. Importantly, project has moved from 39% to 70.2% overall performance.</p>	<p>Resolution 3: PMU requested to facilitate the review of DSA given to project board members, as they cannot be given the same rate as community members.</p>

	<p>2. The National Project Manager (NPM) was asked to share strategies adopted for fast tracking civil works. Response: NPM reported that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) ToRs were developed for engaging government engineers under the Micro Projects division in the Economic Planning Ministry. Bi-weekly schedules were developed for civil works M&E. Impact has been that most of the civil works were committed through purchase orders (PO) issued to contractors. Limitation: None comprehensive BOQs in all civil works that were developed using ENTC artisans had to be reviewed by Micro Projects Engineers to meet Industry Council standards. Poor BOQs led to two civil works being deferred to 2021, which are Mantenga paving and Sara camp.</p> <p>3. A concern was raised that the incentive of the Micro Projects Engineers was discouraging their reliability. Response: Micro Projects involvement should be considered as co-financing by government to the project for GEF to appreciate.</p> <p>4. What is the status of game species introductions? Were assessments done for introduced species. Response: The NPM reported that game species were delivered in Malolotja (Blesboks). Management plans informed adaptable species for the landscapes.</p> <p>5. There was a question on the extension of the project. Response: Project was given a one-year extension. This was due to COVID-19 impact on raw material availability which was scarce due to</p>	<p>Resolution 4: PMU was requested to facilitate the improvement incentives for micro project team.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>dependency on South Africa imports on raw materials for civil works.</p> <p>Limitation: During extension, GEF does not fund PMU. UNDP and ENTC had to provide funds for project staff and at the moment UNDP had committed \$55,000.00 for salaries.</p>	
<p>6. Review of Board Tour Report.</p>	<p>The board had requested to have an insight tour of project activities to appreciate progress made on SNPAS investments.</p> <p>1. Observation: Board noticed great concerns at Shewula Mountain Camp, where the community expressed its disappointment on projects that were implemented in 2018 to improve the camp infrastructures (Game fencing and substandard renovation material). This was also raised in the grievance consultancy and issue has gained political attention. The board wanted to know what has been done to rectify that?.</p> <p>Response: UNDP, ENTC and COSPE management had a virtual meeting to discuss issue on the 3rd & a physical meeting on the 10th November 2020 and board was informed that on the 18th November 2020 UNDP, ENTC, COSPE and Shewula community were having a meeting to discuss issues.</p> <p>Findings: generally, information gaps affected relations due to expectations and hopes that were raised to the community which were later not fulfilled due to poor communication of changed project scopes.</p> <p>Proposal: UNDP moved that the project sees how it purchases some fencing to show its understanding while talks with COSPE proceed to find solutions.</p> <p>2. The board noted that funders (GEF, UNDP & Government) visibility is</p>	<p>Resolution 5: The meeting urged UNDP and ENTC to continue addressing the community concerns.</p> <p>Resolution 6: The meeting also resolved that the PMU should try to purchase the fencing material with funds that will be available at year-end.</p>

	<p>not there on infrastructural investments made by the project.</p> <p>3. The board noted with concern that there are no guarantees that the investments done in the private land ownership (PLO) will benefit the nearby communities. Therefore, stringent agreements should be signed with PLO to ensure benefits of investments spill over to communities.</p> <p>4. Board noted with concern that some community infrastructure might not be sustained after project closure, such as proper safeguard of fence in protected wetlands, where fence is not well taken care of (falling). The PMU responded that wetland management plans for fenced wetlands are underway to try correct that and have a sustainable investment.</p>	<p>Resolution 7: It was stated that the PMU should install visibility material that the facilities were supported by GEF funding and also ensure that establishments (ecotourism facilities) are left at a functional state.</p>
<p>7. Quarter 3 Financial Progress Report</p>	<p>The chairperson request the National Project Manager to lead the meeting in reporting for third quarter activities.</p> <p>1. The NPM reported that during the period the project management unit started the quarter with a budget of E 4, 339, 136.82 under ENTC procurement in quarter 3 and only E 3, 116, 304.73 was successfully committed. A sum of E 2, 595, 293.01 was actual expenditure on activities and E521, 011. 72 was funds committed through purchase orders. The committed funds make an overall delivery of 72%.</p> <p>2. UNDP was requested to procure activities worth E 8, 133, 833.68, the overall delivery under this procurement is 90.2%, where E 2, 134, 528.75 is actual, and E5, 202, 762.02 is committed through purchase orders or contracts. Therefore, of the E13, 126, 490.88 Q3 budget requested only E10, 453,</p>	<p>Resolution 8: The project board appreciated the progress report and approved it.</p>

	595.50 has been committed, which is 79.6% delivery.	
<p>Quarter 3 Activities Progress Report</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NPM reported to the meeting that the GIS portal is now fully functional. 2. The Lubombo and Ngwempisi landscape management plans were launched by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Environmental Affairs 3. Community Ecotourism facilities business plans were successfully launched. 4. In the Integrated strategy of IAPs the national consultant has produced a final strategy that has been submitted to the ministry of tourism and environmental affairs, which has been presented to cabinet. 5. The NPM reported that they had done evaluations on OECMs. They evaluated IYSIS which is 21 000 ha, they realised that 500 ha of that is implicated on the encroachment illegal nearby communities that want to take land. They also evaluated shewula which had an issue of dagga 6. The NPM stated that despite the implementation of most activities there were still some challenges faced by the PMU. These were the COVID -19, which made it difficult to receive material mostly on civil works, non-availability of staff, prices and delivery time. The way forward is through extension of contracts or deferral where deemed necessary. 7. The board wanted to know progress made towards the development of guidelines on data sharing. NPM stated that all is moving as planned and they will be developed before year ends. 	

	8. Emphasis was made on ensuring that ecotourism facilities are left at a usable status after completion of construction works.	
8. Budget reallocations	The chairperson requested the NPM to lead the meeting on the next agenda item. The NPM requested to reallocate E40 000 from 2.1.1.2 to 1.3.1.3 which will help the project to launch the Malolotja landscape management plan	Resolution 9: Budget reallocations approved
9. Quarter 4 budget request	<p>The NPM reported that implementation in Q4 will be done through the surplus of funds from Q3 and available funds not used in implementing activities in Q3 which totals to E 2, 467, 685.02.</p> <p>Procurement that was requested to be procured by UNDP shall migrate to Q4 and no new procurement activities will be done. In short, the NPM requested the meeting to approve a budget of E2, 467, 685.02 for Q4.</p> <p>He pointed out that main deliverables for the quarter was the Malolotja landscape management plan and the evaluations on OECMs.</p> <p>Comment from the floor was that would the project team be able to spend everything in less than two months. The project team was also advised to include targets to show whether the amount of money allocated to that budget line is realistic or not.</p> <p>Another advise was that any funds not committed by 31ST December 2020 should be returned to UNDP</p>	<p>Resolution 10: Quarter 4 budget request approved</p> <p>Resolution 11: the project team was requested to do an evaluation and share online the no objection to proceed on the Shewula fence.</p>
10. CLOSURE		Meeting was adjourned.

Mavimbela Lindani (Secretariat)

Date

John Hlophe (Chairperson)

Date