



## Terminal Evaluation

# Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAMPLACE)

UNDP project IDs: PIMS 4173, Atlas Award 00059705, Atlas Project No: 00074796

GEF project ID: 3737

Evaluation time frame: 6 July-31 August 2016

Date of evaluation report: 30 September 2016

Country: Republic of Namibia

GEF SO1/SP3: Strengthened National Terrestrial Protected Area Networks

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)

Evaluator: Jessica Smith

## Acknowledgements

Thank you to all of the individuals whom I met or spoke to during the terminal evaluation. I appreciate the time invested into helping me to understand the dynamics behind the documentation. In particular, thanks to Nelson Zakaapi and Frederika (Maggy) Imbili at UNDP Namibia for supporting my mission. Also to the Project Coordination Unit, especially Laudika Halueendo and Michael Sibatani, for your very professional administration of the project and its documentation, which helped in my task.

I'm grateful to the Landscape Coordinators / secretariats Louisa Richmond-Coogan, Sue Cooper, and Ronnie Mora, who showed me around their respective landscapes and facilitated meetings with other key stakeholders. I appreciate that Teofilus Nghitila, Namibia's Environment Commissioner, found time to meet with me even during the high-level African Drought Policy Forum. Thanks to Chris Brown and Brian Jones, two key figures in Namibian conservation and development involved in the project, who kindly shared their considerable insight with me. Nico Willemse and Jonas Heita were also very insightful.

Thank you to Abiater Amateta for driving and being good company on the road. Finally, thanks to Joanna Patouris for editorial and administrative support in finalising the TE report, and to colleagues who provided substantive comments on the drafts: Martha Naanda and Paul Harrison.

# Executive Summary

## Project Description

1. The Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAMPLACE) Project is designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a large scale network of landscapes. In doing so, it meant to address threats to habitat and species loss on a landscape level approach, ensuring greater responsiveness to variability and seasonality issues around climate change. The project brought an additional 35 thousand square kilometres of land under collaborative management (double the original target) through arrangements designed to conserve biodiversity by establishing five Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCAs). PLCAs were first and foremost managed for the full suite of biodiversity and landscape values, also to generate economic incentives for stakeholders in the landscape (with the feedback loop that the benefits derived from biodiversity further supported positive biodiversity management). The initiative was based on the recognition by Namibia's Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET) that protected areas that operate in isolation of its neighbours are likely to face resistance.

## Project Summary Table

Project Title:		Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (NAMPLACE)		
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 4173		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	Award ID 00059705 Proj. ID 00074796	GEF financing:	4,500,000	4,500,000
Country:	Namibia	IA/EA own:	100,000	100,000
Region:	Africa	Government:	14,000,000	14,000,000
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other (Private sector, UNDP, Bilateral Aid Agencies):	17,883,000	22,627,011.52
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF Strategic Program 3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Areas; GEF Strategic Priority 1: Strengthening National Protected Area Systems.	Total co-financing:	31,983,000	36,727,011.52
Executing	Ministry of Environment	Total Project	36,483,000	41,227,011.52

Agency:	and Tourism	Cost:		
Other Partners involved:	Gondwana Collection Namib Rand Nature Reserve	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		3 February 2011
	Farm Dustenbruck Wilderness Safaris.	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2015	Actual: June 2016

## Summary Evaluation Ratings

2. The following table summarises the project evaluation findings, following UNDP's guidance<sup>1</sup>. Its various sections are also copied over and elaborated on in the full report.

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry	S	Quality of Implementation Agency Execution	S
M&E Plan Implementation	S	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	HS-S
Overall quality of M&E	S	Overall quality of Project Implementation / Execution	S
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes : Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU),</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability : Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance	R	Financial resources	L-ML
Effectiveness	S	Socio-political/economic	L-ML
Efficiency	S	Institutional framework and governance	L-ML
Overall quality of Project Outcome Rating	S	Environmental	L-ML
		Overall likelihood of risk to sustainability	L-ML
<b>5. Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M) , Negligible (N)</b>	<i>rating</i>		

<sup>1</sup> UNDP EO (2012).

Environmental Status Improvement	S		
Environmental Stress Reduction	n/a		
Progress towards stress/status change	S		
Overall project results	S		

## Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

3. Overall the project is largely successful and can be considered an innovative example of co-management, Protected Area (PA)-neighbour relations, and multi-stakeholder landscape-level cooperation. The project achieved most of what it set out to do, delivering on 57% of its indicators fully, and 43% of its indicators partly. This includes **important achievements** such as:
  - 5 operational Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCAs) established in very diverse areas of the country, anchored by national Protected Areas (PAs);
  - Guidance on fruitful park-neighbour relationships that was formalized through national policy; and
  - Co-management activities in 3/5 of the landscapes that enabled wildlife numbers to measurably increase during the project lifespan.
  
4. In more detail:
  - a. **Objective level:** Establishment of 5 PLCAs adjacent to PAs, with land uses that are compatible with biodiversity objectives including wildlife corridors. There were 4 objective-level indicators: 2 were fully achieved, and 2 were partly achieved. Notably the PA and Wildlife Bill - expected imminently at Project Information Form (PIF) stage (8 years ago) - remains in draft, although one could look at this as a positive in that the project experience now feeds into the Bill content.
  - b. **Outcome / Component 1:** Establishment of the PLCAs including their signed constitutions. This component had 4 indicators, three of which were fully achieved and one partly achieved. Significantly, MET itself was not a signatory to each Constitution as had been originally foreseen. However, a template for Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) that could be signed with each association are with the Directorate of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) for consideration.
  - c. **Outcome / Component 2:** Collaborative governance established for the 5 PLCAs, including relevant management plans. Here 2 of 3 indicators were fully achieved. The last involved management and tourism plans for PAs within the landscapes; these have all been developed but 3 of 9 are still pending approval by the Minister (expected imminently).
  - d. **Outcome / Component 3:** Market transformation and incentives that encourage land use change towards wildlife. One indicator relating to the delivery of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEAs) for tourism was fully

achieved. The remaining 2 indicators were partly achieved, namely biodiversity monitoring systems and efforts around supply chains, the latter being critical in the market transformation, important in the ToC of the projects. The evaluator noted only exploratory efforts around identifying supply chains for certification, which was meant to lead to markets established and mobilised for certified supply chains. These themes would be an area of attention for the future Landscape unit (noted in recommendations).

5. Many of the project indicators, however, were defined in terms of process-based outputs and not the desired impacts from these. The impact indicators presented focused on ecological results without counterpart indicators for the socio-economic and development impact of the project. This **hampered the potential effectiveness of the project's result framework** (i.e. usefulness of the targets and indicators set in guiding the project management towards achieving the desired project outcomes and objective).
6. The project investment demonstrates **sustainability** as, the "protected landscape" concept in Namibia is expected to continue beyond the project lifespan, and to be recognized through forthcoming national legislation. Indicatively 4/5 of the landscapes are likely to continue, with a mix of private investment and further donor support, as well as State support through a new landscapes unit in the executing agency. However, it would have been better served by project M&E that helped to quantify the benefits in terms of land value, return on investment, and other forms of benefits that the landscapes approach can yield. (Linked to the above point on indicators, the project would have been strengthened conducting M&E using quantitative indicators that focusses on benefits to humans such as return on investment, livelihood dividends, income generation and/or job creation). Such figures could have extended the project impact by making a strong case for new landscapes to different audiences, based on the project experience.
7. For corrective action, one of the top priorities that the MET landscapes (LS) Unit should prioritise is to **conduct an assessment of the Greater Waterberg Landscape Association** where major challenges were faced and little progress made. As well as demonstrating concern and trying to recover some the goodwill invested by stakeholders in developing the association, the assessment findings should also help to internalize the lessons learning when considering the enabling factors that are required for establishing newly proposed landscapes. Regarding the the scope of the new LS Unit, it should take up functions and tasks beyond focussing only on wildlife within the landscapes. The forthcoming PAs and Wildlife Bill is likely to support a more integrated approach, promoting many types of natural and cultural diversity in harmony. As Namibia is a beautiful and diverse country, with a drive to diversify its rural economy in a water-conscious manner, further development of protected landscapes is encouraged. Future efforts should explicitly target, measure and communicate the socio-economic and poverty reduction dividends that can be achieved through such approaches.

8. Recommendations are made to UNDP to **reinforce the value from this and similar investments**, namely
  - To more aggressively demonstrate the value of its forthcoming projects in development and poverty reduction terms – by for example, reflecting the number of beneficiaries and measurable contribution to poverty reduction and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be achieved in the headline indicators<sup>2</sup>.
  - As a global entity, strengthen its support to landscape projects by itself joining global, regional and multi-country initiatives such as ‘Landscapes for People, Food and Nature’ and seek out knowledge exchange opportunities between UNDP-supported and other landscape initiatives.
  - Since landscape approaches are so critical to achieving the SDGs, and are likely to continue gaining in popularity as a result, UNDP should consider planning a support programme and more actively communicating the benefits of landscape initiatives that brings together research and practitioners, and are likely to deliver more sustainable development benefits and/or create and generate co-benefits on other SDG targets (such as reducing inequality, women’s empowerment, etc.).
  
9. In terms of **proposals for future directions**, the TE recommends broadening the sectors that the landscape concept engages with – from tourism to other industries such as large-scale agriculture and mining that affect biodiversity, sustainable land management, and climate change. This may involve looking at feasibility of either establishing adjacent landscapes building on the successes of existing ones and/or extending the currently established landscape areas to include adjacent areas that involve industries which have the potential to impact biodiversity and wildlife, in particular mining and large-scale agriculture. Initially these landscapes would be seeking out broader collaboration in biodiversity management activities and co-financing from the private sector, but could then become a powerful vehicle for broader sustainability information management and joint action.

---

<sup>2</sup> A reviewer noted limited resources to “conduct an exercise that is valuable to determine the actual impacts”.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

BMM	KfW Bwabwata Mudumu Mamili PAs project
CCF	Cheetah Conservation Fund
CPAP	UNDP Country Program Action Plan
CPP for ISLM	Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management
CO	UNDP Country Office
DEA	MET Division of Environmental Affairs
DRSPM	MET Division of Regional Services and Park Management
DWNP	MET Division of Wildlife and National Parks
EO	Evaluation Office
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEB	Global Environmental Benefits
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ILM	Integrated Landscape Management
IRDNC	Integrated Resource Development and Nature Conservation
KfW	German Development Bank
LS	Landscapes (referring to MET Landscapes unit)
NAMPLACE	Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative
NILALEG	Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCA	Millennium Challenge Account
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
N\$	Namibian Dollar
PA	Protected Area
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PASS	UNDP-GEF Namibia Protected Areas System Strengthening project
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PDF	Project Development Fund
PLCA	Protected Landscape Conservation Areas
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PRF	Project Results Framework
ProDoc	Project Document
RBM	Results-based Management
RTA	UNDP Regional Technical Advisor
RSC	UNDP Regional Service Centre
SAR	Standard Annual Report
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SPAN	UNDP-GEF Namibia Strengthening the Protected Areas Network project
SPR	Standard Project Report
TE	Terminal Evaluation
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNPAF	UN Partnership Framework (Namibia's UNDAF)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
Project Description .....	2
Project Summary Table .....	2
Summary Evaluation Ratings.....	3
Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.....	4
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	7
Table of Contents .....	8
1. Introduction .....	9
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation .....	9
1.2 Scope & Methodology.....	9
1.3 Structure of the evaluation report.....	10
2. Project description and development context .....	11
2.1 Project start and duration .....	11
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address .....	11
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	12
2.4 Baseline Indicators established .....	12
2.5 Main Stakeholders .....	12
2.6 Expected results .....	13
3. Findings.....	14
3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation .....	14
3.2 Project Design / Formulation.....	16
3.3 Implementation and Execution.....	21
3.4 Assessment of outcomes .....	31
3.5 Sustainability .....	33
3.6 Impact.....	36
3.7 Additional results.....	37
4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons.....	39
4.1 Lessons .....	39
4.2 Corrective actions and follow-up .....	42
4.3 Proposal for future directions .....	45
4.4 Conclusions.....	46
5. Annexes - separate volume	

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

10. The Terminal Evaluation (TE) was carried out in August-September 2016. The objectives of the Terminal Evaluation are to:
- assess the achievement of project results, outcomes and impacts;
  - draw lessons that can both, improve the sustainability of project benefits and enhance overall programming of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
  - provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues;
  - contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit.
11. Evaluations for any UNDP supported Global Environment Facility (GEF) financed projects have the following complementary purposes:
- “To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments”.
  - “To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities”.
  - “To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues”.
  - “To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit”.
  - “To gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities.”<sup>3</sup>

## 1.2 Scope & Methodology

12. The TE was conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.
13. The objectives of the evaluation are **to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.**
14. The evaluation covered all activities supported by UNDP-GEF and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, Ministry of Environment &

---

<sup>3</sup> UNDP Evaluation Office (EO) (2012). Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects.

Tourism (MET). It also covered activities that other collaborating partners are supporting as part of the co-finance to the project.

15. The Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex 1) proposed the scope of the evaluation, and detailed the methodology to be employed. The evaluation effort used the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects* (UNDP EO, 2012).
16. The evaluation followed a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.
17. Among other things, the ToR included review of background documents, stakeholder interviews (using both open and defined questions), and field visits to a minimum of 3 (of 5) of the landscapes involved in the project. Annex B provides the rationale for how the evaluator decided on which 3 landscapes to visit. Stakeholders from the additional two landscapes were also consulted remotely. Annex C indicates all those who were consulted within the scope of the evaluation, which included staff from the implementing and executing agencies, line ministries, the steering committee chair and members, consultants to the project, stakeholders and beneficiaries. In brief, it involved a balance of those that were visited by the mid-term reviewers with those that were not, following up specific issues that were raised in project documentation, and prioritizing those which have more communities or Conservancy areas within its borders.

### **1.3 Structure of the evaluation report**

18. The report structure follows the recommended approach (in UNDP Evaluation Office [EO], 2012), namely: 1. Introduction, 2. Project description and development context, 3. Findings, 4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons, 5. Annexes including ToR for the evaluator, detail of the mission undertaken and documents reviewed, table addressing all of the UNDP-recommended Terminal Evaluation (TE) questions, and a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) assessment. The TE tries to refer to detail in other published documents where possible to avoid redundancies and stay within the recommended 40-page limit for the TE report.

## 2. Project description and development context

### 2.1 Project start and duration

19. The project began on 01 August 2011, after a 10-month delay in start up (between project signature and the inception meeting) as a result of delays in staff recruitment<sup>4</sup>. The revised end date of 30 June 2016 was roughly in line with the length of initial delay.

### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

20. The project was based on “the recognition by MET that protected areas that operates in isolation of its neighbours are likely to face resistance”<sup>56</sup>. The Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAMPLACE) Project is “designed to lift the barriers to establishment of a large scale network of landscapes and in doing so address threats to habitat and species loss on a landscape level approach, ensuring greater responsiveness to variability and seasonality issues around climate change.”

21. The barriers addressed<sup>7</sup> were:

1. Absence of or limitations in developing partnerships for Landscape Management: focus on sites rather than landscapes
2. Inadequate governance framework for Landscape Level Management
3. Insufficient focus on Market Transformation and Incentive Measures:

These correspond neatly to the 3 desired outcomes (and related components) described in the next section.

---

<sup>4</sup> According to the 2015 SPR, MTR and other documents.

<sup>5</sup> Taken from the project purpose as listed in the Standard Annual Reports (SARs). The MTR section 2.2 *Problems that the project sought to address* has a different interpretation of the problem statement of the project, which focuses more on ecological connectivity. Unfortunately, the problem statement was implied (through the barriers analysis) but not definitely summarised in the PIF and ProDoc (which reviewed a number of inter-related problems).

<sup>6</sup> A reviewer noted that the MTR (Williams & Mfune, 2014) had a different interpretation of the problem statement, detailed in section 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address. This was a contentious issue within the MTR. The reviewer offered a definition used in the project design: “the term ‘landscape approach’ has been redefined to include societal concerns related to conservation and development trade-offs. It also includes increased integration of poverty alleviation, agricultural production and food security. The approach puts the emphasis on adaptive management, stakeholder involvement and the simultaneous achievement of multiple objectives\*”, and added “with such understanding one would therefore be expected to understand the problem statement along with the project development objective which I think is very clear.”\*Reference to Sunderland, T. 2012. Landscape guidelines and principles. Presentation at conference. Bogor, Indonesia, CIFOR. Cited in: FAO. Climate-Smart Agriculture Handbook. See also text box ‘note on definitions’ in Adaptive management / Feedback from M&E activities section from page 21.

<sup>7</sup> Described in more detail in the PIF, ProDoc and in the Inception Report.

## 2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

22. The project's Development Objective was that: "Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCAs) are established and ensure that land uses in areas adjacent to existing Protected Areas are compatible with biodiversity conservation objectives, and corridors are established to sustain the viability of wildlife populations."

## 2.4 Baseline Indicators established<sup>8</sup>

23. The baseline indicators established at objective level for the project were:
- Changes in the movement patterns of animals in relation to corridors created
  - 5 LCAs are established to improve biodiversity conservation at landscape level; an additional 15,550 km<sup>2</sup> brought under collaborative management with protected areas
  - Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores are improved in protected areas and at landscape level
  - Framework in place for collaborative management among stakeholders within landscapes
24. The project amended the indicators on two occasions – towards the start of the project (approved by the 4<sup>th</sup> PSC) and after the Mid-term Review (MTR), both with approval of UNDP. The Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) on the project at the time reported that this is a common number of revisions (within the normal range).

## 2.5 Main Stakeholders

25. The main implementing partner for this project is the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), which is also a project beneficiary. The landscape concept involved mandates for a number of departments within MET; the project was housed in Division of Environmental Affairs (DEA), but worked closely with Divisions of Tourism (DoT) and Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) via the PSC and in implementation.
26. Landscape stakeholders included the various residents of each selected landscape, such as Protected Area (PA) residents and neighbours including registered / gazetted Conservancies (communal and commercial), private and communal or resettlement farmers adjacent to PAs, and private companies and investors in and

---

<sup>8</sup> The mid-term reviewers provided detailed feedback on the Results Framework and presented a revised version for consideration in *Table 3. The indicators for the project with established baselines and EOP targets* (Williams & Mfune, 2014: 7-12).

adjacent to PAs.

27. Other key stakeholders included sister line ministries – namely, Finance, Fisheries and Marine Resources Mines and Energy, Agriculture, Water and Forestry – as well as regional government, Civil Society, traditional authorities, and the Namibia Wildlife Resorts.

## 2.6 Expected Results

28. The project had three overall outcomes (listed below with related project Component):

Outcome(s)	Component
<p>Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCA) established 5 sites constituting additional 15,550 km<sup>2</sup> of PA (Each PLCA will comprise a current State PA at the core, and adjacent Communal Conservancies and Private Reserves/ land areas operating with shared biodiversity management objectives and frameworks and compatible land use).</p>	<p>1. Establish new Protected Landscape Conservation Areas (PLCAs)</p>
<p>Adaptive collaborative management frameworks for five PLCAs operationalised in line with agreed national framework for PLCAs. This reduces biodiversity pressure and improves status as follows: (i) maintenance of wildlife populations at landscape level; (ii) security for wildlife movements across land units and water and range access; (iii) compatibility of land uses in adjacent land units with overall biodiversity management goals; (iv) containment of threats such as predator control, overstocking with livestock/game, and tourism impacts. Collaborative oversight by individual PLCA authorities, supported by a National PLCA Coordination Unit, assures best practice in PLCA management in line with related national policies and legislation. PLCAs are being adaptively managed to cope with the predicted impact of climate change (shifting biodiversity, integrate sustainable land management, water management strategies; integrated re-management strategies)</p>	<p>2. Collaborative Governance for PLCAs</p>
<p>Production practices on community and private lands within five PLCAs are compatible with best practices in biodiversity management objectives while providing livelihoods to stakeholders. Ongoing paradigm shift from unsustainable to sustainable natural resource use (tourism, game products, revenue diversification) sustained. PLCA management costs are underwritten by stakeholders through an agreed financial management system with appropriate revenue/ benefit sharing mechanisms in place.</p>	<p>3. Incentives and Market Transformation</p>

29. The five participating landscapes were defined at PIF stage, their selection was reconfirmed through the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) studies, and they were formalised with support from NAMPLACE project:
- Mudumu Landscape covering 2047 km<sup>2</sup>.
  - Greater Waterberg covering 18 763 km<sup>2</sup>. Includes Waterberg Park, neighbouring freehold conservancies and nearby communal conservancies.
  - Windhoek Green Belt covering 760 km<sup>2</sup>. Includes Daan Viljoen Game Reserve, neighbouring farms, Windhoek Municipality.
  - Greater Sossusvlei-Namib covering 5730 km<sup>2</sup>. Includes Namib Naukluft Park and neighbouring farms and private game reserves.
  - Greater Fish River Canyon covering 7621 km<sup>2</sup>. Incorporates /Ai-/Ais Hot Springs Game Park and Naute Recreation Resort, private farms, private game reserves and a communal conservancy.

### 3. Findings

30. The following sections consider findings by theme: 3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation, 3.2 Implementation and Execution, 3.3 Assessment of outcomes, 3.4 Sustainability, and 3.5 Additional results. Sections contain a ratings table, which corresponds to the summary presented at the beginning of this document.

#### 3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

Rating of Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E):</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	S	Project followed the plan in place, however was focused on either process-based or ecological indicators. Amendments made did not fully capture the financial or economic dimensions of the landscape concept, and missed the opportunity to have convincing results that could be communicated to further encourage the landscape approach beyond the project.
M&E design at project start up	S	Some drawbacks in the approved Project Results Framework (PRF) were noted early in the project and amended, and again after discussion spurred by the MTR. The PRF included no identified poverty reduction, livelihood or economic benefits for direct or indirect beneficiaries, which may be expected for a UNDP project <sup>9</sup> .

<sup>9</sup> Although I don't believe this was typical for a biodiversity project at the time of the project design, it may be more common today. However, this is based on personal reflection rather than a detailed review of relevant projects.

M&E Plan Implementation	S	The project carried out M&E as expected, however it was not necessarily used strategically to help market the landscape concept beyond the project lifespan. An early study quantifying the value of the landscape benefits would have been powerful, and would have allowed the proponents <sup>10</sup> to show "X" increase in these values through the project lifespan.
-------------------------	---	--

31. The M&E for the project was satisfactory, following the prescribed steps and guidance. However, it was not used as strategically as it could have been – i.e. as a decision support tool contributing to the likelihood of attainment of the impacts beyond the project lifespan attain impact beyond the project lifespan. The project indicators could have been defined more in terms of socio-economic results and benefits. One could imagine a final outcomes statement that summarises e.g. land values in a particular landscape were "A" at the beginning of the project and "B" by the end, once wildlife numbers increased by "C" with "D" investments, yielding a rate of return of "E". Additional economic and financial capacity (through staff or consultancy support) could have helped to define and guide an M&E more strongly linked to project impact. Since there was no baseline or subsequent study of the value of landscape benefits, the project was unable to make a case for the changes its intervention yielded, beyond the ecological improvement.

32. The related UNDP-GEF Strengthening the Protected Areas Network (SPAN, PIMS 3121) in Namibia provides a good illustration of how powerful such M&E-derived figures can be in attaining project impact, well beyond the lifespan of the GEF investment. The project conducted two studies on the investment and return in Namibia's PA estate, showing that with Namibian Dollar / N\$40 million annual costs, it contributed between N\$1,013 million and N\$2,022 million to the national economy – in other words between 3.1% and 6.3% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP)<sup>11</sup>. The study further showed that the rate of return to this investment has been estimated to lie in the area of 23%, and not only economically efficient but with social and environmental benefits also incurred<sup>12</sup>. Such compelling figures resulted in an increase in allocations of 310% by government in park management over the next 4 years<sup>13</sup> (measured via the project's M&E), and entitlement to a proportion of gate fees to individual PAs, which had previously gone to central coffers<sup>14</sup>. The trend towards increased investment into PAs and the PA system has continued, and also served to convince the Ministry of Finance to return a proportion of park entry revenues to the PAs themselves<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> i.e. those bringing forward and supporting the project concept, such as UNDP, MET, and co-financing partners.

<sup>11</sup> Turpie, J. et al (2005). Namibia's protected areas: Their economic worth and the feasibility of their financing. DEA Discussion Paper no. 73: September 2015. Windhoek: MET.

<sup>12</sup> Turpie, J. et al (2004). Strengthening Namibia's system of protected areas, Subproject 1: Economic analysis and feasibility for financing. Windhoek: MET.

<sup>13</sup> Turpie et al 2008.

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Chapeyama, O. (2012). SPAN Final Evaluation.

<sup>15</sup> Reported in the PIF for the follow-on Namibia Protected Areas System Strengthening (PASS) project, page 4.



33. Could a similar level of momentum have been achieved by private landholders around PAs through NAMPLACE if the rate of return on investments of wildlife been calculated and promoted through the project, showing cases from the project demonstration landscapes based on findings of project M&E? I think a compelling case could have been presented.

### 3.2 Project Design / Formulation

34. The project was commendably well-designed and very innovative for its time. Many stakeholders reported it was “ahead of its time”<sup>16</sup>. The project now represents an early example of concepts that are only now being more widely promoted, through a number of international landscape management initiatives. The project also built off a solid base of GEF investments in Namibia. Lessons from other relevant projects were well incorporated in the project design. Notably: from UNDP-GEF Strengthening the Protected Areas Network (SPAN), GEF ID#2492, the value of being situated within the government and working hand-in-hand with national processes; from World Bank GEF Integrated Ecosystem Management in Namibia through the National Conservancy Network (ICEMA) GEF ID #1590, the importance of market transformation and incentives; from World Bank GEF Namib Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management (NACOMA) GEF ID #1505, the benefit of bringing the full range of stakeholders including private sector together in management activities; and from UNDP-GEF Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (CPP for ISLM, developed around one year before NAMPLACE, GEF ID #3356), various approaches for working effectively on sustainability issues within the political context of redistributive land reform and resettlement.
35. The project would have benefited from recently popularized approaches – see UNDP implementation section for details. For example, the PIF already listed the landscapes that were included in the project<sup>17</sup>. The evaluator heard repeated a general criticism<sup>18</sup> that the project concept came “top down” and not enough consultation was conducted in the design stages (PIF or PPG)<sup>19</sup>. Buy-in to the

---

<sup>16</sup> A reviewer from UNDP CO noted, “Looking back (institutional ‘UNDP’ introspection) this is a true reflection. I believe many Namibian-type of projects are much well ahead of time, which has both advantages (+) and disadvantages (-). What appears to be lacking in the TE is how to best assess such type of initiatives and somehow +vely impacting future innovations in programming.” TE response: I hesitate to speculate without taking a comprehensive look at a range of projects to inform on this point. But in some cases (e.g. SPAN and ICEMA), other “ahead of their time” projects were a stand-alone success, possibly because of their strong business case orientation and clear demonstration of returns.

<sup>17</sup> Elaborating that “each PLCA will comprise a current National Park at the core, and adjacent Community and Private Reserves operating with shared biodiversity management objectives and frameworks and compatible land use.”

<sup>18</sup> Reported in the MTR (Williams & Mfune, 2014), Jones (2015), some project documents, also confirmed by various interviewees.

<sup>19</sup> One reviewer noted here that it may be that the design approach was effective and efficient in delivering the PIF for approval (naming the sites and with a convincing case for their selection), however it may have been better (process wise) to come at the same conclusion in a later stage with more stakeholder buy-in for the

landscape selection might have been stronger if the PIF had just listed criteria for selecting the various landscapes<sup>20</sup>, and the process of selecting participating landscapes came later and was more transparent. A number of respondents mentioned the eastern floodplains of Zambezi region, all directions around Etosha and other areas as also promising candidates with arguable reasons to focus there<sup>21</sup>. The original inclusion of Windhoek Green Belt and Waterberg were questioned by some respondents, although the rationale (noted in the PIF and by UNDP Country Office [CO] in interview) was to have bio-geographic representation of vegetation types that were under-represented, including Highland Shrubland (in Windhoek Green Belt), and Thornbush Shrubland (in Waterberg).

36. Some respondents felt that the level and nature of consultation could have been improved at the PIF<sup>22</sup> then PPG stage in particular at landscapes which involved Conservancies members or which were more numerous or heterogeneous (especially Waterberg and Mudumu; Sossuvlei, by contrast, has few permanent residents and very capable private sector stakeholders). Others reported that consultation was extensive enough<sup>23</sup>. My assessment is that some of the baseline assessments were optimistic<sup>24</sup>, although tempered in other documents such as the capacity assessment for implementation of Component 3<sup>25</sup>. If the PIF had only defined the criteria for selecting the participating landscapes, the decision of which landscapes were included, and which indicators were appropriate for each location, could have been taken later into the consultations – either as an outcome of the PPG or even at project inception - and likely been perceived less “top-down”. (This recommended approach is followed in the Namibia’s submission within GEF-6, *Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty* (NILALEG), see PIF, page 18-19.)

37. At the same time, some of the PPG consultations raised expectations that were not

---

selection. Another reviewer relayed the recollection from that period of substantial consultations and of careful reconsideration of the selected landscapes based on consultations and the ‘value’ of the landscapes.

<sup>20</sup> Again, I believe this is more common an approach today than when the project was designed.

<sup>21</sup> UNDP CO reviewer countered that: “Sequencing of existing and then ongoing projects to cover key bio and ecological zones as well as GEF requirements to demonstrate differences between existing and ongoing GEF funded projects influenced the selections. And the UNDP approach to have an inclusive development approach in any country, as focussing on same sites could have been interpreted as if discriminating other socio-economic groupings. The solution now is to use SDG and make cases better with co-benefits of conservation of improved PA management.”

<sup>22</sup> The PIF was developed internally by UNDP CO and RSC. Various constraints (e.g. timeframe, resources) may have negatively influenced the stakeholder consultation process at a very crucial design stage: see later comment that the PIF could have included only the criteria for the sites to be selected. However, there were also limitations identified with the PPG consultations specifically cited with regards to Waterberg, which relate to the approach of not using an experienced CBNRM support organisation (mentioned in more detail elsewhere).

<sup>23</sup> e.g. the CCF needs assessment gives the figure of 289 questionnaire respondents.

<sup>24</sup> For example the pre-feasibility for Waterberg (Versa-con and IECN 2010) suggests the area, Otjozondjupa Region, “is one of the best Tourists Region in Namibia” also that “The cluster is consolidated through partnerships among landowners that could result in the removal of fences to open up landscapes, restoring historical animal wildlife distribution ranges and reconnecting wildlife migration corridors” – which (in my view) is indeed true but with the qualification that such an endeavour would likely take decades.

<sup>25</sup> Versacon and IECN (2010).

met through the project<sup>26</sup>. Where landscapes included communal Conservancies, expert CBNRM support facilitators from the NACSO family of organisations could have been engaged to support the communal Conservancy committees to undertake consultation workshops in their own localities<sup>27</sup>. There is a valuable skillset involved in shepherding such processes locally, and Namibia has a lot of experience and capacity in this area that some respondents might have been put to better use in the project design process<sup>28</sup>. Other respondents felt the communal Conservancies are well-equipped to lead their own internal consultations, and project developers should rely on the governance in place to get feedback.

Furthermore, the selection of some landscapes with mainly private beneficiaries caused some discomfort<sup>29</sup>. For example in Windhoek Green Belt, a freehold farmer not belonging to any of Namibia's designated Previously Disadvantaged People<sup>30</sup> was a project beneficiary of a game-proof fence, while elsewhere other benefits were derived to private tourism operations. This was in line with the project concept, but there was discomfort around this noting also the political history of the country. One respondent said, "it's fair enough to have different perspective on whether that's an appropriate direction of impact from the project." Others argue that the overall outcome supporting wildlife and tourism that generate national development benefits and poverty reduction – are "the big picture" and that the relatively small distribution of benefits to some private individuals along the way is a necessary part of achieving a broader strategy. An approach more explicitly recognising both perspectives could have been to define the criteria for selecting landscapes and defining project beneficiaries, which could have also been widely agreed to as a principles document, guiding the PSC's budget decisions<sup>31</sup>. Perhaps some trade-offs of this nature would have helped in the perception of fairness, while also targeting the project's stated objective.

---

<sup>26</sup> Reported by interviewees, in the MTR and in Jones 2015.

<sup>27</sup> There are several support organisations and NGOs working with Conservancies (see below). Notably the *Namibian Association of CBNRM Service Organisations (NACSO)* provides a platform to organise concerted and well coordinated support to conservancies. The organisation does also, to some extent, service a "communal conservancy association" function, in terms of forming a common CBNRM anchor that keeps its ear on the concerns and needs of the local communal conservancies. The commercial conservancies established in 1996, the *Conservancy Association of Namibia (CANAM)*, an umbrella organisation for registered commercial conservancies. These two organisations certainly will be key stakeholders on a national level for the NAM-PLACE project. However, concerns were raised (e.g. in the needs assessment) about the effectiveness, representativeness and the mandate of CANAM.

<sup>28</sup> Also in implementation, discussed later.

<sup>29</sup> Jones 2015 Section 3.3: Role of MET, also supported through my interviews.

<sup>30</sup> Namibia's Constitution (Articles 23(2) and 23(3) defined these groups in order to redress the imbalance in Namibian society from pre-Independence discriminatory laws.

<sup>31</sup> UNDP CO reviewer note: "Possibly misunderstanding or misinterpretations of project objectives and approach could or perhaps have also created this scenario. For e.g. the project logic of different landscapes almost assumes that there will be differences in approaches to deliver the benefits, to implement and to deal with conflicts and differences on the ground, based on concerned actors, stakeholders and land users and land use arrangements"

38. Finally, there was debate on whether a narrow focus on wildlife (instead of biodiversity more broadly, or even an ecosystem management approach) excluded some potentially interested stakeholders, versus whether keeping it tightly defined was a necessary approach. In general, the field of integrated landscape management seems to be moving towards the multiple objectives approach<sup>32</sup> (see below on definitions). Namibia's draft wildlife bill also embraces a broader approach managing for natural and cultural benefits. As noted e.g. in the section on UNDP implementation, an MFA approach might have yielded benefits.
39. Unfortunately, it seems the it seems (as noted by a reviewer and a respondent) that the MTR exercise may have contributed to narrow in focus and/or understanding of the entire business case being pursued. An official guidance note from UNDP-GEF (global) could have minimised confusion on the official position of the agency, however Namibia being an earlier adopter of this approach also meant that there was no body of projects for the agency to learn from to build such guidance. As noted elsewhere, there are positive and negative aspects to being "ahead of the curve".
40. Yet the innovative aspects of the project should not be under-stated. The project was a very early example of the protected landscapes approach and one which focused on multiple benefits from the interaction between the different landusers. The Eco-Agriculture partnership notes that, "even five years ago the term 'landscape' was rarely used [in this context]... Today, the term, and the management and policy approaches underlying it, are beginning to gain prominence as the limits of narrowly sectoral approaches become more apparent in our interconnected, crowded, resource-constrained and climate-chaotic world<sup>33</sup>." The NAMPLACE project design pre-dates the "popularity<sup>34</sup>" of such approaches and provided an early example of their application. Furthermore, concepts of PA-neighbour cooperation were in infancy compared to the body of experience emerging in this area today. In this regard too, Namibia's conservation sector has been a practice leader. Initially the SPAN project piloted "3) establishment of benefit sharing mechanism for PA residents and neighbours", from which lessons and encouragement supported NAMPLACE's strategy in this regard.

## Analysis of LFA/Results Framework

41. The LogFrame<sup>35</sup> was well-designed for its time<sup>36</sup>, meaning that the project's

---

<sup>32</sup> See e.g. GEF PA impact study.

<sup>33</sup> Eco-Agriculture Partners (2013). Defining ILM for Policy-Makers. Policy Focus No. 10.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> The contemporary template contains a Project Results Framework (PRF) in place of a LogFrame. The term PRF is used in the document when referring to this element of the project design for the sake of familiarity, except where discussing the implications of the previous versus current approach.

<sup>36</sup> Referring here to caveats mentioned in section below on UNDP implementation regarding the value of moving to a Theory of Change approach, which has become popularised for good reason.

objectives and components were largely clear and practicable. Most were feasible within its time frame, especially within Components 1 and 2. Component 3 posed the greatest technical difficulty, given the magnitude of the challenge (incentives and market transformation), the large variety between the 5 PLCAs involved, and the reliance on results in earlier Components, co-financing and partnerships to realise the ambitious strategy at each location. The indicators in Component 3 were largely processed-based, but would have provided a better road map if they had been focused on the desired results. Furthermore, more time would have benefited the team in achieving the desired outcome for Component 3.

### **Partnership arrangements**

42. Partnership arrangements were properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval. Arrangements were exemplary at the landscape scale, bringing the key stakeholders together into each formalised Landscape Association with a clear and sound governance structure. The stakeholders spanned private sector (an innovation mentioned in section 4.1), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and civil society groups, and a range of different land users who normally would not collaborate. Nationally, more effort could have been made by activating the "Advisory Group", which could have included other relevant representatives beyond those in the PSC. FENATA (the national tourism industry body) was included in the PSC but not the communal or commercial conservancies or farming associations. Furthermore, the project would have benefitted from being part of some of the international partnerships around landscapes that have been emerging in recent years (discussed under recommendations in section 4.3).

### 3.3 Implementation and Execution

Rating of Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>IA Implementation and EA Execution:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	S	The project was generally delivered according to expectations, either fully or partly. Further technical support and guidance <sup>37</sup> would have been beneficial to bring development and livelihood benefits to the fore in Component 3.
Implementing Agency Execution	S	A great deal of value and vision was brought at the project design stage, to make this a remarkable project – an early example of concepts that are only now being more widely promoted. During implementation, the support provided by UNDP CO to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) was largely good although suffering from staff turnover at key intervals. Globally and regionally, the agency could have done more to build communities of practice around the landscape approach, sharing experiences between similar projects in its portfolio and synthesise lessons into tools such as practitioner guidance notes.
Executing Agency Execution	HS-S	The project team delivered a challenging project on time and on budget through complex circumstances. They managed external changes largely quite well. The PCU was composed of staff with good technical and managerial skills, with prior GEF experience. Unfortunately, turnover occurred towards the end of the project which affected Component 3 delivery and project close-down. Neither the PCU, nor potentially the PSC, sufficiently addressed the uneven needs of participating landscapes early enough to build a successful strategy <sup>38</sup> . The project sustainability planning could have been more strategic, and come earlier, and/or been served by extending the project.

#### Adaptive management / Feedback from M&E activities

43. The project assumptions and risks were generally well articulated in the PIF and project document. Yet, as external factors presented themselves more clearly during implementation, there were – relatively minor - changes in the environmental and development objectives of the project during implementation. The changes were

<sup>37</sup> Support through consultancy with economic and financial expertise, and guidance from the PSC e.g. through requesting and reviewing ToRs to this effect.

<sup>38</sup> A reviewer from UNDP CO noted that “the PSC, the UNDP and MET had engaged the PMU [or PCU] to do exactly this, but for some reasons it appears it was not done. Waterberg LS was an issue that had separate meetings just dedicated to it, organised, rightly so by the PMU due to their diligent observations of challenges. Yet, PMU sort of treated it as a ‘dead case’.” What other leverage does the PSC hold over the PMU/PCU to insist it act on certain issues? Possibly this could have been explored further if it was evident the PCU was not acting swiftly or effectively enough on troubleshooting known challenges.

made in response to feedback from stakeholders, different approaches by MET, challenges identified in achieving perhaps overly ambitious targets, and due to the wide range of circumstances in the 5 landscapes.

44. The project also underwent a number of changes as a result of recommendations from the mid-term review (MTR), although there was also push-back also as many of the recommendations were deemed “subjective”. Furthermore, the MTR challenged a number of project expenditures and strategies on the basis of the “landscape level conservation” approach while the project was justifiably taking an “integrated landscape management” approach – see below note on definitions.

**A note on definitions:** “Landscape management” is a concept rapidly evolving in international policy, building to some degree on “landscape level conservation” but increasingly simply referring to an intervention that is “place-based”<sup>39</sup> and integrates a number of sectors and/or brings together the stakeholders working alongside one another towards a particular set of shared objectives. The GEF’s financial support to landscape management “has been quite diverse and has included such things as the introduction of sustainable forestry management, and biodiversity-friendly alternative economic activities, such as payment for ecosystem services and mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations into public spending”<sup>40</sup>. While this is certainly broad, a recent impact assessment of GEF investments into and surrounding PAs encourages this diverse approach: “GEF should invest more in interventions that enable dialogue and joint decision-making, not only among multiple stakeholders in and around PAs, but also stakeholders representing different sectors and operating at different scales... that tend to have conflicting development priorities and management objectives with regards to biodiversity conservation”<sup>41</sup>.

While the project defined a Protected Landscape Conservation Area as “a cluster of different land units potentially under different tenure, which will have land-uses compatible with biodiversity conservation,” there was debate around the validity of this Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) approach. As a means for targeting Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs), the mid-term reviewers (Williams & Mfunne, 2014) promoted “landscape level conservation” as being a more appropriate strategy, centred on the conservation of ecological processes, ecosystem function, and with the potential to counter broad-scale ecological changes<sup>42</sup>. However, I understood that it is implied through the GEF-financed UNDP-implemented project portfolio that UNDP supports the integrated approach, referring to “long-term collaboration among different groups of land managers and stakeholders to achieve the multiple objectives required from the landscape”<sup>43, 44, 45</sup>. In the case of the objectives statement of this project – approved by UNDP and endorsed by GEF – that the targeted ILM objective is enhanced potential for wildlife movement and increase in numbers.

<sup>39</sup> See: Landscapes for People Food and Nature initiative.

<sup>40</sup> Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems (2015). Prepared for the 49<sup>th</sup> GEF Council Meeting, 20-22 October, Washington DC. Available online [here](#).

<sup>41</sup> (recommendation 3, page 4) in the above Impact Evaluation.

<sup>42</sup> No reference was provided to further clarify the context of this definition, as for example stakeholders and socio-economic dimensions of landscapes were not.

<sup>43</sup> Eco-Agriculture Partnership, defining Integrated Landscape Management for Policy Makers. Available online [here](#).

<sup>44</sup> See relevant ILM page [here](#).

<sup>45</sup> World Bank (2012). An integrated approach to managing and restoring landscapes. Available online [here](#). See also the Landscape FAQ [here](#).

It is a seemingly small distinction with fairly large implications once looking more in detail at the criteria for whether specific interventions that warrant funding or not with the GEF grant – which were challenged in the MTR. However, I find that the project’s approach is also fully in line with norms established by IUCN (i.e. within Category V<sup>46</sup>), whose World Commission on PAs are a valuable source for benchmarking such definitions<sup>47</sup>.

Namibia’s submission within GEF-6, Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)<sup>48</sup>, is explicitly formulated around the ILM approach.

45. The process involved was that recommended changes were considered and drafted (or synthesized) by the PCU and sent to the PSC for review and consideration. Decisions were taken at PSC level and submitted in writing for approval by the RTA. In general, the changes did not materially change the project outcome, apart from one: the decision made early on (4<sup>th</sup> PSC meeting) not to try to incorporate the landscapes into the formal protected areas system. This was deemed impossible due to delicate considerations around land tenure, as well as lack of a suitable legal framework to recognize the landscapes in this manner (namely lack of the PA Wildlife and Management Bill, which was foreseen in the PIF).

## Project Finance

46. The TE is expected to include a table that show planned and actual co-financing commitments, as follows:

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agencies (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants							0	0
Loans / Concessions							0	0
• In-kind support	100,000	100,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	12,705,000	12,959,274.72*	17,883,000	21,059,274.72
• Other			6,000,000	6,000,000	5,178,000	9,667,736.80	11,178,000	15,667,736.80
Totals							31,983,000	36,727,011.52

\*Comprising from private sector N\$10,916,631.80 cash and N\$9,661,926.60 in-kind support, and from bilateral support, N\$8,583,889.92 cash and N\$0 in-kind. See critical note on currency below.

\*\* NB: Includes \$12,000,000 assessed to have been provided in-kind by MCA-Namibia, but not possible to be confirmed through a final statement to the project as the Compact has closed.

<sup>46</sup> See IUCN definitions [here](#).

<sup>47</sup> Visit WCPA for details [here](#).

<sup>48</sup> Posted for GEF Council Member comments [here](#).



47. A major financial issue in the project period has been the fall of the South African Rand / ZAR (to which the Namibian dollar / NAD is pegged) against the USD. This has had little material effect on the delivery of project co-finance against expected outcomes but is significant in recording actuals against projected amounts in USD, especially as commitments from private sector and a range of bilateral sources were made in NAD. At project inception (3 Feb 2011), N\$1 was worth around USD \$0.15, while at project close (30 June 2016) N\$1 was worth about 40% of the same (USD \$0.06). Where amounts were reported by partners in Namibian Dollars (NAD), the exchange rate to USD for reporting here was taken at a project mid-point, 1 June 2013.
48. The Evaluator confirmed through interviews that all co-financing commitments recorded by the project were actually realised. There was sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources. Additional co-financing was identified through the project lifespan, particularly the contributions of private sector where tourism operators were active in particular landscapes (notably the two southern areas). This support contributed greatly to the tangible conservation outcomes recorded at 3/5 sites, and indeed to the ownership of the landscape by the stakeholders within it. Project activities supported by external funders from bilateral sources (KfW and MCA-Namibia) were well integrated into the overall project, both at site scale and in the policy domain, for example in the development of policies and guidelines such as the *National Policy for the Provision of Housing in Protected Areas* (MET, 2010).
49. Additional, leveraged resources have been committed as a result of the project, for example by TNC to Sossusvlei-Namib landscape and KfW for Bwabwata Mudumu Mamili PAs project (BMM) Parks in Mudumu Complex. Furthermore, additional commitments have come from government to continue supporting landscapes through a new unit, and from the private sector to continue efforts at each landscape.

## UNDP Implementation

50. UNDP implementation refers to both the global unit in New York and in the Regional Service Centre (RSC) in Addis Ababa as well as the Country Office (CO). A large amount of value was reportedly brought from the regional level at the project design stage, particularly the PIF, which was very innovative in approach for its time<sup>49</sup>. The CO oversaw the PPG process, through which the design was also

---

<sup>49</sup> Based on related findings of an unpublished review of UNDP-GEF global protected areas portfolio, and also various external publications including that of Eco-Agriculture Partners mentioned earlier. Also mentioned through interviews with stakeholders that the felt the project approach was extremely innovative, even ahead of its time.

commendably built on extensive baseline, pre-feasibility and feasibility studies. Yet if the project was developed today, it could have benefited from more recently popularised UNDP-GEF global approaches<sup>50,51</sup>:

- The project did not include a Theory of Change (ToC) in the manner that current UNDP-GEF projects are obliged to (in the new GEF-6 Project Document [ProDoc] template); at the time of its development, the LogFrame approach was more generally common<sup>52</sup>. A well thought-through ToC with clear boundaries of influence and more detailed interrogation of risks and assumptions, also more fleshed out mitigation measures if any assumptions were challenged, would have been beneficial through implementation. (A reviewer noted that UNDP also has better understanding of the application of a theory of change today versus when the project design occurred.)
- The landscape management concept lends itself well to Multi-Focal Area (MFA) projects, while NAMPLACE was a single focal-area project. At the time that it was developed, though, MFA projects and other integrated approaches were less common<sup>53</sup>. A project design incorporating the Land Degradation Focal Area / Sustainable Land Management indicators could have done more of immediate value towards the project objectives in some landscapes<sup>54</sup>.
- A much briefer, more focused and development-oriented project document (per the GEF-6 template), with – one could argue – seemingly more onus placed on the project executing arrangements to oversee the needed flexibility in implementation.
- Selection of project sites at PPG stage or later, rather than at the PIF (mentioned earlier).
- A dedicated component on knowledge management and M&E (now proposed in the GEF-6 template). As mentioned in section 3.1 on M&E, the project impact would have benefited from more strategic thought and study here.

51. Through implementation, the CO and RSC played their expected roles. Beyond the M&E requirements and engagement of the CO in the PSC, there was limited time for value-added engagements or discussions, though, as reportedly work loads are a considerable barrier to dedicating more time to each individual project. The project's RTA was however able to undertake a meeting with the CO and PCU which was reported to be valuable additional contact. Some landscape stakeholders mentioned a number of changed or cancelled field visits by UNDP delegations, without recognition of the time invested in preparing these events, for example, to organise meetings, find and secure a venue, arrange accommodation and attendance by landscape members, etc. These instances were noted as frustrating

---

<sup>50</sup> Suggesting that the project can hardly be held accountable for innovations in good practice that would come in future.

<sup>51</sup> These are approaches taken up in a MFA project being prepared by Namibia for GEF-6, now using the new template.

<sup>52</sup> See for example Vogel, I. (2012) "Review of the Use of 'theory of change' in International Development", Review Report, Department for International Development. Available online [here](#).

<sup>53</sup> Based on quantitative results of the UNDP-GEF Africa portfolio review, currently in preparation.

<sup>54</sup> See also Section 3.1.2 "Narrow focus on wildlife and tourism" in Jones (2015).

and disappointing, and communications did not clarify the rationale for changes or cancellations. A reviewer noted that the UNDP Institutional Reform and Change Management process was being undertaken at this time and was a cause of short-staffing leading to operational challenges.

## MET Execution

52. MET was the executing agency for the project. Execution was on the whole very good, strong in particular for Components 1 and 2 which largely came sequentially before Component 3 – i.e., getting the landscape associations formed and their governance operational before focusing on incentives, income generation and market transformation. Major achievements included:
- Finalisation and launch of the *National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities* (2013)<sup>55</sup> – with project logo and recognition on the policy - and inclusion of the “protected landscapes” concept in the new Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill (still in draft going to Parliament), encouraging the harmonisation of nature and culture through the protection of landscapes and seascapes.
  - Consequently, a new MET Division formed to support landscape management (as well as trans-boundary approaches), with recruitment of staff funded by MET’s core budget (i.e. taken as an indication that the Ministry values and is taking forward the concept).
  - The signed constitutions and management plans for each of the 5 PLCAs, 4/5 of which expected to continue beyond the project<sup>56</sup> with state or private resources, and harmonised management plans for a number of sub-units within landscapes. A management plan was also compiled for all parks within the landscapes.
  - Valuable lessons learned, good practices and recommendations for park-neighbour relations and the establishment of PLCAs, based on the experiences of participants<sup>57</sup>, and likely to be taken up in the new landscapes unit<sup>58</sup>. Also fed into national implementation guidelines for the 2013 National Policy on Protected Areas, Neighbours and Resident Communities. Lessons out of the project are seen to have national level applicability given that they are drawn from various, diverse areas of the country.
53. The UNDP RTA noted that the project was always on time or even ahead of its delivery schedule. In late 2015, the PSC Chairman noted: “The project implementation has gone so well that it may well be used as reference for other

---

<sup>55</sup> Specifically, section 4.3: Integrated park management, zoning and landscape conservation: “Landscape conservation to areas adjacent to protected areas should be promoted where appropriate... MET will ensure that all sectors work together through an integrated approach and that participatory approaches through landscape conservation can lead to better conservation and sustainable livelihoods” (page 5).

<sup>56</sup> The final PSC meeting also reports that “Greater Waterberg Landscape (GWL) stands out as the landscape that is not likely to continue after the project”

<sup>57</sup> In Jones 2014 and 2015 respectively.

<sup>58</sup> Although these were not widely disseminated through a national workshop as planned, they’re said to be well-recognised by MET.

projects on the same scale and subject of landscape conservation<sup>59</sup>.”

54. Commendably, the PCU was well-qualified, highly professional, experienced in related projects and fully Namibian nationals, as was the PSC including internationally-recognised experts. The MTR noted the autonomy enjoyed by the team, which I see as a result of their good capacity and level of trust already built between MET and the Country Office, through its successful execution of previous related projects. Unfortunately, the PCU suffered turnover towards the end of 2014<sup>60</sup>, which affected the delivery of Component 3. Also Component 3 presented a number of technical and strategic challenges, which would have benefited from a very experienced team already *in situ* to help navigate successfully<sup>61</sup>. On the plus side, the movement of the southern Landscape Coordinator (promoting a talented young professional to lead a related UNDP-GEF project) catalysed the project to hire two part-time coordinators from the landscapes themselves, which was a successful strategy.
55. The project outputs produced were all of a quite high quality and generally well-regarded by project stakeholders. Project procurement succeeded in identifying strong consultants where external support was utilised<sup>62</sup>. However, within Component 3, on-the-ground investments were reported to be more valued by landscape stakeholders than studies, though one could argue that the studies were important to help prioritise funding allocations. However, in some cases there were “open loops” where studies were commissioned but there was no budget to meaningfully address any of the recommendations, e.g. the wildlife viability study for Waterberg<sup>63</sup>, and some of the tourism Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs<sup>64</sup>).

The varying levels of capacity at each landscape could have been handled better. In fact, the PPG phase capacity assessment for Component 3<sup>65</sup> concludes that, “based on the capacity assessment carried out ... it is clear that different levels of capacity development activities will be required at the national level on the level of the individual PLCAs. The five proposed pilot PLCAs with which NAMPLACE will work are quite different in nature, composition of members and technical needs on the

---

<sup>59</sup> Nov 2015 meeting of the PSC.

<sup>60</sup> Strategies to deal with this were discussed at length, including the potential offering of end-of-project bonuses as was apparently used successfully within the MCA.

<sup>61</sup> See also Jones (2015) Section 3.2 “Complexity of landscape conservation”, also discussed in the MTR (Williams and Mfuno 2014).

<sup>62</sup> However, referencing earlier points on lack of economic and financial capacity; the studies were not always seeking that type of expertise nor positioning the assignments towards livelihood and development benefits, or return on investment.

<sup>63</sup> Humavindu, M. (2016). Viability Study for the African Wild Dog, Okamatapati, Otjituuo, Ozonahi Conservancies, Affirmative Action Farms and Resettlement Farms of the Greater Waterberg Landscape supported by MET through NAM-PLACE Project.

<sup>64</sup> Private tourism operators part of the landscape may be in a position to benefit from recommendations of the tourism studies.

<sup>65</sup> Versa-con and IECN (2010).

ground. It is therefore recommended at the generic proposal for capacity development activities *will be refined and regularly updated at the level of each PLCA*<sup>66</sup>. It is possible that this recommendation was overlooked within the large quantity of project documentation, as it had no specific attached output (see also lessons). A capacity strategy was developed, but only after the project mid-term, at which point some time, momentum and goodwill had already been lost.

56. Certainly, in the case of Waterberg<sup>67</sup> the respondents conveyed that was insufficient shared vision at the landscape level, but what additional efforts could the PSC and PCU have made to address this? For example, part-way through the project the landscape association replaced their Chairman and representative on the PSC<sup>68</sup>, from a commercial farm-owner and successful businessperson to a representative of a communal Conservancy - while of course holding valuable views, not having the comparable executive-level management skills as his predecessor and peers on the PSC. (Mudumu landscape also had a PSC member representing communal Conservancy members but with a much stronger governance structure underpinning his appointment.) Could the project have facilitated a compromise solution wherein the predecessor becomes the Vice-Chair or mentors the new Chair (options assessed as "not likely"), or that the new Chair is mentored by one of his fellow Chairman from another landscape, with backstopping to assist consultations before and after the PSC meetings? Such troubleshooting efforts would not eliminate some of the core fundamental problems with the viability of the landscape but could have gone a distance to even out the capacity imbalance between landscape members engaging the project, particularly in their ability to secure budget allocations. It may have also helped with the legitimacy of the landscape. While a strategy was developed and some efforts were made (e.g. exchange visit to Kunene region), additional project attention to innovation and experimentation with various options could critically have served to improve lessons-learning about how to help the PLCA concept succeed where the baseline is less favourable, but the potential for benefits to be derived for communities was much higher<sup>69</sup>. It may be that the only viable

---

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, further elaborates that: "Capacity needs fall overall into four main categories: a. Awareness raising and knowledge development about a PLCA approach, b. Knowledge and skills for managing PLCAs, c. Technical knowledge and skills, and d. Financial support and investments."

<sup>67</sup> UNDP CO reviewer added: "The issue of this LS is much broader than the NAMPLACE generic issues. There are conflicts and also misaligned objectives of what Conservancies in these area should focus on? I think with the new land use planning for the region being developed, better perspectives would be developed. Such land use plans could have informed the activities in the WB LS better. At the core is a question of whether all conservancies in the country should be geared towards wildlife (e.g. core areas/zones) or some Conservancies may have different land uses that are conservation-friendly but not necessary wildlife based."

<sup>68</sup> The project annual standard progress report for 2013 states regarding Waterberg: "Some stakeholders feel that the chairperson elected to represent the landscape at the Steering Committee has little relation to issues faced by communal groups and will not position their interests fully as a representative from the communal area would have. These differences have resulted in the landscape not able to plan the development of the landscape as a group due to different aspirations".

<sup>69</sup> One of the criticisms levelled (reported in Jones, 2015 and by one respondent in my interviews) was that the project was that the benefits were going to private sector. The context for this is discussed under Section 3.3 Role of MET in Jones, 2015.

strategy was to strengthen the component parts of the landscape, either in tandem or before the landscape approach can be realised. Or that there needs to be a baseline of 10-20 years investment in communal governance at a site level before the Conservancies are strong enough to work together between themselves and with other stakeholders in such an arrangement. Some respondents felt this was not the case – elsewhere, newer Conservancies enjoy more local legitimacy and have more governance capacity. Others felt that there was simply not enough to unite the Waterberg landscape and it should either have been defined in much smaller terms, or not included in the project at all. Where we are at project close is largely debating hypothetical scenarios – but earlier and more experimental efforts in capacity building with close attention from M&E could have yielded more learning on this aspect of the project.

57. There further seemed to be some inconsistency between the principle of having an equal budget to support each landscape, while trying to encourage and support those landscapes that were making more progress. In May 2014, for FY14-15, N\$200,000 was earmarked for each landscape, questioned by a PSC member as conflicting with an earlier resolution that the project will not keep on hold the budget for “slow moving” landscapes<sup>70</sup>. The Chair clarified that “nothing will stop the project from re-allocating the budget to landscapes that are making progress<sup>71</sup>.” (A reviewer clarified that this could have been a strategy to inspire action.) There was uncertainty reported from 2/3 of the landscapes over how much budget they were allocated, and a feeling that was particularly noted at Waterberg was that the allocations they had expected didn’t come to them. Transparency and communications back to landscapes of the budgeting decisions could have been improved – though some respondents felt this was the responsibility of the Chairperson representing the landscape, and not the PCU, the PCU could have supported more where it is known that the Chair’s capacity was lower or a lack of unity within the landscape could be supported by improved communications.
58. The PSC meetings were reportedly well organised and professionally conducted, and being clearly minuted, it was easy to follow the decisions taken. One respondent noted that they were not held frequently enough, and that it would have been beneficial to the project as a whole to have these more often. The PSC meetings could have been more active in rotating between the landscapes, so that there would be more opportunity for the PSC to be exposed to the landscapes and *vice versa*. The project also reportedly set up an Advisory Committee, however it apparently did not meet.
59. There was also an ongoing question of the level of commitment of MET to the project<sup>72</sup>, where different views were presented. Some felt MET’s commitment was “unquestionable” in particular with the prominent and highly engaged role of the

---

<sup>70</sup> PSC meeting resolution.

<sup>71</sup> Minutes of the Special PSC meeting (on financial matters), May 2014.

<sup>72</sup> Also discussed in the MTR (Williams & Mfune, 2014) and Jones (2015), Section 3.3 “Role of MET”.

national Environment Commissioner chairing the project. Others felt the project was implemented “in darkness and doubt” as to MET’s position; in particular the issue that MET was not signing the PLCA constitutions as a normal member (as the PLCAs were non-governmental and/or there was no legal framework in place that supports it<sup>73</sup>). See also section 3.3 regarding signing of the landscape Constitutions. A number of respondents reported variations on “MET then the rest of us” in terms of project priorities. Some indicated MET staff could have been more empowered at the local level to engage in the landscape.

60. Project branding and communication materials were highly professional and a number of stakeholders the evaluator met with wore NAMPLACE branded items that appeared durable<sup>74</sup>. The individual logos for each landscape were cited as being unifying for the landscapes – particularly in Mudumu where it was a participatory process. However, the project communications were arguably more outward focused than internal to the landscape participants<sup>75</sup>. Based on feedback from the landscapes, there was less investment made in the routine communication back to them for example clarifying feedback on funding proposals that they made to the PSC. These lines of communication reportedly relied on those participants from the landscape attending the PSC and reporting back. This obviously depending on the capacity of the Chairperson, the method of communications at landscape level, and the cohesiveness of the Landscape Association to share information within its membership. The lines of communication from the PCU to the landscapes, and also within the landscapes, presented a challenge given e.g. varying levels of access to email and level of network connection, plus of course, the major capacity challenges faced divisions within some associations, etc. Again, there seemed insufficient recognition by the project of these vast differences in terms of supporting especially Waterberg (whereas Mudumu had a full-time Landscape Specialist also backstopping communications, and the other landscapes communicated well through their Chairperson). At the same time the outward-focused communications could have done more to “market” the benefits of joining a landscape with more economically-focused and outcome-targeted M&E results (discussed above under 3.1 M&E).

---

<sup>73</sup> April 2014 PSC meeting minutes.

<sup>74</sup> Expenditure on such items were questioned in the MTR (para 143).

<sup>75</sup> Also criticised in the MTR (Williams & Mfune, 2014), and at the 6<sup>th</sup> PSC for being too expensive relative to “other tangible activities within landscapes”.

### 3.4 Assessment of outcomes

Rating of Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>Outcomes</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	S	Outcomes largely delivered, either fully or partly. Component 1 and 2 of higher quality than Component 3.
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R	The project was highly relevant. Key concepts have subsequently been taken up into national policy and guidance on park-neighbour relations, and in the draft wildlife and PAs bill. The concept was also ahead of the curve in some respects as ILM approaches are now being promoted for SDG achievement. However, focus on the making the case for landscapes within the public sector should have been complemented with focus on private landholders and resource users.
Effectiveness	S	The project was largely effective in Components 1 and 2, and somewhat within Component 3 though it was less consistent.
Efficiency	S	Components 1 and 2 were generally good value-for-money although expenditures in Component 3 could have been better targeted and more demand-driven.

61. Overall the project achieved most of what it set out to do – summarized here:

- **Objective level:** Establishment of 5 PLCAs adjacent to PAs, with land uses that are compatible with biodiversity objectives including wildlife corridors. There were 4 objective-level indicators: 2 were fully achieved, and 2 were partly achieved. Notably the PA and Wildlife Bill - expected imminently at Project Information Form (PIF) stage (8 years ago) - remains in draft, although one could look at this as a positive in that the project experience now feeds into the Bill content.
- **Outcome / Component 1:** Establishment of the PLCAs including their signed constitutions. This component had 4 indicators, three of which were fully achieved and one partly achieved. Significantly, MET itself was not a signatory to each Constitution as had been originally foreseen. However, a template for Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) that could be signed with each association are with the Directorate of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) for consideration.
- **Outcome / Component 2:** Collaborative governance established for the 5 PLCAs, including relevant management plans. Here 2 of 3 indicators were fully achieved. The last involved management and tourism plans for PAs within the landscapes; these have all been developed but 3 of 9 are still pending approval by the Minister (expected imminently).
- **Outcome / Component 3:** Market transformation and incentives that encourage land use change towards wildlife. One indicator relating to the delivery of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEAs) for tourism was fully achieved. The remaining 2



indicators were partly achieved, namely biodiversity monitoring systems and efforts around supply chains, the latter being critical in the market transformation, important in the ToC of the projects. The evaluator noted only exploratory efforts around identifying supply chains for certification, which was meant to lead to markets established and mobilised for certified supply chains. These themes would be an area of attention for the future Landscape unit (noted in recommendations).

62. The relevance of these outcomes (especially within Components 1 and 2) at national level is represented by their inclusion in policy, guidance and (expected) legislation. However, that focus is very much around the enabling environment. The outcomes under Component 3 could have been more relevant also communicating to private landholders and other resource stewards. Many involved could see the benefits, particularly tourism operators where there is a shared asset and companies offer a varied enough product that they are not in direct competition.
63. The project was effective in Components 1 and 2, though Component 3 was only partially effective, as described elsewhere. Similarly, expenditures were generally efficient in Component 1 and 2, but Component 3 could have been better directed. As noted elsewhere, studies were funded which weren't necessarily the top priority for the landscape, and/or did not have any availability funding or interest to address the results of the study. Expenditures were not targeted enough to realising "incentives and market transformation" that benefits beyond the easier cases could be derived.

### 3.5 Sustainability

Rating of Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>Sustainability:</b> Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	L	The concept of protected landscapes is likely to continue in Namibia through MET support, as are 3 or 4 of the 5 landscapes established through the project. Investments made were therefore highly sustainable in terms of embedding this approach at the national level in Namibia.
Financial resources	L-ML	It's expected that each PLCA will identify resources to continue the landscape initiative in one way or another, in some cases with a less ambitious remit. However, more could have been done to demonstrate the financial or socio-economic returns of joining a landscape to different audiences. Sustainability is very likely in 1 or 2 landscapes, and moderately likely in the rest, and generally unlikely in 1.
Socio-economic	L-ML	Largely the landscape concept is demonstrating socio-economic benefits to inhabitants and participants, including increased game quotas for Conservancies, tourism employment, etc. If Component 3 had been better targeted, more such benefits around supply chains could have been realised. Economic benefits for private operators where there is a shared tourism resource were high, but this caused discomfort e.g. amongst some MET staff.
Institutional framework and governance	L-ML	It's expected that 4/5 of the landscapes will continue with the same governance structure, or that institutional arrangements that were agreed in the constitutions will evolve. It is also expected that MET will continue to support those landscapes that are successful – the recommendations suggest that MET should also assess and potentially help reformulate the one that is struggling.
Environmental	L-ML	In 3/5 landscapes, fences are coming down and the expected environmental benefits are being achieved. Human-wildlife conflict in Mudumu landscape exists but the benefits of wildlife towards income-generation are such that it's not expected the environmental gains will be reversed. Poaching is a reality <sup>76</sup> but other projects and MET itself are working to minimize this.

64. All TEs should at a minimum assess "the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this<sup>25</sup>". Sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes.

65. The project developed a sustainability plan towards the final year of operations (meaning here a plan to ensure that the landscape associations remain operational

<sup>76</sup> In more detail, poaching is an identified threat to sustainability especially in Mudumu Landscape but there are already effective mitigation measures either underway or in preparation which are expected to minimize this. Also at global level, major efforts are underway to deal with demand and supply aspects of illegal wildlife trade.

and that they continue to deliver the expected benefits. Financial sustainability is part of the ability for the landscape association to continue). The plan was developed by the project team and endorsed by the PSC<sup>77</sup>.

66. Two main areas suggest sustainability of the “protected landscapes” concept at the national level:

- The protected landscape approach is enshrined through its inclusion in the *National Policy on Protected Areas’ Neighbours and Resident Communities* (MET 2013)<sup>78</sup> and expected inclusion in the (still draft) PAs and Wildlife Bill. Furthermore, MET has invested in a new landscape unit, which is currently recruiting staff and will be funded from the Ministry’s core budget. NAMPLACE equipment and vehicles purchased have been allocated to this new team<sup>79</sup>.
- Namibia is also currently developing a project, which builds closely on the NAMPLACE concept for GEF-6<sup>80</sup>. For this the country is combining all of its STAR allocation into a single Multi-Focal Area project, which is lauded by the UNDP-GEF regional team as an innovative approach that other countries are likely to follow suit with<sup>81</sup>.

67. At the landscape level, referring to the landscapes supported through the project, those involved have discussed various plans underway for identifying and self-funding landscape coordinator or secretariat roles – demonstrating that each of the landscape associations note enough value from the concept to find a suitable modality to at least discuss and consider how to continue it beyond the project<sup>82</sup>. All 5 landscapes re-iterated some interest to continue beyond the project lifespan, and if any reservations were noted, it was generally based on the availability of funding. The Greater Sossusvlei-Namib Landscape reported that they have secured funding from the Nature Conservancy (TNC) for the next five years to pay for core running costs of the landscapes. This includes funds to cover the costs of 2 landscape coordinators, to hold meetings, transportation and office / administration costs.

---

<sup>77</sup> I am not aware if MET has an internal strategy for landscape sustainability.

<sup>78</sup> From page 3: “Landscape conservation to areas adjacent to protected areas should be promoted where appropriate... MET will ensure that all sectors work together through an integrated approach and that participatory approaches through landscape conservation can lead to better conservation and sustainable livelihoods.”

<sup>79</sup> Although some landscape members feel that these resources should stay at the landscape level – and in the case of Greater Fish River Canyon, sent a letter to the Ministry to this effect.

<sup>80</sup> Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG), whose indicative objective is to promote an integrated landscape management approach at national level and in key agricultural and forest landscapes, meeting Namibia’s commitments to the Rio Conventions whilst reducing poverty through sustainable nature-based livelihoods. Although some respondents feel the GEF-6 project may lean more towards agriculture and forestry than wildlife, it will certainly include the country’s biodiversity allocations under STAR and related indicators.

<sup>81</sup> Based on discussion with RTAs and work carried out in the as yet-unpublished UNDP-GEF Africa portfolio review.

<sup>82</sup> I’m unaware if MET has any strategy to continue or ensure that each landscape has a sustainability plan. I did not receive any copies of individual landscapes’ plans but learned of them through discussion with stakeholders.

The Chairman noted that they hope to be able to address the long-term costs of the association through exploring funding options such as:

- a) Annual membership fees / conservation tax for members.
- b) The possible introduction of a tourism conservation levy. E.g. tourism lodges collect a small daily conservation levy from visiting guests.
- c) Negotiate a small percentage, for conservation, from existing levies / park entrance fees.

He reported a vision that the landscape be self-funded and financially sustainable by 2012. This landscape had the most elaborated sustainability plan.

68. The Mudumu landscape is expected to be supported by a KfW-funded project, NAMPARK (with some former NAMPLACE staff). There are however questions of governance and responsibility between the landscape association and the North and South complexes, and it is possible the arrangement could evolve. The Windhoek Green Belt landscape are operating a hiking trail, and would reportedly support the main farm in the landscape to reduce the stocking rate and be more drought resistant. Fish River Canyon are investigating a number of options, and Gondwana Collection is willing to co-finance, but not be the sole financiers (although they continue to make major contributions). The landscape is working on a continuation plan to be discussed at their next meeting. At Waterberg, Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) expressed support to play a secretariat role, but there's limited chance that meetings will continue without an external funding source. The governance may also disintegrate with "in-fighting", making it challenging to identify an external funder who would enter at this stage.
69. If the project had brought the sustainability strategy to the fore earlier, it is likely that feasibility studies and piloting could have helped to weigh up different post-project funding options, and got them working before the project support ended. The project sustainability would have been markedly improved, with as little of 6 additional months timeframe but ideally with 18 months to 2 years further support. Additionally, the sustainability strategy was draft by the PCU with inputs from the PSC and landscape associations. A financial analysis capacity could have yielded valuable insight into the various possible avenues and models for securing financial security.

### 3.6 Impact

Rating of Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
<b>Impact:</b> Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	S	Wildlife numbers are increasing where fences are coming down, i.e. in 3/5 of participating landscapes. Benefits (i.e. game numbers) are evident and supported by many data-gathering methods - aerial survey, camera traps, collaring, game counts, Event Book system, etc.
Environmental Stress Reduction	n/a	
Progress towards stress/status change	S	35,049km <sup>2</sup> was brought into the system of co-management and collaboration around established PAs. If Waterberg is excluded - based on limited or null progress in this location - the initial target of 15,550 km <sup>2</sup> has still been achieved – i.e. total “effectively” brought under landscape conservation is 16,058 km <sup>2</sup> .
<b>Overall Project Results</b>	S	

70. The project generated verifiable improvements<sup>83</sup> in ecological status in 3/5 landscapes: where fences came down, wildlife numbers increased. This assertion is supported by monitoring initiatives put in place by the project: game counts, collaring and satellite tracking, aerial photography, camera traps, etc. as well as MET’s own reported data in and around the project landscapes. The project impact is well-documented at Sossusvlei, Mudumu and Fish River Canyon, although still highly fenced areas of Waterberg and Windhoek Green Belt did not achieve the same effect.

71. The project impact in terms of financial, livelihood or development gains amongst beneficiaries was hard to assess, as it was not explicitly covered by the projects M&E systems. Component 3 is where I expected to find such indicators, but most were process-oriented looking at what studies or plans had been concluded, not what was tangibly achieved in terms of market or behavioural change. Examples of non-ecological benefits that could have been documented or delivered include e.g. incomes generated from certification schemes, measure of benefit sharing linked to the increase in wildlife due to the project intervention, return on investment to land values for farmers who brought their land into the landscape (removed fencing), and/or value derived from wildlife moving between areas.

<sup>83</sup> See also the final PIR / terminal project report for more details – Waterberg and Windhoek Green Belt are still highly fenced and no verifying improvements are reported against the relevant indicator.

## 3.7 Additional results

72. This is a prescribed TE section based on the UNDP TE guidance (UNDP EO 2012) which requests reflections on any additional results derived through the project for country ownership, mainstreaming and catalytic; a 'result' is defined as a describable or measurable development change resulting from a cause-and-effect relationship. Assessing project results involves attention to the full scope of a results based management (RBM) chain, from inputs to activities, to outputs, outcomes and impacts. These are also measured by broader aspects such as: sustainability (covered above in section 3.4), impact (covered within 3.5), country ownership, mainstreaming and catalytic role – detailed below.

### A. Country Ownership

73. Namibia's Constitution highlights the country's natural capital as a development asset<sup>84</sup>. Biodiversity, wildlife and tourism are highlighted as engines for sustained growth in Vision 2030 and its implementing documents, the National Development Plans (NDPs). Namibia's fourth NDP (covering 2012/13 to 2016/17) re-emphasises a strong focus on tourism as an engine for economic growth and poverty reduction, as well as supporting the diversification away from dependence on a few key sectors present at Independence<sup>85</sup>. The landscape approach also received a major endorsement during the project lifespan through the *National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities* (2013), as well as its inclusion in the draft *Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill* (currently scheduled to be discussed in Parliament)<sup>86</sup>.

### B. Mainstreaming

74. The project is in line with Namibia's *United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2014-2018: A Partnership for Growth, Job Creation and Equity*<sup>87</sup>, in particular:

- Outcome 8: is implementing effectively and in a coordinated manner policies and strategies to reduce poverty and vulnerability which are informed by evidence on the causes of poverty and vulnerability, and

---

<sup>84</sup> Article 95 (l) of the Namibian Constitution provides for the "maintenance of ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity of Namibia and utilization of living natural resources on a sustainable basis for the benefit of all Namibians both present and future...".

<sup>85</sup> See also e.g. Lange, G-M. (2003). National wealth, natural capital and sustainable development in Namibia. DEA Discussion Paper No. 56. Windhoek: MET.

<sup>86</sup> The Chairperson of the PSC (also Namibia's environment Commissioner) requested NAMPLCE to support MET in the finalisation of the Bill and to ensure landscapes are properly reflected therein.

<sup>87</sup> Available from [here](#). During its development, the project was also in line with then-current UNDAF (2006-2010)<sup>87</sup>, the NDP of that time, and other guiding strategies – as detailed in the PIF, ProDoc and CEO Endorsement Request.

- Outcome 12: has in place the institutional frameworks and policies needed to implement the Environmental Management Act (2007), National Climate Change Policy (2011) and international conventions, and is implementing these effectively.
75. The project targets poverty in Namibia in the sense of supporting rural development based on wildlife and tourism - almost half (48.7%) of the people in rural areas are classified as being poor, while for urban areas this figure is less than one in five (17%)<sup>88</sup>. It also enhances resilience through diversification of the economy<sup>89</sup>, in a manner that recognizes Namibia's water stress<sup>90</sup>. Some of regions targeted within the project are those that measure lowest on the HDI. Politically, efforts such as the project help to make a case that conservation benefits people, and can be an effective national development and rural poverty reduction strategy<sup>91</sup> – Namibia's successful CBNRM programme is often cited internationally as a prime example making this case<sup>92</sup>.

### C. Catalytic role

76. This category refers to the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up. Certainly, the project demonstrated there is strong rationale to bring stakeholders together at a landscape level to manage resources with greater impact than managing alone at the unit level. Interest in the project outcomes has extended worldwide including to the World Bank's annual land conference, and (as mentioned elsewhere) the integrated landscape management (ILM) concept is up-and-coming in development as a means to rationally plan and help deal with trade-offs in achieving the very inter-linked suite of SDGs. While elsewhere ILM is only starting as a proposed approach, Namibia has at least 5 years experience and a body of lessons, good practices and guidance all ready to be taken up in a new MET unit with the backing of law and policy. The draft Wildlife Bill further emphasizes that protected landscape do not need to be attached to a protected area; they are valuable in their own right.

---

<sup>88</sup> Various studies show that although communities near protected areas are indeed substantially poorer than national averages (as often rural people are), an analysis based on comparison with appropriate controls does not support the hypothesis that these differences can be attributed to protected areas. Other studies indicate that the net impact of PAs, ecosystem protection, and related opportunities such as employment and tourism enterprises was to alleviate poverty. See e.g. Andam, K. S. et al (2010). Protected areas reduced poverty in Costa Rica and Thailand. PNAS 107 (22): 9996-10001.

<sup>89</sup> Lange (2003).

<sup>90</sup> Reid et al (2007). The economic impact of climate change in Namibia: How climate change will affect the contribution of Namibia's natural resources to its economy. IIED discussion paper 07-02.

<sup>91</sup> Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey (NHIES) 2009/2010, cited in the UNPAF.

<sup>92</sup> See for example detail of Namibia and Botswana's participation in African Leadership Group of the NBSAP 2.0 project, encouraging biodiversity strategies to be positioned as development asset. Available online [here](#). Also e.g. work conducted through World Bank WAVES programme and statements made by Conservancy members at the Annual Conservancy Audit and Status Summary and Natural Resource Report.

## 4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons

77. Overall the project is largely successful and can be considered an innovative example of co-management, PA-neighbour relations, and multi-stakeholder landscape-level cooperation. Its major achievements should be recognized - notably 5 functioning PLCAs formally established and operational, covering 4% of Namibia's landmass with various joint actions yielding biodiversity benefits, and recognition in Namibia's policies and legal framework of the approach – and with good practices and lessons learned that can be widely shared. Indeed, many elements of this project concept are only now being more widely taken up amongst GEF-funded projects and other Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)-focused initiatives<sup>93</sup>.
78. The landscapes that were formalized based on already-existing strong baseline and a clear rationale / incentive structure for collaboration were highly successful. However, one in particular which lacked those features was very challenging for the project to manage; at the same time if the concept is to be replicated more widely, it is the question of how to deal with such a suite of challenges that warrant more examination and effort to identify the channels to make tangible progress. It is also notable that the more challenging landscapes were those that had a larger number of potential beneficiaries, in particular in communal Conservancies. More experimentation on dealing especially with the less-capacitated part of the country could help to better understand how the landscape approach could be more widely rolled out, even beyond the PA-adjacent areas.
79. Once the landscape mechanism is in place, it can be a platform for many types of collaboration that will benefit biodiversity – by enhancing the connectivity of wildlife corridors certainly, but also via sharing information, joint planning, various types of impact assessment, increasing negotiating power for communities, a respected governance structure to mobilise resources, the application on research to management, etc.

### 4.1 Lessons

80. The project innovated in a number of ways that yielded lessons:
- Bringing together diverse stakeholders from government, private sector, freehold and communal farmers – given Namibia's history, the national

---

<sup>93</sup> See for example Eco-Agriculture Partners: "Integrated landscape management (ILM) is an increasingly popular approach to addressing development, climate change, food security and a host of other global issues [including biodiversity]. Everyone's talking about landscapes [section heading] Even five years ago the term "landscape" was rarely used [in development] ... Today, the term, and the management and policy approaches underlying it, are beginning to gain prominence as the limits of narrowly sectoral approaches become more apparent in our interconnected, crowded, resource-constrained and climate-chaotic world."



innovation here should not be under-valued<sup>94</sup>. In particular, MET has had reservations working with the private sector<sup>95</sup> - since NAMPLACE facilitated constructive working relations, this may further encourage fruitful public-private collaboration.

- The project was highly successful in securing private investments into each landscape, particularly from the tourism sector as well as individual freehold farmers (many moving from livestock to game farming) and commercial Conservancies. This result was based on a strong original concept and landscape-level business cases for their joint investment. (Although further investment into M&E could have strengthened the communication of this result beyond each individual landscape promoting investment and returns into landscapes more broadly.)
- Hiring the Landscape Coordinators from their local areas in the 2 southern areas, to replace a Windhoek-based Landscape Specialist once the sites were already up-and-running. Large and tangible gains were made by the active champions supported in those two locations.
- Mudumu landscape was represented by a member of the community Conservancies. This was deemed successful as he held a high level of legitimacy amongst the constituencies, which built on an existing framework of good governance and working relationships through Mudumu's North and South Complexes (two entities brought together at landscape level). The landscape was also supported by a full-time Landscape Specialist on-site, who assisted the Chair and association to successfully navigate the PSC and secured budget allocations for widely agreed priorities. Both the chairperson and on-site coordinator supported project communications across the landscape, as well as relationship- and trust development, capacity building, trouble-shooting, and other local implementation considerations<sup>96</sup>.

81. Some apparent weaknesses also yielded insight:

- An important point was lost between the PPG studies and the actual project design (then consequently implementation) – the 5 landscape sites are highly variable, with quite different compositions, populations, levels of capacity and needs. There were two oversights: 1) The recommendation that a **capacity building strategy** be defined for each of the sites and continuously updated, as an essential mechanism to implement the project given their very different starting points. This was in the capacity needs assessment carried out to inform the design of Component 3, however it was not carried through into an output or otherwise a visible piece of guidance. Only after the mid-term review, was a capacity strategy defined and then mainly targeting Waterberg, having already lost momentum and goodwill in the first 2-3 years; and 2) that the **project indicators were defined uniformly across all 5 sites**. This led to activities being implemented faster than sites were ready for, and were sometimes out of step

---

<sup>94</sup> Thanks to Brian Jones for reinforcing this point in our discussion.

<sup>95</sup> See also Jones (2015), section 3.3: Role of MET.

<sup>96</sup> Demonstrated by the absence of these attributes when Waterberg brought a chairman from the community.

with their needs and demands<sup>97</sup>. Indicators more tailored to the respective starting points would have been more appropriate.

- The **project duration** was probably not long enough to fully see through Component 3, especially where the baseline conditions were less favourable. In particular, the sustainability strategy was unlikely to be very successful presented as a document towards the end of the project. To actually realise financial sustainability – by which I mean self-funding the landscape through income derived from its assets, not securing another external project - at each landscape, the project could have helped to shepherd in some pilot efforts (e.g. proposals for hiking trail at Waterberg, lookout point concession at Fish River, bed levy at Sossusvlei), undergo some testing and refinement of the models, and then ensured they were fully functional before the project closed. Extending the project timeframe in light of absorptive capacity realities should not be seen as a failure of management – but also it could be foreseen that the project timeframe was very short for the transformative outcomes that the project was trying to achieve.
- The project also **lost momentum for the delivery of Component 3**, which is arguably the most important in bringing the landscape model from an institutional arrangement to a source of benefits for its constituents. A lesson here could be to have a senior staff member focused on the endpoints - on market transformation, business models and other elements of the incentives and market transformation outcome, already working on pre-feasibility and business modelling support for various proposals, shepherding the SEAs and other guidance studies, poised to support implementation once the landscapes were formalized. Some division of emphasis could have maintained the momentum, while the rest of the staff maintained their efforts on Components 1 and 2, which are in effect pre-conditions for Component 3's delivery of benefits.
- It could also have been valuable to have **enterprise development and economic capacity** on the team to oversee Component 3, for example as a Chief Technical Advisor, and not simply bring this capacity in through standalone consultancies. This could have improved the link from the studies produced to the support and guidance provided to landscapes, as well as to the PSC budgeting process.
- More investment in M&E focusing on the financial and development benefits of participating in a landscape. This would also have helped to further market the concept of protected landscapes beyond the initial 5 supported through the project.
- Finally, the Landscape Specialists capacity could have been divided according to need – specifically a full-time person situated at Waterberg, especially after the challenges were apparent. This role could have been a sub-contractor supervised by the original coordinator, whose responsibilities were split.

82. A more general lesson around landscapes is recognizing the inherent complexity of working at multiple levels and untangling what can and should be done at one level versus another. Some interventions at a site scale (such as building a bridge which

---

<sup>97</sup> Also cited in the MTR (Williams & Mfune 2014) and Jones (2015).

helps the navigability of wildlife corridors as at Wuparo Conservancy) is easily understood as benefiting the landscape. While others (such as community investments into Klein Karas) which have apparent value to landscape cohesion, could be questioned for their relation to the biodiversity dividend. Sometimes the rationale is clearly an environmental one, and other times, it's part of a broader strategy.

83. Finally, when project challenges arise, they should be considered an opportunity to review the project's Theory of Change, interrogate risks and assumptions, and consider what strategies could be employed, what learning can be derived, and become more vigorous in M&E around some innovative experimentation with the goal of deriving some new learning. Even if an attempted measure fails, "its good to be a lesson" – according to one landscape member.

## 4.2 Corrective actions and follow-up

84. Here the evaluator targets the future actions that 1) UNDP, 2) MET, 3) future project developers, and 4) future project management teams should consider to fully take on board the lessons of NAMPLACE in future programming, reinforce benefits from the initial investment, and in the case of MET where post-NAMPLACE corrective action can be taken:

- 1) UNDP are encouraged to more aggressively demonstrate the value of its forthcoming projects in development and poverty reduction terms – by for example reflecting the number of beneficiaries and measurable contributions to poverty reduction and the SDGs to be achieved in the headline indicators<sup>98</sup>. Clearly show how the project is using environmental finance in a strategic way to achieve tangible development outcomes - as measurably and persuasively as possible through the M&E design<sup>99</sup>. UNDP should consider engaging at a more economic and financial analysis capacity at a portfolio or regional level to increase the organisation's technical shaping of this emerging portfolio of landscape-level UNDP-GEF projects (including e.g. those in the IAP on Food Security).

UNDP could strengthen its support to landscape projects by itself joining initiatives such as 'Landscapes for People, Food and Nature' and the Eco-Agriculture Partnership, and seek out knowledge exchange opportunities between UNDP-supported and other landscape initiatives. Since landscape approaches are so critical to achieving the SDGs, and are likely to continue gaining in popularity as a result, UNDP should consider planning a support

---

<sup>98</sup> Picks up on the questions surrounding the beneficiaries in NAMPLACE who caused some discomfort.

<sup>99</sup> Refers to the absence of a compelling case study on how wildlife can enhance land use values to encourage future private investment (in contrast to the case made for State investment successfully executed by SPAN). More generally, the development rationale for undertaking the project is addressed in the first section of the new template "Development Challenge", also strengthened by the addition of a Theory of Change.

programme around landscape initiatives that brings together research and practitioners. The agency could be developing, trialling and improving detailed developers guidance and technical tools that UNDP-GEF landscape projects can practically employ – innovating for the promising landscapes portfolio in the manner that has already been done so successfully within the protected areas portfolio (e.g. the financial scorecard tool<sup>100</sup>) or on eco-system adaptation (with UNEP, IUCN and BMZ).

For NILALEG in GEF-6, UNDP should plan for a baseline study of landscape values and benefits where the project will work. The project's M&E design should be explicitly geared to project impact, ensuring that at the end of the project, a convincing brief on the benefits of the project approach can be derived and will provide compelling evidence beyond the project lifespan. UNDP does not routinely include in the ToRs of the PPG consultants that they should have any role in the inception of a project, and this is rare unless there is an existing relationship. For a large and complex project such as NILALEG, it would be worth bringing the PPG consultants in to brief the project team and help wade through all the project documentation, highlighting any questions and issues for consideration early on.

As the evident benefits of MFA projects are mounting, the management paradigm could switch in that projects should be programmed as MFA (or the new Integrated Approaches) as a default. Rather than single focal area being the default, the new approach could require a justification for undertaking a single focal area approach. A reviewer noted, and I agree, that "this could easily lend UNDP through the GEF portfolio to become a demonstrator of SD benefits and SD co-benefits<sup>101</sup>."

Extensive information is gathered, decisions are taken, and relationships are built by consultants during the PPG phase; yet these can fail to be fully handed across to PCU teams implementing the projects. A future consideration is to budget for handover and interaction between the PPG consultants and the PCU team. There could be a transition phase with some overlap or invitation of the PPG consultants to support work planning or inception meetings. In some cases it's appropriate that a PPG team member is hired into the PCU team, but there should be concern for conflict of interest, and also awareness of the different skill sets for each role. Finally, through the project implementation, much experience and knowledge is gained. This could be better captured via a personalised exit interview, in addition to the formal end-of-project reporting.

---

<sup>100</sup> Bovarnick, A. (2007) and (2010 – 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Financial Sustainability Scorecard: For National Systems of Protected Areas. UNDP: New York.

<sup>101</sup> Further reflecting that "The cost of project design, implementation and management could be made efficient. Although, the cost of M&E could significantly increase."

- 2) MET are requested to encourage the new landscapes unit to conduct an assessment of the various details of the Greater Waterberg Landscape case, and consider what support can be provided to improve PA-neighbour relations in light of goodwill lost. “Rescuing” the association itself might be possible potentially by defining (in a participatory way with stakeholders) a smaller area immediately adjacent to the PA initially, with the strategy to grow if value, willingness and feasibility could be demonstrated. Internalize the lessons learning<sup>102</sup> when considering the enabling factors required for establishing newly proposed landscapes.

When supporting the development of new landscapes, avoid conflating the question of potential financial sustainability for new or existing landscapes with whether a donor project will indefinitely come along to continue the work. The measure should be whether there’s a strong likelihood that “PLCA management costs [can be] underwritten by State and landholders<sup>103</sup>.” Encourage that this definition should also to be internalised by landscape participants<sup>104</sup>. Do not be discouraged by the outcome in Waterberg from engaging in landscapes with high human populations and currently lower wildlife numbers – indeed some of the greatest benefits can be derived through such landscapes. Finally, although NAMPLACE focused on wildlife, take inspiration from the PAs and Wildlife Bill that landscapes can support many types of natural and cultural diversity in harmony – it’s a concept with huge potential for Namibia’s great diversity<sup>105</sup>.

The LS team should examine NAMPLACE project outputs and see what recommendations are there, for example the wildlife viability study for Waterberg, and some of the tourism Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs). Consider whether these should be planned for future update. Also refer here to the feedback on a need for a study of landscape values and value of this for marketing the landscape concept. The LS Unit should consider investments in evidence geared to decision-making (such as economic information generated through and with DEA that has vastly contributed to the success of the CBNRM and PA efforts).

- 3) Future project developers: If there’s a significant finding from the PPG, consider how the counterpart action or mitigation measure can be more prominently reflected in the project design, either as an output, in the project indicators, or perhaps in the risk table. With hundreds of pages of background documentation, useful information risks being overlooked by the team at inception if it’s not in the main design. Also, while an “elegant” project design

---

<sup>102</sup> Detailed here in the TE, as well as in Jones (2015).

<sup>103</sup> From the approved PIF.

<sup>104</sup> Mudumu landscape members cited lack of “sponsorship” available for them to meet after the project – the Conservancies own vehicles, have meat to supply a group lunch, and considerable resources at hand to pay for petrol to bring them together. It should be possible if the will was there to bring them together on their own initiative for a join meeting, yet no future AGM is planned.

<sup>105</sup> Thanks to the Environment Commissioner for his outlook here.

should try to minimize the number of project indicators, in such a case where the areas of intervention are variable, an expanded and tailored set should be considered. Sustainability strategizing should be planned in from the project's inception. The PPG consultants for NILALEG should take into account design lessons from this project. As above, projects would also benefit from engaging the PPG consultants at inception to brief new project teams – consider requesting this be added in ToRs if it is not already planned for.

- 4) Future project management teams: As above, especially in a complex project, there would be value to engage one or more of the PPG team consultants to support the project inception stage. Per UNDP CO reviewer feedback, it's essential to make active use of the project PSC to support the team with challenges and constraints, and navigating successfully through complexities. It may not always be feasible to engage the whole PSC but a task team comprised of PSC members could be formed that supports troubleshooting, for example. UNDP RSC may also be able to suggest peer mentors that have faced similar challenges elsewhere to support the task team.

### 4.3 Proposal for future directions

85. To bring the ILM approach further forward in Namibia over the coming years, as MET has demonstrated willingness to do, and UNDP are committed through NILALEG, the evaluator recommends broadening the sectors that the landscape concept engages with – from tourism to other industries such as large-scale agriculture and mining, that affect biodiversity, sustainable land management, and climate change. Such efforts could involve assessing feasibility of either establishing adjacent landscapes building on the successes of existing ones and/or extending the currently established landscape areas to include adjacent areas that involve industries which have the potential to impact biodiversity and wildlife, in particular mining and large-scale agriculture<sup>106</sup>. Initially these landscapes would be seeking out broader collaboration in biodiversity management activities and co-financing from the private sector. Additionally, collaboration with these industries (once trust and working relationships are effectively established) could then become a powerful vehicle for:

- Information sharing for various environmental initiatives including closer collaboration in activities such as monitoring, remediation, restocking, planning of travel routes to avoid certain areas in breeding seasons, timing of noisy activities to reduce disturbance e.g. for nocturnal animals, etc.
- Building a better knowledge base at landscape level to contribute or input biodiversity and wildlife-related information to assessments of new development

---

<sup>106</sup> Illustratively for the FRC area this could include the Sperggebiet and Rosh Pinah. Some respondents felt this would make the area too large and un-manageable but perhaps an umbrella association or cooperation between adjacent landscapes could be attempted.

in the landscapes e.g., well-known processes of SEAs and EIAs but also Cumulative Impact Assessments and scenario development exercises (projecting out the effects of developments in different sectors under different assumptions or pathways).

- Joint planning and management of e.g. climate adaptation efforts relating to biodiversity and wildlife

## **4.4 Conclusions**

86. The ILM approach has huge potential, and Namibia has already made major strides through demonstrating some key successes and getting the enabling environment in place for more landscapes to be formalised. As Namibia is a beautiful and diverse country, with a drive to diversify its rural economy in a water-conscious manner, further development of protected landscapes is encouraged. Future efforts should explicitly target, measure and communicate the poverty reduction dividends that can be achieved through such approaches.