



**MID-TERM EVALUATION  
BCLME SAPIMP PROJECT**

**PROJECT TITLE:** Implementation of the Benguela Current LME Strategic Action Program for Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Reducing Coastal Resources Degradation

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3305

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 3849

**EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:** April/June 2012

**DATE OF EVALUATION FINAL REPORT:** 24 July 2012

**COUNTRIES:** Angola, Namibia, South Africa

**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** International Waters

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM:** SP-1: Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity

**EXECUTING AGENCY/PARTNER:** UNOPS

**EVALUATOR:** David A. LaRoche

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Evaluator would like to thank the interviewees, personnel of the Implementing and Executing Agencies (UNDP and the UNOPS), staff of the Project Management Unit, and the many others who provided valuable insights into project implementation of the BCLME SAPIMP project to date.

## Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	2
i. Executive Summary .....	5
Project Description .....	5
Evaluation Purpose and Objective .....	6
Methodology .....	7
Principal Conclusions.....	8
Principal Recommendations.....	11
Overall Mid-Term Evaluation Rating .....	13
Summary Rating Table by Outcome .....	14
Summary of Evaluation Findings by Issue .....	14
Evaluation Findings by Issue.....	15
Final Conclusions.....	15
ii. List of Acronyms .....	16
1. Introduction.....	18
1.1 Evaluation Purpose .....	18
1.2 Key Issues Addressed.....	18
1.3 Methodology .....	20
1.4 Structure .....	20
1.5 The Evaluator.....	21
2. Project Description and Development Context .....	22
2.1 Background.....	22
2.2 The BCLME SAPIMP/Project Description .....	23
SAPIMP Project Development.....	23
Project Goal, Objectives, Outcomes and Management .....	23
The Overall Project Objective:.....	23
Project Implementation .....	24
Project Execution .....	24
Project Coordination and Administration .....	25
2.3 Project Start and Duration .....	25
2.6 Main Stakeholders .....	25
2.7 BCLME SAPIMP Project Finance .....	25
Table 1: Project Finance and Co-finance .....	26
3. Project Formulation/Project Concept and Design .....	26
3.1 Analysis - Risks and Assumptions .....	26
Were the Planned Outcomes of the Project <i>Specific</i> ? .....	26
Were the Planned Outcomes of the Project <i>Measurable</i> ? .....	27
Were the Planned Outcomes <i>Achievable</i> ? .....	27
Were the Planned Outcomes <i>Relevant</i> ? .....	28
Were the Planned Outcomes <i>Time-Bound</i> ?.....	28
Original Project Logframe .....	30
3.2 Assessment of the Original Logframe .....	36
General Comments/Observations .....	36
Other Issues Related to Project Concept and Design .....	36
3.3 Lessons Learned from Other Projects .....	38

3.4	Stakeholder Participation .....	39
3.5	Replication Approach.....	39
3.6	UNDP Comparative Advantage.....	39
3.7	Linkages Between and Among Other related Interventions.....	40
4.	Project Implementation.....	43
4.1	Updated Logical Framework Analysis .....	43
	Updated Logical Framework Analysis (May 2012).....	45
	Updated Logframe – General Comments .....	53
	Updated Logframe – Specific Comments .....	53
4.3	Partnerships .....	55
4.4	Financial Planning .....	55
	Yearly Disbursements .....	55
	Table 2: Yearly Disbursements.....	55
	Project Co-finance/Actual and Projected.....	56
	Table 3: Actual and Projected Co-finance.....	56
4.5	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	57
	Table 4: Risk Assessment/May 2012.....	60
4.6	Execution and Implementation .....	65
5.	Project Rating Tables.....	65
5.1	Table 8: Evaluation Rating by Outcome .....	65
5.2	Table 6: Evaluation Rating by Component/Output.....	68
	General Evaluator Comments .....	69
	Specific Evaluator Comments.....	70
	Table 7: Evaluation by Issue .....	71
	Table 8: General Project Evaluation.....	72
6.	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	72
6.1	Conclusions .....	72
6.2	Recommendations.....	76
Annexes	.....	79
	Annex 1 – Terms of Reference .....	79
	Annex 2 – Itineraries (2).....	85
	Itinerary 1.....	85
	Itinerary 2.....	88
	Mission Summaries/Field Visits.....	88
	Annex 3 - List of Interviewees .....	90
	Interview Results – Major Impression .....	92
	Annex 4 - Documents and Publications Reviewed .....	93
	Annex 5 – Updated Co-finance/Leveraged Funding.....	95

## i. Executive Summary

### Project Description

1. The global environmental **Goal**<sup>1</sup> of this Project is:

*The overall reduction in degradation of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME), with emphasis on the restoration of its depleted fisheries, through effective implementation and long-term sustainability of the BCLME Strategic Action Programme (SAP). This will be achieved through the adoption of an integrated transboundary LME management approach and the formalization of an effective and efficient intergovernmental Benguela Current Commission (BCC).*

2. The **objective** of the project is:

*...to implement a Strategic Action Programme for the development and adoption of an effective transboundary LME management structure, primarily addressing fish stock and fisheries rejuvenation and sustainability, supported and made operational by functioning and sustainable transboundary and national level institutions, and guided by a series of lessons and best practices. Such lessons and best practices are intended to further form the basis of replicable procedures to secure management strategies in similar global LMEs.*

3. The **primary outputs** from the Project is to generate:

- A ‘tried-and-tested’ LME Commission along with supportive regional and national structures; and
- An associated binding international legal agreement for transboundary management of the BCLME and its globally important fisheries. Policy, legislation and operational practices were to be amended and realigned at the national level in order to ensure a more regional transboundary management approach to the LME.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Goal statement has been changed from the goal as originally described in the Project Document. The original Goal as described in the Project Document was “To halt the marked depletion of fisheries within one of the most productive yet highly environmentally variable oceanic areas in the world. This will be achieved through adoption of a more appropriate ecosystem approach to fisheries management that includes transboundary cooperation in order to mitigate the overall degradation of the LME and its living marine resources and to build adaptive buffers to variability (both natural and anthropogenic in nature).” The evaluator notes that the updated goal statement places more emphasis on process as opposed to measuring changes in the ecosystem based on a series of interventions over the past fifteen years.

4. Specific support is to be provided to:

- Improve capacities for sustainability through training and institutional strengthening;
- Adopt appropriate financial mechanisms alongside partnership agreements; and
- Enable more effective stakeholder participation throughout all sectors, with a specific emphasis toward community inputs.

5. The project is intended to focus on capturing knowledge products and their distribution and replication, both within the BCLME region and beyond. Activities under the Project are to be linked to an appropriate networking mechanism for LMEs.

6. The successful realization of Project outcomes is to be measured through appropriate deliverables and achievements following GEF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guidance. To this effect, a principal component of the intended Project is:

*...establishment of measurable International Waters (IW) indicators within an effective M&E framework, which are to be incorporated into the BCLME as an intrinsic on-going activity within the work of the Commission.*

7. The end-of-project landscape intended to include:

- A halt to and reversal in the decline of fisheries within the BCLME; and
- Effective conservation and management measures to mitigate degradation of the ecosystem as a whole.

## **Evaluation Purpose and Objective**

8. The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) has been to examine the progress and performance of the project since the start of its implementation. The MTE includes the evaluation of both the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs and outcomes set forth in the Project Document, and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outcomes, and the progress towards project objective. The evaluation also identifies and addresses causes and issues that constrain the achievement of set targets.

9. The MTE is intended to:

- Identify weaknesses and strengths of project concept and design;
- Develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assess Project outputs and outcomes to date;

- Evaluate the efficiency of Project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency
- Detail some recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period;
- Provide opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and thereby enable the project to make prompt and necessary adjustments leading to the remaining 18 months of project implementation;
- Determine the likely outcomes and impact of the Project in relation to the specified Project goal, outcomes, outputs and activities.
- Identify lessons learnt and best practices from the Project that could be applied to future and on-going projects; and, in general,
- Follow approaches adopted by GEF for the assessment of IW projects and UNDP M&E guidelines.

## **Methodology**

10. This Mid-term Evaluation has been conducted in a participatory manner consistent with its essential objective to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide a basis for improvement in implementation over the remaining time of the project, and other decisions.

11. The evaluation has included the following activities:

- A desk review of project document, outcomes, outputs, monitoring reports including, among others, the Mid-Term Evaluation and Final Evaluation of the first GEF funded BCLME project, the BCLME SAPIMP Project Document, the Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings, the Project Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP), Project related websites of the BCC and DLIST, minutes and reports of other relevant meetings, mandatory project reports such as Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and Annual Project Reports (APRs), Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports;
- Two Missions to the Region;
- A review of specific products including content of the Project web site, datasets, management and action plans, publications and other materials and reports;
- Interviews with the Senior Project Manager (SPM) and other project staff in the Project Management Unit (PMU), representatives of the Implementing Agency (UNDP), the Executing Agency (UNOPS), Members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and representatives of the BCC;
- Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives, other related projects and programmes within the region, relevant UNDP personnel, and NGOs; and
- Provision of a Final Report in July of 2012.

## Principal Conclusions

12. **Overlapping responsibilities among projects.** Four inter-related projects have overlapping responsibilities, all under the general umbrella of the BCC, making difficult assignment and measurement of ultimate accountability for the delivery of results. The four projects include:

- Implementation of the Benguela Current Commission's Science Programme (Science Programme) to support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management in the BCLME Region (Norway);
- Strengthening the Capacity (TCB project) of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) to implement an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management in Namibia, Angola and South Africa (ICEIDA);
- Support for the Institutionalization of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) (Angola, Namibia & South Africa); and
- Implementation of the Benguela Current LME Strategic Action Program (Project) for Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Reducing Coastal Resources Degradation (UNDP-GEF), which is the subject of this evaluation.

13. **Participating country commitment.** The three countries continue to be committed to the goal and objectives of the Project and the BCLME Programme. This is evidenced by, among other things:

- The level of cooperation that was exhibited in the successful negotiations leading to the draft Convention;
- The continuing presence of high level representatives from the three governments at BCC Ministerial meetings;
- The level of attendance of government personnel and some stakeholders at committee, work group, and other project meetings and meetings of the BCC;
- The continuing country support for National Focal Points for the project and the BCC; and
- The payment of dues to the BCC by the three participating countries (although some payments have been late in arriving).

14. **Project visibility and stature.** The Project has adhered to its charge, as stated in the Project Document, that the Project is "down-graded to a simple Management Unit within the BCC and for its Manager/Advisor works alongside the Executive Secretary to ensure harmony between the GEF-funded activities and the overall work of the Commission." According to some interviewees, and in the opinion of the evaluator this has led to:

- Low visibility for the Project, with most interviewees having little direct knowledge of Project related activities and results;
- Diminished stature of the Project;
- The appearance that the Project has served as "an ATM for the BCC", as one interviewee stated; and
- A perception that the Project has been, and in the end will be seen in light of the perceived success – or failure – of the BCC, rather than on its own merits.



15. **Assistance to the BCC.** The Project has given a consistent and effective level of attention and accompanying resources to assist the BCC to become fully functional. However, more recently the Project has been providing unplanned, continuing Project resource inputs in efforts to create a greater level of sustainability for the Commission. Some of these unplanned expenditures come at the expense of previously planned Outputs of the Project.

16. **The Convention – negotiation of the text.** Knowledgeable observers give the Project management Unit very high marks for the role it played in organizing and facilitating discussions leading to the successful negotiation of the Convention text.

17. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** A strong majority of interviewees believe that the most important deliverable of the Project, and indeed for the future sustainability of the BCLME programme, is the signing and ratification of the Convention.

18. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** A formal Convention signing and Convention ratification by 31 December 2012 is in serious doubt. Should signing and ratification not occur by that date, participating countries would either have to extend the mandate of the current interim BCC, or the interim BCC would have to cease operations. While interviewees differ on the implications of missing that date, there is agreement that donors and other stakeholders would not see it in a positive light.

19. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** Should the existing draft Convention not be signed and ratified by end of project, i.e. 31 December 2013, it will be seen as a failure of the most salient deliverable of the Project, as noted in the Project Document, original Project logframe, updated Project logframes, and suggested by a vast majority of interviewees as being the most important objective of the Project. Several interviewees also stated that failure to sign and ratify the Convention would be seen by potential donors and other stakeholders as a diminishment of participating country support for the BCLME programme.

20. **Logical Framework Analysis.** The inclusion of mid-term targets in the updated logical framework analysis has added an improved level of project accountability and is extremely helpful to evaluators. The frequent updates to the logframe make it difficult to discern the exact nature and extent to which the goal, objectives, outputs and outcomes of the project have been altered over time.

21. **Development of GEF IW indicators.** The Project Document states that implementation would include “establishment of measurable International Waters (IW) indicators within an effective M&E framework, which are to be incorporated into the BCLME as an intrinsic on-going activity within the work of the Commission.” There is little evidence at this point that the project will be developing GEF IW indicators as part of its monitoring and evaluation efforts.

22. **Intra and inter-project communication.** The Senior Project Manager has not communicated effectively and regularly with key personnel from the Implementing Agency, the Executing Agency, other key Project participants, and some stakeholders. This has, to varying degrees, negatively affected Project efficiencies and results. Given the need to work efficiently and quickly to produce maximum results over the remaining 18 months of implementation, this lack of effective communication, if it continues, will increase the possibility that a number of deliverables will not be met.

23. **Emerging concerns about a Namibia centered Project and Programme.** There have been concerns expressed by several interviewees that the Project and the BCC are starting to be seen as over-weighted toward Namibian nationals, and could as a result come to be seen as disproportionately weighted to Namibian interests. According to Project records, there have been 101 contracts issued. Of that number 69 were issued to Namibian individuals or companies; 20 were issued to South African individuals or companies; 6 were issued to Angolan contractors; and 6 to international contractors. It should be noted that as the Project is located in Namibia, many of the Namibian contracts are for furnishings and other day-to-day supplies to run the PMU. However, even taking into account that need, there still appears to be an over-weighting of contracts to Namibian sources. The PMU has minimized international contracts, consistent with recognition that there is significant capacity within the region and that regional contractors should be given preference.

24. **Stakeholder participation and community involvement.** After a promising start, stakeholder participation and community level involvement, central to GEF projects generally and specifically in this Project, has decreased over the past six months. It is unclear the extent that and the means through which the project will ensure effective stakeholder participation over the remaining 18 months of project implementation. As continuing, broad levels of stakeholder support are seen by many interviewees as necessary to the mid and long term success of the BCLME Programme and the Benguela Current Commission, reduced effort in this area is a concern.

25. **Limited Project resources.** There is limited time and there are limited resources - human and financial - to deliver the following key Project deliverables identified in Project logframes:

- Signature and Ratification of the Convention;
- Completion of the ongoing process of updating the Strategic Action Programme;
- Development of National Action Plans;
- Definition of GEF IW based indicators and more specifically identification, if any, of stress reduction indicators achieved by the BCLME Programme to date;
- Development and adoption of a package of regional guidelines for policy, legislative and management reforms; and
- A refurbished web-based platform and accessible online

26. **Difficulty of access to Angola.** There is no question of the overall commitment of Angola to the Programme and the Project. Angola as an active and effective participant in negotiations leading to the final draft of the Convention; they are active and effective participants in BCC and Project meetings; and they are commonly represented at Ministerial level during Ministerial meetings as part of the BCC. There is, however, an ongoing issue of difficulty in obtaining Angola visas for project consultants and other Project related personnel. A consequence of this difficulty, at best, is that the Project is not able to function at the same and important face-to-face level that is the case in Namibia and South Africa. At worst, this difficulty leads to the inadvertent appearance that the Project does not take seriously enough the imperative of assuring that Project personnel is able to give equal time and effort to Angola. The problem of access is compounded by, among other things, language difference, an economy that is largely cash driven, and other dissimilarities that constantly need to be taken into account by the Project.

27. **Incomplete co-finance information.** The evaluator, despite repeated efforts, was unable to obtain complete co-finance information, thus making it impossible to determine current levels of received co-finance against original projections, and an assessment of project co-finance to the end of the project. This information will be should be gathered and assessed by the project as soon as possible, and the information will also be necessary to gather for purposes of the Terminal Evaluation.

## **Principal Recommendations**

28. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU keep further unplanned transfer of resources to the BCC at a minimum to assure maximum use of remaining resources on the generation of Project Outputs that remain unaddressed.

29. **The evaluator recommends** that as an urgent priority the Senior Project Manager enlist the support of the BCC Executive Secretary, the Implementing Agency, and other human and financial resources necessary to gain ratification of the Convention before the deadline of 31 December 2012. In addition to the direct efforts of the Project Manager, the BCC ES, and representatives of the Implementing Agency and other members of the PSC, this may require the recruitment of high-level project champions, especially in Angola, who would assist in contacting and encouraging key high-level government officials in the three countries to proceed quickly to formally sign and ratify the final version of the Convention text. Securing Convention ratification will require concerted, immediate planning, consultation, and rapid execution as time to secure ratification before the 31 December 2012 deadline is, according to interviewees knowledgeable with the necessary process, fast running out. (N.B. This recommendation is currently being acted upon, in part, as a result of an earlier discussion with the SPM).

30. **The evaluator recommends** that, assuming the signing of the Convention will take place in Angola, the PMU begin now to identify the resource needs that will be required to assure a smooth and successful event given the potential logistical difficulties that such an event, at such a location, will entail. **The evaluator also recommends** that UNOPS

consider sending a representative to Angola to work with the Angola National Coordinator to pre-determine the list of contracting and disbursement requirements that will be necessary to assure a successful signing ceremony.

31. **The evaluator recommends** that the Senior Project Manager, beginning immediately and over the remaining time of project implementation, continue his current level of communication with the ES of the BCC, and establish scheduled, periodic conversations and consultations with key officials of the Implementing and Executing Agencies of the project, and other PSC members and key stakeholders as necessary. The number of important activities to be implemented over the remaining, roughly 18 months of Project implementation will require establishment of tight deadlines, effective engagement of participating country personnel, timely and efficient recruitment of consultants, and overall efficient coordination of effort across the entire range of Project stakeholders.

32. **The evaluator recommends** that the Senior Project Manager engage the Executive Secretary (ES) of the BCC, Project Steering Committee (of which the ES of the BCC is a member), and the Implementing and Executing Agencies (also members of the PSC), in a definitive discussion of priorities and the most effective and efficient use of remaining project resources between now and end-of-project. The definitive discussion should include a list of priority actions that the Senior Project Manager sees as most important to conclude over the next eighteen months; the human and other resources required to address those priorities; timeframes for each; and also a list of previously identified project deliverables that will not be met, if any. (N.B. This recommendation is also currently being acted upon, in part, as a result of an earlier discussion with the SPM).

33. **The evaluator recommends** that, as a matter of urgency, the Senior Project Manager definitively address the issue of stakeholder involvement for the remainder of the project. Key areas should include information dissemination, upgrading the quality of the current BCC website with special attention to highlighting project progress, stakeholder outreach efforts, the engagement of community level stakeholders, and building enduring partnerships that can be of use to the countries generally and the BCC specifically beyond the life of the project.

34. **The evaluator recommends** that over the next 18 months the Project should develop a set of IW indicators, with special emphasis on identifying the extent to which, if any, there are stress reduction indicators that could be reported as a result of the GEF investment in the BCLME programme over a fifteen year period.

35. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU, through the Senior Project Manager, make clear through the use of future QPRs, which Outputs will not be achieved over the remaining period of implementation and the effect the lack of achievement of those Outputs will have on the respective Project Outcomes.

36. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU, the UNDP Country Office, and others as necessary, engage the Government of Angola with the aim of facilitating improved

access of project personnel to Angola through a simplified and streamlined process for obtaining visas.

37. **The evaluator recommends** that the Project make every appropriate effort to engage a greater balance of consultants from the three countries to assure both the fact and the appearance of giving each country equal access to contracts consistent with their equal partnership in the Project and work of the BCC.

38. **The evaluator recommends** that the project complete gathering and assessing current levels of project co-finance and project the likely amount of co-finance that will have been contributed by the end of project implementation.

## **Overall Summary of Mid-Term Evaluation<sup>2</sup>**

39. As indicated in the Table below the overall rating for this Mid-Term evaluation is Marginally Satisfactory. The Marginally Satisfactory rating language as used by the GEF states in part that the Project "...is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global benefits." At this point there is some considerable doubt that the Project, and/or its partners, can achieve the following:

- The signing and ratification of the draft Convention by 31 December 2012;
- A level of stakeholder participation and community level involvement consistent with the language of the Project Document and the overall work programme adopted as part of the Inception Workshop;
- The development of National Monitoring Programmes established and implemented and incorporating GEF IW indicators;
- The development of National Action Plans consistent with their description in the Project Document; and
- Development of a regional, sustainable funding program for the BCC and the overall BCLME approach.

40. The evaluator notes that the signing and ratification of the Convention is in many ways beyond the capacity of the Project to effect. It is also recognized that a true measure of Project success in achieving the objective of signature and ratification of the Convention is to have this occur by 31 December 2013, the Project closing date. The evaluator also notes that the updated logframe includes language that National Action Plans are to be completed by June of 2012. But in the view of the evaluator the lack of progress to date in developing NAPs, and the substantial difficulties the Project has encountered in obtaining data and information from, and even access to one of the countries makes meeting that date difficult.

## **Overall Mid-Term Evaluation Rating**

---

<sup>2</sup> Also based on a requirement of UNDP GEF Guidelines.

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

### Summary Rating Table by Outcome

Outcomes		Evaluation					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Outcome 1	A Benguela Current Commission Infrastructure and Associated Convention <sup>3</sup>						
Outcome 2	National Level Policy and Management Reforms <sup>4</sup>						
Outcome 3	Sustainable Capacity for LME Management <sup>5</sup>						
Outcome 4	Capture and Networking of Knowledge and Best Practices <sup>6</sup>						

### Summary of Evaluation Findings by Issue<sup>7</sup>

41. Note: In relation to the Achievement of objectives and planned results and Attainment of outputs and activities, the evaluator has relied heavily on the latest iteration of the

<sup>3</sup> Project assistance to the BCC and for its assistance in the successful negotiation of the draft Convention would result in a Highly Satisfactory rating for this Outcome. However, the continuing question of whether and when the Convention will be signed and ratified reduces the rating to Satisfactory.

<sup>4</sup> Efforts to bring about these reforms has lagged, and the extent to which the project can successfully focus on achievement of this Outcome over the next 18 months should drive reconsideration of the rating of this Outcome.

<sup>5</sup> This rating is also in part driven by the absence of a signed and ratified Convention, and unplanned and continuing Project inputs of resources to the BCC, at the expense of originally planned Project Outputs.

<sup>6</sup> While not apparent in the wording of this Outcome, it is the Outcome that contains stakeholder and community level participation in the Project, and that participation has lagged.

<sup>7</sup> As prescribed in UNDP-GEF evaluation guidelines.

updated logframe presented to the PSC meeting in May 2012. In the May 2012 update of the logical framework analysis 18 of 29 (62%) of mid-term targets were met; 8 of 29 (27%) of mid-term targets were “ongoing;” and 3 of 29 (11%) of mid-term targets were listed under the heading of “no progress.” It is important to note that this assessment of mid-term targets took place approximately six months past the mid-term point of the Project.

## Evaluation Findings by Issue

Evaluation Issue	Rating
Achievement of objectives and planned results	Marginally Satisfactory
Attainment of outputs and activities	Marginally Satisfactory
Cost-effectiveness	Satisfactory
Impact	Marginally Satisfactory
Sustainability of the Project	Marginally Satisfactory
Stakeholder participation	Marginally Unsatisfactory
Country ownership	Satisfactory
Implementation on the ground and implementation approach	Marginally Satisfactory
Financial Management and Planning	Satisfactory
Replicability	Marginally Satisfactory
Monitoring and evaluation	Marginally Unsatisfactory

## Final Conclusions

42. The Project is entering a critical period where, if performance over the remaining 18 months of implementation is effective and efficient, the overall rating could move from Marginally Satisfactory to Satisfactory. If on the other hand remaining priorities are not executed in a diligent manner it is conceivable that the final rating could move from Marginally Satisfactory to Marginally Unsatisfactory.

43. Interviewees, Project staff, and the evaluator are generally agreed that the most significant and important deliverable of the Project – and indeed the most important objective for any entity engaged in work related to the BCLME – is the signing and ratification of the Convention. Every available means should be employed to deliver the signature and ratification in the remaining 18 months of Project implementation.

## ii. List of Acronyms

APR	Annual Project Review
AU	African Union
AWP	Annual Workplan
BCC	Benguela Current Commission
BCLME	Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem
BENEFIT	Benguela Environment and Fisheries Interaction and Training Programme
CSAs	Cost Sharing Agreements
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs (South Africa)
DLIST	Distance Learning and Information Sharing Tool
EAC	Ecosystem Advisory Committee of the Benguela Current Commission
DIM	Data and Information Manager
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EA	Executing Agency
ES	Executive Secretary of the Benguela Current Commission
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FE	Final Evaluation
GCLME	Guinea Current LME
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOOS	Global Ocean Observation System
GOOS-Africa	Global Ocean Observation System - African Region
IA	Implementing Agency
IBCC	Interim Benguela Current Commission
ICA	Incremental Cost Analysis
ICEIDA	Icelandic International Development Agency
IKM	International Knowledge Management
IW	International Waters
IW:LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange Resource Network
JMP	Joint Management Plan
LME	Large Marine Ecosystem
LME CZM	Large Marine Ecosystem Coastal Zone Management
LMR	Living Marine Resources
MACEMP	Marine and Coastal Management Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MB	Management Board of the Benguela Current Commission
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MLR	Marine Living Resources
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	Marine Protected Areas
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NACOMA	Namibia Coast Conservation and Management Authority
NC	National Coordinator New Partnership for Africa's Development
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development National Focal Institutes
NFIs	National Focal Institutes
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NISG	National Inter-Sector Stakeholder Group
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
ODINAFRICA	Ocean Data and Information Network Africa
PCU	Project Coordination Unit (First GEF Project for the BCLME)



PD	Project Document
PMU	Programme Management Unit of the BCLME SAPIMP Project
PDF-B	Project Development Facility (Block B)
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PSC	Project Steering Committee
QPR	Quarterly Progress Report
RAP	Remedial Action Plan
RMPS	Resource Mobilization and Partnership Strategies
RTO	Regional Training Officer
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SEA	State of the Ecosystem Assessment
SEIS	State of the Ecosystem Information System
SIP	Stakeholder Involvement Plan
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
SPM	Senior Project Manager
SPAN	Strengthening Namibia's Protected Areas Network
TAC	Total Allowable Catch
TCB	Training and Capacity Building
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Programme Country Office
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 Evaluation Purpose**

44. In general, this MTE will follow instructions for preparation of the MTE as drafted by the UNOPS and described in Vacancy Code VA/2011/BCLME/69985/MTE/02, which appears as Annex 1 of this report. More specifically, it will adhere to UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF financed projects dated 17 March 2011, and attached as Annex 2 of this evaluation.

45. The purpose of the MTE is to examine the progress and performance of the BCLME project since the start of implementation. This MTE includes assessments of:

- The progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs and outcomes set forth in the Project Document; and
- An assessment to date of features related to the process involved in achieving those outcomes, and progress toward meeting the project objective.

46. The evaluation also identifies and addresses causes and issues that constrain the achievement of set targets through:

- Identification of weaknesses and strengths in project concept and design;
- Inclusion of recommendations for any changes suggested in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of its implementation; and
- Assessment of project outputs and outcomes to date.

47. Consequently, the MTE provides:

- An assessment of project successes, or failures, and recommends prompt, necessary adjustments; and
- Detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period.

48. The MTE will evaluate the efficiency of Project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the Project in relation to the specified Project goals and objectives.

49. Finally, this MTE identifies lessons learned and best practices from the Project that could be applied to future and on-going IW and related projects.

## **1.2 Key Issues Addressed**

47. The evaluation addresses the following specific elements:

- An assessment of whether the Project concept and design are clear, logical, and commensurate with the time and resources available;
- A summary evaluation of the Project and all of its major components undertaken to date and a determination of progress toward achievement of its overall objectives;
- An evaluation of Project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the original and updated logical framework matrices and the Project Document<sup>8</sup>;
- An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of Project outputs and outcomes produced to date in relation to expected results;
- An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role and effectiveness of the Project Steering Committee (PSC);
- Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document;
- Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made in the project to date, and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the Project; and
- Identification, and to the extent possible the quantification, of the co-financing commitments realized (those committed at the beginning of the project as well as those that have emerged during project implementation).

50. This MTE also includes an evaluation of Project coordination, management and administration provided by the PMU. It includes specific reference to:

- Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
- The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the PMU in monitoring on a day-to-day progress in Project execution;
- Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the Project, and recommendations for any necessary operational changes;
- Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs;
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of UNDP and UNOPS in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in terms of their respective implementing and executing capacities in the project implementation is;
- A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outputs of the Project are likely to be met;
- An assessment of the M&E approach adopted by the Project, with specific reference to and use of GEF IW indicators to identify process, stress reduction, and environmental status indicators;

---

<sup>8</sup> There have been several updates of the logframe since project inception. The Evaluator will be comparing the original logframe as contained in the Project Document in relation to the most recent update adopted by the Project Steering Committee.

- Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities; and
- Lessons learned and best practices during Project implementation that would benefit the GEF IW portfolio;

51. Recommendations are made regarding necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall Project workplan and timetable for purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.

### **1.3 Methodology**

52. This Mid-term Evaluation has been conducted in a participatory manner, consistent with its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide a basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

53. The evaluation began with a desk review of project documentation and also includes the following activities:

- A desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports (including, among others, Project Inception Report, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings, other relevant meetings, Project Implementation Reports (PIRs/APRs), quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- A review of specific products including content of the Project web site, datasets, management and action plans, publications and other materials and reports;
- Interviews with the Senior Project Manager and other project staff in the Project Management Unit and consultants involved in Project implementation;
- Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives, other related projects and programmes within the region, relevant UNDP personnel, and NGOs;
- Presentation of tentative conclusions prior to the Project Steering Committee Meeting at the end May 2012;
- Provision of a draft report by mid-June 2012; and
- A Final Report by the end of June 2012.

### **1.4 Structure**

54. This Final Report includes:

- An executive summary, including findings and recommendations and an overall rating of project performance;
- A detailed evaluation report covering items listed above with special attention to lessons learned and recommendations;
- A table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing for the Project; and

- A list of Annexes prepared by the evaluator, which includes TORs, Itineraries, List of Persons Interviewed, Summary of Field Visits, List of Documents reviewed, Identification of Co-financing and Leveraged Resources, etc.

55. The evaluation will rate the success of the project on a scale from Highly Successful (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HS). The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

- Achievement of objectives and planned results
- Attainment of outputs and activities
- Cost-effectiveness
- Impact
- Sustainability
- Stakeholder participation
- Country ownership
- Implementation approach
- Financial planning
- Replicability
- Monitoring and evaluation

56. Each of the items is rated separately with comments, and an overall rating given. The following rating system is applied, according to the UNDP Evaluation Rating guidelines:

- 1= Highly Satisfactory = HS
- 2= Satisfactory = S
- 3= Marginally Satisfactory = MS
- 4= Marginally Unsatisfactory = MU
- 5= Unsatisfactory = U
- 6= Highly Unsatisfactory = HU

## **1.5 The Evaluator**

57. The MTE Evaluator is Mr. David A. LaRoche, based in the USA and Romania. Mr. LaRoche is an independent consultant with level over thirty-five years of experience in national and international project and programme monitoring and evaluation; institutional and organizational effectiveness; international environmental policy development and negotiations; project and programme management; environmental NGO development and capacity building at national and international levels; project development; and executive level legislative and political experience. Over the past 16 years he has been a consultant to the GEF Secretariat, each of the three GEF Implementing Agencies, UNOPS, and the FAO. In each of those capacities he has worked extensively on international waters issues, including contracts on international river basins, lakes, and large marine ecosystems.

58. He has also been involved as a consultant to numerous non-profits, including as a programme level evaluator for the Pew Charitable Trusts (USA) and the Ivey Foundation

(Canada); and also as a programme level consultant to the Pew Environment Group on forestry and global marine issues.

## **2. Project Description and Development Context**

### **2.1 Background**

59. The Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) Programme (Programme) – a GEF co-sponsored programme of the governments of Angola, Namibia and South Africa – was created to develop a transboundary intergovernmental management process for the BCLME and its associated fisheries. This regional management approach is seen as essential if the countries are to reverse the significant decline in the global important fish stocks within the Benguela and to provide sustainability to fisheries through an overall ecosystem approach that links the welfare of the fishery to effective habitat conservation and management as well as overall management and protection of food webs and associated predator-prey relationships.

60. The Programme has focused not only on the direct issue of fishing practices, monitoring and control of fisheries activities, and a further understanding of interrelationships between the commercial species and their environment; but also on the impacts (potential and real) from other sectors such as the oil and mining industry, coastal development, and generally land and marine based sources of pollution.

61. The Programme is generally seen to have been highly successful in developing regional partnerships in support of transboundary LME resource management, and in capturing accurate knowledge on ecosystem functions and trends. Also, the activities supported by the BCLME Programme have made significant contributions to capacity building, knowledge enhancement, and has successfully captured vital information necessary for an integrated, ecosystem based approach to LME management.

62. Further, regional collaboration with the public and private sectors levels has been significantly strengthened. The participating countries have demonstrated commitment to the programme as evidenced by creation of an Interim Agreement, which brings into being the Interim Benguela Current Commission (IBCC) (Commission). The IBCC made provision for a Conference of Ministers, which at its initial meeting in July 2007 adopted the Commission and its structure, and approved a new regionally funded Science Programme to provide foundational support to the Commission, its policies, and its management procedures. Among other things, the objective of the Interim Agreement is to give effect to the Strategic Action Programme by establishing a Benguela Current Commission in order to:

- Establish a formal institutional structure for cooperation between the Contracting Parties that will facilitate the understanding, protection, conservation and sustainable use of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem by the Contracting Parties; and
- Further the objectives recorded in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP).

## 2.2 The BCLME SAPIMP/Project Description

### SAPIMP Project Development

63. Preparation of BCLME SAPIMP began early in 2007, with the submission to the GEF, by the UNDP, of a Project Preparatory Grant (PPG) request (PDF-B) of US\$ 50,000. The principal activities under the PDF-B included the drafting of a Project Document and the convening of national and regional workshops/meetings and, individual consultations with stakeholders (individuals and organizations) to review, revise and further develop the scope of the project.

64. Workshops and meetings also provided the platform to facilitate agreement about the implementation arrangements, timeframes, M&E framework and total budget of the project. The workshops and meetings were held Luanda, Windhoek and Cape Town that resulted in reaching consensus on the goal and objectives of the project. During and after these workshops the Project Document and incremental cost analysis (ICA) were finalized and shared with UNDP Namibia, as the Implementing Agency (IA), and national stakeholders in each country.

65. In addition to the above, the PDF-B phase also commissioned a review of policy and legislative systems in each country, the development of a Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP), and the development of a Training and Capacity Building Strategy for the BCC.

### Project Goal, Objectives, Outcomes and Management

66. As described in the Project Document **the Project Goal** is:

*To reduce degradation of the BCLME, with emphasis on the restoration of its depleted fisheries, through effective implementation and long-term sustainability of the BCLME SAP.*

### The Overall Project Objective:

67. The Overall Project Objective is:

*The implementation of the BCLME SAP through the adoption of national policy reforms, the sustainable institutionalization of a regional Commission, and the endorsement and ratification of a binding international Treaty for the LME.*

68. Consistent with the Project Objective, the two major deliverables of the Project include:

- *A Benguela Current Commission (BCC) with all its requisite structure and functions; and*
- *A Benguela Current Convention (Treaty) that would form the overarching policy and management framework for the BCLME.*

69. Inclusive in the above deliverables would be a Strategic Plan and Business Plan, National Action Plans (NAPs) that would be consolidated into a Regional Action Plan

(RAP), guidelines for policy and legislative reviews and harmonization, a regional monitoring and assessment programme, and a State of the Ecosystem Information System (SEIS).

**Project Specific Outcomes**, as described in the approved Project Document include:

*Outcome 1: A Benguela Current Commission Infrastructure and Associated Convention.*

*Outcome 2: National Level Policy and Management Reforms.*

*Outcome 3: Sustainable Capacity for Large Marine Ecosystem Management.*

*Outcome 4: Capture and Networking of Knowledge and Best Practice.*

**Specific support** is provided for improved capacities for sustainability through:

- Training and institutional strengthening;
- Development of a strategic plan (as above);
- A business plan and resource mobilization and partnership strategy (also as above); and
- More effective stakeholder participation throughout all sectors with a specific emphasis toward community inputs.

70. The project also intends to develop a mechanism for knowledge capture, development of lessons learned and good practices, and distribution and use of lessons learned and best practices for replication within and beyond the BCLME region. This is being linked to an appropriate networking mechanism for LMEs.

### **Project Implementation**

71. UNDP acts as the Implementing Agency (IA) for the Project with the UNDP Namibia Country Office (CO) as the lead UNDP CO. The UNDP CO has considerable experience in the implementation and management of projects in Namibia and has been working with the BCLME Programme for some 10 years to date. Each of the three countries has an active UNDP CO, which provides in-kind support for project implementation. The three offices are familiar with the BCLME Programme, this Project, and the GEF assistance process. The UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Pretoria provides strategic and technical guidance to the COs and the countries throughout project implementation.

### **Project Execution**

72. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) acts as the Project Executing Agency (EA), through its Global and Inter-Regional Division in accordance with standard operational, financial guidelines and procedures. UNOPS has been managing the BCLME Programme since preparation activities began in 1997 and thus has a detailed corporate memory of events and historic processes. UNOPS remains accountable to UNDP for the delivery of agreed outputs as per agreed project work plans, and for financial management and reporting as well as ensuring cost-effectiveness.



## **Project Coordination and Administration**

73. As the objective of this Project is to develop and build capacity for a Commission and its regional and national structures it is considered to be inappropriate to duplicate BCLME administrative mechanisms through a physically independent PCU as was the approach during the initial BCLME Programme. The intention now is to funnel and focus resources through the Commission. However, it is still necessary to have a small and independent PMU for the BCLME SAP IMP Project in order to administer funding and resources, coordinate project implementation and to provide technical advice to the Secretariat of the Commission. In this context, the day-to-day management and administration of the Project will be carried out by a PMU that would be based within the BCC or its hosting organization, to be based in Namibia.

### **2.3 Project Start and Duration**

74. The GEF CEO signed the Project Document on 21 April 2009. The first project disbursement occurred on 20 May 2009. Project national Coordinators were hired beginning July of 2009, and the Senior Project Manager was hired on 25 January 2010. The Project will be ending most of its day-to-day operations on 31 December 2013, and the Senior Project Manager and core staff will be bringing full closure to the Project at the end of March 2013.

75. The objective of this specific project is to implement a Strategic Action Programme for the development and adoption of an effective transboundary LME management structure primarily addressing fish stock and fisheries rejuvenation and sustainability, supported and made operational by functioning and sustainable transboundary and national level institutions, and guided by a series of lessons and best practices. Such lessons and best practices would further form the basis of replicable procedures to secure management strategies in similar global LMEs.

### **2.6 Main Stakeholders**

76. Key stakeholders have been identified as including:

- Academic and Research Institutions;
- Local Authorities;
- Government Ministries and Departments;
- Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs);
- Industry and Private Sector Entities;
- Parastatals;
- Donors;
- Commercial, Artisanal and Recreational Fishers; and
- Tourism Sector Representatives.

### **2.7 BCLME SAPIMP Project Finance**

77. The table below shows the total project funding (GEF contribution and co-finance), as per the approved Project Document. The co-finance from Norway and Iceland is for the implementation of the BCC's Science Programme and Training and Capacity Building Strategy respectively.

**Table 1: Project Finance and Co-finance**

GEF – SAP Implementation Project (cash)	5,138,460
Governments of Angola, Namibia and South Africa (in-kind)	59,294,983
IKM (NGO) (in-kind)	351,352
Iceland – Implementation of the Training and Capacity Building Strategy (cash)	500,000
Norway – Implementation of the Science Plan (cash)	8,800,000
<b>TOTAL (USD)</b>	<b>74,084,795</b>

### 3. Project Formulation/Project Concept and Design

#### 3.1 Analysis - Risks and Assumptions

78. The Project Concept and Design, as captured in the Project Document, is being evaluated through use of UNDP published criteria for evaluating UNDP-GEF projects. These criteria are summarized in the question as to whether the planned outcomes of the Project were SMART, where SMART stands for:

**S Specific:** Did the Outcomes use change language, describing a specific future condition?

**M Measurable:** Did Results, whether quantitative or qualitative, have measurable indicators, making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not?

**A Achievable:** Were the Results within the capacity of the partners to achieve?

**R Relevant:** Did the Results make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework?

**T Time-bound:** Results should never be open-ended. There should be an expected date of accomplishment.

#### **Were the Planned Outcomes of the Project *Specific*?**

79. In general the planned outcomes of the Project were specific, and did describe a future condition for the BCLME region. The future condition was described as one where there would be:

- A ratified BCLME Convention;
- A functioning Benguela Current Commission; and
- Clearly expressed country commitments to assure the financial future and ongoing relevance of the BCC.

### **Were the Planned Outcomes of the Project *Measurable*?**

80. The key Project feature that should capture the measurability of results is the Project Logical Framework Analysis, or logframe. The original Project logframe did in general establish measurable targets. However, for most of the indicators identified in the project document logframe specific timeframes for the achievement of targets as either not specified or seemingly identified arbitrarily. For example:

- The training and capacity building activity had an indicator that stated “80% of TCB activities satisfactorily completed by year 5” but a rationale for how or why the 80% target was decided upon does not exist.
- The original logframe states as a deliverable that policy, legislative and management reforms will be adopted and implemented at national level, and then states that “80% of objectives achieved by year 5.” But no rationale is presented to justify why the 80% figure was identified.
- The original logframe also establishes a target for 80% of the listed stakeholder participation activities are to be completed by year 5 of the project, with no accompanying rationale.
- The African LME networking component states that “60% of year 1 work plan activities will be satisfactorily completed” but there is no rationale for this target, nor is it clear what the year 1 activities include.

81. The Project did establish more specific targets as part of its updating of the logframe, elaborating a number of very specific targets to be achieved by mid-term. A definitive update of the extent to which these targets have been met has not yet been submitted to the Mid-Term Evaluator, although preliminary estimates indicate that between 60-70% of targets have been met.

### **Were the Planned Outcomes *Achievable*?**

82. A number of Project outcomes were not within the power of the project to deliver. A general example of this issue is the effective subordination of the Project to the BCC. Examples of such outcomes include, among others:

- The signing of the Convention;
- The ratification of the Convention;
- Regional sustainable funding programme adopted and implemented;
- Regional work plan adopted for further science and technical studies necessary for LME;
- National Monitoring Programmes established and implemented and incorporating appropriate IW indicators;
- Staffing, performance, and the general management of the BCC;
- Regional Training and Capacity Building (TCB) Strategy and work plan adopted by the BCC; and
- LME related Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEAs) ratified by each country.

83. Certainly GEF projects have deliverables that are not entirely within the power of the project to deliver, and UNDP-GEF evaluation guidelines clearly state that achievability should be seen in the context of something that the project *partners* should be able to deliver.

84. But in the estimation of the evaluator the fact that the BCLME SAPIMP project has so many of its key outcomes that are predicated on partners to achieve, and is effectively subordinated to the BCC, its lack of control over the extent to which deliverables have and will continue to pose significant problems and challenges to project management. As a result, the Project must pay special attention to updating risks and, importantly, continuously be updating strategies and exhausting a full range of actions to overcome those risks. As will be detailed later in this evaluation, the project has managed its risk updating obligation well.

85. For example, and as mentioned above, the ratification of the Convention depends on a complex set of political and socio-economic considerations and decisions in each of the countries, is different in each of the countries, and very likely dynamic in each of the countries. These considerations have and will continue to span various ministries, agencies and individuals with which the Project, or the BCC, has little or no contact, influence or even knowledge. Thus the Project should not ultimately be held accountable for failure of the countries to ratify the Convention, should this failure occur.

86. QPRs and TPRs did an adequate job of updating project risks, and the development of an updated project risk profile in May 2012 was a positive step toward updating risks, and will be discussed later in this evaluation.

### **Were the Planned Outcomes *Relevant*?**

87. The Project concept and design did identify considerable and detailed national priorities of the participating countries and the concept and design addressed selected priorities of the respective national development frameworks. A major test of relevance is the extent to which the project is responsive to well defined and explicitly described country priorities, and in the judgment of the evaluator each of the four planned outcomes of the project is indeed relevant.

### **Were the Planned Outcomes *Time-Bound*?**

88. The original Project concept and design did not effectively establish timeframes for achievement of outcomes as part of the Logical Framework Analysis (logframe), although there were specified timeframes as part of the stakeholder involvement plan.

89. The updated logframes developed during project implementation have added timeframes that are not only useful to, but also necessary for effective monitoring and evaluation.

90. The logframe in the Project Document (original logframe) specifically included identification of Results, Indicators of Success, and risks and Assumptions. As the

original logframe differs significantly from updated logframes that are currently in use by the Project, the original logframe appears below:

## Original Project Logframe

RESULTS	INDICATOR	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<b>GOAL:</b> To halt the marked depletion of fisheries within one of the most productive yet highly environmentally variable oceanic areas in the world. This will be achieved through adoption of a more appropriate ecosystem approach to fisheries management that includes transboundary cooperation in order to mitigate the overall degradation of the LME and its living marine resources and to build in adaptive buffers to variability (both natural and anthropogenic in nature)		
<b>Objective of the Project:</b> the implementation of a Strategic Action Plan that builds on a foundation of scientific and technical studies and evolving partnerships, and uses these to inform policy, legislative and management decisions at the regional and national level.	An effective regional and national capacity established and sustainable that will manage the LME in a cooperative, transboundary manner	Risk that senior national political figures may not grasp the long-term importance of the need to manage and conserve fisheries and other associated living marine resources within the LME. Especially in relation to other pressing social and economic issues. Assumes that political support fostered under the original BCLME Programme will continue and expand under BCLME SAP Implementation Project. Overall assumption that the regional and national structures can be made politically and economically sustainable.
<b>Outcome 1: A Benguela Current Commission Infrastructure and Associated Treaty</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
1.1 Commission formally adopted, to include all its requisite regional structures and responsibilities	BCC operational base and staff in place	Risk that countries may not initially agree on the structure and mandate/responsibilities of the BCC.
1.2 Signature and ratification of a binding international LME Treaty to formally support the Commission	BCC Treaty in place	Assumption that countries willing to negotiate and adopt a binding Treaty which commits them beyond the existing non-binding Agreement.
1.3 Regional guidelines for national policy and legislative reforms agreed and circulated	Agreed guidelines, approved by the BCC, in place	Assumption that countries will adopt and implement these guidelines and reforms (see below under Outcome 2).

1.4 Standardised regional monitoring and assessment programme adopted for national distribution	Monitoring and assessment programme under implementation at national level	Assumption that countries are prepared to cooperate on Monitoring and Assessment and to share skills, expertise, facilities, resources and information. Risk that there is inadequate funding to cover effective transboundary monitoring and assessment exercises.
1.5 Regional work plan adopted for further science and technical studies necessary for LME	Science and technical studies work plan in place	Assumes that there is sufficient funding to support necessary scientific and technical studies nationally and regionally.
<b>Outcome 2: National Level Policy and Management Reforms</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
2.1 National coordinating ministries and coordinating institutes adopted and functioning	National Coordinators appointed and operating from national institutions	Assumes countries will nominate appropriate Ministry and Institute that can most effectively deliver BCC requirements at the national level and can also facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation.
2.2 National Action Plans (NAPs) adopted capturing regional guidelines and requirements	National Action Plans in place	Assumes that all appropriate government and sectoral bodies willing to cooperate on developing and implementing NAPs. Risk that there is insufficient financing or political support to ensure that NAPs are effectively implemented.
2.3 Regional guidelines for policy, legislative and management reforms adopted and implemented at national level	Guidelines implemented in all three countries (80% of objectives achieved by year 5)	Assumes continued political commitment to undertake reforms and realignments as defined in the original Sap and re-confirmed through interim agreement and final Treaty. Risk that political commitment may change as a result of changes in political balance of power both nationally and regionally.
2.4 National Monitoring Programmes established and implemented and incorporating appropriate IW indicators	IW indicators under implementation through National Monitoring Programmes. IW indicator data incorporated into BCC State of the Ecosystem Information System (SEIS)	Assumes willingness between countries to adopt similar standards in order to effectively monitor at the LME level rather than just the national level. Assumes willingness for countries to share their data at the regional level in order to support the LME approach.

		Assumes a certain baseline of capacity and available resources/ equipment. Risk that nationally responsible bodies will not have access to sufficient funding to be able to contribute effectively and equally.
2.5 National Stakeholder Groups (NSGs) established	National Stakeholder Groups in place and participating in the SAP IMP Project	Assumes that various stakeholders at all sectoral levels have the time, interest and resources to engage effectively in the BCLME process. Assumes that BCC is prepared to accept stakeholder input to the overall regional policy and management process. Risk that relations between government, NGO, private sector, community grass-root organisations, etc. may not always be conducive to effective cooperation.
2.6 LME related Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEAs) ratified by each country	LME-related MEAs in place	Assumes commitments involved in ratifying certain MEAs are acceptable to specific governments.
<b>Outcome 3: Sustainable Capacity for LME Management</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
3.1 Regional Training and Capacity Building (TCB) Strategy and work plan adopted by the BCC	BCC Regional TCB Strategy in place	Assumes that BCC can agree on priorities and funding at the regional level. Risk of conflict between countries within BCC relating to major gaps in capacity levels and training needs between countries.
3.2 TCB adopted and implemented through NAPs	TCB under implementation at national level (80% of TCB activities satisfactorily completed by year 5)	Assumes availability of appropriate individuals to train and appropriate institutions for building of capacity. Risk of disagreements and contention between institutions on national priority needs for TCB Risk that institutes may not nominate suitable candidates for training. Significant risk of loss of trained capacity due to more attractive opportunities in other sectors.



3.3 Three-yearly review and update of TCB at regional and national level	Regional TCB Strategy updated (end of 2011)	Assumes sufficient funding available to support a further 3-year cycle of training and capacity building at both the regional and national level
3.4 Effective implementation of the Stakeholder Participation Plan (SPP)	80% of objectives in the SPP achieved by end of Project	Assumes sufficient interest from necessary stakeholders (particularly in the private sector). Also assumes that BCC will allow effective and truly participatory involvement of all stakeholders at all appropriate levels of the BCC (regional and national). Always a risk of conflict between stakeholders that may frequently have opposing views that could threaten the stakeholder participation process.
3.5 Regional sustainable funding programme adopted and implemented	BCC Sustainability Strategy in place. Initial Government commitments (US\$ vs. number of years) to finance the BCC in place	Assumes that stakeholders are willing to confirm sufficient funding for long-term support of the BCC at the regional level. Risk that BCC evolves into too large and expensive a body that cannot be supported by regional funding commitments. Risk of overall loss of interest by funding sources after initial 5-10 years leaving the BCC and the overall BCLME process unsustainable.
3.6 National sustainable funding programmes annexed as part of the BCLME NAPs	National Sustainability Strategies in place (outlining financial commitments to the BCC)	Assumes that national stakeholders (particularly government) are willing to confirm sufficient funding for long-term support of the BCC at the national level. Risk that national commitments to BCC are seen to be too large and expensive cannot be supported by national funding commitments. Risk of overall loss of interest by national funding sources after initial 5-10 years leaving the national BCC coordinating and stakeholder agencies unsustainable.

3.7 Regional partnership agreements and work plans formally adopted and implemented	Number of regional partnerships (with associated outputs, outcomes and impacts). 80% of annual partnership activities satisfactorily completed.	Assumes an interest in the BCLME from potential regional partners at the level of the private sector, NGOS or communities. Risk that regional partners may lose interest after initial agreement period if they cannot see any personal benefits.
3.8 National partnership agreements annexed as part of the BCLME NAPs	National Partnership Agreements in place	Assumes an interest in the BCLME from potential national partners at the level of the private sector, NGOS or communities. Assumes the possibility for a comfortable relationship between potential national partners and government agencies directly responsible for the implementation of the overall LME approach. Risk that national partners may lose interest after initial agreement period if they cannot see any personal benefits.
<b>Outcome 4: Capture and Networking of Knowledge and Best Practices</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
4.1 Information critical to policy and management decisions identified, packaged and distributed to appropriate targets	Number of information packages developed and distributed annually (information on topics, distribution list, etc. captured as part of monitoring)	Assumes that senior management and policy-makers will read and act on these briefing documents. Risk that information delivered may not be specific or sufficiently compressed to be absorbed by busy politicians and senior managers.
4.2 Lessons and best practices reviewed, documented and distributed for transfer and replication	Number of lessons and best practice documents produced and distributed annually (information on themes/ topics covered, distribution list, replication, etc. captured as part of monitoring)	Assumes that lessons and best practices are transferable and can be realistically replicated. Risk that countries may not be willing to fully share their experiences with other countries.

4.3 African LME networking process and mechanism defined and implemented	<p>Concept Paper (outlining objectives, approach, participation, etc.) on African LME Network in place. Agreed work plan and budget for African LME Network establishment.</p> <p>First African LME Network approved work plan and budget in place.</p> <p>60% of year 1 work plan activities satisfactorily completed.</p>	<p>Assumes sufficient commitment within the African continent and associated regional bodies to support a long-term African LME network both politically and financially.</p> <p>Risk that lessons and best practices could be transferred and replication attempted without taking into account local, national or regional differences and requirements that might entirely alter their effectiveness and appropriate nature.</p>
4.4 Global networking mechanism established including linkages with other regional initiatives such as GOOS and NEPAD	<p>Number of international networking and partnership agreements (with detailed terms of references for partnerships) in place.</p>	<p>Assumes sufficient global commitment within the appropriate bodies to support a long-term global LME network both politically and financially.</p> <p>Risk of discord between global agencies over responsibilities for such a global LME networking facility and its funding.</p> <p>Risk that lessons and best practices could be transferred and replication attempted without taking into account local, national or regional differences and requirements that might entirely alter their effectiveness and appropriate nature.</p>
<b>Project Management</b>		
<b>Total financing from UNDP/ GEF (\$)</b>		<b>5,138,460</b>

## 3.2 Assessment of the Original Logframe

### General Comments/Observations

91. In general the original logframe effectively describes the goal, objectives, outcomes, and outputs of the Project. The goal as stated in the original logframe focuses on what the GEF would term stress reduction and environmental status indicators<sup>9</sup>, whereas the project is a much more process oriented exercise that is not likely to lead to many examples of stress reduction or environmental status indicators, at least during Project implementation.

92. However, while the original Project logframe did in general establish measurable targets, for most of the indicators it did not specify timeframes for the achievement of targets, or seemingly identified specific timeframes arbitrarily. For example:

- The training and capacity building activity had an indicator that stated “80% of TCB activities satisfactorily completed by year 5” but a rationale for how or why the 80% target was decided upon does not exist.
- The original logframe states as a deliverable that policy, legislative and management reforms will be adopted and implemented at national level, and then states that “80% of objectives achieved by year 5.” But no rationale is presented to justify why or how the 80% figure was identified.
- The original logframe also establishes a target for 80% of the listed stakeholder participation activities are to be completed by year 5 of the project, with no accompanying rationale.
- The African LME networking component states that “60% of year 1 work plan activities will be satisfactorily completed” but there is no rationale for this target, nor is it clear what the year 1 activities include.

### Other Issues Related to Project Concept and Design

93. There is a pronounced lack of clarity with regard to functions and responsibilities within the project framework. Examples include:

- There are no Terms of Reference for the Project Steering Committee.
- There is clear language stating that the project is “downgraded” in comparison to the first GEF sponsored BCLME project, the first BCLME funded project, thus arguably, if inadvertently, undercutting the perceived importance and stature of the current project.
- The PD contains differing and seeming contradictory language concerning the independence of the project.

---

<sup>9</sup> GEF IW projects utilize three indicators of success. They include: (1) Process Indicators, which are actual, on-the-ground *evidence* of institutional and political progress; (2) Stress Reduction indicators, which refer to on the ground or on/in the water measures *implemented* by the participating countries at national or regional level; and (3) Environmental Status indicators, which are measures of *actual performance* or *success* in restoring and protecting the targeted water body.

94. On the one hand, the Project Document states that the BCLME SAPIMP project is “downgraded” to a “simple management unit within the BCC.”

95. On the other hand, the PD also states that it continues to be “necessary to have a small and independent PMU for the BCLME SAP IMP Project in order to administer funding and resources, coordinate project implementation and to provide technical advice to the Secretariat of the Commission. In this context, the day-to-day management and administration of the Project will be carried out by a PMU which would be based within the BCC or its hosting organization, based in Namibia.”

96. However, at this time the PMU is neither hosted within the BCC nor even in the same city, as the BCC made the decision at the end of 2011 to move from Windhoek, where the project continues to be situated, to Swakopmund. The move of the BCC to Swakopmund has had and will likely continue to have resource implications for the project that were not foreseen in PD.

97. For example, as a consequence of the BCC move from Windhoek to Swakopmund, two senior staff members of the BCC resigned their posts. As their work was inextricably tied to the ongoing work of the Project, the Project concluded that it was in the best interests of the project and its partners that UNOPS favourably consider the temporary retention of the two employees on a project contract to assure as smooth as possible a transition and ensure as much as possible the continuation of important work of both the Project and the BCC. This had an adverse effect on Project financial and other resources which are described later in this evaluation.

98. Further, the notion of an “independent” PMU raises the question of independent how, and to what degree?

99. The lack of clarity of the Project’s relationship to the BCC has led to a view expressed by several interviewees that the BCLME SAPIMP is a “cash cow” or “an ATM” for the BCC. The evaluator concludes that as long as the BCC is seen as a successfully functioning entity, then the Project being seen as a source of important financial support mechanism for the BCC is not a liability, consistent with the Project meeting its other obligations. However, if the BCC is seen to have functioned inefficiently and has lost, or in future loses stature in the eyes of the participating countries, then the perception could easily become one of the Project having been ineffective.

100. Last, the original logframe did not, in the judgment of the evaluator, contain especially robust development of risks and assumptions. For example:

- The current difficulty in securing a formal, joint participating country signature of the Convention, and also ratification, might have been mitigated had there been more robust updating of risks and development of more risk mitigation strategies.

- Ongoing difficulties in overcoming challenges posed by effectively dealing with the different culture and language of Angola, including difficulties of access to Angola by project personnel and consultants, were not adequately identified in the original logframe, thus mitigation strategies have not been possible. This problem could easily have been foreseen as it was discussed at some length in both the MTE and FE of the first GEF supported BCLME project.
- The complex array of socio-economic and political considerations attached to a country decision to join LME related Multilateral Environmental Agreements were not well identified in the risks and assumptions portion of the original logframe. Participating country accession to multi-lateral agreements depend on a broad array of factors in addition to environmental ones, and ultimately the decision to acceded is undertaken at the political level, an area where the Project has little direct influence.

101. Both the original logframe and the updated logframe that was presented and approved at the Inception Workshop, and updated again in November of 2011 and May of 2012, contained language on assumptions and risks. However, in the judgment of the evaluator many of the assumptions and risks were not particularly robust. This lack of robustness has inhibited the capacity of the project to develop timely and appropriate risk mitigation strategies. For example:

- The current difficulty in securing a formal, joint participating country signature of the Convention, and also ratification, might have been mitigated had there been more robust updating of risks and development of more risk mitigation strategies.
- Ongoing difficulties in overcoming challenges posed by effectively dealing with the different culture and language of Angola, including difficulties of access to Angola by project personnel and consultants, were not adequately identified in the original logframe nor in the updated versions of the logframe, thus mitigation strategies have not been possible.
- The complex array of socio-economic and political considerations attached to a country decision to join LME related Multilateral Environmental Agreements were not well identified in the risks and assumptions portion of either the original logframe and thus risk mitigation strategies have not been identified.

### **3.3 Lessons Learned from Other Projects**

102. There is explicit recognition in the Project Document the need to evolve an effective global network in support of LME management and sustainability that will channel and encourage the sharing of experience as well as providing a conveyance for the transfer of model activities and management components from other projects. Existing support mechanisms, particularly IW:LEARN, are employed to assist in this process.

103. The BCLME SAPIMP project is tasked with coordinating its activities and results with the Orange River IWRM Project to ensure synergy and understanding between the need to reduce impacts on the LME and its fisheries and the aim of the IWRM Project to

improve transboundary management and mitigation of discharges into the Orange River basin and then into the LME.

### **3.4 Stakeholder Participation**

104. Stakeholder participation in project preparation was extensive. During Project preparation extensive missions by project preparation consultants were taken to each of the three participating countries, and an array of stakeholders, including government officials at national and local levels, academics, scientists, NGOs and CBOs, and representatives of business and industry. The evaluator would rate the efforts and results of stakeholder participation in project preparation as **Highly Satisfactory**.

### **3.5 Replication Approach**

105. The Project Document comprehensively addressed issues of project replicability. Replicability was to be targeted to individual LME level (i.e. within the BCLME itself) through the transfer lessons and best practices across the three countries and between appropriate sectors.

106. At the larger super-regional level, it was intended that the African LMEs as a continental group would network closely and exchange lessons and best practices.

107. The actual mechanisms for transfer and replication of lessons and models were to make good use of existing entities such as International Knowledge Management (IKM) and their partner DLIST, as well as IW:LEARN.

108. In particular, it was intended that DLIST would provide a major input to a number of activities associated with the capture and transfer of best practices and lessons learned as well as assisting in the networking processes.

109. In terms of networking, DLIST (IKM) was to assist in the development and implementation of a formal LME networking process between the African LMEs, including (for example) biennial meetings for information sharing and discussion, online information sharing services as well as a quarterly digital newsletter. Such a mechanism could be extended to in-country projects such as the Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP) and Namibia Coast Conservation and Management Authority (NACOMA) Projects and help them link into the broader LME process.

### **3.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage**

110. The UNDP comparative was explicitly described in the Project Document. The PD described UNDP's considerable experience in the implementation and management of LME projects globally, and that the Namibia CO had been working with the BCLME Programme for some 10 years previous to the current BCLME SAPIMP project. Each of the three countries has an active UNDP Country Office, which can and has consistently provided considerable in-kind support to project development and implementation, and all of these COs are familiar with the BCLME Programme and the GEF assistance process.

### 3.7 Linkages Between and Among Other related Interventions

111. While the subject of this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is the project titled the Benguela BCLME SAPIMP Project. There are four projects that comprise an overall programme “nested” in the interim Benguela Current Commission (BCC). Each of these projects has objectives that directly relate to the BCLME SAPIMP project. These four projects include:

- Implementation of the Benguela Current Commission’s Science Programme (Science Programme) to support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management in the BCLME Region (Norway).

112. The Goal of the Science Programme is to ensure optimal and sustainable utilization of the resources of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) while restoring, maintaining and conserving the ecological integrity of the system; and its Purpose is to provide the BCC and Contracting Parties with the best available scientific advice for regional management of the BCLME.

Objectives of the Science Programme include:

- i. Implementation of a programme of extended trans-boundary scientific activities that are implemented, and regional integration of national scientific activities;
- ii. Formal structures for the operation of the Ecosystem Advisory Committee (EAC) and for cooperation among regional scientific and technical staff are established and functional; and
- iii. Human scientific and technical capacity within the national research institutes is improved and strengthened.

113. The Science Programme is operating on a five-year budget of US\$ 9.475 million, and has just undergone a Mid-Term Evaluation.

- Strengthening the Capacity (TCB project) of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) to implement an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management in Namibia, Angola and South Africa (ICEIDA).

114. The Goal of the TCB project is the same as that of the Science Programme. Its objectives include:

- i) Provision of prioritized training and capacity building (TCB) in the region through a dedicated TCB programme with dedicated funding and, the creation of a Regional Training Officer (RTO) portfolio; and
- ii) An outline of a long-term strategy for the effective implementation and management of a TCB programme for the BCC (including management, budget and timelines for delivery).

115. The TCB project is operating over four years with a budget of US\$ 500,000, and has also recently gone through a Mid-Term Evaluation.



- Support for the Institutionalization of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) (Angola, Namibia & South Africa).

116. The BCC Institutionalization project shares the same goal as the Science Programme and the TCB project. Its projected Outcomes are to include:

- i. Continuation of key scientific activities initiated under the BCLME Programme;
- ii. Successful national and regional level implementation of the BCC Science Programme;
- iii. Successful national and regional level implementation of the BCC Training and Capacity Building Strategy; and
- iv. Successful national and regional level implementation of the BCLME SAP IMP.

- Implementation of the Benguela Current LME Strategic Action Program (Project) for Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Reducing Coastal Resources Degradation (UNDP-GEF).

117. This Project is the subject of the MTE that follows.

118. To review, the Project Goal, as stated in the Project Document and associated logical framework analysis (logframe) is:

*(T)to halt the depletion of fisheries within one of the most productive yet highly environmentally variable oceanic areas in the world. This will be achieved through adoption of a of a more appropriate ecosystem approach to fisheries management that includes transboundary cooperation in order to mitigate the overall degradation of the LME and its living marine resources and to build adaptive buffers to variability (both natural and anthropogenic in nature).*

119. The Project Goal, as stated in updated project logframes, is:

*(T)the overall reduction in degradation of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME), with emphasis on the restoration of its depleted fisheries, through effective implementation and long-term sustainability of the BCLME Strategic Action Programme (SAP). This will be achieved through the adoption of an integrated transboundary LME management approach and the formalisation of an effective and efficient intergovernmental Benguela Current Commission (BCC).*

120. The Project's stated objective in the Project Document and associated logframe is:

*(T)the implementation of a Strategic Action Programme that build on a foundation of scientific and technical studies and evolving partnerships, and uses thee to inform policy, legislative and management decisions at the regional and national level.*

121. The Project's stated objective in the updated logframes is:

*(T)to implement the BCLME SAP through the adoption of national policy reforms, the sustainable institutionalisation of a regional Commission, and the endorsement and ratification of a binding international Convention for the LME.”*

122. Project Outputs in both the Project Document and associated logframe and those listed in the updated logframes are consistent, and include:

1. A Benguela Current Commission Infrastructure and Associated Convention.
2. National Level Policy and Management Reforms.
3. Sustainable Capacity for LME Management.
4. Capture and Networking of Knowledge and Best Practices.

123. The interlocking nature of these four projects, all nested within the BCC, pose significant difficulty and complexity for the BCLME SAPIMP project and, consequently, for this MTE. The projects have overlapping activities that include, among others:

- Rendering of assistance to create a sustainable BCC (all projects across overlapping issues of science, policy, TCB, human and financial resources).
- Emphasis on the delivery of TCB, generally and specifically (the ICEIDA sponsored TCB project, the BCC Institutionalization project, the UNDP-GEF project and, to a more limited degree, the Science Programme).
- Responsibility for the Science Programme to be developed and in place, by 2013 as one of the UNDP-GEF deliverables, which raises the question of where the ultimate responsibility lies for successful development of the Science Programme (the UNDP GEF Project, the Science Programme, and the BCC Institutionalization project).
- As the UNDP-GEF Project has financed the MTEs of the Science Programme and the TCB project there has been some oversight of the process and content of those MTEs by the UNDP-GEF project, which begs questions of clarity between the ultimate authorities/responsibilities of each.

124. The above issues create significant complexity for this MTE in that the mandate for the Evaluator is to undertake an MTE only of the UNDP-GEF project. Indeed, undertaking a synthesized evaluation of the four projects, and of the functioning of the BCC would require time and other resources far in excess of those available for the UNDP-GEF MTE. Yet it is difficult if not impossible to keep issues of the other projects within the ongoing programme from the content of this MTE given that a considerable number of important deliverables of the UNDP-GEF project rely at least in part, and in some instances entirely on the extent to which the other projects are performing.

125. Accordingly, the Evaluator has in this evaluation has attempted to:

- Restrict comment as much as possible to the Goal, Objective, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities of the UNDP-GEF Project, noting as necessary the possible implications of changes in wording that may have occurred from the original wording in the Project Document and original logframe to that which appears in updated logframes.
- Recognize that the nature and content of the BCLME SAPIMP requires reference to some degree to the other projects that are intertwined with it.

- Note where Project deliverables identified in both the original and updated Project documents are not ultimately within the power of the Project to deliver, either as a result of those deliverables being more properly within the mandate of the BCC, the other three projects that are a part of the ongoing programme under auspices of the BCC, or related to the internal political decision-making of the participating countries.
- In comparing language of the Project document, and especially the Project Document logframe, the most recent updated logframe will be used.
- Draw conclusions on the extent to which original and updated assessment of risks and risk mitigation strategies have identified issues related to those deliverables.

## **4. Project Implementation**

### **4.1 Updated Logical Framework Analysis**

126. In addition to the original logframe, there have been at least three updates, thus creating four versions of the logical framework analysis. The dates of the four logframes are as follows:

- The original logframe submitted as part of the Project Document that was approved by the GEF Council in April 2009.
- An initial updated logframe dated 4 August 2010 and presented to the Project Inception Workshop. This initial logframe update is included as an Annex to the Inception Report.
- A second update of the logframe dated October 2011.
- A third update of the logframe dated May 2012, and presented at a meeting of the PSC in May 2012, and further discussed at an Extraordinary Meeting of the PSC in late June 2012.

127. Simple logic would suggest that if the logical framework analysis approved by the GEF Council were to be significantly altered during project implementation, the result, depending on the extent and nature of the modifications, could be a project that is increasingly measured against continued and convenient downgrading of expected project results, rather than originally agreed to standards and measures.

128. There is, however, no explicit GEF guidance for modifying the Outputs described in the logframe during project implementation, and in the end it is the Project Steering Committee that must exercise its best judgment on the extent to which a logical framework analysis can be modified. While it appears that the Goal and Outcomes of the Project have not been significantly modified, the amendment to a number of Outputs and the deletion of other Outputs makes questionable the extent to which certain Outcomes can be achieved. This is detailed later in this evaluation.

129. Each of the BCLME SAPIMP updates of the project logframe has been approved by the PSC. And each update contains varying degrees of modifications from the content of

the original logframe. Thus a comparative analysis of the four logframes is impossible to undertake.

130. For purposes of this evaluation the latest available update of the logframe, received by the evaluator in late May 2012, is compared to the original as submitted to and approved by the GEF Council. The original project logframe appears earlier in this report. Following is the latest updated logframe, with general comments on the content of the updated logframe followed by a comparative analysis of the original logframe to the latest update.

## Updated Logical Framework Analysis (May 2012)

**GOAL:** The overall reduction in degradation of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME), with emphasis on the restoration of its depleted fisheries, through effective implementation and long-term sustainability of the BCLME Strategic Action Programme (SAP). This will be achieved through the adoption of an integrated transboundary LME management approach and the formalisation of an effective and efficient intergovernmental Benguela Current Commission (BCC).

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
<b>Objective:</b> To implement the BCLME SAP through the adoption of national policy reforms, the sustainable institutionalisation of a regional Commission, and the endorsement and ratification of a binding international Convention for the LME	An effective regional and national capacity established and sustainable that will manage the LME in a cooperative, transboundary manner	Benguela Current Commission (BCC) Secretariat in place with Executive Secretary (ES), Regional Training Coordinator (RTC), Data and Information Manager (DIM), Secretary, Administrative Officer and General Worker. - List EC in baseline even though filled in Mar 2011; - RTO not in convention structure – fall away beyond ICEIDA funding	- Commission fully functional and reviewed by mid-term	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Support the formation of the Finance and Administration Standing Committee and, Compliance and Enforcement Standing Committee.	

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
Output 1.1. A Permanent Regional Commission with all requisite structures and functions	BCC national and regional structures and functions in place by 2011	BCC Ministerial Conference; Management Board (MB); Secretariat; Ecosystem Advisory Committee (EAC); Regional Training Coordinator (RTC); Data and Information Manager (DIM); Administrative Officer; Office Secretary; Cleaner; Working Groups for Water Quality and Pollution; Living Marine Resources; and Biodiversity and Ecosystem Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Coordinators for the BCC in each country</li> <li>- Revised BCC structure is approved by the Ministerial Conference</li> <li>- Working groups in place.</li> </ul>	<b>ACHIEVED</b>  <b>ACHIEVED</b>  <b>ONGOING</b>	The project will support BCC in 2012 with the formation of the Finance and Administration Standing Committee and, Compliance and Enforcement Standing Committee	Dec 2012
	Regional monitoring and assessment programme in place by Jun 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual joint surveys of shared/ straddling stocks</li> <li>- Agreed regional indicators for monitoring for the State of the Ecosystem Information System (SEIS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National monitoring and assessment needs identified for incorporation into a regional programme</li> </ul>	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Review user needs analysis and extract data needs for Angola and South Africa. Collaboration underway with NACOMA <sup>10</sup> and SPAN <sup>11</sup> Projects in Namibia to deliver a set of marine and coastal indicators for Namibia.	Jun 2013

<sup>10</sup> Namibia Coast Conservation and Management (NACOMA) Project

<sup>11</sup> Strengthening of Namibia's Protected Areas Network (SPAN) Project

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
	At least two regional and/ or bilateral planning, management and policy making instruments recommended by Jun 2013	- Draft policy instruments in place from the BCLME Programme	Proposed EOP targets: - At least 1 bilateral instrument in place; - At least 1 regional instrument in place	<b>ONGOING</b>	The review and updating of the TDA, SAP and Science Programme will make recommendations for priority regional and bilateral instruments to give effect to the principles of the Convention.	Jun 2013
	BCC Science Programme for the period 2013 – 2017 in place by mid-2013	- BCC Science Programme	- BCC Science Programme revised	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Final report available	N.a.
Output 1.2. A legally binding multilateral Convention, Regional Action Plan and associated guidelines, protocols and codes of conduct	BCC Convention in place by end of December 2012	- BCC Interim Agreement	- At least 2 national level consultation meetings held. - At least 2 regional consultation and negotiation meetings held. - Draft Convention in place (ready for final consultation and negotiation)	<b>ACHIEVED</b> <b>ACHIEVED</b> <b>ACHIEVED</b>	Planned support for the Convention Signing Ceremony in 2012. Activities to support planned ratification 31 December 2012. No other support planned.	Dec 2012
	Original SAP revised and gaps addressed by Jun 2013	- SAP	- SAP reviewed at national level and recommendations made for revisions	<b>ONGOING</b>	Angola reviewed and reprioritised SAP actions. Formal TDA, SAP and Science Programme review and updating will commence in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> half of 2012.	Jun 2013
	Regional Action Plan (RAP) in place by 2013 (resulting from the revision and updating of the original SAP)	- Strategic Action Programme (SAP) in place - BCC Science Programme	- National Action Plans in place for each country (that feeds into the RAP)	<b>NO PROGRESS</b>	Review and updating of the SAP would result in the BCC Regional Action Plan (RAP).	Jun 2013

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
		- BCC Training and Capacity Building (TCB) Strategy				
Output 2.1. National Structures established in support of a Benguela Current Commission (BCC)	National Focal Institutes (NFIs) in place and functioning by end of 2010	- National Fisheries Research Institute (INIP), Angola; National Marine Information and Research Centre (NatMIRC), Namibia and; Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), South Africa	- NFIs support to the BCC formalised	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Inquire with BCC regarding the status of Cost Sharing Agreement (CSAs) between UNDP and the governments for the payment of dues. Does the Secretariat intend on having similar agreements with the Focal Ministries? Project can support the drafting of MoUs between BCC and NFIs to formalise relationships.	Jun 2013
National Intersectoral Stakeholder groups gone	National Action Plans (NAPs) in place by Jun 2013 for the implementation of the RAP (revised original SAP)	- No NAPs in place	- NAP in place for each country	<b>NO PROGRESS</b>	Draft NAP in place for Angola developed by the GCLME. Project recommends developing concise operational NAPs for the BCLME once the TDA, SAP and Science Programme have been revised.	Jun 2013



RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
Output 2.2. Enactment of National Policy and Legislative Reforms	At least two national or bilateral planning, management and policy making instruments recommended by Jun 2013	- Draft instruments developed by the BCLME Programme, e.g. Management Plan for Top Predators.	- Proposed EOP targets: - At least 1 bilateral instrument - At least 1 national instrument from the three countries	<b>NO PROGRESS</b>	The review and updating of the TDA, SAP and Science Programme will make recommendations for priority national and bilateral instruments to give effect to the principles of the Convention.	Jun 2013
Output 3.1. Implementation of a Training and Capacity Building Strategy	BCC Training and Capacity Building (TCB) Strategy (based on the original TCB Strategy) date?	- BCC TCB Strategy developed in 2008	- Current BCC TCB Strategy revised and TCB needs assessment updated at national level. - BCC TCB Strategy for the period 2012-2016 in place.	<b>ONGOING</b>  <b>ONGOING</b>	Complete the TCB Strategy review and updating by end of Dec 2012. No further support planned for 2012.	Dec 2012
	Number of partnerships for long-term sustainable TCB through mentoring, skills sharing, staff exchanges and in-service training	- None	- TCB partnerships with at least 1 institution/ organization per country - TCB partnerships with at least 2 regional/ international institutions/ organization	<b>ACHIEVED</b>  <b>ACHIEVED</b>	Review current partnerships to prioritise, formalise where necessary and mobilise in line with the revised and updated TCB Strategy	Jun 2013
Output 3.2. National and regional strategies for sustainable financing in support of the LME approach of the BCC	Resource Mobilisation and Partnership Strategies (RMPS) in place by 2013	- None	- National level strategies for resource mobilisation in place by 2012	<b>ONGOING</b>	RMPS to be completed by Jun 2012 and would incorporate strategies to leverage resources at national level. Project plans to support a Donor Conference in 2013	Jun 2012
	BCC Business Plan in place by 2012	- None	- BCC Business plan in place and ready for endorsement	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Draft in place and final Business plan to be completed by Jun 2012.	Jun 2012

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
Output 3.3. Partnerships to support the LME management approach	Number of regional partnerships by 2013	- Partnerships with UNDP/ GEF, Norway and ICEIDA, FAO/ MRI, Governments of Angola, Namibia and South Africa; FAO NANSEN EAF Project	- At least 3 regional partnerships in place	ACHIEVED	Review current partnerships to prioritise, formalise where necessary and mobilise in line with the BCC's Strategies and Business Plan.	Jun 2013
	Number of national partnerships by 2013	- None	- At least 2 national partnerships in place per country	ONGOING	Review current partnerships to prioritise, formalise where necessary and mobilise in line with the BCC's Strategies and Business Plan	Jun 2013
Output 4.1. Procedures for the capturing, transferring and replicating of knowledge, lessons and good practices	LME-CZM integration and Public Participation distance learning training courses developed and available for distance learning	- None	- LME-CZM integration and Public Participation distance learning training developed and available.	ONGOING	Draft course outline to incorporate elements of LMEs are in place. The project will try to support completion of the course in 2012	Dec 2012
	Percent (%) of information pieces critical for management and policy making delivered on time	- Popularised summaries of projects and recommendations developed and distributed to ministries	- Information needs and timing of delivery of such information defined at national and regional levels.	ACHIEVED	The project will support development of materials for specific target audiences with support from the Media and Communications Specialist and Graphics Designer and, disseminate wider through existing channels.	Jun 2013
	Percent (%) of lessons	- None	- At least 70% of lessons and	ACHIEVED	100% of material developed	Jun 2013

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
	and good practice materials disseminated to target audiences <sup>12</sup>		good practices disseminated		has been disseminated and made available during events and via the web. The project will support wider dissemination and development of materials for specific target audiences.	
Output 4.2. Partnerships and networking with LMEs and relevant initiatives	African LME networking established	- None	- Three African LMEs participate in annual BCC Science Forum	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	The African LME Caucus BCC as Chair of the Caucus invited Mediterranean LME Partnership and the Red Sea LME to the Caucus. The project will support BCC's participation in Caucus meetings.	Jun 2013
	Global LME networking established	- Networking established with ODIN AFRICA	- At least 3 LME networking partnerships in place	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Review current partnerships to prioritise, formalise where necessary and mobilise in line with the BCC's Strategies and Business Plan. Capitalise on potential partnerships that could be formalised and mobilised with ease, e.g. NOAA, NFFP, ANU-Rhodes-BCC, ACP-EU Fish II, etc.	Jun 2013

<sup>12</sup> A dissemination list will be used to monitor distribution and to solicit feedback about the usefulness of the information. This will form an integral part of the ongoing and annual M&E of IKM's work.

RESULTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	MID-TERM TARGETS	PROGRESS AT END OF MAY 2012	WAY FORWARD TO MEET OUTSTANDING TARGETS	PROPOSED DATE FOR TARGETS
	Networking and/ or partnerships established with other (non-LME) relevant	- Networking established with ODIN AFRICA	- At least 3 networking partnerships in place (e.g. Abidjan Convention, IOC, AU and GOOS Africa)	<b>ACHIEVED</b>	Review current partnerships to prioritise, formalise where necessary and mobilise in line with the BCC's Strategies and Business Plan.	Jun 2013

### **Updated Logframe – General Comments**

131. The addition of a column in the updated logframe establishing Mid-Term Targets aids in establishing a greater level of Project accountability and is of great assistance in the evaluation process.

132. In this iteration of the logframe 18 of 29 (62%) of mid-term targets were met; 8 of 29 (27%) of mid-term targets are listed as “ongoing;” and 3 of 29 (11%) of mid-term targets are listed under the heading of “no progress.” It is important to note that this assessment of mid-term targets took place approximately six months past the mid-term point of the Project.

### **Updated Logframe – Specific Comments**

133. In its updates of the logframe, the Project has been clear in noting additions and amendments to existing Outputs. It has not been quite as clear in relation to identifying explicitly to the PSC those Outputs that have been eliminated from the original logframe in the Project Document. Outputs listed in the original logframe that are no longer present in the most recent logframe update include:

- i. Regional guidelines for national policy and legislative reforms are circulated;
- ii. Standardized regional monitoring and assessment program adopted for national distribution;
- iii. Regional guidelines for policy, legislative and management reforms adopted and implemented at national level;
- iv. National monitoring programs established and incorporating appropriate International Waters indicators;
- v. National Stakeholder Groups (NSGs) established;
- vi. LME related multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEAs) ratified by each country;
- vii. TCB (training and capacity building) adopted and implemented through NAPs; and
- viii. Effective implementation of the Stakeholder Participation Plan.

134. An analysis of the above indicates that numbers iii, iv, v. and vi are four of the six Outputs listed under Outcome 2 in the original Project Document logframe, placing in jeopardy the achievement of this Outcome.

135. Further, of these eight Outputs the elements deemed most important, based on interviews and documents reviewed, are those related to stakeholder participation.

136. The Project Document was clear in underlining the importance of effective stakeholder participation as a means of not only satisfying GEF requirements, but also of ensuring the longer term sustainability of project results and the BCC.

137. During Project preparation, stakeholders indicated that that they would prefer a combination of mechanisms for providing feedback regarding their participation in the BCLME SAPIMP Project. According to the Project Document:

*The proposed feedback mechanisms were to be email queries via the process update newsletter and annual stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders believed that levels of stakeholder participation in the BCLME SAPIMP Project could be measured and evaluated by undertaking a detailed baseline assessment of participation levels at the beginning of the project using questionnaire-based consultations with a sample of stakeholders from each country. This procedure could then be followed at two-year intervals during the project, and results could be compared to the baseline to track changes in participation levels.*

138. A limited amount of this activity has taken place during Project implementation to date.

139. Given general agreement among interviewees and others of the importance of stakeholder involvement in future working of the BCC, a Project focus on effective stakeholder and community level involvement over the remaining time of the Project is seen as a necessity.

140. From the beginning of the BCLME programme, and the first GEF sponsored project for the BCLME, public participation and overall involvement in the activities of the programme have been seen as important issues to be addressed and deserving of considerable project resources. Indeed, the interim Agreement created a Management Board one of whose responsibilities was to “ensure that there is adequate consultation with stake- holders in relation to the development and amendment of the Strategic Action Programme and other action plans.”

141. It is of note that stakeholder involvement, community level participation, and other stakeholder related activities are nowhere mentioned in the current Convention text awaiting signature and ratification. One can only assume, or at least hope that notwithstanding this absence, the BCC will be empowered to continue these activities, as many interviewees consider to the building of broad stakeholder support for the BCC and its activities to be a crucial element of BCLME programme sustainability.

142. The project has contracted a media and communication specialist to undertake project related activities, and a communications plan was developed and activities undertaken which included:

- Development and approval of a Communications Strategy that included specific text on the integration of the IKM component into the Communications Strategy.
- Extensive work for the BCC leading to a BCC centered fact sheet.
- The re-design of the BCC website which upgrades information about both the BCC and the project. However, the website has yet to be upgraded consistent with the re-design.

- Numerous media releases including, among others, releases on the Ministerial Conference of March 2011; launch of the Ecofish Project; and a news release on the annual BCC Forum.
- Initial work on explanatory text re. the first meeting of the Africa LME Forum.

143. Notwithstanding progress that was made in 2011, the past six months have been characterized by fewer products and a loss of momentum in overall stakeholder and community level progress.

### 4.3 Partnerships

144. The Project has developed effective partnerships with what the evaluator would describe as an “inner circle” of stakeholders. This “inner circle” would include the BCC and its Management Board, the Norway sponsored Implementation of the Benguela Current Commission’s Science Programme (Science Programme) to support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management in the BCLME Region, the ICEIDA Training and capacity Building project, the Ministries of Environment and Fisheries, and other key Ministries in the participating countries, through the creation of National Coordinators and National Focal Ministries. The Project has not been as successful in creating partnerships with NGOs and private sector interests, and not successful at all in creating partnerships with local communities.

### 4.4 Financial Planning

#### Yearly Disbursements

145. Yearly disbursements have closely matched yearly estimated projections by UNOPS, as shown in the table below depicting Project budgeted amounts by year, actual expenditures, and balances.

**Table 2: Yearly Disbursements**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Deemed Accruals</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Balance Budget</b>
Opening						
2009	264500.00	199500.66	0	0	199500.66	64999.34
2010	1360497.00	922086.05	0	0	922086.05	438410.95
2011	1793039.30	1618865.31	0	0	1618865.31	174173.99
2012	1632795.00	106627.36	15914.88	9160.87	131703.11	1501091.89

146. However, unplanned expenditures or expenditures as a result of questionable planning have resulted in the curtailing or elimination of a number of Outputs. Examples of questionable planning and unplanned expenditures include:

- The hiring of three National Coordinators (July of 2008), well before the hiring of the Senior Project Manager (February of 2009). The result was approximately six months of National Coordinator salaries during which time there was little Project

- related task accomplishment. Combined salary over that time period was roughly US\$ 100,000.
- The Project underwriting the mid-term evaluation costs of the Implementation of the Benguela Current Commission's Science Programme (Science Programme) to support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management in the BCLME Region (Norway), and Strengthening the Capacity (TCB project) of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) to implement an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management in Namibia, Angola and South Africa (ICEIDA). The cost of the Science Programme MTE was US\$ 38,400; the evaluator inquired of the cost for the ICEIDA MTE but has not received a dollar figure. Both of these costs arguably should have been underwritten by those projects rather than the BCLME SAPIMP project.
  - The unplanned underwriting of numerous BCC related travel, contractual and other costs.

147. While the cumulative costs to the Project of these expenditures cannot be calculated – the evaluator has not received information from the Project – these funds would most certainly have made a positive difference in the Project's ability to achieve at least some of the Outputs that are now being foregone due to lack of financial resources. Further, while a case can be made that the Project Document states that development of a Science Plan and a Training and Capacity Building Plan and activities are Project Outputs, and therefore can be cited as justification for funding the respective MTEs of those projects, the specific funding of those activities by co-funders would normally include funding for evaluation.

148. The Outputs that have been curtailed as a result of lack of remaining resources have been listed previously on P. 55 of this evaluation as part of specific evaluator comments on the most recent update of the logframe.

149. Last, Atlas budget tables and internal Project accounting does not make possible a precise breakdown of expenditures by Outcome. However, the assessment of Outputs within Outcomes that will now be foregone are strongly suggests that Outcome 1, which includes support to make the BCC viable, has absorbed a greater proportion of Project resources than originally intended.

### **Project Co-finance/Actual and Projected**

150. The evaluator was not able to complete the following co-finance table as a result of incomplete information received from the Project notwithstanding repeated requests by the evaluator.

**Table 3: Actual and Projected Co-finance**

<b>Co-Finance (Type)</b>	<b>Government (millions US\$)</b>	<b>Other Sources (millions US\$)</b>	<b>Total Co-Fin to date (millions US\$)</b>	<b>Estimated End-of- Project (millions</b>



							US\$)
	Proposed	To Date	Proposed	To Date	Proposed	To Date	End of Project
Grant			9,300,000 <sup>13</sup>				
Cash/In-Kind <sup>14</sup>	59,294,983		351,352 <sup>15</sup>				
TOTAL	59,294,983		9,651,352				

## 4.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

151. The monitoring and evaluation plan described in the Project Document has been partially implemented. The Inception Meeting, Inception Report, Quarterly Progress Reports, and Project Implementation Reports have been completed on a planned basis. However, the development of GEF IW indicators and the development of other indicators of Project success have lagged. The M&E Plan as presented in the Project Document, with an added column for comments by the Evaluator, appears in the Table below.

<sup>13</sup> Contributions from Norway and Iceland for, respectively, the Science programme and the Training and Capacity Building Program and associated activities.

<sup>14</sup> The Incremental Cost Analysis in the Project Document made no distinction between the cash and in-kind contributions of Governments.

<sup>15</sup> In-kind contribution from IKM.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time frame	MT Evaluator Comment
Inception Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Manager/ Advisor</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF</li> </ul>	Within first two months of project start up	Inception Meeting held within two months of the hiring of the SPM. Inception report finalized August 2010
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> </ul>	Immediately following Inception Meeting	Inception report compiled and distributed to PSC members and other attendees of the Meeting August 2010
Measurement & Verification for IW Indicators and Project Progress performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversight by Project GEF Technical Advisor and Project Manager/ Advisor</li> <li>Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs</li> </ul>	Start, mid and end of project	IW indicators not yet formulated. Project performance indicators also not yet formulated. M&E specialist only hired in year two of Project
PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF</li> </ul>	Annually	PIRs submitted for each year of project implementation
TPR and TPR report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government Counterparts</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU)</li> </ul>	Every year, upon receipt of APR	TPRs completed
Steering Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Manager/ Advisor</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> </ul>	Following Inception and subsequently at least once a year	Steering Committee Meetings held on yearly basis, but delays in holding the last PSC meeting in hopes that the Draft Convention could be formally signed in parallel w/ PSC meeting. Extraordinary PSC meeting held in late June 2012.
Periodic status reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined by Project team and UNDP CO	Quarterly Project Reports have been developed and submitted as planned by the PMU and reviewed by the IA and EA
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team</li> <li>Hired consultants as needed</li> </ul>	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP CO	Periodic technical reports have been issued
Mid-term (External) Evaluation (MTE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF RCU</li> <li>External (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	At the mid-point of project implementation.	The MTE was completed in July 2012
Final External Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team,</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF RCU</li> <li>External (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	At the end of project implementation	Timing to be determined
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>External Consultant</li> </ul>	At least one month before the end of the project	Timing to be determined
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team</li> <li>Consultancies</li> <li>UNDP/ GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc)</li> <li>BCC Management Board and MACs</li> </ul>	Yearly	Lessons learned have been reported routinely in QPRs and PIRs.

Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	Yearly	Audits have taken place on a yearly basis
Visits to field sites (UNDP staff travel costs to be charged to IA fees)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP Country Offices</li> <li>▪ UNDP/ GEF RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	Yearly (average one visit per year.)	N/A as the Project does not have specified field sites except for the offices of the National Coordinators.

152. An additional issue related to Monitoring and Evaluation is the management of risks. The Project has been updating risks as part of its monitoring activities. The table below represents the PMUs most recent table of risks. The evaluator has added risks that appear in blue highlight.

**Table 4: Risk Assessment/May 2012**

#	Risk Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Risk Status
1	The three governments may not agree on policy and management measures for the BCLME.	Nov 2007 (revised regularly since)	Political	<p>The absence of harmonized policy and legislative frameworks could delay the implementation of an effective integrated transboundary LME management approach. This could lead to further degradation of the ecosystem and its species.</p> <p><b>Probability (P)</b> on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) P = 2</p> <p><b>Impact (I)</b> on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) I = 4</p>	Commitment was reaffirmed during the 2nd Ministerial Conference held on 2 September 2010 for the BCC and the Convention. A draft Convention is in place and the project plans to support its signing in 2012. Review of TDA, SAP and SP will propose regional and bilateral policies to support the Convention.	Sr. Project Manager (SPM)	SPM, updated by M&E Officer (MEO)	22 May 2012	No change
2	Trained personnel will seek better salaries and working conditions within the private sector and will be lost to the government institutions	Nov 2007 (revised regularly since)	Operational/ Strategic	High staff losses and the lack of competitive packages from institutions could lead to further staff losses at national institutions. This threatens the ability of the countries and the Commission to adequately implement an integrated transboundary LME management approach	The project is supporting the review of the current Training and Capacity Building (TCB) Strategy. However, it remains paramount that the improvement of staff conditions/ packages must be nationally	SPM/ES	SPM, updated by MEO	22 May 2012	Increasing as more staff leave institutions for better packages elsewhere

#	Risk Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Risk Status
	affiliated with the BCC.			P = 4 I = 4	driven. This is by no means a risk the project can control rather, being flexible to support specific national requests.				
3	Project personnel will seek or be offered and accept new positions as the project moves toward closure.	May 2012	Operational	With end of project looming at end of 2013/first quarter of 2014 project staff will need to consider future employment, and key staff could move to new positions outside of the project.  P=3 I=4	UNOPS and UNDP should have a contingency plan should this occur. Short-term consultancies of experienced professionals for remainder of project.	SPM/UNOPS/UNDP	MTE Evaluator	May 2012	Will increase as project moves toward closure, and, should resignations occur, rapid back-filling of the positions will be an imperative.
4	Risk of not securing sufficient and appropriate long-term financial support for the Commission.	Nov 2007 (revised regularly since)	Financial/ Strategic	If long-term financial and other support is not secured for the BCC, its feasibility and long-term existence may be in jeopardy.  P = 3 I = 4	Ongoing support from governments since 2008 to date. The project supports the development of a Strategic Plan, Business Plan and Resources Mobilization and Partnership Strategy (RMPS) and, to support a 'BCC Donor Conference' in mid-2013. The Strategic	ES/SPM	SPM, updated by MEO	22 May 2012	Draft strategic plan, business plan, and partnership strategy now available. Awaiting finalization. Donor conference planned for 2013.

#	Risk Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Risk Status
					and Business Plans and RMPS will be useful for the Commission in fundraising.				
5	Risk that countries do not agree over the sharing of resources, their exploitation and management	Nov 2007 (revised regularly since)	Political/Strategic	Potential conflicts could create friction and disagreement that could represent a risk to the Convention and to national commitments.  P = 3 I = 4	The countries are advancing toward joint management of stocks as the project will support Namibia and Angola with joint management planning for horse mackerel and, Namibia and South Africa with developing a consistent survey approach.	SPM	SPM, updated by MEO	22 May 2012	Decreasing as countries show increasing commitment for cooperation and joint management
6	Risk that the final draft Convention is not signed and ratified due to delays at national level.	May 2012	Political/Operational	Absence of legally binding agreement for transboundary management of the BCLME could seriously undermine the authority and sustainability of the BCC. P=3 I=5	Not within projects power. Project will support initiatives to meet and sign the convention including costs of the signing ceremony.	ES/SPM/IA	SPM, updated by MEO	22 May 2012	Convention document ready for signature but no date announced for signing.
7	Risk that current Angola visa requirements in the region may hamper effective inclusion of	May 2012	Operational	Unbalanced participation in the activities of the BCC with some getting more exposure than others. P=4 I=4	Project PSC will recommend to the MB the engagement of BCC Secretariat with the Ministries of Foreign Affairs in the	SPM/ES/IA	SPM, updated by MEO and MTE Evaluator	22 May 2012	A number of SAP activities did not materialize due to visa related issues. The

#	Risk Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Risk Status
	Angola in project activities and BCC's work programme.				three countries				project informs stakeholders of these requirements.
8	Risk that lack of intra-project communication will delay or prevent completion of project activities.	May 2012	Operational	Recent history of growing lack of effective communication between the PM and UNOPS/UNDP and other key personnel.  P=3 I=5	Planned, periodic conference calls to identify problems and constraints and identify solutions and approaches	SPM/IA/EA/Others as necessary	MTE Evaluator	May 2012	Risk of detrimental effect increases as pressure to deliver products on ever shrinking timetable increases.
9	Risk that lack of targeted, effective stakeholder involvement could hamper future BCC effectiveness and threaten sustainability of project and programme progress.	May 2012	Strategic	Budgetary and other constraints have limited and will limit project stakeholder involvement and community level activities over the remainder of project implementation.  P=3 I=4	Retention of some budget and contractual services to assure continuing explicitly identified stakeholder involvement activities over the remainder of project implementation.	PM/ES/UNOPS	MTE Evaluator	May 2012	IKM contract not renewed and no explicitly identified stakeholder activities and budget noted on updated project workplans. Draft Convention silent on Stakeholder involvement in future BCC activities.
10	Risk that remaining funds will not be	May 2012	Operational	P=5 I=4	Adaptively manage, w/ advice and consent of the PSC, to prioritize	SPM, PSC, BCC	MTE Evaluator	May 2012	Planning to adaptively manage ongoing

#	Risk Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Risk Status
	sufficient to accomplish full range of Outputs				unfinished activities based on maximizing opportunity to meet the Project Goal and Objective				in conjunction w/ PSC.



## 4.6 Execution and Implementation

153. Representatives of the PMU, who have the greatest level of interaction with the Project, were generally complimentary on the performance (responsiveness) of both the Executing (UNOPS) and Implementing Agencies (UNDP). The UNDP Country Office was seen to have been especially responsive to the expressed needs of the Project. There were some reports of slow issuance of contracts and receipt of payments, although one major contractor was clear in stating that receipt of payments had been timelier than most previous experience with other project contracts and this was deeply appreciated. There was concern expressed by one interviewee that IA and EA presence in Project decision-making was “domineering.” However, the evaluator concludes based on overall interviewee responses and a review of numerous Project and other documents that IA and EA presence in the decision-making process of the Project has been consistent with their role as PSC members and in their fiduciary role (UNOPS) and as the responsible entity for assuring that the Project adheres to UNDP-GEF requirements (UNDP).

## 5. Project Rating Tables

### 5.1 Table 8: Evaluation Rating by Outcome

Outcomes		Evaluation					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Outcome 1	A Benguela Current Commission Infrastructure and Associated Convention <sup>16</sup>						
Outcome 2	National Level Policy and Management Reforms <sup>17</sup>						
Outcome 3	Sustainable Capacity for LME Management <sup>18</sup>						
Outcome 4	Capture and Networking of Knowledge and Best Practices <sup>19</sup>						

#### Evaluator Notes:

154. Outcome 1: The Project has given a consistent and effective level of attention and accompanying resources to enable the BCC to become fully functional. Further, the

<sup>16</sup> Project assistance to the BCC for its assistance in the successful negotiation of the draft Convention would result in a Highly Satisfactory rating for this Outcome. However, the continuing question of whether and when the Convention will be signed and ratified reduces the rating to Satisfactory.

<sup>17</sup> Efforts to bring about these reforms have lagged, and the extent to which the Project can successfully focus on achievement of this Outcome over the next 18 months should drive reconsideration of the rating for this Outcome.

<sup>18</sup> This rating is also in part driven by the absence of a signed and ratified Convention, and unplanned, continuing Project inputs of resources to create a sustainable Commission that suggests that current country dues to the Commission may be insufficient to sustain the Commission post-project.

<sup>19</sup> While not apparent in the wording of this Outcome, it is the Outcome that contains stakeholder and community level participation in the Project, and that participation has lagged.

Project receives very high marks for its facilitation of negotiations among the three countries leading to an agreed upon Convention text. It remains to be seen if the three countries will sign and ratify the Convention before the end of the Project. The Project however has limited inherent capacity to drive the political level decisions necessary for Convention signing and ratification.

155. The remaining challenges and potential constraints to signature and ratification of the Convention should not be underestimated. There has been a recognition on the part of a number of interviewees that there is still a need to raise political support and develop a strong constituency within the senior political echelons of all three countries to assure a long-term commitment to a stable, efficient, and adequately funded BCC. The difficulties encountered in attempts to obtain government signature to and ratification of the Convention text is illustrative of this need.

156. Outcome 2: National Coordinating Ministries have an uncertain future, as in the draft Convention their continuation beyond the life of the Project is left to the individual countries rather than being incorporated into the BCC staffing structure. National level policy reforms have been slow to materialize. Some modest contractual resources have been committed to this Outcome, and depending on progress made over the remaining 18 months or so of implementation, the rating for this Outcome could well slip to Unsatisfactory.

157. National Action Plan development has been slow to non-existent. The most current Project budgeting document states that “(G)iven the proposal for the TDA, SAP and Science Programme revision, this activity would not be feasible until the mentioned instruments have been updated. Thus recommended to drop this activity.”

158. BCC policy, planning research and management instruments have been targeted to be endorsed at national level, and consultations with stakeholders to incorporate their views were to have been undertaken. Based on evidence gathered by the Evaluator to date, it seems doubtful that the objectives described for this activity will be met.

159. Outcome 3: The ICEIDA supported CB&T initiative, and substantial additional funding for Project focus on this Outcome over the remaining 18 months indicates that TCB targets established by the Project will be met. Upon completion of the ICEIDA and Project TCB support, however, a continued regional level commitment to TCB is, according to some interviewees, in question. While capacity building is mentioned in the draft text of the Convention, it is not mentioned in the context of a regional approach and responsibility for it is not assigned to any of the Committees to be established. In the view of the Evaluator, if regional level TCB is to be sustained beyond the life of the ICEIDA and project commitment to it, provision must be made for earmarked funding of the activity in the annual dues the countries pay for sustenance of the BCC.

160. Sustainability for the BCLME SAPIMP project is fundamentally tied to eventual ratification of the Convention, which in turn enables continuation of the BCC, the

principal mechanism through which sustainability can be assured. Principal risks to sustainability include:

161. Financial Risks: Even with the interim Agreement (now Convention) in place and countries committed to annual dues, Angola has been in arrears but is now current. Should the Convention not be ratified country obligations to pay for the sustenance of the BCC will technically come to an end. This could be mitigated by the countries formally or informally agreeing to continue paying dues through continuation of the terms of the interim agreement and BCC. Further, the project has been under-writing some BCC travel and contracting costs, which would suggest that the current level of dues the countries are paying for BCC operations may not be sufficient after end-of-project.

162. Institutional Framework and Governance Risks: As with the financial and socio-economic risks, unless the Convention is ratified by 31 December 2012 the interim arrangements of the past 5 years are scheduled to end. This would place the future of the BCC and its committees and activities in limbo.

163. Environmental Risks: As with the above, absence of a ratified Convention would place at risk the country commitments expressed in the Convention to deal not only with risks to the sustainability of the fisheries of the BCLME, but also potential and growing environmental risks from mining and oil exploration and extraction.

164. Overall, the evaluator would rate sustainability of the outcomes, outputs, and activities of both GEF sponsored projects and the work of the BCC as **Moderately Unlikely** should the participating countries fail to ratify the draft Convention. “Moderately Unlikely” is defined in UNDP-GEF guidelines as “substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some project outputs and activities should carry on.”

165. Should the participating countries ratify the Convention the evaluator would rate the risks to sustainability of the outcomes, outputs, and activities of both GEF sponsored projects and the work of the BCC as **Moderately Likely**. “Moderately Likely” is defined in UNDP-GEF guidelines as “moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.”

166. Partnerships at regional level have been created and the number created has surpassed mid-term targeted levels. National level partnerships have not however kept pace.

167. Resource mobilization at country level will become a critical issue if countries are not able to sign and ratify the draft Convention by the end of 2012. A continuation of interim arrangements should be accompanied by strong approaches to the countries to continue to keep their dues to the BCC current and, at the very least, maintain current levels of funding.

168. Coordination and implementation of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan is in serious question. The discontinuation of the IKM involvement in project activities and slow pace of stakeholder involvement activities to date make achievement of established targets doubtful.

169. Outcome 4: The African LME networking process is up and running, and the BCLME is an effective partner. Global networking has also been a focus of Project activity with successful outreach to GOOS, the Abidjan Convention, and a presence by Project personnel in international fora.

170. The web-based platform refurbishment has languished, and Project visibility on the BCC website is minimal. Notwithstanding a strong expressed commitment to stakeholder involvement and community level activities in the Project Document, a requirement for GEF IW projects, stakeholder involvement initiatives have languished and community level involvement in Project activities will no longer be funded over the remainder of the Project.

171. More specifically, restricted funding has led to a decision to cancel most IKM activity as was included and described in the Workplan developed consistent with the original logical framework analysis and as a result of the Inception Workshop. This will significantly limit the amount of community level involvement and participation in Project activities from what was described in the original Project Document, the subsequent Workplan, and the contractual arrangements originally foreseen for IKM.

## 5.2 Table 6: Evaluation Rating by Component/Output<sup>20</sup>

Component		Evaluation					
		HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Output 1.1	Commission formally adopted to include all its requisite regional structures and responsibilities						
Output 1.2:	Signature and ratification of a binding international LME Treaty to formally support the Commission						
Output 1.3:	Regional guidelines for national policy and legislative reforms agreed and circulated						
Output 1.4:	Standardized regional monitoring and assessment programme adopted for national distribution						
Output 1.5:	Regional work-plan adopted for further science and technical studies necessary for LME						
Output 2.1:	National Coordinating Ministries and Coordination Institutes adopted and functioning						
Output 2.2:	National Action Plans adopted capturing regional guidelines and requirements						

<sup>20</sup> Outcomes 2.2, 2.6, 3.2, 3.5, and 3.6 cannot be rated at this point as they are projected to be completed between the MTE process and end of Project

Output 2.3:	Regional guidelines for policy, legislative and management reforms adopted and implemented at national level						
Output 2.4:	National Monitoring Programmes established and implemented and incorporating appropriate IW indicators						
Output 2.5:	National Stakeholder Groups established						
Output 2.6:	LME-related MEAs ratified by each country						
Output 3.1:	Regional Training and Capacity Building Work-Plan and Strategy adopted by BCC						
Output 3.2:	T&CB plans adopted and implemented through National Action Plans						
Output 3.3	3-yearly review and update of T&CB at regional and national level						
Output 3.4	Effective Implementation of Stakeholder Participation Plan						
Output 3.5	Regional Sustainable Funding Programme adopted and implemented						
Output 3.6:	National Sustainable Funding Programmes annexed as part of the BCLME National Action Plans						
Output 3.7	Regional Partnership Agreements and Work-Plans formally adopted and implemented						
Output 3.8	National Partnership Agreements annexed as part of the BCLME National Action Plans						
Output 4.1	Information critical to policy and management decisions identified, packaged and distributed to appropriate targets						
Output 4.2	Lessons and Best Practices reviewed, documented and distributed for transfer and replication						
Output 4.3:	African LME networking process and mechanism defined and implemented						
Output 4.4:	Global Networking mechanism established including linkages with other regional initiatives such as GOOS and NEPAD						

### General Evaluator Comments

172. The evaluator was not able to rate Outputs 2.2 (National Action Plans adopted capturing regional guidelines and requirements); 3.2 (T&CB adopted and implemented through National Action Plans); 3.5 (Regional Sustainable Funding Programme adopted and implemented); 3.6 (National Sustainable Funding Programmes annexed as part of the BCLME National Action Plans); or 3.8 (National Partnership Agreements annexed as part of the BCLME National Action Plans). Work on these Outputs was either not far enough along for a rating to be justified or had not yet been engaged by the Project. Evaluation of these Outputs will have to await the Terminal Evaluation.

173. Of the remaining Outputs, the evaluator assigned a score of 5 for Highly Satisfactory, 4 for Satisfactory, 3 for Marginally Satisfactory, 2 for Marginally

Unsatisfactory, 1 for Unsatisfactory and 0 for Highly Unsatisfactory. Under this system the 17 ranked Outputs received a total of 50, yielding an average score of just over 3, or an overall rating of Marginally Satisfactory, consistent with the overall Project rating referenced below in the General Project Evaluation table.

### **Specific Evaluator Comments**

174. Output 1.1: The Project receives high marks for logistical, organizational and other support given to the BCC. Difficulties encountered with staffing and other issues related to the move of the BCC from Windhoek to Swakopmund were not occasioned by the Project. Indeed, the project has done much to minimize those difficulties.

175. Output 1.2: The project receives high marks for the quality of the organizational, logistical and other support rendered to negotiators during the successful negotiation of the Draft Convention.

176. Output 1.3: Progress on this Output has lagged. Currently the PMU has stated that there has been “NO PROGRESS” on this issue.

177. Output 1.4: National M&E assessment needs have been identified and incorporated into a regional programme.

178. Output 1.5: There is now a BCC Science Plan in place for the period 2013-2017.

179. Output 2.1: National level coordinating Ministries are in place.

180. Output 2.2: National Action Plans are reported in the updated logframe as having made “NO PROGRESS.” It is projected that the NAPs will have been completed by end-of-project, and thus would be an important factor to consider in the Terminal Evaluation.

181. Output 2.3: This Output has been revised to accomplish 2-5 regional or bilateral management and policy-making instruments by end-of-project.

182. Output 2.4: This Output does not appear in the most recent update of the logframe.

183. Output 2.5: This Output has been dropped due to insufficient funds.

184. Output 2.6: This Outcome has been dropped in the most recent update of the logframe.

185. Output 3.1 This Outcome has been the principal objective of the ICEIDA funded project. Progress has been made through targeted and completed CB&T exercises, although the evaluator was not able to obtain the mid-term review of the project from the PMU.

186. Output 3.2: As there are no NAPs, this Outcome has not been achieved. The extent to which, if at all, the T&CB plans will be built into the NAPs is not addressed by the Project at this point.

187. Output 3.3: As above, the Evaluator was not able to obtain a copy of the MTE for this project from the PMU.

188. Output 3.4: The stakeholder participation plan started well, as stated elsewhere in this evaluation. However, since the end of the 2011 to present progress has lagged.

189. Output 3.5: A donor conference is planned toward the end of project implementation. No progress to report at this time.

190. Output 3.6: As the NAPs are not in place, there is no progress to report on this Output.

191. Output 3.7: The target has been revised to accomplish 2 national partnerships per country by end-of-project.

192. Output 3.8: As there are no NAPs in place, there is no progress to report on this Output. However, national partnerships have been, and will continue to be developed and thus it should be possible to annex a description of the partnerships to the NAPs, should the NAPs be successfully developed by end-of-project.

193. Output 4.1: Very limited progress for this Output, and resources necessary to satisfy this Output are not available, according to the updated logframe. Also, plans to update the web-based platform have been dropped due to lack of resources.

194. Output 4.2: Limited success on this Output. Unclear whether existing Project resources will enable further work. No mention of further plans for this Output in the updated logframe.

195. Output 4.3: The project has been active in the establishment and functioning of the Caucus.

196. Output 4.4: The Senior Project Manager has been active in and a key participant in Global IW activities.

197. Following are Outcome-by-Outcome evaluator comments:

**Table 7: Evaluation by Issue**

Evaluation Issue	Rating
Achievement of objectives and planned results	Marginally Satisfactory
Attainment of outputs and activities	Marginally Satisfactory

Cost-effectiveness	Satisfactory
Impact	Marginally Satisfactory
Sustainability of the Project	Marginally Satisfactory
Stakeholder participation	Marginally Unsatisfactory
Country ownership	Satisfactory
Implementation on the ground and implementation approach	Marginally Satisfactory
Financial Management and Planning	Satisfactory
Replicability	Marginally Satisfactory
Monitoring and evaluation	Marginally Unsatisfactory

**Table 8: General Project Evaluation**

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

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

### 6.1 Conclusions

198. **Overlapping responsibilities among projects.** Four inter-related projects have overlapping responsibilities, all under the general umbrella of the BCC, making difficult assignment and measurement of ultimate accountability for the delivery of results. The four projects include:

- Implementation of the Benguela Current Commission’s Science Programme (Science Programme) to support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management in the BCLME Region (Norway);



- Strengthening the Capacity (TCB project) of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) to implement an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management in Namibia, Angola and South Africa (ICEIDA);
- Support for the Institutionalization of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) (Angola, Namibia & South Africa); and
- Implementation of the Benguela Current LME Strategic Action Program (Project) for Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Reducing Coastal Resources Degradation (UNDP-GEF), which is the subject of this evaluation.

199. **Participating country commitment.** The three countries continue to be committed to the goal and objectives of the Project and the BCLME Programme. This is evidenced by, among other things:

- The level of cooperation that was exhibited in the successful negotiations leading to the draft Convention;
- The continuing presence of high level representatives from the three governments at BCC Ministerial meetings;
- The level of attendance of government personnel and some stakeholders at committee, work group, and other project meetings and meetings of the BCC;
- The continuing country support for National Focal Points for the project and the BCC; and
- The payment of dues to the BCC by the three participating countries (although some payments have been late in arriving).

200. **Project visibility and stature.** The Project has adhered to its charge, as stated in the Project Document, that the Project is “down-graded to a simple Management Unit within the BCC and for its Manager/Advisor works alongside the Executive Secretary to ensure harmony between the GEF-funded activities and the overall work of the Commission.” According to some interviewees, and in the opinion of the evaluator this has led to:

- Low visibility for the Project, with most interviewees having little direct knowledge of Project related activities and results;
- Diminished stature of the Project;
- The appearance that the Project has served as “an ATM for the BCC”, as one interviewee stated; and
- A perception that the Project has been, and in the end will be seen in light of the perceived success – or failure – of the BCC, rather than on its own merits.

201. **Assistance to the BCC.** The Project has given a consistent and effective level of attention and accompanying resources to assist the BCC to become fully functional. However, more recently the Project has been providing unplanned, continuing Project resource inputs in efforts to create a greater level of sustainability for the Commission. Some of these unplanned expenditures come at the expense of previously planned Outputs of the Project.

202. **The Convention – negotiation of the text.** Knowledgeable observers give the Project management Unit very high marks for the role it played in organizing and facilitating discussions leading to the successful negotiation of the Convention text.

203. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** A strong majority of interviewees believe that the most important deliverable of the Project, and indeed for the future sustainability of the BCLME programme, is the signing and ratification of the Convention.

204. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** A formal Convention signing and Convention ratification by 31 December 2012 is in serious doubt. Should signing and ratification not occur by that date, participating countries would either have to extend the mandate of the current interim BCC, or the interim BCC would have to cease operations. While interviewees differ on the implications of missing that date, there is agreement that donors and other stakeholders would not see it in a positive light.

205. **The Convention – signing and ratification.** Should the existing draft Convention not be signed and ratified by end of project, i.e. 31 December 2013, it will be seen as a failure of the most salient deliverable of the Project, as noted in the Project Document, original Project logframe, updated Project logframes, and suggested by a vast majority of interviewees as being the most important objective of the Project. Several interviewees also stated that failure to sign and ratify the Convention would be seen by potential donors and other stakeholders as a diminishment of participating country support for the BCLME programme.

206. **Logical Framework Analysis.** The inclusion of mid-term targets in the updated logical framework analysis has added an improved level of project accountability and is extremely helpful to evaluators. The frequent updates to the logframe make it difficult to discern the exact nature and extent to which the goal, objectives, outputs and outcomes of the project have been altered over time.

207. **Development of GEF IW indicators.** The Project Document states that implementation would include “establishment of measurable International Waters (IW) indicators within an effective M&E framework, which are to be incorporated into the BCLME as an intrinsic on-going activity within the work of the Commission.” There is little evidence at this point that the project will be developing GEF IW indicators as part of its monitoring and evaluation efforts.

208. **Intra and inter-project communication.** The Senior Project Manager has not communicated effectively and regularly with key personnel from the Implementing Agency, the Executing Agency, other key Project participants, and some stakeholders. This has, to varying degrees, negatively affected Project efficiencies and results. Given the need to work efficiently and quickly to produce maximum results over the remaining 18 months of implementation, this lack of effective communication, if it continues, will increase the possibility that a number of deliverables will not be met.

209. **Emerging concerns about a Namibia centered Project and Programme.** There have been concerns expressed by several interviewees that the Project and the BCC are starting to be seen as over-weighted toward Namibian nationals, and could as a result

come to be seen as disproportionately weighted to Namibian interests. According to Project records, there have been 101 contracts issued. Of that number 69 were issued to Namibian individuals or companies; 20 were issued to South African individuals or companies; 6 were issued to Angolan contractors; and 6 to international contractors. It should be noted that as the Project is located in Namibia, many of the Namibian contracts are for furnishings and other day-to-day supplies to run the PMU. However, even taking into account that need, there still appears to be an over-weighting of contracts to Namibian sources. The PMU has minimized international contracts, consistent with recognition that there is significant capacity within the region and that regional contractors should be given preference.

210. **Stakeholder participation and community involvement.** After a promising start, stakeholder participation and community level involvement, central to GEF projects generally and specifically in this Project, has decreased over the past six months. It is unclear the extent that and the means through which the project will ensure effective stakeholder participation over the remaining 18 months of project implementation. As continuing, broad levels of stakeholder support are seen by many interviewees as necessary to the mid and long term success of the BCLME Programme and the Benguela Current Commission, reduced effort in this area is a concern.

211. **Limited Project resources.** There is limited time and there are limited resources - human and financial - to deliver the following key Project deliverables identified in Project logframes:

- Signature and Ratification of the Convention;
- Completion of the ongoing process of updating the Strategic Action Programme;
- Development of National Action Plans;
- Definition of GEF IW based indicators and more specifically identification, if any, of stress reduction indicators achieved by the BCLME Programme to date;
- Development and adoption of a package of regional guidelines for policy, legislative and management reforms; and
- A refurbished web-based platform and accessible online

212. **Difficulty of access to Angola.** There is no question of the overall commitment of Angola to the Programme and the Project. Angola as an active and effective participant in negotiations leading to the final draft of the Convention; they are active and effective participants in BCC and Project meetings; and they are commonly represented at Ministerial level during Ministerial meetings as part of the BCC. There is, however, an ongoing issue of difficulty in obtaining Angola visas for project consultants and other Project related personnel. A consequence of this difficulty, at best, is that the Project is not able to function at the same and important face-to-face level that is the case in Namibia and South Africa. At worst, this difficulty leads to the inadvertent appearance that the Project does not take seriously enough the imperative of assuring that Project personnel is able to give equal time and effort to Angola. Over the last eighteen months

of project implementation the pace of activities will increase, as will the importance of project personnel and consultants to gain access to Angola as part of their responsibility to effectively assure that Angola is indeed an equal partner in the project and in the work of the BCC. The problem of access is compounded by, among other things, language difference, an economy that is largely cash driven, and other dissimilarities that constantly need to be taken into account by the Project.

213. **Incomplete co-finance information.** The evaluator, despite repeated efforts, was unable to obtain complete co-finance information, thus making it impossible to determine current levels of received co-finance against original projections, and an assessment of project co-finance to the end of the project. This information will be should be gathered and assessed by the project as soon as possible, and the information will also be necessary to gather for purposes of the Terminal Evaluation.

## 6.2 Recommendations

214. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU keep further unplanned transfer of resources to the BCC at a minimum to assure maximum use of remaining resources on the generation of Project Outputs that remain unaddressed.

215. **The evaluator recommends** that as an urgent priority the Senior Project Manager enlist the support of the BCC Executive Secretary, the Implementing Agency, and other human and financial resources necessary to gain ratification of the Convention before the deadline of 31 December 2012. In addition to the direct efforts of the Project Manager, the BCC ES, and representatives of the Implementing Agency and other members of the PSC, this may require the recruitment of high-level project champions, especially in Angola, who would assist in contacting and encouraging key high-level government officials in the three countries to proceed quickly to formally sign and ratify the final version of the Convention text. Securing Convention ratification will require concerted, immediate planning, consultation, and rapid execution as time to secure ratification before the 31 December 2012 deadline is, according to interviewees knowledgeable with the necessary process, fast running out. (N.B. This recommendation is currently being acted upon, in part, as a result of an earlier discussion with the SPM).

216. **The evaluator recommends** that, assuming the signing of the Convention will take place in Angola, the PMU begin now to identify the resource needs that will be required to assure a smooth and successful event given the potential logistical difficulties that such an event, at such a location, will entail. **The evaluator also recommends** that UNOPS consider sending a representative to Angola to work with the Angola National Coordinator to pre-determine the list of contracting and disbursement requirements that will be necessary to assure a successful signing ceremony.

217. **The evaluator recommends** that the Senior Project Manager, beginning immediately and over the remaining time of project implementation, continue his current level of communication with the ES of the BCC, and establish scheduled, periodic conversations and consultations with key officials of the Implementing and Executing Agencies of the project, and other PSC members and key stakeholders as necessary. The

number of important activities to be implemented over the remaining, roughly 18 months of Project implementation will require establishment of tight deadlines, effective engagement of participating country personnel, timely and efficient recruitment of consultants, and overall efficient coordination of effort across the entire range of Project stakeholders.

218. **The evaluator recommends** that the Senior Project Manager engage the Executive Secretary (ES) of the BCC, Project Steering Committee (of which the ES of the BCC is a member), and the Implementing and Executing Agencies (also members of the PSC), in a definitive discussion of priorities and the most effective and efficient use of remaining project resources between now and end-of-project. The definitive discussion should include a list of priority actions that the Senior Project Manager sees as most important to conclude over the next eighteen months; the human and other resources required to address those priorities; timeframes for each; and also a list of previously identified project deliverables that will not be met, if any. (N.B. This recommendation is also currently being acted upon, in part, as a result of an earlier discussion with the SPM).

219. **The evaluator recommends** that the Project definitively address the issue of stakeholder and community level involvement for the remainder of the project. Key areas should include information dissemination, upgrading the quality of the current BCC website with special attention to highlighting project progress, stakeholder outreach efforts, the engagement of community level stakeholders, and building enduring partnerships that can benefit countries generally and the BCC specifically beyond the life of the project.

220. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU, through the Senior Project Manager, make clear through the use of future QPRs, which Outputs will not be achieved over the remaining period of implementation and the effect the lack of achievement of those Outputs will have on the respective Project Outcomes.

221. **The evaluator recommends** that over the next 18 months the Project should develop a set of IW indicators, with special emphasis on identifying the extent to which, if any, there are stress reduction indicators that could be reported as a result of the GEF investment in the BCLME programme over a fifteen year period.

222. **The evaluator recommends** that the PMU, the UNDP Country Office, and others as necessary, engage the Government of Angola with the aim of facilitating improved access of project personnel to Angola through a simplified and streamlined process for obtaining visas over the remainder of the Project implementation period.

223. **The evaluator recommends** that the Project make every appropriate effort to engage a greater balance of consultants from the three countries to assure both the fact and the appearance of giving each country equal access to contracts consistent with their equal partnership in the Project and work of the BCC.

224. **The evaluator recommends** that the project complete gathering and assessing current levels of project co-finance and project the likely amount of co-finance that will have been contributed by the end of project implementation.

## **Annexes**

### **Annex 1 – Terms of Reference**

Title:	Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation
Project:	BCLME/ 69985
Duty station:	Home-based with missions to the participating countries
Section/Unit:	EMO IWC
Contract/Level:	International - Specialist ICA, Level 4
Duration:	02/04/2012 through 30/06/2012
Supervisor:	Senior Portfolio Manager, Ms. Katrin Lichtenberg

#### **1. General Background**

(Brief description of the national, sector-specific or other relevant context in which the individual contractor will operate)

The overall goal of this project in the three countries is to secure the restoration and sustainability of the depleted marine fish stocks and associated degraded biodiversity of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME). The objective of this specific project will be to implement a Strategic Action Programme for the development and adoption of an effective transboundary LME management structure primarily addressing fish stock and fisheries rejuvenation and sustainability, supported and made operational by functioning and sustainable transboundary and national level institutions, and guided by a series of lessons and best practices. Such lessons and best practices would further form the basis of replicable procedures to secure management strategies in similar global LMEs.

The envisaged primary outputs from the Project have been partially achieved and are close to being finalized. These include 1) a ‘tried-and-tested’ LME Commission along with supportive regional and national structures, and 2) an associated binding international legal agreement for transboundary management of the BCLME and its globally important fisheries. Guidelines are being developed for the amendment and realignment of national management and policy instruments which would set the scene for the review and harmonization of policies and laws at national level. Specific support is provided to improve capacities for sustainability through training and institutional strengthening, the development of a strategic plan, business plan and resource mobilization and partnership strategy and more effective stakeholder participation throughout all sectors with a specific emphasis toward community inputs. The project has also started the process of developing a mechanism for the capturing of knowledge, development of products (lessons and good practices) and distribution and use for replication within and beyond the BCLME region. This will be linked to an appropriate network mechanism for LMEs.

The successful realisation of project outcomes would be measured through appropriate deliverables and achievements following GEF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guidance. To this effect, the services of a qualified, competent and experienced project/

programme evaluator is sought to carry out the mid-term evaluation of the BCLME SAP IMP Project.

## **2. Purpose and Scope of Assignment**

(Concise and detailed description of activities, tasks and responsibilities to be undertaken, including expected travel, if applicable) The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to examine the progress and performance of the project since the start of its implementation. The MTE will include the evaluation of both the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs and outcomes set forth in the Project Document, and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outcomes, and the progress towards project objective. The evaluation will also identify and address causes and issues that constrain the achievement of set targets.

The MTE is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design, and to develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing Project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the MTE mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The evaluation will follow approaches adopted by GEF for the assessment of IW projects and UNDP M&E guidelines.

The MTE mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the Project that could be applied to future and on-going projects.

## **3. Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

The scope of the MTE will cover all activities undertaken within the framework of the project. One evaluator with a combination of regional knowledge, evaluation experience, and in-depth knowledge of GEF IW projects will compare planned project outputs and outcomes to actual/achieved outputs and outcomes and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of Project objectives.

The evaluation will extract lessons learned, diagnose and analyse issues of concern and formulate a concrete and viable set of recommendations. It will evaluate the efficiency of Project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the Project in relation to the specified Project goals and objectives.

The evaluation will comprise the following elements:

- (i) Assess whether the Project design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;



- (ii) A summary evaluation of the Project and all of its major components undertaken to date and a determination of progress toward achievement of its overall objectives;
- (iii) An evaluation of Project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document;
- (iv) An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of Project outputs and outcomes produced to date in relation to expected results;
- (v) An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role and effectiveness of the Project Steering Committee (PSC);
- (vi) Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document;
- (vii) Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first 2.5 years of the Project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the Project;
- (viii) Identification and to the extent possible the quantification of the co-financing commitments realized (those committed at the beginning of the project as well as those that emerged during the project implementation).
- (ix) An evaluation of Project coordination, management and administration provided by the PCU. This evaluation should include specific reference to:
  - Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
  - The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the PCU in monitoring on a day-to-day basis, progress in Project execution;
  - Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the Project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes; and
  - Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
- (x) An evaluation of the effectiveness of UNDP and UNOPS in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in terms of their respective implementing and executing capacities in the project implementation.
- (xi) A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outputs of the Project are likely to be met;
- (xii) An assessment of the M&E approach adopted by the Project;
- (xiii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities;

(xiv) Lessons learned and best practices during Project implementation which would benefit the GEF IW portfolio;

(xv) Recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall Project workplan and timetable for purposes of enhancing the achievement of Project objectives and outcomes.

#### **4. Mid-Term Evaluation Methodology**

The Mid-term Evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide a basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

The evaluation will start with a desk review of project documentation and also include the following activities:

(i) Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports (such as, among others, Project Inception Report, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings, other relevant meetings, Project implementation Reports (PIRs/APRs), quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);

(ii) Review of specific products including content of the Project web site, datasets, management and action plans, publications and other materials and reports;

(iii) Interviews with the Senior Project Manager and other project staff in the Project Management Unit and consultants involved in Project implementation;

(iv) Participation in the third PSC meeting to be held in Angola in early 2012 where Project personnel will deliver a comprehensive report on Project progress over the past year and where PSC members and Project staff and consultants can be interviewed;

(v) Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives, other related projects and programmes within the region, relevant UNDP personnel, and NGOs;

(vi) Draft report by May 29th

(vii) Final version June 22nd

The Project Management Unit will provide the consultant with support to obtain all the necessary and requested documentations and necessary logistical assistance to conduct the evaluation mission.

#### **5. Monitoring and Progress Controls**

(Clear description of measurable outputs, milestones, key performance indicators and/or reporting requirements which will enable performance monitoring)

The expected output from this evaluation is a full evaluation report that would include:

- (i) An executive summary, including findings and recommendations and an overall rating of project performance;
- (ii) A detailed evaluation report covering items presented above in the Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation of this TOR with special attention to lessons learned and recommendations;
- (iii) A table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing for the Project;
- (iv) A list of Annexes prepared by the evaluator, which includes TORs, Itineraries, List of Persons Interviewed, Summary of Field Visits, List of Documents reviewed, Questionnaire used and Summary of results, Identification of Co-financing and Leveraged Resources, etc.

Suggested Table of Contents of the Mid-Term Report will be shared with the consultant together with the UNDP MTE guidance note.

## **6. Qualifications and Experience**

(List the required education, work experience, expertise and competencies of the individual contractor. The listed education and experience should correspond with the level at which the contract is offered.)

### **a. Education (Level and area of required and/or preferred education)**

Master of Science degree in Water Resource Management or related field and relevant demonstrated regional/international consulting experience in marine sciences or large marine ecosystems

### **b. Work Experience**

(List number of years and area of required work experience. Clearly distinguish between required experience and experience which could be an asset.)

- A minimum of 15 years' relevant experience is required. Previous experience in the region advantageous; and
- Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies and/or other major donors.

### **c. Key Competencies**

(Technical knowledge, skills, managerial competencies or other personal competencies relevant to the performance of the assignment. Clearly distinguish between required and desired competencies)

- Excellent English writing and communication skills and demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions;
- An ability to assess policy and governance framework and institutional capacity;
- Understanding of governance, political, economic and institutional issues associated with transboundary water issues in Africa; and
- Familiarity with GEF International Waters strategies and its portfolio.

## Annex 2 – Itineraries (2)

### Itinerary 1<sup>21</sup>

Friday, 23 March 2012				
Flight	AF2489 - Air France		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For Air France		YUJABC	
Class	J - Business		Non Stop	
Departs	20:05	Otopeni International, Bucharest Romania	OTP	
Arrives	22:15	Charles De Gaulle Intl Arpt, Paris France	CDG	Terminal 2F
	Flight Time	3:10	Carbon Emission: 296.08 kgs	
	Equipment	Airbus Industrie A319		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Meal		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-2PC		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0575118755307(Electronic)	3A	

Friday, 23 March 2012				
Flight	AF990 - Air France		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For Air France		YUJABC	
Class	Z - Business		Non Stop	
Departs	23:20	Charles De Gaulle Intl Arpt, Paris France	CDG	Terminal 2E
Arrives	11:00	O R Tambo International Arpt, Johannesburg South Africa * Saturday, 24 March 2012	JNB	Terminal A
	Flight Time	10:40	Carbon Emission: 997.33 kgs	
	Equipment	Airbus Industrie A380-800 Pax		
	Services	Duty Free Sales,In-Seat Power Source,Video,Library,Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Breakfast/meal		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-2PC		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0575118755307(Electronic)	66A	

Sunday, 01 April 2012				
Flight	SA405 - South African Airways		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For South African Airways		YUJABC	
Class	Y - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	10:15	O R Tambo International Arpt, Johannesburg South Africa	JNB	Terminal B
Arrives	11:55	Port Elizabeth Airport, Port Elizabeth South Africa	PLZ	
	Flight Time	1:40	Carbon Emission: 184.17 kgs	
	Equipment	Boeing 737-800		
	Services	Audio Programming,Non-Smoking,No Duty Free Sales		
	Meal	Snack		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-23K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals

<sup>21</sup> The Angola portion of the Mission was not possible due to refusal of Angola to issue a visa to the MTE consultant.

* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0835118755309(Electronic)	22C	
Thursday, 05 April 2012				
Flight	SA1808 - South African Airways, Operated By South African Express		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For South African Airways		YUJABC	
Class	Y - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	12:10	Port Elizabeth Airport, Port Elizabeth South Africa	PLZ	
Arrives	13:50	Cape Town International, Cape Town South Africa	CPT	
	Flight Time	1:40	Carbon Emission: 184.17 kgs	
	Equipment	De Havilland DHC-8 Dash 8-400		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Lunch		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-23K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0835118755309(Electronic)	4D	
Thursday, 05 April 2012				
Flight	SA1751 - South African Airways, Operated By South African Express		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For South African Airways		YUJABC	
Class	B - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	15:45	Cape Town International, Cape Town South Africa	CPT	
Arrives	16:50	Hosea Kutako International Arpt, Windhoek Namibia	WDH	
	Flight Time	2:05	Carbon Emission: 194.79 kgs	
	Equipment	UNKNOWN		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Lunch		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-23K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0835118755309(Electronic)	3A	
Sunday, 15 April 2012				
Flight	SW772 - Air Namibia		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For Air Namibia		RK7Y5	
Class	K - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	08:35	Hosea Kutako International Arpt, Windhoek Namibia	WDH	
Arrives	11:15	Four De Fevereiro Arpt, Luanda Angola	LAD	
	Flight Time	2:40	Carbon Emission: 249.33 kgs	
	Equipment	Boeing 737		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Breakfast		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-32K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		1865118755310(Electronic)	6F	
Friday, 20 April 2012				
Flight	SW773 - Air Namibia		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For Air Namibia		RK7Y5	
Class	B - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	12:15	Four De Fevereiro Arpt, Luanda Angola	LAD	
Arrives	14:55	Hosea Kutako International Arpt, Windhoek Namibia	WDH	
	Flight Time	1:40	Carbon Emission: 184.17 kgs	
	Equipment	Airbus Industrie A319		

	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Lunch		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-32K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		1865118755310(Electronic)	9F	
Friday, 20 April 2012				
Flight	SA1752 - South African Airways, Operated By South African Express		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For South African Airways		YUJABC	
Class	K - Economy		Non Stop	
Departs	17:20	Hosea Kutako International Arpt, Windhoek Namibia	WDH	
Arrives	20:25	Cape Town International, Cape Town South Africa	CPT	
	Flight Time	2:05	Carbon Emission: 194.79 kgs	
	Equipment	UNKNOWN		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Dinner		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-23K		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0835118755309(Electronic)	2A	
Thursday, 26 April 2012				
Flight	KL598 - KLM Royal Dutch Airlines		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For KLM Royal Dutch Airlines		YUJABC	
Class	I - Business		Non Stop	
Departs	23:35	Cape Town International, Cape Town South Africa	CPT	
Arrives	11:00	Schiphol Arpt, Amsterdam Netherlands * Friday, 27 April 2012	AMS	
	Flight Time	11:25	Carbon Emission: 1067.46 kgs	
	Equipment	Boeing 777		
	Services	Additional Service(s) Exist,Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Meal		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-2PC		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0575118755307(Electronic)	5J Window	
Friday, 27 April 2012				
Flight	KL1375 - KLM Royal Dutch Airlines		HK - Confirmed	
	Confirmation Number For KLM Royal Dutch Airlines		YUJABC	
Class	J - Business		Non Stop	
Departs	12:40	Schiphol Arpt, Amsterdam Netherlands	AMS	
Arrives	16:25	Otopeni International, Bucharest Romania	OTP	
	Flight Time	2:45	Carbon Emission: 257.13 kgs	
	Equipment	Boeing 737		
	Services	Non-Smoking		
	Meal	Meal		
	Comments	Baggage Allowance : Adult-2PC		
		Ticket Number	Seat	Special Meals
* LAROCHE/DAVIDMR		0575118755308(Electronic), 0575118755307(Electronic)	2F Window	

## **Itinerary 2**

25JUN 2220 LH 421 Z DEP BOSTON (NONSTOP) 26JUN 1135 OK  
ARR FRANKFURT

26JUN 2010 SW 286 J DEP FRANKFURT (NONSTOP) 27JUN 0510  
OK ARR WINDHOEK

29JUN 2005 SW 285 J DEP WINDHOEK (NONSTOP) 30JUN 0700 OK  
ARR FRANKFURT

30JUN 1240 LH 422 C DEP FRANKFURT (NONSTOP) 1435 OK  
ARR BOSTON

## **Mission Summaries/Field Visits**

The evaluators filed visits began with attendance at a meeting/workshop of the Africa LME Caucus.

The workshop was constructed to resemble an International Waters Conference at the regional scale, with a focus on inter-project knowledge sharing (Best Lessons and Challenges). Workshop participants, mostly Project Managers of Africa LME projects, discussed some potential course modules to be provided by partners on content requested by Project Managers. Future learning priorities were also featured on the agenda, including twinning exchanges between projects and future workshops supported by GEF IW:LEARN. Facilitators were drawn from the Global Community of Practice Partners (UNESCO, IUCN), Rhodes University as well as from actors in the region.

The overall aim of the workshop was to foster cooperation and sharing amongst the various IW projects in Africa so as to be able to capture and replicate best practices while identifying challenges and working together to address these challenges and find solutions. The workshop also aimed to improve participation and interaction within the IW:LEARN Global Communities of Practice (along with UNESCO and IUCN)

The workshop had the following primary objectives:

- A. The presentation of areas of achievement and best practice as well as areas of challenge within each Project
- B. Discussion of Priority Issues identified by the Projects in their responses to the Questionnaire (see Annex 1)
- C. Identification of Potential Twinning Exercises
- D. Priorities and deliverables from the following two (IW:LEARN / Rhodes) workshops



The BCLME SAP IMP project was represented by the Senior Project Manager and the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.

This Workshop was followed by a planned trip to Windhoek, Luanda, and Cape Town to interview project personnel and stakeholders, and to intensively review documents in the Project Management Unit. While the Windhoek and Cape Town portions of the Mission were successful, repeated efforts to obtain a visa to undertake interviews in Luanda were unsuccessful. This has led to a conclusion in the Final Report that there is an ongoing issue of difficulty in obtaining Angola visas for project consultants and other Project related personnel.

A consequence of this difficulty, at best, is that the Project is not able to function at the same and important face-to-face level that is the case in Namibia and South Africa. At worst, this difficulty leads to the inadvertent appearance that the Project does not take seriously enough the imperative of assuring that Project personnel is able to give equal time and effort to Angola. Over the last eighteen months of project implementation the pace of activities will increase, as will the importance of project personnel and consultants to gain access to Angola as part of their responsibility to effectively assure that Angola is indeed an equal partner in the project and in the work of the BCC. The problem of access is compounded by, among other things, language difference, an economy that is largely cash driven, and other dissimilarities that constantly need to be taken into account by the Project.

This conclusion was followed by a recommendation that the PMU, the UNDP Country Office, and others as necessary, engage the Government of Angola with the aim of facilitating improved access of project personnel to Angola through a simplified and streamlined process for obtaining visas over the remainder of the Project implementation period.

The evaluator's second Mission to the region was necessitated by the twin needs of interviewing Angolan representatives to the Project in Windhoek, since it was impossible for the evaluator to secure a visa, and also to attend the Extraordinary Project Steering Committee Meeting, an objective of which was for the evaluator to present tentative conclusions and recommendations of the MTE and entertain questions on those tentative conclusions and recommendations.

### Annex 3 - List of Interviewees

Interviewees	
Dr. Nico Willemse Senior Project Manager BCLME SAPIMP Project Windhoek, Namibia	Dr. Hashali Hamukaya Executive Secretary Benguela Current Com. Swakopmund, Namibia
Nawala Nakashole Administrative Assistant BCLME SAPIMP Project Windhoek, Namibia	Mr. Silvanus Kathindi Managing Director Etale Fishing Company Walvis Bay, Namibia
Dr. Samantha de Villiers Senior Manager Marine Programmes WWF, Cape Town, SA	Mr. Teofilus Nghitila Env. Commissioner Dept. of Env. Affairs Windhoek, Namibia
Dr. Francois Odendaal CEO EcoAfrica Group Pretoria, SA	Ms. Sandy Davies Consultant Gaborone, Botswana
Bernice McLean EcoAfrica Cape Town, SA	Mr. E. Victor Bok Legal Advisor Ministry of Justice Windhoek, Namibia
Dr. Fairuz Mullagee Consultant IKM Cape Town, SA	Ms. Grettel Miller-Tjiroze Former ICA/Finance BCC Swakopmund, Namibia
Mr. Itai Mukuvari Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist BCLME SAPIMP Project Windhoek, Namibia	Dr. Akiko Yamamoto Regional Team Leader Technical Advisor Oceans/Adaptation UNDP/Pretoria SA
Dr. David Vousden Project Director ASCLME LME Project Grahamstown, South Africa	Ms. Martha Mwandingi Assistant Res. Rep. Head, Env. & Energy Windhoek, Namibia
Dr. Magnus Ngoile Policy and Governance Coordinator ASCLME Project Grahamstown, SA	Claire Atwood Communications Advisor BCLME SAPIMP Project Cape Town, SA
Dr. Johann Augustyn Project Steering Committee Member Cape Town, South Africa	Ms. Maria des Lourdes Sardinha National Project Coordinator BCLME SAPIMP Project Luanda, Angola
Ms. Silvi Nsiangango	Frikkie Botes

INIP Luanda, Angola	National Project Coordinator BCLME SAPIMP Project Swakopmund, Namibia
Gcobani Popose National Project Coordinator BCLME SAPIMP Project Cape Town, South Africa	Ms. Katrina Lichtenberg Senior Portfolio Manager, UNOPS IW Copenhagen, Denmark
Dr. Andrew Menz UNDP-GEF Consultant Amsterdam, Netherlands	Mr. Fredrik Lindhe UNOPS Copenhagen, Denmark
Mr. C.A.R. Bross Secretary South African Deep-Sea Trawling Industry Association Cape Town, South Africa	Dr. David Japp Marine Fisheries Consultant Cape Town, South Africa
Mr. Ashley Naidoo Director Oceans Conservation BCLME SAPIMP PSC member Cape Town, South Africa	Mr. Gabes Simeon Chief Control Officer Marine Pollution Control Walvis Bay, Namibia
Ms. Maria Dombaxe INIP Luanda, Angola	
<b>In addition to the interviewees listed above, the evaluator, as part of this evaluation, attended a workshop of the Africa LME Caucus, where discussions about the BCLME SAP IMP project took place with a number of attendees, workshop participants are listed below</b>	
Ms. Doris Mutta UNEP Atlantic/Indian ocean SIDS project	Mr. Michael Kamaano Kalahari Conservation Society Botswana IWRM project
Mr. Birane Sambe Project Manager FAO Guinea Current LME project	Mr. Hugh Gibbon Project Manager UNIDO Coastal Tourism project
Mr. Mish Hamid Project Manager IW:LEARN	Mr. Stephen Maxwell Donkor Project Manager UNIDO Guinea Current LME project
Mr. Patson Mwasila UNDP/UNOPS Lake Tanganyika project	Mr. Hawa Msham UNDP/UNOPS Lake Tanganyika project
Mr. Celeus Ngowenubusa UNDP/UNOPS Lake Tanganyika project	Mr. Gerson Jophet Fumbuka Transboundary Commission Lake Victoria II project
Mr. Raymond Mngodo Transboundary Commission Lake Victoria II project	Mr. Christoph Mor Project Manager/UNDP-UNOPS Orange-Senqu River Basin project

Mr. Rondolph Payet Project Manager SWIOFP Project World Bank	Mr. Demba Kone Sub-Saharan Africa LME fisheries
Mr. Olumide Akinsola UNEP/Project Manager Volta River project	Mr. Dhanabalan Naiker South African Maritime Safety Agency West Indian Ocean Highway project

## **Interview Results – Major Impression**

Many of the details of interviews are captured in the report are captured in the main report that has preceded these Annexes. However, interviewees possessed very little direct information on the Project as opposed to the workings of the BCC Secretariat and the workings of the BCC generally. While unique in the experience of the evaluator, this finding was not a complete surprise, given that the role of the Project has been one of supporting the work of the BCC, even to the point of the Project Document stating that the Project was to be “downgraded” in comparison to the first GEF sponsored BCLME project, thus arguably, if inadvertently, undercutting the perceived importance and stature of the current project and placing the focus of stakeholders on the workings of the BCC rather than on the Project.

## **Annex 4 - Documents and Publications Reviewed**

BCLME SAP IMP Inception Workshop Minutes and Final Report  
BCLME SAP IMP Stakeholder Involvement Plan  
BCLME SAP IMP PMU personnel contracts  
BCLME SAP IMP Quarter 1 Report\_Jan-Mar 2010 (14 Apr 2010)  
BCLME SAP IMP Quarter 2 Report Apr-Jun 2010 (19 Jul 2010)  
BCLME SAP IMP Quarter 3 Report Jul-Sep 2010 (11 Oct 2010)  
BCLME SAP IMP Quarter 4 Report Oct-Dec 2010 (20 Dec 2010)  
BCLME\_Q 1 Report 2011 (25 Apr 2011)  
BCLME\_Q 2 Report 2011\_FINAL  
BCLME\_Q 3 Report 2011\_22 Sep 2011  
BCLME\_Q 1 Report 2012  
BCLME SAP IMP Upcoming consultancies 2012  
Mid-Term\_Review\_of\_the\_BCC\_Science\_Programme - Final DRAFT for reviewers  
with comments attached (nw)  
Report 1LOW.pdf  
RTO and DIM motivation\_20 Feb 2012.pdf  
SAP-IMP 2011 TBWP (4 Feb 2011 APPROVED).pdf  
SAP-IMP TBWP (8 Jul 2010).pdf  
Draft Agenda\_3rd BCLME PSC Meeting  
Jan 2011-May 2012\_Progress Report\_SAP IMP Project  
BCLME Contractors List  
BCLME SAP IMP Upcoming consultancies 2012  
Draft minutes of the 3rd PSC meeting (NW)  
Motivation to hire RTO and DIM on UNOPS contracts  
MTE Info Needs  
PSC recommendations to BCC MB\_20 May 2012\_NW notes  
SAP IMP Logframe\_MTE proposal  
SAP IMP Risk Log\_22 May 2012-1  
SAP IMP Staff Monitoring\_13 June 2012  
Status of SAP Implementation\_30 May 2012  
UNDP NAMIBIA CO Independent Evaluation-final report\_October 2009  
UNDPevaluation guidance draft\_forEvaluationTeam\_versionMarch172011  
BCLME1.MTE Final Report  
2010 Progress Summary Report\_SAP IMP Project  
3305 Benguela Project Document for Endorsement/Note  
BCC Convention\_clean version\_16 Jan 2012  
BCLME SAPIMP outputs-acts.doc  
2011PIR PIMS 3849 BCLME SAPIMP Final 13Oct2011  
3849 BCLME SAPIMP PIR2010 final  
Draft Mins\_2nd SAP IMP PSC meeting 22 Mar 2011  
Draft Minutes (+Annexes)\_1st SAP IMP PSC Meeting 8 Jun 2010 (6 Aug 2010)  
SAP IMP Inception Report\_Eng  
SAP IMP Logframe Update April 2011  
SAP IMP Logframe Update October 2011

SAP IMP Logframe\_2012 PLANNING  
BCLMEcapsule  
BCLME Final Evaluation  
IW:LEARN3\_act1c\_rhodes\_1stworkshop\_agenda\_21mar  
Participation\_iwl3workshop1\_africa.  
Publication\_BCC PROJECT DOCUMENT  
Publication\_SAP\_Part 1  
Publication\_SAP\_Part 2  
Midterm Evaluation – Science Programme, Draft  
PSC recommendations to BCC MB\_20 May 2012\_NW notes.doc

## **Annex 5 – Updated Co-finance/Leveraged Funding**

As mentioned in the body of the main text of this report, and captured in a report Conclusion and accompanying recommendation, the evaluator was not able to obtain updated information on planned as opposed to actual co-finance received to date, and projected co-finance over the remainder of the Project.