

Botswana Country Report – Final

Mid Term Review of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty- Environment Initiative (PEI) Scale-Up

•

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CBO	Community Base Organisations
CKGR	Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve
Danida	Danish International Development Assistance
DFID	Department for International Development
IEC	Information Education Communication (a technique used in health education and communication strategies)
MFDP	Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MTR	Mid Term Review
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PE	Poverty and Environment
PEF	Poverty and Environment Facility (Nairobi)
PEI	Poverty and Environment Initiative
PRODOC	Programme Document
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

List of contents

Main findings.....	3
Main recommendations.....	4
Main lessons learned.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Questions asked.....	5
The reviewed intervention.....	6
Budgeting and financial monitoring and evaluation.....	7
Findings.....	8
Progress on results.....	8
Relevance.....	8
Efficiency.....	10
Conclusion on efficiency.....	14
Effectiveness.....	14
Impact.....	16
Sustainability.....	17
Conclusions.....	17
Assessments of intervention results and performance against given review criteria and standards of performance.....	17
Lessons learned.....	18
Recommendations.....	18
Annexes.....	20
Annex 1 Details of the PEI Botswana.....	20
Socioeconomic Situation.....	20
Climate and Climate Change.....	20
Annex 2 Methodology for data collection and analysis.....	24
Annex 3 List of persons met.....	25
Annex 4 References consulted in the MTR for Botswana.....	27
Annex 5 Aide Memoire presented in Gaborone.....	29
Annex 6 Brief overview of some of the key social issues affecting Botswana’s population..	34
AIDS HIV.....	34
Gender and gender violence.....	34
Botswana’s ethnic groups/indigenous peoples.....	35
Annex 7 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	37
Annex 8: Advocacy and communication strategy.....	44

Main findings

The Botswana PEI (PEI) has found a good entry point to champion poverty environment (PE) mainstreaming in the government at high, middle, and, as the PEI proceeds with future activities, at decentralized levels, including among community base organisations (CBOs) and NGOs. In line with the PEI approach to PE mainstreaming, the programme implementation team is currently housed at the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. The rationale behind the institutional anchoring of the Programme Implementation Team is relevant and appreciated by Ministries of Finance and Development Planning and Environment Wildlife and Tourism as a good strategy for engaging other line ministries in PE mainstreaming. In general, the degree of achieved institutional connectedness is good. Furthermore, PEI appears fairly effective at linking ministries. The adequacy of advice and inputs by the PEF, Africa RT and Botswana country team is high, and the level and competence of technical assistance is also good and appreciated by government and the UN.

Value added: PEI added value includes the development of partnerships with IIED and the World Bank (WAVES), and UNEP Geneva (on Green Economy). These partnerships enhance the quality of the programme and provide an important aspect of global networking and benchmarking, dealing with emerging issues, pursuing programme synergies (e.g. WB WAVES programme on PEI-BW Output 5 activities) and co-financing options, and global cutting edge input into the work of PEI Botswana.

Although the poverty aspect of PEI could be further strengthened (e.g. by enhancing the involvement of Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government), PEI adds value to PE development planning by broadening the otherwise generally conservation focused environmental agenda to encompass people-centered and socio-economic aspects. The inclusion of climate change in the Botswana PEI is also relevant because the anticipated impact of climate change on the environment and livelihoods in Southern Africa is considerable. In Botswana's case, this inclusion seems not to be creating a problem of spreading PEI too thinly over too many thematic areas. On the contrary, the climate change adaptation agenda constitutes an opportunity to promote PE considerations in government.

Despite the fairly good progress mentioned above, there have however, been some efficiency problems. The implementation of the two-year PEI is at a crucial juncture. There were extensive delays in starting: a three-month delay before the project manager was installed, a nine-month one before the international technical assistance advisor started. Most of the delays are as a result of processes outside of ATLAS e.g. procurement approval processes. The delays are substantial in a project designed to last 24 months. The main findings therefore focus more on addressing how to mitigate the fallout of these delays rather than on a description of any impact, which cannot reasonably be expected to have accrued yet. PEI will not be able to spend all monies included in the budget or finish all activities before ending in December 2011¹. It is difficult to ascertain progress vis-à-vis the intentions of the PRODOC, because few clear targets have been set for the results/outputs and activities. Furthermore, the PRODOC contains no indicators and baseline for outcome 2, so it will also be difficult to measure programme outcomes. Moreover, no reporting takes place against the indicators in the joint programme-monitoring framework in the PRODOC, and the output indicators reported on in the progress reports change from one report to the next. Furthermore, the actual uptake and utilization of the knowledge and skills provided through awareness-raising and capacity building are not systematically monitored yet. However, steps are already being taken to improve M&E and indicators.

Poverty is multidimensional, including non-income and income factors. Non-income poverty includes factors such as HIV-AIDS, gender, ethnicity, and indigenous peoples. Even though a project design

¹ Approximately 1,000,000 USD was spent by August 2011 (while in Botswana the mid term review team requested exact figures: these will be added to the final draft when made available). Approximately 1,000,000 USD will not be spent before the PEI Botswana ends in December 2011.

cannot mention all social, poverty and environmental problems that the PEI aims to tackle, and even though HIV-AIDS, ethnicity and gender are sensitive issues, they are profitably mentioned in the Botswana context because they have PE connectivity (cf. UNFPA, and UNICEF documents²); and because of PEI's aim to mainstream poverty and environment (in all their relevant aspects) at high and middle levels of government. For this reason, HIV-AIDS, gender, and ethnicity issues should have enjoyed greater prominence in PEI design.

Despite these issues, some activities have already resulted in concrete products, e.g., the advocacy & communication strategy has been designed.

Main recommendations

- Involve poverty oriented line ministries (including Agriculture and Local Government) more actively in PEI and the project technical committee (this is foreseen in the coming months).
- Reduce the over ambitious scope of the study of one of the main agriculture support programmes³ in Botswana, and, before any more activities take place connected to this study, to i) consult with Agriculture and obtain their 100% buy-in in the study (to pre-empt Agriculture at a later stage from being able to disregard the study findings as being irrelevant because they were not involved in design or implementation of study activities); ii) to change the methodology of the study from a mainly extractive, large scale, statistically valid sample type of study to one which combines participatory and inclusive methods. It is important to identify incentives, which can be used to bring Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government on board⁴.
- Although the M&E approach is in line with UN requirements, it is recommended to continue the ongoing redesigning to improve M&E the monitoring system, including indicators and targets, and report systematically and regularly against indicators and targets at all levels.
- Monitor actual uptake and utilization by stakeholders of skills and knowledge provided through capacity building and awareness-raising.
- Give the programme a no-cost extension up till end 2012, on condition that: i) The programme work plan focuses on consolidation and integration in government ii) Ministry of Finance dedicates one staff member to work with the PEI full-time or at least 50% time- or use an ad hoc arrangement that meets this recommendation and that is acceptable to both sides; iii) UNDP Botswana provides more technical support to PEI.
- Develop a procurement plan for services (e.g. consultant input) and prepare terms of reference in advance of the planned input date, in order to try and reduce delays. Furthermore, PEI should utilize existing framework contracts with national institutions, and thereby involve service providers quickly.
- Should funds for a second phase of PEI Botswana become available, it is recommended to operate with a longer and more realistic timeframe, e.g. five years with clearly established outcome objectives and targets. However, the second phase should be divided into two stages, with financing for the second stage being conditional upon successful delivery of the targets of the first stage.

² UNFPA, 2007. Second Common Country Assessment for Botswana; UNICEF/GOB, 1989, Children, Women and Development in Botswana: A Situation Analysis, Gaborone. UNICEF Botswana, 2005. "A shining example..."

³ Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of the Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development.

⁴ The MTR team unsuccessfully tried to meet ministry of Agriculture and Local Government representatives, e.g. to discuss areas of interest in relation to PE issues, so the MTR team are lamentably unable to provide answers here on this issue.

- Advocacy and communication strategy: as a training and mentoring exercise for the communication specialist (hence serving a dual purpose), the communication specialist and project manager are recommended to conduct participatory consultation focus groups outside Gaborone with grassroots stakeholders. Since training of district councils has begun, funded by PEI, it is suggested that the communication specialist participate by piggybacking in these sessions as an observer to conduct focus groups to improve quality of data for improving the design of the communication strategy.
- PEI would be recommended to mention gender/gender mainstreaming and vulnerability in the possible phase 2 PRODOC in the indicators in the new M&E system.
- Include an additional member of staff with a specific poverty focus/training in the Government counterpart organization and in the project implementation unit (This recommendation is probably redundant already because MTR has been informed that under UNDAF, UNDP are recruiting a Poverty Expert for placement with MFDP (as currently perceived) in support of activities under the UNDAF Component on Poverty and Economic Diversification; PEI BW would work closely with the specialist.

Main lessons learned

The main lessons learned are: i) the UN (and also Government of Botswana) systems of procurement are rather slow and sometimes inefficient: an inception phase of 6 months could permit the project to make all arrangements and get staff into place before actual start date; ii) a delay of 9 months to contract the ITA inevitably led to inefficiencies of implementation and delay; iii) Government could—with hindsight—have been requested to clarify if the project implementation unit and the “poverty section” currently in Finance were going to move to the Office of the President before start-up, so that an alternative procurement and budgeting system could have been designed to reduce delays; iv) large scale studies, while they may be useful in the long term, will with difficulty produce results in a two-year project— a lesson learned here is that qualitative, or much smaller scope baseline/socio economic surveys studies might be more useful in a new programme designed for an initial phase of two years only.

Introduction

The overall purpose of this review is described in the Terms of Reference for the MTR (Annex 7). As far as possible the MTR team has endeavoured to make “findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery” of the Botswana PEI. However, given the constraints of budget and time, the level of detail cannot be as deep as would be the case of a country evaluation with two to three weeks in-country, a period of time that would be more normally associated with a review of a country programme with similar budget (2.25 million USD).

Questions asked

The main questions the MTR team made refer to: eliciting opinions from stakeholders about PEI’s relevance to national policies, in particular concerning the links between the overall PEI PRODOC result framework and the Botswana PRODOC; and the strategy’s relevance and realism for meeting the implementation challenge on time. Effectiveness: i) adequacy of advice and inputs by the PEF, the Africa RT and the Botswana country team on PE mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management; and ii) institutional connectedness, and whether PEI is effective at linking ministries of finance with line ministries and e.g. ministries of environment, and agriculture, and at enhancing collaboration between ministries with environment and poverty related mandates. Efficiency: i) assessment of completion of key activities and achieving programme outputs: assessment of progress towards achieving targets and expected outcomes vis-à-vis each result area (also asked at global levels); ii) review PEI execution modalities, i.e. the management and institutional set-up (membership and profiles, cost-effectiveness, lead agency, national ownership

including the role of the national management). Preparing for impact and sustainability: i) assessment of changes in the degree to which pro poor environmental sustainability is included and operationalised in national, sector and sub-national development plans and budgets; ii) the likelihood of the outputs and outcomes that PEI is producing bringing about durable change and ensuring that environment and poverty concerns are embedded in institutional development planning processes used by different sectors of the government.

Mid term review team and organisation of the annexes

The country mission to Botswana was undertaken from 9-15 August by PEMConsult of Copenhagen. David Moore, team leader, poverty and livelihoods expert, and Kris Rao, livelihoods and natural resources expert, comprised the team. The team stayed in Gaborone only. The methodology used by the MTR team is in Annex 2. The list of persons met by the MTR team is found in Annex 3. Annex 4 refers to the literature consulted and which is cross-referenced in this report. Annex 5 is the Aide Memoire presented in Gaborone on August 15. Annex 6 presents a brief overview of some of the key social issues affecting Botswana's population. Annex 7 are the TOR of the MTR. Annex 8 has some details of the advocacy and communication strategy.

The reviewed intervention

PEI aims to support the integration and harmonization of sustainable renewable natural resource management in national, sectoral and district level policy planning and budgetary processes. In particular it aims to develop awareness and promote action to tackle key environmental problems and their socio-economic impacts in order to support delivery of the Government's Vision 2016 and National Development Plan 10 (National Development Plan 10) which, as over-arching goals, intend to support economic growth and diversification and eradicate poverty. In addition PEI will provide some support to assist the Government in responding and adapting to climate change by enhancing the knowledge base on the socio-economic impacts of climate change.

According to the PRODOC, Phase 1 of PEI will run from 2010 to 2011 with an anticipated second phase to follow in 2012. The main activities include, i) development of an advocacy & communication strategy to create awareness of PE linkages and issues, ii) awareness raising workshops for government, NGOs and media, iii) support to the national Strategy for Sustainable development and Rio+20 processes to include PE linkages (e.g. a workshop on Green Economy and awareness raising), iv) support to parliamentary committees on climate change issues including support to negotiations and on understanding the links between climate change and PE, and vi) Preparation for Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of the Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development, and one Economic Study with overview paper on contribution of environment and natural resources to the economy (GDP) and two sector studies on agriculture and tourism, and a final product in the form of a policy brief (cf. Annex 1 for more details of PEI, including implemented and ongoing activities vis-à-vis the PRODOC).

Organisation and management

Global-overall organisation and management of PEI

The PEI Joint Management Board consists of the Director of UNDP's Environment and Energy Group, UNEP's Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation⁵. The Poverty and environment Facility (PEF) based in Nairobi is jointly managed by a Director and a Manager, appointed by UNDP and UNEP, who report to the Board. It is charged with global coordination and management of the programme, including budget management and reporting to donors on expenditure and results. It also offers knowledge management and technical advisory services to the regional and country programmes. Each country programme is developed jointly with the Government and formalized in a joint Programme Document (PRODOC) approved by the main Government partners, the PEF, and the UNDP Country Office.

⁵ Until August 2010, the UNEP representative was the Director of the Division of Regional Cooperation).

Under the guidance of the PEF, the PEI regional teams provide support to the country programmes, and uses the results framework in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC and reports with the PEI country partners against this results framework and associated indicators. The PEI regional teams also support the design and delivery of the country programmes, in cooperation with the UNDP country office and the Government, and is responsible for responding to demand in their respective region.

PEI Botswana organisation and management

PEI is embedded in the overall UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Botswana and reports to the UNDAF Steering Committee. PEI is integrated in two of the UNDAF components, economic diversification and poverty reduction, and environment and climate change. As specified in the PRODOC, the UNDAF economic diversification and poverty reduction Component Coordination Group acts as Programme Technical Committee for PEI Botswana. In addition to the formal UNDAF Component Coordination Groups, an informal PEI specific project technical committee has been formed to provide more detailed guidance to PEI implementation, the Project Technical Committee meets quarterly. The design of the PEI intervention in Botswana was undertaken by the PEI Africa regional team and UNDP Botswana in coordination with the Government of Botswana in connection with the detailed designed of the UNDAF/ United Nations Programme Operational Plan .

Programme implementation team

There is a programme implementation team headed by a Programme Manager who is advised by an International Technical Adviser. The administrative/finance assistant position has been vacant since 1 August 2011, and the previous assistant was for personal reasons unable to fulfil her duties, which has added to the workload of the Programme Manager and International Technical Adviser. As from 1 August 2011, a third member of staff, a communications/media specialist, has been employed through the United Nations Volunteer mechanism. Currently, the Programme Implementation Team is in the Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section, under the Socio-economic Policy Sub-division of the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, which is scheduled to be relocated to the Office of the President. The Programme Implementation Team handles day-to-day management and implementation of PEI Botswana. Together with the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, the Programme Implementation Team handles planning and operational management of the programme, as well as reporting and accounting, monitoring and evaluation of the programme activities. In turn Programme Implementation Team provides support and advise to internal Ministry of Finance and Development Planning processes.

Budgeting and financial monitoring and evaluation

The total budget for PEI is USD 2,250,000, of which UNDP Botswana and UNDP-UNEP PEI each contribute USD 1,000,000 and Government contributes an equivalent of USD 250,000 in kind over a two-year period. Since PEI is a jointly managed initiative with pooled funds, contributions from PEI Scale-up donors are pooled and jointly managed by the PEF under the UNDP Atlas system in accordance with UNDP NEX procedures. Planning, disbursements, procurement, and financial accounting are currently handled by UNDP. However, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning is in the process of establishing a “below-the-line” account; once this account is in place, UNDP will transfer funds to Ministry of Finance and Development Planning in tranches and Ministry of Finance and Development Planning will handle procurement of goods and services below USD 30,000 in accordance with Government procedures. The budget is developed by the PEF in consultation with PEI Africa and PEI Botswana team. The budget is based on the commitments as stipulated in the PEI Botswana prodoc and annual work plans. UNDP Botswana currently makes all disbursements which are immediately recorded in ATLAS. In 2010, PEI spent a total of USD 107,528 as follows: National staff USD 30,751, local consultants 15,873, contractual services USD 52,661, Sundry USD 113.

Stakeholders

The main PEI stakeholders in Botswana are:

Stakeholder	PEI relevance
Ministry of Finance and Development Planning	Responsible for planning and coordination across ministries, and as specified in the PRODOC, (Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section) hosts the Programme Implementation Team and co-chairs the Programme Technical Committee with Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism
Office of the President	Planned to assume responsibility for poverty eradication. The Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section is planned to move from Ministry of Finance and Development Planning to Office of the President
Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	Co-chairs the Programme Technical Committee with Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, as specified in the PRODOC
UNDP	UN country lead and responsible for administration support and financial management for PEI
Ministry of Agriculture	Responsible for developing the agriculture and livestock sectors and support to rural poor depending natural resources for agricultural production
Ministry of Local Government	Responsible for support and regulation of district councils
Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources	Responsible for regulating the mining sector, which has a significant influence on the environment and job creation and is the main generator of revenues
Ministry of Lands and Housing	Responsible for land use planning and land tribunals
District councils	Responsible for development and implementation of district development plans
University of Botswana	Generates new knowledge on PE, e.g. in relation to PEI studies. Educates future government staff and decision-makers
Civil Society Organisations	Environment and rural development NGOs
Media	Outreach, a possible vehicle for awareness creation on PE issues
Private sector	Can impact on the environment and on poor, both in terms of negative impacts (e.g. pollution of aquifers/water supplies) and positive impacts (e.g. employment creation)

Findings

Progress on results

Relevance

Botswana is a mid-income country. But its economy is overly dependent on natural resources, especially minerals. Furthermore, the non-extractive economy depend on renewable natural resources such as land, agricultural soils, water resources, fisheries and forests for supporting key economic activities including tourism, agriculture and industry. However, environmental degradation is a major issue⁶. 69% of Botswana's land is degraded as a result of deforestation, overgrazing, and erosion. Nonetheless, sustainable utilization of natural resources through improved and pro-poor management (e.g. community-based natural resource management, soil-water conservation, eco-tourism, renewable energy) also presents opportunities to improve the livelihoods of rural poor. Southern Africa is generally anticipated as being one of the regions to be negatively affected by climate change. Given the current poverty rate of 30%, poverty eradication is a high priority for Botswana. Given the clear poverty-environment linkages and issues, PEI is relevant for Botswana.

Government's development priorities are guided by Vision 2016 and National Development Plan 10 (2010-2016). The latter promotes an integrated approach and has eight inter-ministerial thematic

⁶ Cf. M. Darkoh, Desertification in Botswana.

working groups covering priority areas⁷, including i) sustainable economic growth and competitiveness; i) b) sustainable environment, to which the PEI responds. Although Botswana is not a designated One UN country, the Government and UN follow the One UN principles: All UN agencies and activities operate through the UNDAF framework, which through five components⁸ directly supports four of the eight priority areas of National Development Plan¹⁰. As previously mentioned, PEI is integrated in the UNDAF component on i) economic diversification and poverty reduction, and ii) environment and climate change. The UNDAF is implemented through the United Nations Programme Operational Plan.

Despite PEI being integrated into the UNDAF management structure, the informal Project Technical Committee was formed to provide more detailed guidance to PEI implementation, as it has proven impossible to get this level of implementation management support from the UNDAF/ United Nations Programme Operational Plan Component Coordination Group. The integration with UNDAF and the support for specific National Development Plan 10 components is appropriate and relevant; and the pragmatic approach of combining UNDAF committees with an informal PTC for more specific support appears justified and relevant, although key line ministries (e.g. Agriculture and Local Government) which have poverty/development mandates, while represented in the Project Technical Committee, do not yet participate very actively (although some activities with the latter Ministry have already taken place- capacity building/training at decentralised council levels).

In line with the PEI approach to PE mainstreaming, the programme implementation team is currently housed at the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. The rationale behind the institutional anchoring of the Programme Implementation Team is relevant and appreciated by Ministries of Finance and Development Planning and Environment Wildlife and Tourism as a good strategy for engaging other line ministries in PE mainstreaming.

The PEI Botswana's intervention logic, outputs and activities accord with the approach and strategy of Phase 1 as outlined in the global PEI Scale-up PRODOC. Furthermore, with an integrated approach being embraced by National Development Plan 10, the timing of PEI is good and Government appears open towards the PE mainstreaming agenda and interested in enhancing its capacity to deal with PE issues. The focus on awareness creation and capacity building is also relevant, because the "how to" remains a challenge for Government and other stakeholders. The Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development and sector economic studies are a good entry point to generate important information and engage with key non-environmental line ministries.

Although the poverty aspect of PEI could be further strengthened (e.g. by enhancing the involvement of Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government), PEI adds value to PE development planning by broadening the otherwise generally conservation focused environmental agenda to encompass people-centred and socio-economic aspects. The Local Government ministry's involvement is crucial, from an entry points and strategic perspective, since PEI wants to mainstream PE linkages at district level development planning. The inclusion of climate change in the PEI is also relevant because the anticipated impact of climate change on the environment and livelihoods in Southern Africa is high. In Botswana's case, this inclusion seems not to be creating a problem of spreading PEI too thinly over too many thematic areas. On the contrary, the climate change adaptation agenda constitutes an opportunity to promote PE considerations in government.

Gender: The designers of PEI did not include the gender dimension enough in its design. In Botswana, gender equality is a key poverty and environment issue. Although Botswana has made considerable progress with regard to gender equality, in that many previously-discriminatory laws

⁷ 1) Competitive and productive human resources, 2) knowledge society, 3) sustainable economic growth and competitiveness, 4) sustainable environment, 5) enhanced well being and social responsibility, 6) safe, secure and peaceful nation, 7) open and transparent governance, and 8) national unity, pride, morality and tolerance

⁸ 1) Economic diversification and poverty reduction, 2) environment and climate change, 3) children, youth and women, 4) health and HIV/AIDS, 5) Governance and human rights promotion

have been reformed and women enjoy reasonably equal access to jobs, education and health care, women nevertheless experience higher poverty rates than males, higher unemployment, lower pay for similar work, and are increasingly victims of crime (rape and femicide) (UNFPA 2007: 5).

Ethnicity: Ethnically, Botswana is reasonably homogeneous. While ethnic origin of the population is not formally recorded, the census does record first language. This shows that 78% of the population are Setswana speaking, 8% speak Kalanga, 3% speak Sekgalagadi, and English, Sembukushu and Sesarwa 2% each. The remaining 5% speak a range of other languages. There are concerns that some minority communities (such as Bakgalagadi, Bayei, Bambukushu, Basarwa/San, Baherero etc.), particularly those living in the more remote areas of western Botswana, experience higher poverty rates and less favourable human development (health & education etc.), although data [are] not available to measure this directly (UNFPA 2007: 5) (cf. Annex 6).

Rights-based approaches to Botswana's development attempt to look beyond national averages to consider the specific situation of women and children, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and other weak or marginalized groups. Where possible, data are presented on development as it affects these groups, although in many cases the data are not available to do so (UNFPA 2007: 2). An inclusive approach to development pays particular attention to the most disadvantaged and vulnerable members of society and emphasizes human dignity, equity and equality among geographic regions, among ethnic groups, social strata, between men and women, between adults and children, and is measured in terms of the progress of all members of society towards realizing the aims and principles of the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs (UNFPA 2007: 4-5).

Experience of development programmes shows that – even if dimensions such as gender and ethnicity / ethnic rights are supposedly included “by default” in programme activities– if they are not specifically mentioned in a log frame, then they may not be prioritised sufficiently, or even neglected in project activities. Gender in Botswana is a vital dimension of poverty and environment, and therefore warrants highlighting if possible in project strategy as a cross cutting issue. Ethnicity and indigenous peoples, although delicate subjects in Botswana, need as much as possible, and in diplomatic ways, to be mainstreamed and mentioned in project monitoring systems and activities: this is also a requirement of Danida, one of PEI's donors/supporters. Danida (cf. Danida 1, Danida 2) has practical guides to including indigenous/ethnic dimensions in development planning and also in M&E, which can usefully be consulted.

Recommendation: PEI would be recommended to mention gender/gender mainstreaming and ethnicity in the current M&E system and also in a possible future phase in its new PRODOC, because ethnicity and gender are part of the poverty dimension in Botswana, and because the MDGs measure gender equality (UNFPA 2007)).

Conclusion on relevance

Overall the PEI is found to be: i) highly relevant to Government policy in the areas of poverty reduction, pro-poor growth and protection of the environment, and is relevant to the development challenges in Botswana; ii) relevant in design and strategy, with the caveat that gender and ethnicity (as important aspects of poverty/vulnerability) could have been highlighted; iii) relevant in its choice of partners from the UN, Government, and civil society sectors; iv) relevant to the needs of the rural and urban poor of Botswana whose livelihoods depend heavily on a diminishing natural resource base; and v) relevant to the policies of One UN and UNDAF Botswana's poverty reduction and environmental objectives. The relevance of the PRODOC design to Botswana's development and PE issues could be enhanced by inclusion of gender and ethnicity / indigenous peoples as parameters for monitoring and planning.

Efficiency

It is useful to consider efficiency, broken down by the outputs:

Output 1: Economic evidence of the impacts and costs and benefits of both environmental degradation and climate change generated and disseminated.

Project administration and management: efficiency of staff has been somewhat hampered by some transport and slow internet speed problems in the Office in the ministry of Finance. These inefficiencies affect the project staff's ability to perform as it is often difficult to get transport from MFDP as the demand is more than the available resources.

The main indicative activities under this output are: strategic analytical studies; policy briefs, presentations, communications materials; regular dialogues, debates with policy makers, civil society organizations, and private sector. There has also been capacity building to develop PE specialist expertise in key institutions. There do not appear to be any negative issues associated with the efficiency of delivery of the training of 30 participants from Central Statistics Office, MFDP, Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism, MoA, Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources. Two important ongoing activities under this output are: Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of ISPAD and the Economic study of NR sectors (agriculture and tourism). Although there have been/continue to be efficiency concerns that affect these activities, in general the activities are underway now, although not all activities could be finished before the end of the two-year PEI.

Delays associated with contracting affected some of the activities are well reported in PEI M&E systems: e.g. "The highlights for the 2nd quarter 2011 period include the following: Evaluation of the request for proposals for the economic analysis of natural resources study. *The downside was that it took almost the whole quarter to finalise the contracting process.* A lesson for the future is to have all preparation well before the anticipated start date of any consultancy" (our emphasis) (quoted from QPR⁹).

Output 2: National capacity to integrate and coordinate PE issues in national, sector and district level policies, plans, budgets and monitoring systems enhanced.

The main indicative activities under this output are technical inputs to planning and policy reviews (e.g. National Strategy for Poverty Reduction, district development plans). Capacity building for oversight and technical committees and personnel (including a multi-sectoral committee on poverty reduction, natural resources technical committee) are also key activities. Some of the important activities in this component refer to development of poverty indicators, viz.:

- Develop key poverty and environment indicators
- Support the review of national & sector monitoring systems
- Capacity building for district planners and decision makers on identification and integration of P/E issues
- Facilitate the integration of PE issues in the development and monitoring of annual district plans and budgets
- Support processes to develop key poverty and environment indicators for district level monitoring including planned work on indicators by DEA.
- Support the review of district level monitoring systems

There were some delays in capacity-building. E.g., in activity 2.5 ("Capacity building for district planners on identification and integration of P/E issues in annual development plans, budgets and monitoring"), delays caused by "public sector strike affected activities in the district and delayed the workshop¹⁰".

⁹ UNDP/UNEP Poverty-Environmental initiative (PEI) botswana. Quarterly report april – june 2011 date: 15th july 2011, p. 3.

¹⁰ UNDP/UNEP Poverty-Environmental initiative (PEI) botswana. Quarterly report april – june 2011 date: 15th july 2011, p. 9.

Recommendation: PEI would be recommended to mention gender/gender mainstreaming (and, if possible, or relevant, ethnicity) in the activity “ support processes to develop key poverty and environment indicators for district level monitoring including planned work on indicators by DEA”. Indicators developed for the PEI’s M&E system could also be linked to these gender (and ethnicity) indicators for decentralized district level monitoring.

Output 3: Knowledge and awareness of PE and CC linkages by policy and decision-makers, civil society, the private sector and the media increased

Some of the key activities under this output include dialogues, conferences, workshops: e.g., the environment and development dialogue, held on 4th June in Letlhakane as part of the World Environment Day commemorations. The purpose of the dialogue was to create discussions about possible economic activities that the communities can engage in within the Makgadikgadi wetlands system.

Advocacy and communication strategy: Additionally, the advocacy and communication strategy (see Annex 8 for more details) has been carried out under this output. Even though some progress has been made, the strategy is quite behind in implementation, but should however be finished within the recommended one year no cost extension to PEI. It is important to gain momentum as soon as possible in implementing the 16-month communication strategy within Phase 1. One deficiency in the communication strategy (mainly, that it did not consult with stakeholders outside the Gaborone government and highly educated circles) will need to be addressed. (Note: the strategy states (p.15): “Ensure effective participation by all stakeholders (including non state actors and private sector) in the PEI processes”). The PRODOC states that the four categories of stakeholders (high level-government; private sector non state actors; and development partners / media) should be involved in the strategy. One additional activity is therefore recommended to be carried out as soon as possible, viz.:

Recommendation

It is recommended that- as a training and mentoring exercise for the communication specialist (hence serving a dual purpose)- the communication specialist and project manager conduct participatory consultation focus groups outside Gaborone with grassroots stakeholders. These are recommended to be: - a) urban poor and peri urban poor groups; b) farmers; c) and other vulnerable groups such as female headed households and ethnic minorities; and d) other stakeholders such as civil society organizations, the district councils, and traditional chiefs who exert power and who allot communal lands and other natural resources. Since training of district councils has begun, funded by PEI, it is suggested that the communication specialist participate by piggybacking in these sessions as an observer to conduct focus groups to improve quality of data for improving the design of the communication strategy.

Output 4: Poverty and environment issues integrated in key national development frameworks. Under this output there have been the following activities: Green Economy workshop (Sept 7-8, 2011) in cooperation with IIED, London was organized in support of NSSD and Rio+20 process.

Output 5: Application of integrated approaches, tools, methodologies and assessments for mainstreaming environment in policies and plans for promoting growth and poverty reduction enhanced.

There is insufficient information in the 2010 and 2011 Quarterly Progress Reports to report on efficiency of these two outputs: the Annual Joint Review was not obtained by the MTR; there may be information in that document.

Staff recruitment: There was a delay in employing the International Technical Advisor of six months from date of interviewing the International Technical Advisor (March 2010). (The PRODOC was signed in January 2010; the International Technical Advisor started in September 2010)).

Procurement: Procurement of goods and services is handled by UNDP, and has in some cases been rather slow, reportedly because the tendering and procurement processes are managed in a top down way: Tender offers need to be sanctioned by UNDP Pretoria. Procurement can take three months or more from when the process is started. Overall, the procurement modality determines the length of time for procurement.

The Poverty and Social Impact Analysis and economic sector studies are delayed in design, tendering and contracting phases. This means that the study results will be ready late in the programme, which delays the access to evidence supporting advocacy and communication activities under result area 3. From the point of view of the programme implementation team (in commenting on the first draft of this review report), the knock-on effect is less serious because “this is Phase I of PEI and evidence is crucially important to show the poverty dimension in the natural resources sectors so that planning and budgetary considerations may be mainstreamed; the latter is the main focus of Phase II of PEI”. Nevertheless, the review team believes that the point stands that one cannot assume that there will be a phase II of PEI. Furthermore, the PRODOC assumes the data from the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis and economic sector studies will be ready within the time frame of (the current phase of) PEI.

Transport: Initially, transport was highlighted as a problem¹¹. Transport was not budgeted for in the PRODOC as it was to be part of the Government contribution. The transport issue has been raised with UNDP on a number of occasions. At this stage, due to the relatively short time span remaining under the programme, the Programme Implementation Team is understandably reluctant to buy a vehicle, not least when considering the time consuming procurement processes, and rely on access to Ministry of Finance and Development Planning vehicles for missions and some out-of-Gaborone travels, and the private vehicles of Programme Implementation Team staff. To solve this problem in a cost-effective manner, it could be considered to rent a vehicle when necessary¹².

United Nations Programme Operational Plan implementation has experience significant delays considerably due to the process of transformation from a project/programme mode to integrated support of National Development Plan 10. As mentioned in Progress Reports, due to these delays an opportunity to influence NDP10 and District Development Plan 7 formulation was missed. The slow procurement processes also impact negatively on implementation progress.

Implementation: The delays experienced mean that PEI Botswana will not be able to move to the possible Phase 2 within the current global PEI Scale-up programme. However, while UNDP procurement procedures are a slow, procurement planning in advance could offset some of the delays, e.g. by preparing Terms of Reference well before a study is scheduled to take place. It thus appears that training and enhanced and recurring technical backstopping from UNDP Botswana on UNDP procedures, tools and requirements could improve procurement for PEI.

PE supervision arrangement: Two staff (up to September 2011, 1 staff after mid September) from the PEI Africa visit the Botswana PEI for a few days 1-3 times every quarter, depending on activities. Furthermore, PEI Africa requires biweekly email updates on activities of the Programme Implementation Team, which also provide the basis for biweekly teleconferences with the Programme Implementation Team, PEI Africa, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning and UNDP Botswana. These current reporting arrangements reportedly work well, and for PEI the exchanges are

¹¹ Quarterly Report (QR) July-September 2010 (dated 15 October 2010): the QR (p. 6) proposes procuring a vehicle.

¹² According to the programme implementation team (in commenting on the first draft of this review report), the transport issue is not resolved. Particularly because the programme will now start working with district structures and transport will be needed for prolonged activities outside Gaborone. It is highly doubtful whether MFDP transport will be available and unrealistic to assume that staff members will use their own vehicles; renting is an option but in fact may work out more expensive than a locally procured small vehicle (which could be taken into a possible Phase II).

helpful to focus programme activities, get feedback on similar activities in other PEI countries and discuss emerging issues. The Programme Implementation Team has expressed an appreciation of the technical input received from the PEI Africa Regional Manager, but the team would like more technical support.

Conclusion on efficiency

Significant delays in i) the formulation process (due to the desire to integrate PEI in the overall UNDAF and United Nations Programme Operational Plan formulation process); ii) programme implementation team staff recruitment, and iii) establishment of office facilities, have significantly affected programme progress. PEI Botswana has been delayed for approximately one year. The intended results are therefore not achievable within the two-year programme period (January 2010-Dec 2011). The programme will not be ready to move into PEI Phase 2 in 2012 as anticipated in the PRODOC. Up until June 2011 no activities were implemented under result areas 4 (USD 100,000) and 5 (200,000 USD); relatively few activities were undertaken under result area 2 (the largest cost result area (600,000 USD)). The main focus has been on implementing activities in result areas 1 (200,000 USD) and 3 (300,000 USD).

It is difficult to ascertain progress vis-à-vis the intentions of the PRODOC, because only few clear targets have been set for the results/outputs and activities. Furthermore, the PRODOC contains no indicators and baseline for outcome 2, so it will also be difficult to measure programme outcomes. Moreover, no reporting takes place against the indicators in the joint programme-monitoring framework in the PRODOC, and the output indicators reported on in the progress reports change from one report to the next. Furthermore, the actual uptake and utilization of the knowledge and skills provided through awareness-raising and capacity building is not monitored. The planning and design of the PEI is at a crucial juncture. Due to a 10-month delay in start-up, this two-year programme will not be able to spend all monies included in the budget or finish all activities before officially ending in December 2011 (approximately 1,000,000 USD has been spent by August 2011. While in Botswana the MTR team requested exact figures, which have not been made available. Approximately 1,000,000 USD will not be spent before the PEI Botswana ends in December 2011).

The dependency on the UN system and UNDP procedures, has had some major implications for PEI implementation, and has caused overall substantial delays.

Effectiveness

At the level of government policy, PEI is making its expertise and resources available to high-level planners, e.g., i) by lobbying, mentoring, and providing expert advice to ministries such as Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism on designing a new wildlife policy and support to the finalisation of the tourism policy; ii) through presentation of evidence provided from various studies (e.g., Poverty and Social Impact Analysis, and the economic sector studies). At the lower, decentralised levels of government, and also among civil society, activities such as training of project/programme staff and district planners have begun.

Specific attempts to facilitate PE integration have been made by having Ministry of Finance and Development Planning as main partner and using the UNDAF economic diversification and poverty reduction Component Coordination Group as Programme Technical Committee. PEI has so far closely involved Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism in activities. Additionally, contacts have been established with all relevant Ministries (MoA, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Minerals, Energy, and Water Resources as partners) and the planning cadre of these Ministries were invited to (and in part attended) the April 2011 workshop. It is important to emphasise that more direct involvement of these Ministries will happen as part of the planned studies and as a follow up to those studies when PE mainstreaming activities will start focusing on methods and tools for mainstreaming and actual activity within the context of the MTR of NDP10 and the next national development plan planning phase (which should coincide with the planned PEI Phase II).

Currently, Ministries of Finance and Development Planning and Environment Wildlife and Tourism are members of the informal Project Technical Committee that meets monthly, the Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government are not yet involved in this group, and are presumed to join at a later stage. The upcoming economic study on selected natural resource sectors and the joint PEI-Ministry of Agriculture and Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of the Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development may help enhance involvement of some of these ministries.

NPM and CTA have extensive experience in grassroots planning and implementation and have been involved with numerous project-based poverty activities (not only of an environmental nature but also in small scale income generation and job creation projects) throughout the country for over two decades: thus poverty and environmental expertise are well covered in the programme implementation unit.

Three activities from the results framework (1.2.2, 1.2.3, and 2.1) are used here to illustrate capacity building activities for government:

- **1.2.2** (“Undertake an economic study on the main natural resources sectors in Botswana to assess their contribution to economic growth”). The result of this study will – if used well and in a structured way – serve as a vehicle for training and capacity improvement of key government civil servants working in the Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism (Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Tourism and Department of Wildlife and National Parks), MoA, Department of Water Affairs, Department of Energy Affairs, and the Ministry of Lands and Housing to seek their buy in for the PE integration.
- **1.2.3** (“Facilitate regular dialogues with policy makers, Civil Society Organisations and Private Sector”) introductory meetings have been held with several key government¹³ agencies¹⁴.
- **2.1** (“Provide technical inputs to plan and policy reviews to promote integration of environmental sustainability across sectors/ Identify two policies that are being reviewed for mainstreaming of PE linkages”): The PEI team: i) provided input to the draft tourism policy under development in 2010; and ii) engaged with the Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism for the wildlife policy (also under review in 2010) PEI identified areas where PE mainstreaming will be required.

The above are examples of the capacity building activities PEI is doing. As with all capacity-building projects, there is some danger that because the activities are being done by PEI or by consultants hired in, that the capacity to mainstream PE will not actually be created/remain in house in the ministries/agencies. The activities are being carried out by consultants/PEI staff because of inadequate capacity for PE mainstreaming in Government. The PEI strategy rationale is that the capacity building activities are mostly targeting Government staff so that the latter will eventually be able to carry out PE mainstreaming on their own. These are initial capacity-building activities which need to be repeated, followed up, and followed on by activities which deal with the actual tools and methods to mainstream PE issues into planning and budgets. Indeed, one of the previous workshops targeted ministerial planners who are at the core of mainstreaming activities in the various line ministries; follow-up activities are in the pipeline for other key government staff.

As anticipated in the Botswana PRODOC, the intention is to move Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section, including the Programme Implementation Team, from Finance Ministry to the Office of the President. This move has not happened yet and there are some concerns that this move could impact negatively on PEI due to capacity constraints at the Office of the President and a stronger high-level political emphasis on investment projects than policy formulation. To what extent all Finance Ministry’s responsibilities vis-à-vis poverty eradication will be transferred to Office of the President remains to be seen. The possible move is not an easy issue; as there are indeed concerns that OP may be mainly interested in enhancing capacity to improve on their ‘backyard gardens’

¹³ Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism, Department of Industrial Affairs, Department of Energy Affairs, Department of Water Affairs, Department of Waste Management and Pollution Control, Department of Rural development Policy, Department of Lands, Department of Crop Production and Department of Water Affairs.

¹⁴ QR, July-Sept., 2010 (date 15 Oct. 2010), p. 7.

coordination mandate. A move may equally offer opportunity to mainstream PE issues at a higher policy level whilst maintaining strong links with MFDP and other stakeholders.

Conclusion on effectiveness

Advice and inputs by the PEF and the Africa regional office delivered to the Botswana country team on PE mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management, appear to have been satisfactory, with the caveat that connection speed of Government web servers has challenged the Botswana team's ability to respond immediately to electronic reporting. PEI has been effective at linking UN institutions, UNDP and UNEP, in one project. PEI is effectively part of the UNDAF Botswana. Outside the UN, PEI has effectively liaised with its key partner institutions in government, and at high and decentralised levels. PEI added value includes the development of partnerships with IIED and the World Bank (WAVES), and UNEP Geneva (on Green Economy). These partnerships enhance the quality of the programme and provide an important aspect of global networking and benchmarking, dealing with emerging issues, pursuing programme synergies (e.g. WB WAVES programme on PEI-BW Output 5 activities) and co-financing options, and global cutting edge input into the work of PEI Botswana. In the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, Office of the President, Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism, Ministry of Local Government and Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources, contacts have been established and activities carried out such as capacity-building for staff, and consultancies paid by PEI for production of policy papers, the Advocacy & Communication strategy, and policy workshops at central and (increasingly) at decentralized levels. Contacts need to be made stronger however between PEI and Agriculture. A problem noted by PEI Quarterly Reports is that some civil servants do not know how to include the themes, Poverty and Environment, in their daily planning activities especially as regards designing PE indicators.

Effectiveness of PEI Botswana would have been stronger without the delays which have slowed overall progress and hence diminished effectiveness; nevertheless, with the no cost one-year extension and improved momentum, there seems a good chance that PEI will overall be fairly effective.

Impact

Policy level impact: While it is too early to see clear impacts of PEI, PEI has provided input to the new Tourism and Wildlife policies. Reportedly, issues such as sustainable and pro-poor use of resources and community-based natural resource management have been incorporated in these policies. The advocacy and communication strategy is beginning to have some impact. IEC material was designed soon after the NPM was hired and brochures produced in September 2010. Banners have since been produced and other advocacy activities such as dialogues and presentations have been ongoing for more than a year. It would be useful if PEI could produce simple monitoring sheets to monitor impact of this kind of activity (IEC material/banners): this would help future evaluations of PEI and of this component.

The integration of PEI in UNDAF and its alignment with National Development Plan 10 and Vision 2016, as well as the physical location of the PIT at Ministry of Finance (which interviewed informants agree is the key institution to lead the PE mainstreaming), should facilitate the ownership and understanding of PE mainstreaming. It should also facilitate the transfer of knowledge and skills for both Government and UN Botswana to continue with PE mainstreaming in policy and planning processes and ideally in implementation.

Potential impact of the PEI is being considerably dissipated because "it is difficult for stakeholders to understand what the PEI is about". This problem involves both a lack of ownership and a lack of understanding so far. In particular, Agriculture reportedly "does not understand the PE linkages for its sector and in relation to other sectors". Given the delays in getting the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis and the economic studies to start (data results which could help persuade Agriculture and help them and others better understand PEI concepts), this problem may be critical (see recommendations, below). The problem is further exacerbated with the potentially short time frame

available to build sufficient ownership, understanding and skills to fully mainstream PE across Government practices and processes. The two-year time frame of PEI phase 1 is insufficient to deliver the expected outcomes.

Sustainability

Sustainability for a policy oriented programme like PEI has two dimensions: i) to ensure sustained changes in government practices and approaches to policy formulation and planning, so they include mainstreaming of PE considerations. This definition accords with the OECD/DAC definition of sustainability: ii) In the context of Botswana and the United Nations which promotes the PEI globally and nationally, sustainability needs to be further defined as “enhancing and ensuring poverty and environmental concerns are mainstreamed in government planning; and that government planning in one area or sector does not contradict poverty environment linkages nor United Nations and donor guidelines”.

The crucial factors which have direct bearing on sustainability of PEI within government planning and policy structures are: i) it is not possible in the time left to integrate PE in all government structures and processes (according to PEI Botswana, that was never the end goal of Phase I, in fact most of that work would happen in Phase II); ii) the PEI may not be able to go to Phase II and ensure PE integration in budgeting processes (e.g. depending on the overall PEI financing situation post 2012); iii) the government capacity to ensure continuation of PE is not yet up to mark; and iv) and is unlikely to become so because of the belt tightening (second year in a row) which resulted from the budget deficit in 2009-2010. As well as current capacity and expertise constraints, more budgetary constraints likely to emerge for the next financial year (2012).

Conclusions

Assessments of intervention results and performance against given review criteria and standards of performance

The PEI is an important attempt to mentor, lobby, and guide the government of Botswana in understanding poverty and environmental linkages and to change policies and promote PE mainstreaming in government planning and governance across all sectors, especially those most associated with poverty, people, and environment (mining, agriculture, tourism, finance, etc.).

PEI aspires to strengthen government’s understanding of PE linkages and chains of causation, and to combat poverty by mainstreaming poverty and environmental concerns in a concerted and coordinated way. PEI suffers from two constraints at the moment: **First**, its design and timetable are ambitious given the documented constraints of time and resources and the resultant delays (with the caveat that a second phase is foreseen in the PRODOC). **Secondly**, the monitoring and evaluation systems need to reflect – through additional indicators- whether poverty, gender, vulnerability, ethnicity / indigenous rights concerns are being addressed and measured in the programme (because the UN and donors are committed to promoting and mainstreaming them in their development assistance). However, it is also true that UN is currently addressing how to improve M&E and it could be problematic to add additional indicators which measure issues which were not part of the original design and activity plan of PEI BW. If a second phase of PEI is recommended, the M&E system and the level of detail of the activities in a new PRODOC would need to reflect the concerns to improve M&E.

PEI strategy and activities are relevant and the entry points well chosen. Procurement and contracting of staff and services have been generally inefficient. Resultant implementation inefficiencies have slowed down progress, and, hence, lessened potential impact at this stage. With the one year no cost extension, it is hoped that there will be more substantial impact to review at the end of 2012.

Lessons learned

The main lessons learned are:

The UN system of procurement is somewhat inefficient in delivery, therefore an ambitious programme has difficulty delivering all outputs in a two year phase (caveat: PEI was designed reportedly with a second phase in mind); Government of Botswana could – with hindsight- have been requested to clarify if the project implementation unit and the “poverty section” currently in Finance were going to move to office of the president before start-up, so that an alternative procurement and budgeting system could have been designed to reduce delays.

Large scale, expensive studies, while they may turn out to be useful in the long term, are not effective in a two-year project because until the results are known, the project’s potential lobbying and influencing power (especially regarding ministries of Agriculture and Local Government) is reduced; Since some key poverty and vulnerability issues (ethnicity and gender) have not been specifically mentioned in the PRODOC, they therefore do not enjoy sufficient profile in the activities: this is not a reflection on the programme implementation staff, but on the designers of the PEI.

Recommendations

The following actions are recommended to enhance the PEI Botswana:

- Involve poverty oriented line ministries (including Agriculture and Local Government) more actively in PEI and the project technical committee (this is foreseen in the coming months).
- Reduce the over ambitious scope of the study of one of the main agriculture support programmes¹⁵ in Botswana, and, before any more activities take place connected to this study, to i) consult with Agriculture and obtain their 100% buy-in in the study (to pre-empt Agriculture at a later stage from being able to disregard the study findings as being irrelevant because they were not involved in design or implementation of study activities); ii) to change the methodology of the study from a mainly extractive, large scale, statistically valid sample type of study to one which combines participatory and inclusive methods. It is important to identify incentives, which can be used to bring Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government on board¹⁶.
- Although the M&E approach is in line with UN requirements, it is recommended to continue the ongoing redesigning to improve M&E the monitoring system, including indicators and targets, and report systematically and regularly against indicators and targets at all levels.
- Monitor actual uptake and utilization by stakeholders of skills and knowledge provided through capacity building and awareness-raising.
- Give the programme a no-cost extension up till end 2012, on condition that: i) The programme work plan focuses on consolidation and integration in government ii) Ministry of Finance dedicates one staff member to work with the PEI full-time or at least 50% time- or use an ad hoc arrangement that meets this recommendation and that is acceptable to both sides; iii) UNDP Botswana provides more technical support to PEI.

¹⁵ Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of the Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development.

¹⁶ The MTR team unsuccessfully tried to meet ministry of Agriculture and Local Government representatives, e.g. to discuss areas of interest in relation to PE issues, so the MTR team are lamentably unable to provide answers here on this issue.

- Develop a procurement plan for services (e.g. consultant input) and prepare terms of reference in advance of the planned input date, in order to try and reduce delays. Furthermore, PEI should utilize existing framework contracts with national institutions, and thereby involve service providers quickly.
- Should funds for a second phase of PEI Botswana become available, it is recommended to operate with a longer and more realistic timeframe, e.g. five years with clearly established outcome objectives and targets. However, the second phase should be divided into two stages, with financing for the second stage being conditional upon successful delivery of the targets of the first stage.
- Advocacy and communication strategy: as a training and mentoring exercise for the communication specialist (hence serving a dual purpose), the communication specialist and project manager are recommended to conduct participatory consultation focus groups outside Gaborone with grassroots stakeholders. Since training of district councils has begun, funded by PEI, it is suggested that the communication specialist participate by piggybacking in these sessions as an observer to conduct focus groups to improve quality of data for improving the design of the communication strategy.
- PEI would be recommended to mention gender/gender mainstreaming and vulnerability in the possible phase 2 PRODOC in the indicators in the new M&E system.
- Include an additional member of staff with a specific poverty focus/training in the Government counterpart organization and in the project implementation unit (This recommendation is probably redundant already because MTR has been informed that under UNDAF, UNDP are recruiting a Poverty Expert for placement with MFDP (as currently perceived) in support of activities under the UNDAF Component on Poverty and Economic Diversification; PEI BW would work closely with the specialist.
-

Annexes

Annex 1 Details of the PEI Botswana

Socioeconomic Situation

Botswana covers a land area of 581 730km² (CSO, 2006). At the last census in 2001 Botswana's population was 1.6 million (CSO, 2001). It is estimated that the population is now about 1.8 million which is considered low for the land area (CSO, 2006). The country has a population growth rate of 2.4% although this is showing a downward trend (CSO, 2001). 77% of land area is covered by the Kgalagadi desert in the west of the country (CSO, 2006).

Women and youth who are also the least skilled and qualified make up much of the urban unemployed. They are highly active in the labour market and are also the ones most likely to migrate to urban areas.

Climate and Climate Change

Botswana's climate is arid and semi-arid, with low rainfall and high rates of evapotranspiration. Mean annual rainfall is 416 mm, ranging from 650 mm in the north east to 250 mm in the extreme southwest (CSO, 2006). Rainfall pattern has large temporal and spatial variations. Rain generally falls between October and March, but the pattern is highly irregular. Frequent droughts are characterized by conditions of low rainfall, high temperatures and elevated soil moisture stress (MEWT, 2006).

These conditions greatly diminish the ability of the agricultural sector to produce enough to meet the country's food needs. Only about 5% of the country is suitable for agricultural crop production and less than 1% is cultivated (Draft ASPR, 2007).

Drought affects the livelihoods of the majority of the population which is dependent on agriculture and the rural communities that depend on individual water sources that cannot withstand prolonged drought. Droughts have occurred in 2001-03, 2005-06 and 2007 (MFDP, 2008). The consequences of drought induced water stress adversely affects crop and livestock productivity as well as the condition of wildlife.

Botswana is vulnerable to climate variability and experiences some drought and flooding. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) indicates that over the longer term Botswana will be affected significantly by climate change. This is likely to result in increased frequency and intensity of severe weather events including droughts and floods. Whilst climatic change modelling is subject to uncertainty a general synopsis for Southern Africa suggests that Botswana may, on average, experience up to 20% less rainfall each year and that average temperatures may rise by 1-2 Celsius (MEWT, 2006).

PEI Botswana will contribute to the achievement of UNDAF outcome 2: A diversified economy whose growth is rapid, inclusive, sustainable and generates decent employment opportunities by 2016; and UNDAF outcome 4: By 2016, the rural poor, especially women, will enjoy greater benefits from the environment and natural ecosystems. The objectives of the programme are (i) to enhance Integration of equitable and sustainable development in national, sector and district level policies, plans, budgets and monitoring systems enhanced; and (ii) to improve knowledge and use of integrated frameworks, approaches, tools, methodologies and assessments for sustainable utilization of environment and natural resources improved.

PEI Botswana will assist Government in tackling the challenges identified by supporting activities to achieve the following key results:

- (i) Economic evidence of the impacts and costs and benefits of both environmental degradation and climate change generated and disseminated.
- (ii) National capacity to integrate and coordinate PE issues in national, sector and district level policies, plans, budgets and monitoring systems enhanced.

- (iii) Knowledge and awareness of PE and climate change linkages by policy and decision-makers, civil society, the private sector and the media increased
- (iv) Poverty and environment issues integrated in key national development framework
- (v) Application of integrated approaches, tools, methodologies and assessments for mainstreaming environment in policies and plans for promoting growth and poverty reduction enhanced

The table below compares the indicated activities for each result as indicated in the PRODOC with implemented and ongoing activities from Jan 2010 to June 2011.

PRODOC indicative activities	2010 work plan activities/targets	2011 work plan activities	Implemented Jan 2010 – June 2011	Ongoing/under preparation June 2011
OUTCOME 1: INTEGRATION OF EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN NATIONAL, SECTOR AND DISTRICT LEVEL POLICIES, PLANS, BUDGETS, AND MONITORING SYSTEMS ENHANCED				
Output 1: Economic evidence of the impacts and costs and benefits of both environmental degradation and climate change generated and disseminated.				
Strategic analytical studies	2 strategic analytical studies	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of Integrated Support Programme on Arable Agriculture Development Economic study of NR sectors (agriculture and tourism)		Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of ISPAD Economic study of NR sectors (agriculture and tourism)
Policy briefs, presentations, communications materials	2 policy briefs	Policy brief on economic study findings Presentation to parliament, (i)Civil Society Organisations, private sector of study findings	Policy brief and summary brief on environment outlook	
Regular dialogues/debates policy makers/ (i) Civil Society Organisations, private sector	- 2 dialogues/ debates - situational analysis on knowledge management networks	Policy advisory to MSCPR	Introductory meetings with: Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism, and 8 Departments	
Capacity building to develop PE specialist expertise in key institutions	- Capacity building needs assessment - Training modules Capacity building for 30 participants	Training of 30 participants from Central Statistics Office, MFDP, Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism, MoA, Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources on PE mainstreaming	- Trained members of the Project Technical Committee on PE issues	
Output 2: National capacity to integrate and coordinate PE issues in national, sector and district level policies, plans, budgets and monitoring systems enhanced.				
Technical inputs to plan & policy reviews (e.g. National Strategy for Poverty Reduction, district development plans, RNPRD?)	Inventory of key PE policies	Review of NSPR	2 Advisory notes on PE integration (in tourism and wildlife policies) Information note for Rio+20 preparation	Green economy workshop Preparation for Rio+20 Retreat on improving poverty coordination
Capacity building for oversight and technical committees and personnel (incl. multi-sectoral committee on poverty reduction, natural resources technical committee)		Training for technical committee members 3 sensitization seminars for MSFPR, NRTC and TPAC committee members	Half day awareness workshop for committees Participation in CC workshop for parliamentary committees Workshop on PE linkages for MSPR? and NRTC Capacity assessment of 2 parliamentary committees	
Annual public expenditure review on impact of environment and natural resource expenditures	District Planning Handbook Audit Report	PE audit of District Planning Handbook Audit Report Sensitization seminar Analysis of public expenditure on environment and natural resources		ToRs are in place
Develop poverty and	Report on PE indicators	Identify PE indicators at		

PRODOC indicative activities	2010 work plan activities/targets	2011 work plan activities	Implemented Jan 2010 – June 2011	Ongoing/under preparation June 2011
environment indicators		national, sector and district levels		
Support reviews of national and sector monitoring systems	1 policy plan with PE indicators in monitoring system			
Capacity building for district planners and decision makers on identification and integration of PE issues	Capacity building for district planners and decision makers: - Sensitization of 30 decision makers - Training of 50 planners	Development of PE mainstreaming guidelines for district planners 2 training seminars 2 training sessions for district planners on use of guidelines	PE mainstreaming workshop for planning officers from ministries	
Integration of PE issues in development and monitoring of annual district plans and budgets				
Development of district level poverty and environment indicators, including Department of Environmental Affairs indicators		PE indicators		
Review of district monitoring systems		Review report on existing systems and process for collection of PE data		
OUTCOME 2: KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF INTEGRATED FRAMEWORKS, APPROACHES, TOOLS, METHODOLOGIES, AND ASSESSMENTS FOR SUSTAINABLE UTILIZATION OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES IMPROVED				
Output 3: Knowledge and awareness of PE and CC linkages by policy and decision-makers, civil society, the private sector and the media increased				
Materials to promote awareness and debate by parliamentarians on PE and CC	Communication and advocacy materials	Communications and advocacy strategy implemented to promote awareness IEC materials developed Recruit communications intern	Communications intern recruited Promotional banners Brochure Communication strategy	
Policy debates with Government, civil society, private sector and donors on PE linkages to support inclusion in policies and plans	Policy debates	Environment and development dialogue debates facilitated quarterly Policy dialogue on the role of natural resources	Environment and development dialogue on community economic activities in Makgadikgadi wetlands for private sector, civil society, government and public - TV debate on biodiversity and poverty alleviation	Environment and development dialogue on CC and food security
Training media to increase awareness and coverage of PE and CC	Media training		- 2 media awareness workshops	- Media workshop on PE reporting
Promote civil society capacity, awareness, coordination and research to input PE and CC issues in plan and policy making processes	Civil society training/awareness	- PE linkages workshop for (i) Civil Society Organisations - Civil Society Organisation capacity building needs assessment	Central Statistics Office awareness workshop	
Output 4: Poverty and environment issues integrated in key national development framework				
Analysis of critical PE and CC contributions to achievement of national development priorities to inform MTR of National Development Plan 10	Study on PE and CC contributions			
Review of sector policies and plans to inform National strategy for Sustainable Development outcomes	Assessment of selected sector policies and plans			

PRODOC indicative activities	2010 work plan activities/targets	2011 work plan activities	Implemented Jan 2010 – June 2011	Ongoing/under preparation June 2011
Output 5: Application of integrated approaches, tools, methodologies and assessments for mainstreaming environment in policies and plans for promoting growth and poverty reduction enhanced.				
Tools and methodologies for integrated assessments linked to existing plans, e.g. ODMP	- Development of tools - 2 training sessions			
Training on application of tools and methodologies for integrated assessments (IEAs, SEAs, Poverty and Social Impact Analysis, economic analysis)				
Pilot ecosystem assessments in 2 priority ecosystems				
Pilot economic valuation of key environment and natural resource sectors and promote integration in national system of accounts	Pilot economic valuation of key environment and natural resource sectors Training in economic valuation Sensitization of economic planners/Central Statistics Office Updating and publication of accounts Support integration of natural accounts (water, livestock, minerals) into the NA			

Annex 2 Methodology for data collection and analysis

The methodology for the MTR in Botswana is based on the following activities:

- Interview key stakeholders, individually or in small thematic groups: ask key questions that are not leading, listen with respect and engage in a mutual learning process in reviewing project progress. This attitude is important for reviewing the PEI because PEI is a programme with great emphasis on lobbying, advocacy, and mentoring.
- Desk review of key documents (at home office, in Nairobi, and in Botswana)
- Key questions to key stakeholders that emerge from close reading of the key documentation
- Follow up interviews with the same stakeholders if clarifications are necessary/ if any points were unclear from prior meetings/interviews
- Close coordination with the Botswana PEI programme team, the PEF team, and Africa regional team in Nairobi
- Final participatory SWOT analysis with key government and civil society stakeholders (including the Africa regional team responsible for Botswana) in Gaborone in order to ensure preliminary findings are on track, to clarify misconceptions and to make recommendations that are realistic, possible to implement and monitor within the timeframe of the PEI, and which have ownership by the stakeholders

Annex 3 List of persons met

People met, PEI Botswana

Date	Person	Position/Institution
8 Aug (Nairobi)	Themba Kalua	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Anne Nielsen	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
9 Aug	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
10 Aug	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
	Ruud Jansen	Chief Technical Adviser, PEI
10 Aug	Disikalala M. Gaseitsiwe	Deputy Secretary, Socio-Economic Policy, MFD
	Chada Koketso	Head, Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section, Socio-Economic Policy Sub-Division, MFD
	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
10 Aug	Ruud Jansen	Chief Technical Adviser, PEI
10 Aug	Ingrid Otukile	Chief Natural Resources Officer, Department of Environmental Affairs, MEWT
11 Aug	Leonard Dikobe	Programme Specialist (Energy and Environment), UNDP
11 Aug	Steve Monna	Director, Department of Environmental Affairs, MEWT
11 Aug	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
11 Aug	Sennyne Obuseng	Economist, UNDP
12 Aug	Khin-Sandi Lwin	UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative
12 Aug	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
14 Aug	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
15 Aug	Dorcas Masisi	Principal Meteorologist, DNA, Dept of Meteorological Services, MWET
	Moemi Batshabang	DWNP/MEWT
	Themba Kalua	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Anne Nielsen	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Kutlwano Sebolaaphuti	MFD
	Keneilwe Moseki	Executive Director, ST
	Mookho Kamyuka	DTRP
	Balisi Gopolang	Principal Meteorologist, Dept of Meteorological Services, MWET
	Kuda Mpolokang	Department of Environmental Affairs, MEWT
	Elsie Tolani Mvimi	National Coordinator, GEFSmall Grants Programme, UNDP
	Angela Mdlalani	Communications intern, PEI
	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
15 Aug	Elsie Tolani Mvimi	National Coordinator, GEFSmall Grants Programme, UNDP
	Angela Mdlalani	Communications intern, PEI
	Boatametse Modukanele	Programme Manager, PEI
	Themba Kalua	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Anne Nielsen	Programme Officer, Africa Regional

Date	Person	Position/Institution
		Team, PEI
	Kutlwano Sebolaaphuti	MFDP
	Sennye Obuseng	Economist, UNDP
	Chada Koketso	Head, Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section, Socio-Economic Policy Sub-Division, MFDP
	Mookho Kamyuka	DTRP
16 Aug	Themba Kalua	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Anne Nielsen	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
17 Aug (Nairobi)	David Smith	Manager, Africa Regional Team, PEF, PEI
	Alex Forbes	Programme Specialist, Assessments, PEF, PEI
	Victoria Luque	Programme Officer, PEF, PEI
17 Aug (Nairobi)	David Smith	Manager, Africa Regional Team, PEF, PEI
	Alex Forbes	Programme Specialist, Assessments, PEF, PEI
	Victoria Luque	Programme Officer, PEF, PEI
	Themba Kalua	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
	Anne Nielsen	Programme Officer, Africa Regional Team, PEI
20 Aug (Nairobi)	David Smith	Manager, Africa Regional Team, PEF, PEI

Annex 4 References consulted in the MTR for Botswana

Darkoh, M, “Desertification in Botswana” RALA Report no. 200. Department of Environmental Science, University of Botswana, Private Bag 0022, Gaborone, Botswana.

Danida 1, “Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous Peoples”.
<http://www.amg.um.dk/NR/ronlyres/05BBD684-3752-42C1-ADD2-E6DC93BBFA9C/0/StrategyForDanishSupportToIndigenousPeople.pdf>.

Danida 2, “Monitoring and Indicators: Indigenous Peoples in Bilateral Assistance March 2006” Publisher, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. um@um.dk www.um.dk. Technical Advisory Service. ISBN 87-7667-459-2 (print version) ISBN 87-7667-460-6 (internet version).

Government of Botswana / UN reports/publications
Botswana Millenium Development Goals. Status Report 2010. Republic of Botswana/UN.

Government of Botswana-United Nations. Programme Operational Plan (2010-2014). 2009.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative, Phase 1, Joint Programme Document. Jan 2010.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Annual Report, 2010. February 2011.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Quarterly Report, July – September 2010. October 2010.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Quarterly Report, October – December 2010. January 2011.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Quarterly Report, January – March 2011.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Quarterly Report, April – June 2011. July 2011.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Annual Work Plan 2010.

Government of Botswana, UNDP, UNEP. UNDP-UNEP Botswana Poverty-Environment Initiative. Annual Work Plan 2011.

M. Leepile, Advocacy & Communication Strategy for PEI BOTSWANA. JUNE 2010, Botswana Government.

IWGIA 1: Article On Bushmen. Ref: http://www.iwgia.org/news/search-news?news_id=94, Jan. 2011.

IWGIA 2: Mine Approved on Bushmen Land IWGIA document, http://www.iwgia.org/news/search-news?news_id=88, “Botswana approves \$3bn mine near Bushman community”, January 21 2011.

KEITSEOPE NTHOMANG, 1999, “The Basarwa/San/Bushman Question in Botswana. Community Economic Development (CED): Creating Opportunities for Empowerment”. *Journal of Social Development in Africa* (1999), 14, 1,53-67.

PEI: 1 UNDP/UNEP POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT INITIATIVE BOTSWANA AWARENESS WORKSHOP FOR CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS VENUE: CRESTA LODGE. GABORONE. DATE: 14TH JUNE 2011.

PEI, 2009: Draft Institutional Analysis Report for PEI Botswana September 2009.
<http://www.unpei.org/PDF/botswana-InstitutionalAnalysisReportPEI%20Botswana.pdf>

UNFPA, 2007. Second Common Country Assessment for Botswana. Final Report. United Nations System in Botswana December 12, 2007.

UNICEF/GOB, 1989, Children, Women and Development in Botswana: A Situation Analysis, Gaborone.

UNICEF Botswana, 2005. "A shining example, a stark warning – A special World AIDS Day report on the impact of HIV/AIDS in Botswana". http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/botswana_30241.html

Annex 5 Aide Memoire presented in Gaborone

AIDE MEMOIRE
15 August 2011

Mid Term Review of the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) Scale-Up

David Moore, Team Leader, poverty expert
Kris Prasada Rao, environmental and livelihoods expert

Introduction

The mid term review team has been in Botswana from August 9 until August 16, 2011. The PEI Botswana (PEI) ends in December, 2011. The team has met with most key stakeholders in Botswana, except for Office of the President officials, Ministry of Agriculture officials, and Ministry of Local Government officials who have unfortunately not been available for interview or participation in the mid term review team's mini workshop (held on 15 August).

The reviewed intervention

PEI Botswana aims to support the integration and harmonization of sustainable renewable natural resource management in national, sectoral and district level policy planning and budgetary processes. In particular it aims to develop awareness and promote action to tackle key environmental problems and their socio-economic impacts in order to support delivery of the Government of Botswana's (GoB) Vision 2016 and National Development Plan 10 (NDP10) which, as over-arching goals, intend to support economic growth and diversification and eradicate poverty. In addition PEI will provide some support to assist the GoB in responding and adapting to climate change by enhancing the knowledge base on the socio-economic impacts of climate change. Phase 1 of PEI will run from 2010 to 2011 with an anticipated second phase to follow in 2012.

Specific objectives of the MTR

1. Assess the current value added of the PEI and whether changes in the wider policy environment, i.e. opportunities and challenges in view of the climate change agenda, green economy, and consideration of other-related initiatives or actors that have emerged since 2002 have implications for how PEI operates to 2012 (relevance).
2. Assess the progress to date of the Initiative and its implementation against the results and resources framework of the Scale-up joint programme and identify its strengths and weaknesses. In this sense, emphasis should be put on the analysis of results obtained compared to the "targeted results" that were expected taking into account the actual inputs, outputs and outcomes (effectiveness and efficiency).
3. Provide findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery. These should focus on:
 - a. The global joint PEI design and arrangements (including the PEF, PEI governance and operational and technical support from UNDP and UNEP)
 - b. PEI regional teams
 - c. PEI country programme design and implementation

Programme implementation team

There is a programme implementation team, headed by a country manager who is advised by an International Technical Adviser. The administrative/finance assistant position is currently unfilled. As from 9 August 2011, a third member of staff, a communications/media specialist, has been employed through the United Nations Volunteer (UNV) mechanism.

Currently, the programme implementation team is physically located in the Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section, under the Socio-economic Policy Sub-division of the MFDP, which is scheduled to be relocated to the Office of the President (OP). The programme implementation team handles day-to-day management and implementation of PEI Botswana. Together with the MFDP, the programme implementation

team is responsible for planning and operational management of the programme, as well as reporting and accounting, monitoring and evaluation of the programme activities.

Stakeholders

- MFDP – hosts PEI and is responsible for planning and coordination across ministries
- Office of the President –it has been planned since 2009 for the Office of the President to assume responsibility for poverty eradication. It is planned to move the Food and Poverty Policy Coordination Section from MFDP to the Office of the President, but it is still not known when the move will take place
- UNDP – UN country lead and responsible for administration support and financial management for PEI
- Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism
- Ministry of Agriculture
- Ministry of Local Government
- Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources
- Ministry of Lands and Housing
- District Councils
- University of Botswana
- CSOs
- Media
- Private sector

Budgeting and financial monitoring and evaluation

The total budget for PEI Botswana is USD 2, 250,000, of which UNDP Botswana and UNDP-UNEP PEI each contribute USD 1,000,000 and GoB contributes the equivalent of USD 250,000 in kind.

Since PEI is a jointly managed initiative with pooled funds, contributions from PEI Scale-up donors are pooled and jointly managed by the PEF under the UNDP Atlas system. Planning, disbursements, procurement, and financial accounting are handled by UNDP. The MTR team is still clarifying how the budget is divided up and accounted for at the Botswana country level, given the use of the Atlas system. When this clarification is obtained, the findings will go into the country report.

Persons interviewed and institutions visited-methodological aspects of the Botswana country review

The methodology for the mid term review in Botswana is based on the following activities:

- Interview key stakeholders, individually or in small thematic groups: ask key questions that are not leading, listen with respect and engage in a mutual learning process in reviewing project progress. This attitude is important for reviewing the PEI because PEI is a programme with great emphasis on lobbying, advocacy, and mentoring.
- Desk review of key documents (at home office, in Nairobi, and in Botswana)
- Key questions to key stakeholders that emerge from close reading of the key documentation
- Follow up interviews with the same stakeholders if clarifications are necessary/ if any points were unclear from prior meetings/interviews
- Close coordination with the Botswana PEI programme team, the PEF team, and Africa regional team in Nairobi
- Final participatory Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats (SWOT) analysis with key government and civil society stakeholders (including the Africa regional team responsible for Botswana) in Gaborone in order to ensure preliminary findings are on track, to clarify misconceptions and to make recommendations that are realistic, possible to implement and monitor within the timeframe of the PEI, and which have ownership by the stakeholders

The team has held extensive interviews with stakeholders from the government and the UN system in Botswana. In addition to the interviews, the mid term review team conducted a two-hour SWOT/mini workshop on August 15 with officials from Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Finance, meteorological services, other government ministries and agencies (specified in the Botswana country report), civil society and UNDP.

The main conclusions and recommendations of the SWOT mini workshop broadly match those that the mid term review team has already reached. The main conclusions and recommendations of the SWOT mini workshop will be incorporated into the Botswana country report for the mid term review.

Main findings

Progress on results

According to the PRODOC, PEI Botswana aims at achieving the following key results:

1. Economic evidence of the impacts and costs and benefits of both environmental degradation and climate change generated and disseminated.
2. National capacity to integrate and coordinate PE issues in national, sector and district level policies, plans, budgets and monitoring systems enhanced.
3. Knowledge and awareness of PE and CC linkages by policy and decision-makers, civil society, the private sector and the media increased
4. Poverty and environment issues integrated in key national development framework
5. Application of integrated approaches, tools, methodologies and assessments for mainstreaming environment in policies and plans for promoting growth and poverty reduction enhanced

Delays in implementation

Overall, significant delays in the formulation process (due to a wish to integrate PEI in the overall UNDAF and UNPOP formulation process), programme implementation team staff recruitment, and establishment of office facilities, have significantly affected programme progress. PEI Botswana officially started in January 2010, but the Programme Manager started in April 2010, the International Technical Adviser started in September 2010, and the office facilities and equipment were only fully in place by December 2010. PEI Botswana has thus been delayed for approximately one year and the intended results are therefore not achievable within the two-year programme period (January 2010-Dec 2011). Thus the programme will not be ready to move into PEI Phase 2 in 2012 as anticipated in the PRODOC.

Up until June 2011 no activities were implemented under result areas 4 (USD 100,000) and 5 (200,000 USD); and relatively few activities were undertaken under result area 2, which in budgetary terms is by far the largest result area (600,000 USD). It appears that the main focus has been on implementing activities in result areas 1 (200,000 USD) and 3 (300,000 USD). Annex 1 (of the Botswana country report, and also annexed to this Aide Memoire) provides an overview of activities implemented vis-à-vis the indicative activities outlined in the PRODOC.

However, it is difficult to ascertain progress vis-à-vis the intentions of the PRODOC, as only few clear targets have been set for the results/outputs and activities. Furthermore, the PRODOC contains no indicators and baseline for outcome 2, so it will also be difficult to measure programme outcomes. Moreover, no reporting takes place against the indicators in the Joint Programme Monitoring Framework (JMPF) in the PRODOC, and the output indicators reported on in the progress reports change from one report to the next. Furthermore, the actual uptake and utilization of the knowledge and skills provided through awareness raising and capacity building is not monitored

The planning and design of the PEI is at a crucial juncture. Due to a 10-month delay in start-up, this two-year programme will not be able to spend all monies included in the budget or finish all activities before officially ending in December 2011.

Relevance of overall design and programme concept

Findings

The PEI Botswana intervention logic, outputs and activities are in line with the approach and strategy of Phase 1 as outlined in the global PEI Scale-up PRODOC. Furthermore, with an integrated approach being embraced by NDP10, the timing of PEI is good and GoB appears open towards the PE mainstreaming agenda and interested in enhancing its capacity to deal with PE issues. The focus on awareness creation and capacity building also is relevant, because the “how to” remains a challenge for GoB and other stakeholders. The poverty and social impact analysis study of ISPAAD and sector economic studies are a good entry point to generate important information and engage with key non-environmental line ministries.

Although the poverty aspect of PEI could be further strengthened, PEI adds value to PE development planning by broadening the otherwise generally conservation-focused environmental agenda to encompass people-centered and socio-economic aspects in national development planning and policy formulation.

The inclusion of climate change in the Botswana PEI is also relevant because the anticipated impact of climate change on the environment and livelihoods in Southern Africa is high. In Botswana, this inclusion does not appear to cause major difficulties in terms of PEI covering too many thematic areas – rather, the climate change adaptation agenda appears to be an opportunity to promote PE considerations in national development planning and policy formulation.

Relevance of individual components: The individual components are relevant to the overall objective of achieving mainstreaming of PE in government planning and policy development.

Effectiveness

Findings

In general terms, at the level of government policy makers, the PEI is making its resources available to high-level planners, e.g., i) by lobbying, mentoring, and providing expert advice to ministries such as Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism on designing a new tourism policy; and ii) evidence to be provided from various studies (e.g., poverty and social impact analysis study, and the economic sector studies). At the lower, decentralised levels of government, and also among civil society, activities such as training of district councillors is beginning.

While specific attempts to facilitate PE integration have been made by having MFDP as main partner and using the UNDAF economic diversification and poverty reduction Component Coordination Group as Programme Technical Committee, PEI appears so far to have been more successful in closely involving Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism than line ministries with a poverty/socio-economic/development mandate, i.e. Agriculture, Local Government, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Minerals, Energy, and Water Resources. For example, while MFDP and Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism are members of the informal PTC that meets monthly, Agriculture and Local Government are not involved in this group. The upcoming economic study on selected natural resource sectors and the joint PEI-Min. of Agriculture poverty and social impact analysis of the ISPAAD are likely to contribute to enhanced involvement of some of these ministries.

Efficiency:

Findings

In general terms, as concerns disbursement of UN funds to procure goods and services, there are inefficiencies. Procurement of goods and services has been slower than is acceptable, reportedly because the tendering and procurement processes are managed in a top down way and involve the New York level.

- Staff recruitment: There was a delay in employing the International Technical Adviser of six months from date of interviewing the International Technical Adviser (March 2010). (The PRODOC was signed in January 2010; the International Technical Adviser started in September 2010).
- Implementation: The delays experienced mean that PEI Botswana will not be able to move to Phase 2 within the current global PEI Scale-up programme. Furthermore, as mentioned in Progress Reports, due to the delays an opportunity to influence NDP10 and District Development Plan 7 formulation was missed. The slow procurement processes also impact negatively on implementation progress.

Impact

Findings

Policy level impact: While it is too early to see clear impacts of PEI, the PEI has provided input to the new Tourism and Wildlife polices.

The integration of PEI in UNDAF and its alignment with NDP10 and Vision 2016, as well as the physical location of the programme implementation team at MFDP (which interviewed informants agree is the key institution to lead the PE mainstreaming), should facilitate the ownership and understanding of PE mainstreaming. It should also facilitate the transfer of knowledge and skills for both Government and UN Botswana to continue with PE mainstreaming in policy and planning processes and ideally in implementation.

Potential impact of the PEI is being dissipated because “it is difficult for stakeholders to understand what the PEI is about”. This problem involves both a lack of ownership and a lack of understanding of what linking poverty and environment means. In particular, the Ministry of Agriculture reportedly “does not understand the

PE linkages for its sector and in relation to other sectors". Given the delays in getting the poverty and social impact analysis study and the economic studies to start (data results which could persuade the Ministry of Agriculture and help them and others better understand PEI concepts), this problem may be critical (see recommendations, below). The problem is further exacerbated by the short time frame available to build sufficient ownership, understanding and skills to fully mainstream PE across Government practices and processes.

Sustainability and ownership

Findings

The crucial factors which have direct bearing on sustainability of PEI within government planning and policy structures are: i) it is not possible in the time left to integrate PE in all government structures and processes; ii) the PEI may not be able to go to Phase II and ensure PE integration in budgeting processes (e.g. depending on the overall PEI financing situation post 2012); iii) the government capacity to ensure continuation of PE is not yet up to mark; and iv) and is unlikely to become so because of the belt tightening (second year in a row) which resulted from the budget deficit in 2009-2010.

The reported go slow/passive resistance attitude of some civil servants may also further threaten uptake and sectorally integrated implementation of the PEI concept and, therefore, its long-term sustainability in policy circles.

Preliminary recommendations

R1. To include poverty and livelihoods-oriented line ministries in the project technical committee, e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, Local Government

R 2. To overhaul the monitoring system of the Botswana PEI, including indicators and targets, and report systematically and regularly against indicators and targets at all levels.

R 3. To monitor actual uptake and utilization by stakeholders of skills and knowledge provided through capacity building and awareness raising

R 4. To give the programme a no-cost extension up till end 2012, on condition that:

- a) The programme work plan focuses on consolidation and integration in government
- b) MFDP dedicates one staff member to work with the PEI full-time or at least 50% time.

R. 5 To consider recommending a Phase II, the decision to be based by a Final Evaluation of the performance of PEI Botswana two months before the end of the recommended no-cost one-year extension of the programme.

Next steps

The MTR will complete the Botswana country report in the coming week. The report will be sent to all relevant stakeholders in Botswana and in the PEF and PEI global programme for comments. The comments and corrections of factual errors made to this Aide Memoire will be incorporated into the Botswana Country Report.

Gaborone 15 August 2011-08-15

David Moore Team Leader, poverty expert
Kris Prasada Rao Environmental and livelihoods expert

Annex 6 Brief overview of some of the key social issues affecting Botswana's population

This annex provides a brief overview of some of the key social issues affecting Botswana's population – different sections in the report refer to this annex mainly because it is not possible to include these details in the main report body for space reasons.

AIDS HIV¹⁷

In the struggle against AIDS, Botswana has done so much right -- health care is free for children here and all citizens are encouraged to be tested for the virus at clinics; there is also free access to treatment at clinics where prevention of mother to child transmission (PMTCT) aims to ensure a baby is born free of the disease even if its mother is not. There is thorough counselling and the HIV tests are ready within 20 minutes. If a patient is HIV-positive and the CD 4 count is under 200, he or she is put on anti-retroviral drugs (ARVs), which are also free of charge.

In Botswana, there is serious political commitment to fight the disease and the government has put aside a huge slice of its budget towards health -- 25% of the budget and only 5% towards the army. Too many mothers are falling through the cracks and AIDS-related illnesses are killing Botswana's babies like nothing ever has before. Over the past decade child mortality has soared, up by more than 20%.

Botswana has the second-highest HIV prevalence in pregnant women in the world -- trailing Swaziland -- 38 percent of all pregnant women in Botswana are HIV positive. But every single age group has been hit, making it a generalized HIV epidemic. The AIDS epidemic threatens the very existence of a country with only 1.8 million and twice as many cattle as people.

Good infrastructure has been a curse as well as a blessing. One of the reasons for the spread of the disease is Botswana's highly mobile population - buses and good roads have linked it to other countries with high rates of infection. In the furthest corners of the country across the vast desert of the Kalahari, the San Bushmen once lived isolated and independent lives. But now AIDS has visited. Humanitarian organisations, like UNICEF and its partners, have set up a pre-school for their children; some are orphaned, all are vulnerable.

The lives of HIV-positive children here are in the balance – only one out of every 10 children infected is actually on treatment, even with huge support from the private sector and drug companies. Drugs for children are difficult to come by, difficult to swallow and cost up to four times more than adults' drugs. Most children are treated at the state-of-art Baylor Clinic in Gaborone, where treatment is free for paediatric AIDS patients: "The warning here is that things can only get worse. Infant mortality has gone up. But in many other countries where you're already struggling with traditional killers, this is going to be an added burden. Children are receiving much less attention than adults. Children always come last," said Dr. Gabriel Anabwani of the Baylor Clinic.

The other gap to be filled is making sure all pregnant women go to PMTCT clinics: "As long as you have HIV-positive babies being born to HIV-positive women who have not enrolled into PMTCT programmes, you will have this problem," said Jonathan Lewis, UNICEF Representative in Botswana. "There is a very low coverage rate of HIV-positive children on the national anti-retroviral (ARV) programme."

Cemeteries stand silent witness to the explosive change in Botswana society because of AIDS – average life expectancy has plummeted from 65 years to just 39 years old in the past decade. The inscriptions on the tombstones are a stark warning: Born 2004. Died 2004. Botswana is now racing against time to save its children from an early grave. It is sounding a warning to other countries too to invest in the Future Generation before they miss out on a future altogether.

Gender and gender violence

Botswana has made considerable progress with regard to gender equality, in that many previously-discriminatory laws have been reformed and women enjoy reasonably equal access to jobs, education and health care. Nevertheless, women experience higher poverty rates than males, higher unemployment, lower pay for similar work, and are increasingly victims of crime (rape and femicide), partly because cultural attitudes that hinder women's progress are changing more slowly than the formal legal environment (UNFPA 2007 pp 5-6).

¹⁷ Source of this section: UNICEF Botswana, 2005.

Gender Based Violence: Gender-based violence is a form of discrimination that seriously inhibits women's ability to enjoy their rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men. Gender based violence continues to pose a serious threat to the attainment of gender equality in Botswana. A few gender disaggregated police reports, civil society organisations and the media have highlighted the extent and nature of the problem. The key types of violence against women are: rape, assault, emotional and financial violence, incest, defilement, sexual harassment and femicide.

There is secrecy with which family members treat cases of incest, and the associated low reporting of such cases. The low reporting of cases is further perpetuated by the seeming reluctance of the police to handle such cases, adding to the culture of silence that surround these acts.

Botswana has experienced a spate of femicides popularly referred to as 'passion killings'. These crimes are perpetrated by males who were either engaged in relationships with the victims or estranged lovers. Most acts of violence against women are domestic. The domestic violence bill, currently being considered by Parliament, aims to address the problem in all its manifestations (UNFPA 2007 24-25).

Botswana's ethnic groups/indigenous peoples

Previous efforts to assist the San / Basarwa / Bushmen: The government of Botswana developed a Basarwa Development Policy in the early 1970s in recognition of the under development which confronted the Basarwa at the time. The policy was a precursor to the development plans currently undertaken by the government of Botswana to address "the Basarwa problem." Current plans as contained in a technical Project Memorandum prepared for National Development Plan 7 includes:

- Provision of land. The focus is on land for residential and arable purposes, as well as access to grazing areas (though no policy guidance is given).
- A campaign to combat negative attitudes in land boards and other institutions relevant to the distribution of land rights.
- Hunting rights through distribution and issuance of special game licenses to Basarwa living in Wildlife Management Areas.
- Economic activities as promoted through Economic Promotion Fund.
- Labour intensive works compensate the settlements for the withdrawal of drought relief programmes .
- Continued provision of water, education and health services. (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1996) (Source: KEITSEOPE NTHOMANG, 1999).
-

Today, Basarwa communities comprise mainly .. small settlements, experience high rates of unemployment and limited capacity to generate income... As a result, poverty tends to be more widespread and absolute than in other Tswana villages. The level of poverty is often indicated by poor shelter, inadequate food resources, low levels of nutrition, excessive alcohol intake, high levels of poverty-related diseases such as tuberculosis, inadequate clothing, poor sanitation, high dependency ratios and lack of cash and purchasing power (Source: KEITSEOPE NTHOMANG, 1999).

According to UNICEF (1989), about 90% of the Basarwa, especially those in the settlements, depend on food rations to meet their survival needs. Some Basarwa live in camps provided by their farm employers and may be chased out at the whims of their employers. Generally, the Basarwa farm labourers are underpaid and live under the most squalid conditions (Source: KEITSEOPE NTHOMANG, 1999).

Ethnically, Botswana is reasonably homogeneous. While ethnic origin of the population is not formally recorded, the Census does record first language. This shows that 78% of the population are Setswana speaking, 8% speak Kalanga, 3% speak Sekgalagadi, and English, Sembukushu and Sesarwa 2% each. The remaining 5% speak a range of other languages. There are concerns that some minority communities (such as Bakgalagadi, Bayei, Bambukushu, Basarwa/San, Baherero etc.), particularly those living in the more remote areas of western Botswana, experience higher poverty rates and less favourable human development (health & education etc.), although data is not available to measure this directly (UNFPA, 2007).

Human rights issues in Botswana have generally had a low international profile given its record of democracy and good governance. In recent years, the most contentious issue has been that of the resettlement of Basarwa/San from the Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve (CKGR), which has generated considerable international publicity – mostly negative – for Botswana. The controversy stems from a government decision to move several hundred Basarwa/San from the CKGR to resettlement villages outside of the reserve, and to cease providing services (water, education, health services etc.) inside the CKGR. A full range of modern services would be provided in the resettlement villages (UNFPA, 2007).

The issue quickly became controversial. The government's position is that the continued provision of services in the remote area of the CKGR was expensive and unsustainable, and furthermore that the existence of settlements within the CKGR was inconsistent with its primary purpose of providing a haven for wildlife. The government also wished to see the Basarwa/San have access to the full range of services enjoyed by other groups in society, and, to that extent, to become further integrated into mainstream society (UNFPA, 2007).

Opponents of government policy, including some Basarwa/San groups and NGOs, have presented the story differently, claiming that the Basarwa/San have been subject to forced removals and unjustly deprived of the traditional lands and lifestyles, to which, as the original, "indigenous" inhabitants of the area, they have a special claim, over and above later arrivals. There have also been claims that the Basarwa/San were removed to facilitate mineral exploration in the CKGR and to prevent or pre-empt Basarwa/San claims to any minerals that might be found there, although there would be no such rights under Botswana law (UNFPA, 2007).

Local NGOs have attempted to play a constructive role between Government and the Basarwa/San, early on in the process formed a Negotiating Team had established a productive dialogue between the Government and San representatives, leading to a mutually agreed Management Plan for the CKGR. However, the involvement of the international NGO Survival International, with an aggressive anti-government campaign, led to a hardening of attitudes on all sides and a confrontational approach that has benefited neither the Government nor the San (UNFPA, 2007).

The debate as to whether the San people were being forced out of the Kalahari eventually ended up in the High Court, in the longest and most expensive legal case in Botswana's history. The Court eventually ruled that the CKGR residents who brought the case had lawfully occupied the land and were unlawfully deprived of it without their consent, and that it was unlawful and unconstitutional to deny residents entry into the CKGR. However, the court also ruled that the termination of services was neither unlawful nor unconstitutional, and decided that the government was not obliged to restore basic and essential services (UNFPA, 2007; IWGIA 1; IWGIA 2).

While the Court ruling has gone some way to bringing this issue to a close, there still remain several points of contention between Government and the Basarwa/San (and their supporters), on which further negotiations will be required. The High Court ruling also concluded that only through negotiations could this matter be successfully brought to a close. The UN Special Rapporteurs on the Human Rights of Indigenous People and the Right to Food have written to the Government to express concern over reports of human rights violations of those who were forced from their lands and have requested further information from the Government in that regard (UNFPA, 2007).

While the CKGR case has been the most prominent human rights issue in Botswana in recent years, there have nevertheless other human rights issues at play. These include: other minority issues such as the status of "majority" tribes under the constitution, and access to mother tongue education; the continued use of the death penalty; legal backing for gender equality; gender based violence; legal education and access to the legal system; issues relating to HIV and AIDS (such as routine HIV testing in public health facilities, and protection from arbitrary dismissal for HIV-positive workers); the criminalisation of homosexuality; the effectiveness of employment laws (UNFPA 2007: 28-29).

Annex 7 TERMS OF REFERENCE

TOR for MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE UNDP-UNEP POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT INITIATIVE (PEI) SCALE UP

1 – Background and Introduction

PEI – FROM THE PILOT TO THE SCALE-UP

The UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) has its roots in the growing appreciation of how environmental sustainability can contribute to pro-poor growth and poverty reduction that emerged in the late 1990s and was endorsed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 in Johannesburg. UNDP launched the first PEI activities during the late 1990s. This was a policy initiative focused on desk studies and policy recommendations. Meanwhile, UNEP launched its own poverty-environment project which concentrated on the significance of ecosystem services for poor people.

Increasingly substantive collaboration between UNDP and UNEP commenced in early 2005 and the initial joint UNDP-UNEP PEI was formally launched at a side event – Environment for the MDGs – at the 2005 World Summit, with strong donor support. The two institutions effectively combined their efforts and their funds in support of a set of 7 country programmes in Africa. This is referred to as the PEI Pilot Phase. (The one PEI country programme in Asia remained a UNDP supported programme)

In late 2006, UNDP and UNEP undertook a vigorous effort to learn from the experience gained in this Pilot Phase. With the backing of key donors, UNDP and UNEP jointly prepared a formal proposal to seek financial support for a UNDP-UNEP PEI Scale-up.

The favourable reaction by donors to this proposal led to UNDP and UNEP launching the joint UNDP-UNEP PEI Scale-up in February 2007. The joint programme document for “Scaling-up the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative” (commonly referred to as the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC - see Annex I) set an initial target of expanding the programme to work in about 25-30 countries (from 8 in the pilot phase) with a budget of \$33 million over five years. Its implementation effectively started in 2008.

THE POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT INITIATIVE IN BRIEF

The PEI is a global UN programme that supports country-led efforts to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into national development planning, from policymaking to budgeting, implementation and monitoring. We provide financial and technical assistance to governments to set up analytical, institutional and capacity strengthening programmes with the aim of influencing policy and budgets and bringing about enduring institutional change by increasing the understanding of country poverty-environment linkages. In order to achieve that, PEI works increasingly in collaboration with other relevant actors at the country level such as leading practitioner and knowledge organizations, civil society organizations, and the private sector. It is a significant example of commitment to UN Reform, including One UN.

The UNDP-UNEP PEI:

- Was formally launched in 2005 and significantly scaled-up in 2007;
- Currently works in Africa, Asia-Pacific (PEI A-P), Europe and the CIS (PEI ECIS) and Latin America and the Caribbean (PEI LAC). There are currently 16 PEI country programmes under implementation, 5 under preparation and 5 where PEI provides targeted technical support ; (Note: this number is under review consistent with resource realities).
- Operates through a joint UNDP-UNEP Board, a global Poverty-Environment Facility (PEF), four regional teams (RTs) and the UN country teams (UNDP COs);
- Funding has been provided by the Governments of Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the European Commission and core funding from UNDP and UNEP;
- Contributes to the UN ‘Delivering as One’ process and strengthening the capacity of its host agencies to mainstream environment in their country operations.

The value added of the PEI is that there is a demonstrable need to improve the incorporation of environmental sustainability in country development processes and that the PEI is the one major international programme that attempts to operationalise the integration of pro-poor environmental sustainability into national development processes and budgets – using a country-led approach based upon experience and lessons learned. Furthermore, the UNDP-UNEP PEI is a leading example of UN interagency co-operation and UN reform in action. Our team has achieved a significant expansion of the existing PEI programme through a formal UNDP-UNEP joint programme which will now undergo a mid-term review.

PEI IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

PEI is a pioneering example of a joint UNDP-UNEP programme – with a Joint Management Board, the Poverty-Environment Facility (PEF) and four PEI regional teams (RTs). Both host institutions contribute core staff – some full-time, some part-time - at the global, regional and country levels. Since PEI is a jointly managed initiative with pooled funds, contributions from PEI Scale-up donors are pooled and jointly managed by the PEF under the UNDP Atlas system .

The PEI Joint Management Board consists of the Director of UNDP's Environment and Energy Group, UNEP's Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (Note: originally and until August 2010, the UNEP representative was the Director of the Division of Regional Cooperation). The PEF based in Nairobi is jointly managed by a Director and a Manager, appointed by UNDP and UNEP, who report to the Board. It is charged with global coordination and management of the programme – including budget management and reporting to donors on expenditure and results. It also offers knowledge management and technical advisory services to the regional and country programmes. Each country programme is developed jointly with the Government and formalized in a joint Programme Document (PRODOC) approved by the main Government partners, the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility, and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO). The four regional teams support the design and delivery of country programmes, in cooperation with the UNDP COs and the Government, and are responsible for responding to demand in their respective region. Under the guidance of the PEF, the regional teams use the results framework in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC and report with our country partners against this results framework and associated indicators. DAVID COMMENT: i.e monitoring itself rather+ than actual measuring poverty reduction indicators / environmental improvement indicators using MDGS/

A Donor Steering Group (DSG) formed by donor contributing to the PEI Scale-up meets annually and provides guidance and feedback to management. Reporting to donors is done through a consolidated annual progress report - rather than individual donor reports - as agreed with the Donor Steering Group. In addition to reporting on progress and results, the annual report is used for disseminating information on lessons learned in programme countries and other outreach purposes. During the last DSG meeting it was agreed David: why ? to reconvene the PEI Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to provide strategic advice to the management of the PEF. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS - PEI COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

PEI's strength is in the proven approach it employs at the country level. PEI works with the government to establish institutional and management arrangements that create a well-functioning team that works to deliver sustainable results for poverty reduction and improved environmental management. PEI country programmes operate through the UNDP CO, with joint support from PEI regional teams and the broader UN country team. In general, the ministry of planning and finance is the most suitable entity to lead the effort, in close collaboration with environmental institutions. In most cases PEI is integrated in an existing government-led:

- Steering Committee- including high level environment institutions, planning and finance ministries, sector ministries, subnational actors, and non-governmental actors, which provides strategic and political guidance to the poverty-environment mainstreaming process.
- Technical committee or task team- Provides technical inputs and guidance throughout the poverty-environment mainstreaming process. This team can be composed of external experts, government officials, UN staff, and local officials.

The PEI country teams vary in composition. Drawing on support from the PEI RT and the PEF they focus on a specific entry point, such as a development policy process, budgeting process, sector or local planning process, or similar process to integrate environment into development and poverty-reduction policies.

THE PEI PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH

The PEI has developed a programmatic approach for mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national development planning. This programmatic approach consists of three components or phases:

1. Finding the entry points and making the case, which sets the stage for mainstreaming
2. Mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into policy processes, which is focused on integrating poverty-environment linkages into an ongoing policy process, such as a PRSP or sector strategy, based on country-specific evidence
3. Meeting the implementation challenge, which is aimed at ensuring integration of poverty- environment linkages into budgeting, implementation and monitoring processes

The diagram below explains the activities of the three phases in more detail. This approach is flexible and can be tailored to each country context .

2 – Objectives of the external PEI mid-term review

Section 3.5 of the Joint Programme Document “Scaling-up the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative” (PEI Scale-up PRODOC), states that “an external mid-term review (MTR) will be carried out in Year 3”. This PEI MTR will be conducted according to these TOR.

The PEI Scale-up proposal also indicates that the objective of the external mid-term review of the PEI Scale-up is “to assess overall programme progress. An external evaluation will be conducted in Year 5 to assess programme results and to make recommendations for a second –year phase”.

This review follows a mid-term evaluation and final evaluation of the pilot African PEI programme. These evaluations were prepared for Belgium and Norway, respectively (copies of the reports are contained in the memory stick). Hence this MTR will not cover pilot African PEI country programmes.

According to the above, and as suggested by donors, the purpose of this MTR is to serve as a monitoring tool focusing on how the programme is operating and if any major changes are required, while the final evaluation

would look at the overall programme objectives; what impact has been achieved and lessons learned to be applied to a new programme and/or alternatively to develop indicative recommendations for PEI post 2012. The specific objectives of this external MTR are:

1. Assess the current value added of the PEI and whether changes in the wider policy environment, i.e. opportunities and challenges in view of the climate change agenda, green economy, and consideration of other-related initiatives or actors that have emerged since 2002 have implications for how PEI operates to 2012 (relevance).
2. Assess the progress to date of the Initiative and its implementation against the results and resources framework of the Scale-up joint programme and identify its strengths and weaknesses. In this sense, emphasis should be put on the analysis of results obtained compared to the “targeted results” that were expected taking into account the actual inputs, outputs and outcomes (effectiveness and efficiency). David: Impact?
3. Provide findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery. These should focus on:
 - a. the global joint PEI design and arrangements (including the PEF, PEI governance and operational and technical support from UNDP and UNEP)
 - b. PEI regional teams
 - c. PEI country programme design and implementation.

The key documents that will guide the review are (A memory stick will be prepared with all the key PEI documents for the reviewers):

- Annex I: the PEI Scale-up proposal
- Annex II: the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC,
- Annex III: the PEI pilot phase Norwegian evaluation,
- Annex IV: the PEI pilot phase Belgium evaluation,
- The PEI Scale-up Annual Progress Reports for 2008 and 2009,
- The PEI proposed M&E framework for the PEI Scale-up,
- Relevant PEI Scale-up country PRODOCs (to be provided to the MTR team).

The target groups for the results of this review are the main PEI stakeholders: i) the PEI teams (includes beneficiary countries), ii) PEI donors (including both the Technical Advisory Group and the Donor Steering Group and iii) UNDP and UNEP Senior Management (includes the PEI Joint Management Board).

3. Scope of the MTR

The review will cover PEI Scale-up work carried out over the first three years of the PEI Scale-up at global, regional and country level (up until December 2010) in PEI Scale-up countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the CIS and Latin America and the Caribbean.

Reporting requirements: The MTR will provide the main PEI stakeholders indicated in general and the PEI management in particular (including the PEI Joint Management Board and the Donor Steering Group) with a review of the implementation and performance of the PEI and it will make recommendations to improve those for the remaining period. The review will include a detailed management response with action plans to implement recommendations.

Limits of the MTR: Due to the early stages of implementation of many PEI Scale-up country programmes, it is too soon to provide substantive evidence on PEI’s possible impact on poverty reduction and sustainable growth. Furthermore, the joint PEI Scale-up PRODOC (see page 16) already points out at the fact that: “An assessment of PEI, therefore, must focus on the processes generated or facilitated by the programme [...]”. The impact assessment is, by definition, relatively less applicable in a mid-term review exercise, since impact assessment examines the achievements made by the results in the longer term. This MTR should instead provide recommendations on the likelihood that PEI outputs will deliver the expected outcomes and impact in beneficiary countries as indicated in their respective country PRODOCs. In this sense, the MTR will address important aspects impacting on present and future performance, such as country ownership or UNDP and UNEP joint programming related issues. It will also review design and implementation – including organizational and institutional arrangements or project design - to identify process issues that may impact on overall PEI delivery. As such, and in line with the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC, the review team will focus on understanding and commenting on the extent to which the PEI is assisting in creating the enabling conditions needed to effectively mainstream poverty-environment in national development plans and policy processes and the likelihood that those PEI-driven changes have an impact on the ground. For example, that additional investment will be made in sustainable agricultural practices.

CRITERIA AND SPECIFIC TASKS

The five OECD/DAC traditional evaluation criteria will be the substantive focus of this review - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Standard evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness will be used to assess the core of the MTR, i.e. the performance of the PEI, as follows: (Some suggested modifications may be discussed in the MTR review inception report, but any substantive changes would require the agreement of donors).

Relevance - the MTR will comment on whether the portfolio of different outputs undertaken by PEI country programmes are the right ones to deliver the enabling conditions for poverty-environment mainstreaming in the light of the context post-2002 as indicated for the specific objective 1). In particular, the MTR will address the following key review questions:

1. Assess PEI's value added, including areas of strength and competitive advantage and areas for improvement;
2. Assess whether the three project outputs, as formulated in the Scale-up joint PRODOC, still represent the best project strategy for achieving PEI objectives;
3. Assess the consistency of the PEI Scale-up country programmes to be reviewed (e.g. two from the Africa and Asia-Pacific regions and one from ECIS and LAC, respectively) with the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC and where there are significant differences, assess the rationale for such differences and their broader implications for the PEI. This includes in terms of both process and content;
4. Considering the time left until the end of the PEI, assess whether the timeframe is still realistic to deliver on the expected outputs in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC. If applicable, outline recommendations for a process that would lead to revised timings for the remaining implementation time;
5. Assess the PEI phased and adaptive mainstreaming model, with a view to clarify: a) the 'exit' criteria, i.e. conditions, pre-requisites and steps including making a transition to other stakeholders at the country level, b) the post 2012 scenario for PEI, i.e. integration in the structure/work of the two host organisations (related to bullet point 5 under effectiveness).

Effectiveness - the extent to which the programme is contributing to its objectives or its desired potential outcomes through delivery of outputs and through its implementation at national, regional and global levels, including the degree to which the programme responds to national priorities:

1. Review progress and achievement of the PEI Scale-up poverty-environment mainstreaming outputs at global, regional and country levels (in the selected countries) in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC;
2. Review the adequacy of advice and inputs by PEF, RTs and selected PEI Scale-up country teams on poverty-environment mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management;
3. Assess the main underlying factors beyond the programme's immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's management strategies for these factors: e.g. review the proposed PEI Theory of change;
4. Review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the partnership between UNDP and UNEP with respect to the PEI Scale-up at the global, regional and country level, including UNDP and UNEP support for the PEI Scale-up in programmatic, operational and governance terms. This should include of both poverty and environment elements of UNDP, i.e. the role of UNDP and UNEP against the requirements set out in the PRODOC;
5. Review the degree to which PEI is integrated in UNEP and UNDP and delivers experiences, approaches, network and partners etc. to other UNEP and UNDP activities.

Efficiency - the cost-effectiveness of the transformation of inputs into outputs. This MTR should provide an analysis and recommendations on the use of available resources in terms of timeliness and quality delivery of services.

1. Assess the evolution, effectiveness and efficiency of the current M&E design for PEI, and identify any changes needed to ensure that the M&E system provides adequate measure of results, including performance and impact indicators.
2. Review the PEI country programmes' execution modalities, i.e. assess the management and institutional set-up (membership and profiles, cost-effectiveness, lead agency, national ownership including the role of the national management);
3. Identify the major factors that have facilitated or impeded the progress of the country PEI programme in achieving its desired results/objectives. This should also take into account the political and institutional country situation during programme implementation and related impacts;
4. UNDP and UNEP resource mobilization efforts to the PEI pooled fund, plus PEI country programme resource mobilisation efforts;

Preparing for impact and sustainability

Impact - for the purpose of this review, impact represents changes in the degree to which pro-poor environmental sustainability is included and operationalised in national, sector and sub-national development plans and budgets, whether planned or unplanned, positive or negative, that the programme brings about. This MTR should provide recommendations on the likelihood that PEI outputs deliver the expected outcomes and impact in beneficiary countries as indicated in their respective country PRODOCs. Note: as the PEI is a partnership programme, with country programmes strongly embedded in existing government processes and agencies, impact should be assessed in such a partnership context, the policy and budgeting processes where all parties play key roles, rather than impact on enhanced environment and poverty conditions.

Sustainability – the MTR will comment on the likelihood that the outputs and outcomes that the PEI is producing and contributing to will bring about significant and durable change and will ensure that environment is embedded in institutional development planning processes used by different sectors of the government.

5 - Methodology or review approach

The MTR will be a progress review, focusing on whether the UNDP-UNEP PEI outcomes are likely to be achieved. The independent review will take into account the changing global environmental and poverty debate as well as evolving international concerns and priorities. It must provide evidence-based information that is independent, credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by the main stakeholders and applicable to the remaining period of PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC duration.

The evaluation will consist of three main phases in the course of which five methodological stages will be developed.

Three Main Phases of Development: Five Methodological Stages:

Structuring of the evaluation

Inception/ design Data collection

Implementation Analysis

Synthesis/reporting/dissemination phase Judgements on findings

Recommendations

The MTR should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. It will be carried out by the MTR team through the following elements:

- Documentation review (desk study): the list of relevant documents includes those listed under section 2, related reports and internal guidance documents. These and other relevant documents will be made available as indicated in section 7. The desk study should be complemented by a participatory approach including the full range of PEI Scale-up stakeholders and the following elements:
- Global and regional consultations: headquarters and regional centres will be contacted by the MTR team to interview UNDP and UNEP staff and to consult with selected staff of partner organizations and stakeholders operating at global and regional levels. These will include bilateral donors, plus international NGOs and institutions with overlapping interests, priorities and concerns such as the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) or the World Resources Institute (WRI).
- Country Field visits: should be made to at least one country PEI programme per region (two in Africa and two in Asia-Pacific), i.e. a total of six countries. For this purpose the team will carry out substantive analyses of background documentation, plus interviews with key stakeholders focusing on country teams (key Government officials, UNDP CO, national project managers and coordinators, technical advisors) and relevant non-governmental actors and bilateral and multilateral donors. The team will also direct observations on a small sample of programme and project sites, in order to gather evidence to respond to the key evaluation questions.
- The main criteria for country selection are to attain a regional balance and include a mix of country typologies -not only least-developed, but also middle income countries. Other important criteria include: i) country programme developed as part of the Scale-up, ii) enough progress made to provide valid data to the MTR, iii) cost-effectiveness of travel by the MTR team.
- Desk reviews, including phone calls with Management and Senior Management from additional country offices and regional centres will be used in a number of the other PEI countries.
- Use of questionnaires or mini-surveys as needed to complete and validate the information obtained through other sources to respond to the review questions.

Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART. Disaggregated data should be presented to clarify any differences between sexes and between different groups of poor people, included excluded groups.

Taking into account that the conceptual nature of the subject does not lend itself easily to quantitative analysis, the approach to the review will be further discussed, refined and finalized with the MTR team.

6 - Expected outputs and timeframe

The main output will be a final MTR report, not exceeding 30 pages, excluding annexes. The final report will synthesize the evidence from all the components of this evaluation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations will be summarized in an Executive Summary.

Preparation: the review team will submit a technical and a financial proposal for the review, including in-country visits and interviews during the implementation of the MTR. This proposal should follow the methodology indicated above and include draft travel agendas and persons to be interviewed in each country. The proposal should detail costs and be presented to the PEF for review and approval. There will also be reports from the 6 country studies that will not exceed 10 pages each, excluding annexes. The country reports will be summarized in an annex to the main report. The draft report will highlight recommendations to address issues identified. It will be presented to the PEF for comments by the end of June 2011 [26 of September].

Final report: based on feedback from the PEF and lead donors, the external review team will present a final report consistent with the objectives, scope and methodology of the review as set out above by the date agreed to with the PEF. The final report will be approved by the PEF and the findings will be presented to the main PEI

stakeholders. The report will also be circulated to the participating UNDP and UNEP units and country offices, partner organizations and other key stakeholders.

The final report (maximum of 30 pages without annexes) should include:

- Executive summary (no longer than five pages summarizing findings, conclusions and recommendations)
- Introduction (including description of the review methodology)
- Findings and review outcomes following an analysis consistent with the above taking into account best practices and lessons learned, focusing on internal factors (strengths, weaknesses) affecting implementation and management arrangements of the programme, areas for corrective action, areas for potential success and external factors (opportunities, threats) affecting the implementation (i.e. such as Government commitment or political will)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations*
- Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, samples of questionnaires and tools used for the review, etc.

*Recommendations:

The report should provide detailed and operational recommendations, relevant within the UNDP and UNEP contexts, organised by target groups. These recommendations should be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation. Options to implement the recommendations with the indication of the respective limits and possible risks should be presented. Recommendations will in all cases need to be cross-referenced to the corresponding conclusions. Furthermore the evaluation team may select (and justify) the 3 most important recommendations that should be highlighted to PEF, RTs, country teams (including recipient governments), UNDP and UNEP management. Appropriate feedback mechanisms shall be provided so that all types of evaluation results are transmitted effectively to all persons responsible for decision-making.

The other output will be a stakeholder validation/a review workshop at which all team members and the full range of stakeholders discuss and agree on findings, conclusions and follow-up recommendations.

Timeframe:

The proposed timeframe of the MTR will be 60 person days plus travel time and mission time in-country over a maximum period of three months from the beginning of April 2011 [mid of July 2011], with the draft report being available for comments by the mid of June 2011 [26 of September].

7 - Profile of the MTR team and qualifications of the external consultants

The MTR will be managed by the PEF in collaboration with lead donors, including the choice of evaluators.

The PEF will have final responsibility for the selection of the external consulting firm. All external consultants will be hired in accordance with the UNDP rules and regulations. Its composition will be announced by the PEF to donors as soon as it is confirmed. The external review team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the MTR, in close consultation with the PEF.

Areas of expertise required for the external consultants include the following:

- Advanced technical knowledge and experience in development cooperation policy, and poverty-environment mainstreaming and linkages.
- Knowledge of the UN system and the 'Delivering as One'.
- Recent demonstrable knowledge of current evaluation theory and practice in field situations (results-based management evaluation methodologies) and several years of experience in evaluating poverty-environment-related development programmes and projects.
- Recent demonstrated experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
- Recent demonstrated experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures and recent knowledge of UNDP and UNEP M&E Policy is an advantage.
- The team should demonstrate analytical skills, consideration for gender balance and familiarity with the different regions.
- The team leader must have demonstrable strong management, negotiation and communication skills and expertise in the subject matter.
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to natural resource management projects is an advantage.
- Excellent English communication skills. French, Spanish and Russian knowledge an advantage.

It is also worth taking the following into consideration:

- Reviewers are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries.
- Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly.

- The MTR team is able to work freely and without interference, i.e. it is assured of co-operation and access to all relevant information.

Management Arrangements

The MTR team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the MTR, in close consultation with the PEF. All team members will be responsible for drafting components of the report while the team leader will be responsible for drafting the integrated final report and executive summary, with the support of the PEF.

The PEF will be responsible for the overall direction of the MTR process. It will provide backstopping support and ensure coordination and liaison with all concerned UNDP and UNEP units and other key agencies; it will provide overall guidance, focused on ensuring delivery consistent with the MTR TORs.

In the case study countries and regions, the country teams and regional teams will support the MTR team in liaising with key partners and in discussions with the team, and make available to the team all relevant review material. They will also provide support on logistical issues and planning for the country visits by the evaluation team. In addition, each country team and regional team will appoint a focal point for the MTR that will assist in preparing relevant documents and setting up meetings with all relevant stakeholders in connection with the respective country missions.

The UNDP-UNEP PEI will meet all costs related to conducting this review and will manage its process, providing support and ensuring coordination and liaison with key development partners. The PEF, in collaboration with the MTR team leader, will be responsible for presenting the MTR report to the PEI Joint Management Board and the Donor Steering Group during its Annual Meeting in 2011.

Annex 8: Advocacy and communication strategy

With assistance from the PEF in Nairobi, PEI Botswana has developed an advocacy and communication strategy¹⁸ which aims to i) develop an advocacy and communication strategy whose objectives are aligned to the PEI Botswana programme; (ii) identify stakeholders, their perceptions, and design manners of influencing them; (iii) to list themes for social debates and recommend how PEI could engage in these debates; (iv) to identify tools and activities for communicating messages; (v) to develop an action plan, indicating roles and responsibilities, timelines and possible partners linked to the achievements of the key results. The strategy was designed involving as many key stakeholders as possible¹⁹.

There are limitations to the strategy- as it is now designed. The former are mainly i) it is not inclusive of people outside Gaborone, government, and highly educated circles (travel was limited to Gaborone because of resource constraints); ii) the time available for conducting the research was limited; iii) the study on which the advocacy and communication strategy is based would have benefited from the use of other tools such as focus groups; iv) most questionnaires sent by e-mail or fax were not answered²⁰. The document provides insight into the considerable environmental and institutional problems facing Botswana, ranging from lack of coordination between ministries such as Agriculture, which has policies detrimental²¹ to water resources; and also mining by companies and government, and solid waste collection services by local councils. Both miners and councils disregard, or do not adhere sufficiently to, proper environmental practices and cause heavy pollution according to the findings (generated by the LEAD International participatory workshop) reported in the strategy.

The main strategy is outlined in the action plan for public education and timelines for delivering outputs, viz.:

- Developing IEC Materials for Policy and Decision Makers
- Promoting public debates targeting all stakeholders
- Engaging media through training to increase their knowledge and reporting of issues
- Capacity building of civil society
- Implementation strategies

The action plan is ambitious, for two reasons: i) there is only one staff member, appointed in August 2011, who has limited experience (recent graduate, little work experience); ii) the communication specialist does not have the time to implement the ambitious strategy (cf., p. 41, the GANT chart which has a 16 month time-line for delivering the strategy) without guidance, training, and more support. The Communication Strategy did not specify that a Communication Officer should be hired; that was an initiative taken by PEI as it was deemed to add value and improve delivery on the activities proposed in the Communication Strategy. It is positive that the communications officer will receive support from the PM, ITA, PEF and PEI Africa. There is a toolkit already for PEI communications/advocacy, which should also help the new Communication Officer in the remainder of PEI.

¹⁸ M. Leepile, *Advocacy & Communication Strategy for PEI BOTSWANA*, June 2010, Botswana Government.

¹⁹ A participatory workshop of key stakeholders was held in December 2009 in Gaborone. This workshop was facilitated by LEAD International, a UK-based PEI Africa partner organisation which focuses on training and networking on global issues relating to sustainable development. The workshop findings were used to design the terms of reference for the communication strategy.

²⁰ M. Leepile, p. 9.

²¹ E.g., farmers' use of artificial fertilisers, which the Integrated Support for Arable Agriculture Development; and the Livestock Management Improvement Development programmes promote as part of the food productivity/security promotion drive by the Government. Excessive or uninformed application could pollute watercourses or affect the productivity of arable land over time.