Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	1056
GEF Agency project ID	1767
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF - 3
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast
Country/Countries	South Africa
Region	AFR
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	Operational Program 2 – coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Easter Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Not involved.
Private sector involvement	Not involved.
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	January 4, 2006
Effectiveness date / project start	September 29, 2006
Expected date of project completion (at start)	December 12, 2010
Actual date of project completion	December 31, 2013

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		$6.5	$6.5
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		$6.5	$6.5
Total Co-financing		$24.318	$17.561
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		$30.818	$24.061

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	May 2014
TE submission date	May 2014
Author of TE	James Lenoci
TER completion date	February 2015
TER prepared by	Erika Hernandez
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	NA	MS	NA	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NA	MU	NA	MU
M&E Design	NA	MS	NA	MS
M&E Implementation	NA	MS	NA	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	S	NA	MU
Quality of Execution	S	S	NA	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NA	NA	NA	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project's Global Environmental Objective is to: "contribute towards the improvement of South Africa's Protected Area System. The Project seeks to develop a representative protected area (PA) estate on communally owned land along the Wild Coast." The project seeks to expand its network of type 1 protected areas (PAs) by 8% of the country's terrestrial land surface in 2010, and from 5% to 20% for the marine and coastal environments. PAs are sought to be administered under co-management agreements between provincial and national authorities, local communities and the private sector [p. 25, PD]. Although South Africa is well known for its PA management, the PD identifies that some of them are not being managed effectively as per the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score. Category 1-3 MPAs are not representative of all PAs as only 9% of this area is no-take [p. 6, PD]. Despite the presence of MPAs, marine, coastal and freshwater biodiversity continue to experience major threats particularly in areas where no PAs are present. The threats are:

- some marine and estuarine resources have been over-harvested as seen through the extensive mussel removal by local communities;
- forest resources have been over-extracted: harvesting or poaching of medicinal and ornamental plants has led to some species to become extinct outside the protected areas, thus expansion of PAs is required; and,
- overgrazing of grasslands and compensatory burning is leading to habitat degradation, such as the loss of endemic species like the African black oystercatcher [p. 8-20, PD].

For the reasons abovementioned, the project seeks to expand protected areas management in a more representative way that ensures the protection of marine, coastal and freshwater biodiversity.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the PD, the main development objective is "an effective network of protected areas is established on the Wild Coast and provides tested co-management models for replication." Its aim is to contribute to achieving its goal through: (i) expanding Protected Areas (PA) coverage, and improving management effectiveness in PAs along South African Wild Coast; (ii) augmenting the management tool box, by establishing a paradigm for co-management of protected areas that may be replicated; and, (iii) providing a model for integrating PA management and poverty alleviation programs operative on communal lands [p. 26, PD].

The project has three main intervention areas: "strengthening the institutional framework for co-management; strengthening management effectiveness in existing Type I PAs; and strengthening management in Type II PAs. These interventions will be nested in an integrated *land use plan* for the Wild Coast that integrates the management of PAs with the regional sustainable development framework" [p. 25, PD]. The project includes the following outcomes [p. 26, PD]:

Outcome 1: Institutional framework and capacity to facilitate co-management systems for PAs is in place.

Outcome 2: Management effectiveness is enhanced within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas (Type 1 PAs), operating under co-management agreements with local communities and the private sector.

Outcome 3: A functioning network of managed resource use protected areas (Type 2 PAs) is in place, and is being effectively managed in active collaboration with local communities.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There was no change in the Global Environmental and Development Objectives.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project is relevant to both the GEF and to the Government of South Africa. The PD states that project objectives are in line with South Africa's Government priorities. The Government is committed to ensuring that its protected area network provides adequate protection to South Africa's 9 biomes and that its network of type 1 protected areas (PAs) is expanded by 8% of the country's terrestrial land surface in 2010, and from 5% to 20% for the marine and coastal environments[p. 6, TE]. This aim is related to the concern that management effectiveness of the Wild Coast has been moderate to very low, which the government seeks to improve [p. 9, TE]. The project corresponds with the Government's national strategy and adopted legal framework. It is supported by key instruments like Green Paper on Development and Planning (199), the White Paper on Spatial Planning and Land Use Management and the National Spatial Development Plan (2003), which shape current spatial planning and development in South Africa. The new "Land Use Management Act" will be proposed as a way to introduce a more unitary planning system that would replace the Development Facilitation Act, so as to establish effective collaborative systems that strongly involve

local communities [p. 5, TE]. Currently, the South African National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment is being drafted and classified South Africa's Protected Areas into 3. For the GEF, the project is in line with GEF's Biodiversity focal area. It will also contribute towards its Operational Program 2 - *Coastal, Marine and Freshwater ecosystems*.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates project effectiveness as *moderately satisfactory*. This TER rates it as *moderately satisfactory* because the project experienced significant shortcomings but that are likely to be resolved in the following months. The project's objective of establishing a network of Protected Areas has not been met. Although a higher number than expected provincial PAs and indigenous state forests PAs were considered, they are still under negotiation. This issue is likely to be solved in the following months. Some areas that had satisfactory ratings include: training and budget management. Training was provided to all staffing levels. Budget management to the eastern region appears to be within expected budgetary targets, making it effective. Two out of five PAs achieve their expected Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score target. Co-management models were not yet replicated elsewhere in the region.

The following bullets describe the level of completion for each project objective [p. i-ii, TE]:

A. <u>Project Objective</u>. *An effective network of protected areas is established on the Wild Coast and provides tested co-management models for replication*. **(TE rating – Moderately Satisfactory; TER rating – Moderately Unsatisfactory)**. The number of protected areas has not been proclaimed but PAs are being negotiated and an agreement has not been reached. This number correspond to original targets (expected number of provincial PAs was 32,000 ha and negotiated PAs are 32,984 ha; expected indigenous state forests were its 63,000 while its actual number is 66,316 ha) [p. 1, Annex 6, TE]. Given that PAs have not been proclaimed, assessment on the compatibility of economic and employment returns was not conducted. However, the TE estimates that achieving the target of R110/ha per annum is relatively high as well as that of 32,000 person days per year for employment returns. In addition, potential sources of alternative livelihoods were identified, training was provided and basic supplies were given to community members. Hence, a total of 234 community members were trained [p. 31, TE].

   a. <u>Outcome 1</u>. *Institutional framework and capacity to facilitate co-management systems for PAs is in place.* **(TE rating – Satisfactory; TER rating – Satisfactory.)** Institutional capacities of ECPTA were notoriously improved. All staffing levels received training. At the senior management level, ECPTA had the "structure, competency and skills to broker and implement co-management." The only challenge was the Reserve Manager level given that there has been a high turnover, which could result in poor management if this situation continues to develop. In total, training of 80 community members was provided and who were later hired as reserve guards. The Project Community Liaison Officer was also hired as the ECPTA People's and Park Manager. The average score for the ECPTA staff was 3.0 in 2013, which the TE indicates that is an improvement compared to 2012 (score is not provided). The project's management seems to have been carried out within the desired results of operational budget for the eastern region. Out of the total operational budget, R27 million were expected to be allocated to the region. Although R21.8 million were

disbursed, they were complemented through government social responsibility programs [p. 3-5, Annex 6, TE].

b. Outcome 2. *Management effectiveness is enhanced within a rationalized and more representative system of protected areas (Type 1 PAs), operating under co-management agreements with local communities and the private sector.* **(TE rating – Moderately Satisfactory; TER rating – Moderately Satisfactory).** Increased Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores that met expected targets only happened for 2 out of 5 protected areas (for Mkhambathi its expected was 74% and actual was 77%, while for Pondoland its expected was 60% and its actual was 69%). Although targets were not met in the other 3 PAs, their METT scores increased. Out of all the five Type 1 PAs, only the Mkhambathi and Silaka, alien infested vegetation areas developed an eradication program [p. 5-6, Annex 6, TE].

c. Outcome 3. *A functioning network of managed resource use protected areas (Type 2 PAs) is in place, and is being effectively managed in active collaboration with local communities.* **(TE rating – Moderately Satisfactory; TER rating – Moderately Unsatisfactory).** The project negotiated beyond the original communal land hectares (original: 14,000 ha, under negotiation: 25,000 ha). However, none of these areas have been proclaimed. By end of the project, 6 co-management structures were expected to be under operation but they have not been formalized. Increased METT scores for State Forests and Coastal Conservation were expected to be increased by 41 and 45, respectively; the State Forest target was met and exceeded by 49. The objective of developing 2 co-management models replicated elsewhere in South Africa was not met.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE rates project efficiency as *moderately satisfactory*. The TER rates efficiency as *moderately unsatisfactory*. The project experienced numerous delays that extended the project's completion date four times. The project was initially expected to conclude in December 12, 2010. The first extension protracted the date until the end of 2012. The third and fourth extensions moved the date to July 2013 and then to December 2013, respectively. The last extension set the final completion date until the end of June 2014, which allowed, both, the project administration and terminal evaluation to be completed [p. 5, TE]. The TE attributes these delays finishing up implementation activities, caused by very low initial efficiency by the Project Coordinator. During the first two years of the first Project Coordinator's work, delivery ratio was under 60%. Efficiency later improved in 2011 at 72% and peaked in 2012 [p. 33, TE]. The TE found compliance with incremental cost criteria as established in the PD. The project also maintained strong financial controls. Leading agency, ECPTA and secondary agency, DEA, increased the commitment of their co-financing amounts. However, only 72% of overall co-financing was materialized (for more on this, see section 5.2) [p. 3, TE]. In addition, illegal tree cutting and bark harvesting rebounded in the Manubi State forest after temporary contracts with community guards and maintenance staff were finished. Thus, cost-effectiveness in this forest was low [p. 36, TE].

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE rates project sustainability as *moderately unlikely*. This TER rates sustainability as *moderately unlikely* because the project faces financial, sociopolitical and institutional risks that may threaten its sustainability. Sociopolitical risks are related to insufficient integration of municipalities and power struggles between local authorities. Financial risks concern lack of financial commitment by the Central Government. The project's institutional risks are related to discrepancies between the government and municipalities' priorities.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

- **Financial sustainability. (TE Rating – Moderately Likely. TER Rating – Moderately Unlikely)** The project faces several financial risks in the long term but that could be overcome if part of the Wild Coast budget is allocated for these purposes. Financial risks are related to hiring cutbacks by the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery (DAFF), which the TE has understood them as lack of government support [p. v, TE]. After land proclamations are fulfilled, the TE considers that future investment in infrastructure (roads, fences, facilities, etc.) will be needed. Community association funds are limited and GEF disbursements are contingent upon project finalization. In contrast, the TE identifies some future funding opportunities: partial investments from the private sector in Mkambathi, and having the Wild Coast allocate funds to local economic development and social responsibility program [p. 35-36, TE]. This TER considers that this solution is questionable given that the TE states that socioeconomic conditions within the rural Wild Coast (Eastern Cape) have been deteriorating [p. 30 & 36, TE] and, hence, it is possible that, instead, Wild Coast funds be allocated to immediate socioeconomic needs.

- **Sociopolitical sustainability. (TE Rating – None. TER rating – Moderately Unlikely)** Some of the socio-political constraints are related to power struggles and management disagreements between local authorities, which can challenge the success of co-management structures. This has affected the proclaiming process of one grassland area (8,000 ha). The project's environmental education program has sought to promote a better understanding of environmental co-management and to the long-term mitigation of socioeconomic risks. It has trained personnel from ECPTA, the Ministry of Education, SANBI, DAFF, and local municipalities. However, the TE considers that interagency and community cooperation needs to be further enhanced in order to address contention over land restitution and equitable access [p. 37, TE]. Some of the stakeholders that were less committed to land restitution were District and Local Municipalities, the Department of Rural Development & Land Reform, and the Land Claims Commission [p. 34, TE].

- **Institutional sustainability. (TE Rating – Moderately Likely. TER rating – Moderately Unlikely)** Institutional sustainability is supported by progressive conservation legislation adopted before the project start, such as the Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003 and the National Forest Act 84 of 1998, at the national level. The TE identifies discrepancies in national and subnational (municipal) priorities and that additional effort needs to be made in integrating conservation issues into municipal planning processes [p. 37, TE]. For instance, TE reports that Silaka's community was not fully committed to the project as the municipality refused to include the (Communal Property Association) CPA in their planning process in their integrated development plan (IDP).

Important contributions were made on the provincial level by "supporting the DEDEAT Environmental Management Framework" [p. 37, TE]. Deteriorating relationships with municipalities related to a belated process in land settlement reclamations could further impact institutional sustainability.

- **Environmental sustainability. (TE Rating – Likely. TER rating – Unable to Assess)** A study conducted by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) identified that some of the future environmental risks are near-shore temperature, driving range extensions and ecosystem changes [p. 37, TE]. However, the TE does not mention whether these impacts could be caused due to lack of project continuation or if these impacts are related to external factors like global warming.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Total co-financing at endorsement was US $24.318 million and decreased at completion at US $17.561 million. ECPTA (Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency) and DEA (Department of Environmental Affairs) exceeded their co-financing commitments, which partially compensated for commitment withdrawal by the Eastern Cape Province and a reduced commitment by the Marine and Coastal Management and the DAFF (Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) [p. 21, TE]. ECPTA's co-financing support doubled by the end of the project but there was generally a lack of tracking of how the co-financing was allocated [p. 21-22, TE]. Although the original US $10 million committed by the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DSBA) is not shown in Exhibit 7: Co-Financing Table, DSBA did with its commitments through having disbursed US $0.16 to support the Wild Coast strategic environmental assessment and having invested time in bioregional planning, spatial development planning and GIS system development, which the TE esteems to have mounted to more than the US $10 million. In total, only 72% of the expected co-financing was materialized. Co-financing management experienced coordination issues related to tracking and reporting [p. 23, TE].

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project underwent several delays which caused project completion to be extended four times. The project was initially expected to conclude in December 12, 2010. The first extension protracted the date until the end of 2012. The third and fourth extensions moved the date to July 2013 and then to December 2013, respectively. The last extension set the final completion date until the end of June 2014, which allowed, both, the project administration and terminal evaluation to be completed [p. 5, TE]. The TE attributes these delays finishing up implementation activities, caused by very low initial efficiency by the Project Coordinator.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE rates country ownership as *moderately satisfactory*. This TER found that government commitment varied across agencies and government department. ECPTA demonstrated a strong commitment to the project (as seen in increased co-financing). However, stakeholders like District and Local Municipalities, the Land Claims Commission and the Department of Rural Development & Land Reform, that had the capability to greatly influence successful land settlements and making a positive impact, were not actively involved [p. 34, TE]. No formal partnerships for project implementation were established. National level coordination was inexistent as Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) did not administer the Wild Coast Program. The TE states that formalization of partnerships could have benefitted the project. This TER considers that, having included a national level ministry could have, as a consequence, increased project awareness by the Central Government. This is of great relevance given that it would have further supported ECPTA. This was a recently created parastatal agency that was undergoing a process of transferring staff and assets from DEDEAT [p. 8, TE].

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E design as *moderately satisfactory*. This TER rates the section as *moderately satisfactory*. Although the design incorporated relevant elements like targets and baseline figures, it did not include biodiversity inventories. The M&E section had a strong design that allowed the project to monitor activities as well as to identify percentage of progress per component / activity. In its Part II, the PD includes a Logical Framework Matrix that lists indicators, baselines, targets risks and assumptions, per objective and per outcome. Activities are included within project outputs. The PD described the frequency of progress reporting as well as financial auditing and evaluation [p. 24, TE].

As per the SMART acronym (*specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely*), the project's indicators were primordially *specific, measurable*, and *achievable*, although a few indicators were not or *realistic* or *timely*. To start, the target of creating 95,000 ha of provincial protected areas was not a realistic indicator because the project assumed that land reclamations would take less time. The target of increasing budget for the recurrent operational management cost through concession fees, new financing mechanisms or others is not yet lateralized so this target was not *realistic*. The TE critiques the logframe matrix in that it was ambitious as it could have been changed once the project began facing legal constrains related to settlement concessions [p. 31, TE]. The PD allocated ECPTA, the main beneficiary and executing agency, good institutional participation. More community involvement could have been included in the PD through

training. Other items that were not incorporated in baseline monitoring were biodiversity inventories and socioeconomic conditions [p. 24, TE].

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E implementation as *moderately satisfactory*. This TER rates the section as *moderately satisfactory*. Reports can be improved by providing more quantitative data but progress reports were provided. The project prepared several progress reports (6 PIRs were identified in the PMIS system), including a Mid-Term Review that took place in 2011. Independent financial audits were conducted each year. For every project component, the PD identified the amount of M&E budget that it would use. The TE mentions that the reports contained "limited quantifiable data" and assumes that monitoring was rather weak during this process. Based on quantifiable indicators, monitoring reports could have made a better job in reporting percentage of progress. Nevertheless, this TER considers that monitoring performance was still within the minimal monitoring requirements as reports (PIRs) presented qualitative evidence and some quantitative data. Several project activities could not be reported given that land reclamation was still under negotiation. This TER concurs with the TE in that several activities depended on the objective of reaching management agreements over land reclamations [p. 12, TE], which negatively impacted project outcomes. Indeed, more realistic indicators could have been introduced during the MTR and could have included the issue of protracted land reclamations. Post-project monitoring is not addressed in the TE.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rated Quality of Project Implementation as *satisfactory* because it participated in some Project Steering Committee meetings and provided input to Project progress reports. The TER rates this section as *moderately satisfactory* as UNDP's supervision was limited and it did not modify indicators to improve outcome completion. TE identifies UNDP CO staff as having provided progress reports and participated in some Project Steering Committee meetings. At the preparation phase and first couple of years, TE reports UNDP involvement but states that it did not find strong evidence of monitoring during the early phases of project implementation [p. 29, TE]. The second Environment and Energy Program Manager at the UNDP CO was not provided with the necessary resources to visit project sites, participate in inception workshops, or training to project managers in order to carry out its corresponding M&E tasks. Thus, the TE considers that UNDP CO could have had a more proactive performance by having trained ECPTA staff as it was new

in partnering with UNDP [p. 29, TE]. This TER concurs with the TE in that UNDP could have had fixed logframe indicators so as to reflect the reality that land reclamation negotiations were taking more time than the PD had originally expected. This opportunity was given during the Mid-Term Review but UNDP did not seize this.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rated Quality of Project Execution as *satisfactory*. The TER rates this section as *satisfactory* because project executor achieved all its goals and sought additional funding for post-project continuation. The TE considers that the Co-management Assistance Support Unit (CASU) within ECPTA adequately coordinated the project. The project coordinator facilitated a cooperative spirit among target communities and headed advocacy efforts in including environmental education and outreach to provincial and national stakeholders, like the Eastern Cape DEDEAT [p. 18, TE]. The coordinator has also sought additional financial sources after GEF funds been exhausted [p. 30, TE]. In addition, co-financing commitments by ECPTA exceeded initial pledges by having more than doubled (initial commitment was of US $2.608 million; final disbursement was US $5.926) [p. 21, TE]. Project coordinator appears to have taken over additional responsibilities.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

NOTE: The TE rates the project's overall impact as *unlikely* based on: unresolved legal constraints over land settlement claims; local capacity remained weak and no exit strategy was present; inter-agency collaboration is not present and is regarded as *unlikely*; and, because additional expenditures for the Wild Coast do not appear possible [p. 41, TE].

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE found sound qualitative evidence on the reductions in stress on ecological systems during project implementation. However, assessing demonstration results such as reductions in illegal tree cutting or bark harvesting was not possible as monitoring was weak and their baselines were poor. According to interview

reports from reserve and State forest managers, the project was able to reverse unsustainable and illegal actions in the Protected Areas [p. 39, TE].

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE did not identify socioeconomic and market changes.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project enhanced local capacities by providing training to the Eastern Region of the Eastern Cape Parks Board and key institutions like municipalities, Land Affairs, among others. Another way in developing capacities could have been through the production of the "how to kit" for setting up co-management agreements but the TE does not mention whether this was concluded. The TE states that capacity among local communities remains weak and because local conservation agencies are unwilling to proceed if no further commitments are guaranteed [p. 40, TE].

b) Governance

The project contributed towards strengthening environmental governance structures through facilitating co-management systems for protected areas such as the draft ECPTA policy and the gazetted DEDEAT environmental management framework [p. 40, TE]. Nevertheless, this TER considers that success of co-management structures may be assessed if co-management negotiations are reached and agreements implemented. In addition, the project demonstrated improved PA management through participatory community management arrangements [p. 40, TE].

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE did not identify unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been

mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Although project replication in two different demonstrations on other communal lands in South Africa (Output 3) was not achieved, some progress towards this output was made. Regulations for co-management of protected areas were drafted by the DEA, a sustainable resource use policy was written for the ECPTA, among others [p. 14, TE].

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

Lessons learned. Some of the lessons learned are as follow [p. 47-48, TE]:

➢ Engaging local communities takes a considerable amount of time and the right skills set;
➢ Management strategies should be both participatory and adaptive;
➢ Multi-sectoral interventions require multi-sectoral stakeholder involvement;
➢ The effects of protected areas on human well-being is not straightforward to measure and requires sufficient baseline information;
➢ Involving local communities into protected area governance can exacerbate tensions within those communities;
➢ Higher level of preparedness are required to raise financing for micro-enterprises.

Good Practices. Some of the good practices that the TE identified were the following [p. 46-47, TE]:

• Engaging communities in the land use planning and Project oversight;
• Hiring a community liaison officer with ties and understanding of the target communities;
• Supporting communal co-management on a contract basis, without formal agreements;
• Developing an environmental education program;
• Utilizing experience and structures developed by other interventions.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations [p. 43-46, TE].

Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits from the Project.

• Support a facilitator for minimum 2 years to further support advancement of co-management arrangements;
• Compile results of improved management effectiveness under communal, co-management;

- Organize a joint workshop on co-management policies and experiences;
- Train local community members in biodiversity monitoring;
- Continue efforts to facilitate arrangements between conservation agencies and the communities living near the Dwesa-Cwebe Marine Protected Area (MPA);

<u>Proposals for Future Directions Underlying Main Objectives.</u>

- Consider biodiversity mainstreaming as a complementary measure;
- A multi-sectoral implementation modality might lead to more meaningful stakeholder involvement;
- Strong coordination role from national-level stakeholders;
- Assess possibilities for linking Project objectives with large infrastructure developments;
- More emphasis should be made on collecting supportive baseline information;
- UNDP's experience in human development issues should be better utilized.

<u>Operational Issues.</u>

- Better utilize the inception phase to sort out project uncertainties;
- Risk management should be more inclusive among key stakeholders;
- Work programming should be more extensive and be linked to the logical results framework;
- UNDP should support project management training;
- Clear instructions should be communicated for accounting of project management costs;
- Combined delivery reports should be broken down by project outcome, at a minimum.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	*The TE provides a thorough assessment of project outcomes as well as environmental, capacity and governance impacts. The TE does not indicate socioeconomic impacts as this component had not been developed at the time of producing the TE.*	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	*The TE is internally consistent and presents evidence its assessments. Ratings were generally well justified.*	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	*The project includes a very good assessment of financial, institutional, sociopolitical and environmental risks. However, this TER disagreed with its rating on environmental sustainability as it found it unable to assess.*	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	*Lessons learned are mostly supported by the evidence provided. However, in its lessons learned, it does not recognize that the project assumed that land reclamation negotiations would not be protracted.*	**MS**

Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	*The TE provides actual project costs per activity, original versus actual co-financing as well as totals.*	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	*The TE adequately assessed M&E systems by having identified opportunities for improving the project's logframe matrix.*	HS
Overall TE Rating		S

Overall TE rating: (0.3*(4+5)) + (0.1 * (4+4+5+6)) = 2.7 + 1.9 =4.6 = S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

This TER used the TE, PD and PIRs.