

`GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review – Project ID 1124

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		01/15/2010
GEF Project ID:	1124		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1382	GEF financing:	3.93	3.93
Project Name:	Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas, Phase I	IA/EA own:	0.46	UA
Country:	Cape Verde	Government:	3.52	UA
		Other*:	2.20	UA
		Total Cofinancing	6.18	6.14
Operational Program:	OPI (Arid & Semi Arid Zone Ecosystems)	Total Project Cost:	10.11	10.07
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Cape Verde; US Peace Corps; German Cooperation Agencies BMZ and GTZ	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		October 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: September, 2007	Actual: June 2009
Prepared by: Rajesh Koirala	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 68 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 20 months
Author of TE: Tamar Ron and Charles Yvon Rocha		TE completion date: September 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: November 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 2 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S		MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MU		MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	NA	S		MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. Although the terminal evaluation does not cover important evaluation aspects such as co-financing and ownership,

in detail, it should be considered a good practice because it provides detailed information on all the activities carried out by the project, explores the weaknesses, and provides lessons and recommendations.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

The terminal evaluation has not reported such instances. A follow-up is not required.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project appraisal document, the global environmental objective of the project was *“the conservation of globally significant biodiversity; the reduction of land degradation and desertification in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde; contribution to poverty alleviation through sustainable use and management of natural resources in the area of the project’s influence.”*

According to the terminal evaluation, there was no change in the global environmental objectives.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The project appraisal document does not mention a specific development objective other than the overall project objective. This is an output oriented project, and as mentioned in the document, the project intends to achieve following six outcomes:

1. “Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas”
2. “Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems”
3. “Two natural parks created and under participatory community management”
4. “Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management”
5. “Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities”
6. “National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals”

As per the information provided in the terminal evaluation, no change was made in the project outcomes.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
Based on the information provided in the project document, the outcomes are relevant both to the GEF focus and the country priorities. The project is consistent with the GEF operational strategy for biodiversity conservation, and operational programs on Arid & Semi Arid Zone Ecosystems (OP 1). It also supports a key objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the in situ conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The project objectives closely relate to some other articles of the CBD such as: Article 7 (Identification and Monitoring), Article 8 (In-situ Conservation), Article 10 (Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity), Article 11 (Incentive Measures), Article 12 (Research and Training), and Article 13 (Public Education and Awareness).	
According to the project document, Cape Verde has ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1995 and other	

13 international agreements related to environment protection. It has prepared a National Action Plan on the Environment, which considers the conservation of biodiversity as a priority activity in natural resources management and sustainable development. In 2001, the General Direction of Environment formulated a National Biodiversity Support Action Plan (NBSAP), under which the development of a system of protected areas was identified as a national priority. Among the 20 priority sites, identified by NBSAP, for conservation of biodiversity, six sites are covered by this project.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

The project appraisal document lists six expected outcomes. There were significant achievements for all these outcomes. These include establishment of two national parks, development of institutional and legal framework, and capacity building both at national and local level. Further details are presented below:

Initiate legal frameworks for biodiversity conservation: The Protected Area Law and Protected Area Regulations were ratified. The project completed land tenure registry and land use planning in both Protected Areas. A land tenure report was published, but the recommendations were not implemented. The project provided inputs to revise EIA legislation. Aiming at developing policies on forest and rangeland protection outside of PAs, consultants were hired for the study on livestock management and sustainable grazing, but the policies were not formulated.

Strengthen institutional capacity: The project carried out a training need assessment, and capacity building programs. The project sent two government staff to study MSc in Environmental Science in Brazil. The project also offered 11 short term technical courses to the government staff, project staff, and community representatives.

Create two natural parks: Two protected areas, Serra Malagueta NP and Monte Gordo NP, were formally established by the project. Boundaries of both parks and buffer zones were demarcated with participation of local communities. For both PAs, the project prepared detail management plans. The project carried out eleven baseline ecological studies such as inventories of invertebrates, birds, reptiles and forest. These studies helped in building a database on biodiversity, ecological and socio-economic issues for the project area.

Strengthen local capacity for participatory ecosystem management: Project established 3 farmer associations and 2 community development associations, and provided trainings to stakeholders on biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource management. Four workshops were held on water and soil conservation at both parks. In active participation of the local communities, 50000 seedlings of endemic species were planted in and around the parks.

Provide alternative livelihood opportunities to local communities: An ecotourism committee was established in each park, and three local staff were recruited. Seventy one families from both parks received total 11,000 \$CV in form of small grants. Local communities were provided trainings on improved agriculture, livestock, land management practices, tourism related income generating activities, and implementation of the micro-credit and small grants.

Conduct awareness activities: Country PAs communication strategy was developed and agreed by marine and terrestrial PAs project. The project organized clean-up campaigns with communities and schools. In cooperation with Austrian film-makers, four films on different aspects of the project were produced. The project also constructed own website to make publications electronically available. Project staffs visited to local schools to provide students informal training on biodiversity conservation.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

According to the terminal evaluation, there was delay in start of the project. The document was signed on October 2003, while the hiring of key staff was completed in late 2004. Because of this delay, the completion date was postponed for one year. It was eventually closed after a delay of 20 months. The project, however, delivered its expected outputs by project completion.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

According to PIR 2007, because of the project biodiversity conservation and PA management have been incorporated in the latest National Environment Action Plan. Formation of Protected Areas Authority (PAA) is also proposed. The PIR also states that the management of another PA, Fogo Natural Park, was improved by applying experience learned from this project.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources

Rating: MU

According to the terminal evaluation, although the Government has committed to secure a budget for the operation of Protected Areas, no specific financial mechanism has been established to sustainably manage the national network of Protected Areas.

b. Socio political

Rating: L

Based on the evidence provided in the terminal evaluation, the government, private sector, and local communities have strong support to the project, none of them poses a risk to continuation of the project activities.

c. Institutional framework and governance

Rating: ML

As mentioned in the terminal evaluation, the government has promulgated Protected Areas Laws and Regulations. The project established a national coordination unit and two site units, operating within the framework of DGA. However, there is no agreement within the government on the nature and institutional status of a Protected Areas Authority. Moreover, as the terminal evaluation mentions, the existing institutional framework and decision making processes in relation to the project's activities and park management is "too centralized", and does not encourage participation of stakeholders.

d. Environmental

Rating: L

There doesn't seem to be any environmental risks.

4.3 Catalytic role

a.. Production of a public good

The protected areas contribute to ameliorate the local and regional environment by protecting biodiversity and supplying environmental goods and services, including water, soil and carbon. The project facilitated emergence of a pool of professionals that are technically capable and are likely to assume leadership roles in extending protected areas network in the country. Training provided to local communities on sustainable resource management and alternative livelihood contributed to increase skill and knowledge on respective areas.

b.. Demonstration

The project was not able to conduct demonstration activities.

c.. Replication

According to the terminal evaluation, the government has been trying to replicate experience of this project and create four more protected areas, but the plan has not materialized yet.

d.. Scaling up

According to PIR 2007, the project resulted in the policy and the legislation of regulating environment. New National Legislation on PA and fauna and flora has been designed and enacted. To incorporate the experience of the project, EIA was revised in 2006.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation, the co-financing was essential to achieve the project's outcome. There seem to be almost the same level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing. The terminal evaluation provides no further discussions on co-financing.

b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the terminal evaluation, there was delay in commencing the project. The document was signed on October 1, 2003, while the hiring of key staff was completed in late 2004. No causal factor is reported, both in the terminal evaluation and PIRs, for this delay. Because of the delay in initiation, the completion date was revised to December 2008, from original December 2007. When the project was about to be over, the government was not fully prepared to take complete responsibilities. This caused project set for operational closure for December 2009. The effect of delay on project's outcome and sustainability is not reported

c. 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.

According to the terminal evaluation, the government adopted Protected Area Legislation accepting the project's proposal on boundaries, operation of the two pilot protected areas, and their buffer zones. This step was important to achieve the project outcome, establishment of two protected areas.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry

Rating (six point scale):

MS

The M&E plan included in the project appraisal document specifies indicators for project outcomes, responsible institutions or individuals, time frame and estimated budget to carry out the tasks of monitoring and evaluation. But indicators are too many (twenty to forty per outcome), most of them are repetitive, some are not quantifiable, and some are over-ambitious. For example, M&E plan indicated to establish two natural parks by the end of the third year and four natural parks by the end of the project, whereas only two parks were established during this project.

b. M&E plan Implementation

Rating (six point scale):

MS

<p>Although a mid-term review was conducted, it would have been better if it was conducted earlier. As reported in the terminal evaluation, the mid-term evaluation report was submitted in November 2007 – only a year before the expected closing – leaving only one year to address the recommendations. The project monitored the performance by field visits, PIRs, MTE report, quarterly reports. According to the terminal evaluation, the project coordinator and the UNJO monitored the progress on development of the two parks through the GEF BD1 tracking tool. The PIRs assessed the strengths and weaknesses of project management and performance, and most of them were addressed in the following years. According to the PIR 2006, the project had substantial risks regarding operational, financial and organizational aspects of the project. After recognizing those risks, both IA and EA played necessary roles. As a result, according to PIR 2007, the project attained “a great deal of improvement in performance and remarkable change within the project”. Recommendations provided by MTR were not implemented. The PIR 2008 attributes to time limitation for not applying them.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? As mentioned in the project document, US \$ 404,000 was allocated for all M&E related activities, which, according to the terminal evaluation, was sufficient.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p> <p>The mid-term evaluation provided seventy seven specific recommendations to address the project failings and weaknesses. It also proposed a total revision of the project’s log frame, including the reformulation of the objective, reducing number of indicators and the merging of certain outcomes. According to the PIR 2008, as such revision could have procedural consequences, for example the need for the project to be resubmitted to the GEF Council for re-approval, a lengthy process with uncertain outcomes, the revisions proposed by the mid-term evaluation were not executed.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. Yes. Although the project did not implement MTR recommendations, by sufficiently addressing weaknesses and recommendations identified through field visits and PIRs, the project achieved all of the intended outcomes.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</p> <p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation, the project design should have given sufficient consideration on its sustainability and exit strategy. According to the PIR 2005, the logical framework approved during the project design was “over-ambitious” and “complex”, which soon after the beginning of the project proved to be “totally unrealistic” and “not matched” by actual capacity of executing agency and the country office of implementing agency. According to the PIR 2006, “the project document makes the implicit assumption that many activities (social mobilization, partner involvement in conservation planning, demonstration projects, etc) can take place simultaneously and rapidly. But, it takes a great amount of time to do these activities correctly.” So, the IA simplified and developed a suitable framework for implementation immediately after the project started. As mentioned in the PIR 2006, the revised framework identified the “sequential nature” of the project activities, balanced the activities to be carried out in two parks, and reduced the number of indicators of outcomes. The PIR 2006 reported inadequate support of UNDP country office to the EA. UNDP corrected this by implementing UN Joint Office. The Environment Programme Manager of the IA dedicated 20% of his time for this project. The IA decentralized financial activities by using HACT initiative. According to the terminal evaluation, the implementing agency constructively engaged and played the supervisory responsibilities effectively.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) S</p>
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</p> <p>As mentioned in the terminal evaluation, the executing agency (Ministry of Environment) collaborated to effectively execute this project with other national institutions such as Center for Agriculture and Animal Husbandry (DGASP),</p>

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

National Institute of Rural Development (INIDA), Ministry of the Economy, Growth and Competitiveness (MOEGC) and Ministry of Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT). Although the country is “too centralized”, MOE designed and executed the project in participation of all stakeholders such as local communities, state resource management agencies, private sector interests, and international donors. The PIR 2005 reported inadequate management set-up as the government appointed national project coordinator had no role to affect the project progress. According to the PIR 2007, the government corrected this by recruiting new project staff, more speedily providing co-financing, and appreciating the recommendations of stakeholders. Because of the improved performance, UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa included the government one of the “top GEF performers in Africa.”

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

As presented in the terminal evaluation, followings are lessons learnt from this project -

1. While designing a project, sustainability and exit strategy should be sufficiently addressed as an integral part and closely followed during the implementation.
2. The project should balance long term impacts by strengthening institutional capacity at national level and short term impacts providing benefits to community at the local level.
3. Identification of key partners and careful planning for partnership strategy enable a project to maximize the contribution of external and internal agencies such as Peace Corps, INGOs, and NGOs. There should be regular interaction among project partners, staff, and stakeholders, which helps to quickly resolve any misunderstandings or differential interpretations.
4. The project budget should focus more on sustainability inducing expenditures than on expensive infrastructures.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The terminal evaluation’s recommendations are:

1. To create sustainable financial mechanism and establish Protected Area Authority, both at the national and local level, defining its roles and responsibilities, institutional status, and degree of autonomy.
2. To develop a strategic national and site-specific plans for specific activities such as institutional capacity building, income-generating trainings, small grants and micro-credit programmes, awareness raising, and eco-tourism development and marketing.
3. To enhance a participatory decision making and implementation regarding all aspects of park management and natural resources management.
4. To increase the cooperation and partnership with national and international institutions, thereby to extend opportunities for technical and financial support.
5. To include a built-in adequate exit strategy, aiming to secure sustainability, in the design of any future project.
6. To design and develop modest infrastructures in protected areas based mainly on local material.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The terminal evaluation presents detail activities and achievements against each intended outcome, but some of achievements are mentioned repeatedly.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is consistent. Although some issues have been discussed more than once others such as causes of delay and co-financing are not adequately discussed.</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p>	S

It indicates project's weaknesses in sustainability and exit strategy.	
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are supported by evidence and are comprehensive.	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report includes total project costs per activity, but it provides limited information and discussion on co-financing.	MS
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report assesses the quality of project's M&E plan at entry and during implementation.	S

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.