

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form**

<b>1. PROJECT DATA</b>					
				Review date:	10/30/06
GEF Project ID:	134		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)	
IA/EA Project ID:	P035923	<b>GEF financing:</b>	<b>12.30</b>	<b>12.19</b>	
Project Name:	<i>Cape Peninsula Biodiversity Conservation Project</i>	IA/EA own:			
Country:	South Africa	Government:	77.9 (Domestic: Govt + other)	92.02 (Domestic: Govt + other)	
		Other*:	1(foreign)	1.46 (foreign)	
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	<b>78.90</b>	<b>93.48</b>	
Operational Program:	3,2	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<b>91.28</b>	<b>105.67</b>	
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:		Work Program date			
		CEO Endorsement			01/15/1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)			06/01/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2004	Actual: 06/30/2004	
Prepared by: Divya Nair	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 6 years (74 months)	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing:	Difference between original and actual closing:	
Author of TE: Jeeva A. Perumalpillai-Essex and Amanda Younge		TE completion date: 2/2/2006	TE submission date to GEF OME:	Difference between TE completion and submission date:	

\* 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**

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	HS	HS	HS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	HL	HL	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S			S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The Cape Peninsula Biodiversity Conservation Project was the first GEF project in South Africa. South Africa ranks as the third most biologically diverse country in the world, and is the only country in the world to have within its borders an entire plant kingdom, the Cape Floral Kingdom (CFR). This region harbors exceptional biodiversity, exemplified by high species richness, habitat diversity and gamma diversity (turnover) across the ecological landscape. (TE)

The project objective responded to the severe levels of threat faced by the fauna and flora of the CFR, and the urgent need to preserve this ecologically unique region from degradation. (TE, pp2)

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The project development objective was: *“to ensure the rehabilitation and sustainable protection of globally significant flora and related fauna of the Cape Peninsula including surrounding marine ecosystems, and to initiate planning and conservation activities for the entire Cape Floral Kingdom.”*(TE, pp2)

The project financed the development of a long-term strategy to conserve the CFR, while also providing funds to fast-track the establishment of a national park in the most threatened and biodiverse part of the region, the Cape Peninsula Mountain Chain, and to capitalize an existing small grants fund to support NGO activities across the CFR, targeting conservation priorities.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts, as described in the TE?**

According to the TE (pp4), achievement of the overall project objective has been rated as highly satisfactory.

- The objective of ensuring **the rehabilitation and sustainable protection** of globally significant flora and related fauna of the Cape Peninsula including surrounding marine ecosystems, through the establishment of a financially and institutionally viable Park has been very well achieved.

Specifically: (a) a revised target of nearly 85% of the invasive woody species was achieved, with GoSA funds committed to completing the task; all cleared areas are under maintenance; (b) in areas cleared of alien invasive plants, three endangered plant species have expanded their range and numbers; (c) there has been no extinction of tracked species; (d) levels of fire-preparedness are significantly higher than at project inception and fire services are better organized; (e) a marine protected area has been proclaimed and is

being implemented under an agreed management plan; and (f) TMNP is financially in surplus.

- The **establishment of the Park and financial success** is now used as a model for other parks in the country. TMNP is now the second most profitable of the 22 parks run by SANParks. GoSA and other domestic co-funding of the component in the project period reached \$77.8 million, exceeding the appraisal target by \$8.2 million
- The **Table Mountain Fund is considered to be a 'model' trust fund'** to support biodiversity and conservation in the area. The Fund, administered by WWF-SA, has provided catalytic resources for over 60 projects (many are community based) amounting to \$2.5 million in the past 6 years. In at least 80% of cases, TMF funding has served as seed funding, leveraging resources from other sources and building partnerships.
- **Institutional development** impacts are seen in GoSA's biodiversity conservation policy. This includes the expansion of the South Africa National Biodiversity Institute's role to include responsibility for bioregional planning and programs and the establishment of the TMNP and its impact on the SANParks approach to conservation management. Capacity to manage environmental resources has improved significantly within the TMNP. (TE, pp9)

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes

###### A Relevance

Rating: HS

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

According to the TE, the project objective was relevant as it responded to the severe levels of threat faced by the fauna and flora of the CFR, and the urgent need to preserve this ecologically unique region from degradation. The project was consistent with the efforts of the Government of South Africa (GoSA) to address national and global environmental priorities by supporting the development of an enabling environment to reverse land degradation and conserve biological resources.

###### B Effectiveness

Rating: HS

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

**The TE (pp4) rates the overall achievement of project objectives as Highly Satisfactory.**

Specifically, the objectives of GEF assistance were to (TE, pp23):

1. Roll back the threat of invasive alien species to allow the natural regeneration of indigenous species, protect the area from raging wildfires and recreate nature's own renewal process, extend the realm of effective conservation to surrounding marine areas, upgrade the capacity to provide environmental education, improve roads and paths to minimize erosion and enhance accessibility, upgrade the monitoring and study of biodiversity in this unique area.
2. Ensure the maintenance in perpetuity of biodiversity conservation on the Cape Peninsula and beyond in the Cape Floral Kingdom, extending the reach of conservation activities to private land outside the National Park, and using NGOs as implementing agencies and decision-makers.
3. Lay the strategic foundation for effective conservation of the Cape Floral Kingdom.

**As per the TE, these objectives were "largely met and in many instances exceeded by the project, and significant global benefits leveraged".**

Also,

4. The CAPE strategy presented a first serious attempt to apply the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) ecosystem approach to conservation, and **catalyzed a paradigm shift** from species-based and "in-park" conservation management approaches to landscape-level conservation strategies and activities across the country. Both the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment (2004) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2005) incorporated insights and lessons from the project. (TE, pp9)

<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p><b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual project cost was about 15 percent above the appraisal estimate, or US\$14.5 million equivalent. Almost <b>all of that amount was raised from local nongovernmental sources</b>. Total domestic co-financing (government and other) exceeded the appraisal target by \$14.12 million (118.1%), and international co-financing exceeded the appraisal target by \$0.46 million.</li> <li>• Domestic in-kind contributions to the CAPE Strategy during project implementation and in support of the post-strategy transition period were estimated at \$0.43, nearly five times the appraisal target</li> <li>• The GEF contribution amounted to almost 12 percent of actual cost. (IEG- TE Review). Of the total GEF grant of US\$12.3 million, only about US\$137,000 remains undisbursed.</li> <li>• At project effectiveness US\$5 million was disbursed as equity investment to the Table Mountain Fund. The remaining resources of US\$7.3 million were primarily for the TMNP and developing the CAPE strategy.</li> </ul>	

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b> Yes, given its success and ‘High Sustainability’, it is likely to have impacts.</li> </ul>

**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.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>Financial risks, as reported in the TE appear to low</p> <p><u>Positive factors</u> reducing financial risk reported by the TE include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the TE, the “Park is now financially sustainable with an explicit commitment of SANParks to sustaining the GEF investments” (TE, pp11).</li> <li>• GoSA is financially committed to investing a significant amount (current estimate US\$55 million), through the Expanded Public Works Program over the next 3 years, to upgrade tourism infrastructure; (TE, pp5)</li> <li>• The Cape Strategy is well under implementation through mainstreaming. Two projects, evolving out of the CAPE strategy continue to receive GEF funds, namely - Cape Action Plan for the Environment Implementation Program and the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative.</li> <li>• A number of incentives are now in place to support further contracting-in of private land, including a rates exemption offered by the City Council to private landowners.</li> </ul> <p>However, there are some factors whose future implications are <u>not clearly addressed in the TE</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The last PIR(2005) states that “clarity is required from SANParks on how it intends to ensure that adequate financial provision is made for the ongoing clearing of alien invasive vegetation in the Table Mountain National Park.”</li> <li>• Fluctuation of the exchange rate between the US dollar and the South African rand impacted the actual rate of return from the Table Mountain Fund (TE, pp11)</li> </ul>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the TE, strong emphasis was placed on building partnerships between executing agencies, non-governmental organizations, research institutes and the private sector from the outset, in order to <b>create commitment</b> to implementation and ensure long-term social sustainability to match the efforts towards ecological sustainability. Its success, attributed in large part to strong government commitment and stakeholder support, provides a strong assurance that further conservation measures intended to realize the C.A.P.E. vision have a high probability of success, both in terms of mitigating threats and ensuring sustainability. (TE, pp8)</li> </ul>	

<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>According to the TE the following reasons ensure high sustainability of the project (TE ,pp11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Park has protection through legislation</li> <li>• the Park’s environmental education program has been mainstreamed within the curriculum of the provincial Department of Education;</li> <li>• the Park is managed by by SANParks, the country’s premier conservation agency with the highest levels of expertise and management capability;</li> <li>• the new biodiversity legislation ensures that the managers of protected areas are to develop and implement plans to control and eradicate invasive alien plants;</li> <li>• partnerships agreements exist with all major institutional stakeholders</li> </ul>	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>Given the following factors there is low environmental risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful roll back of the threat of invasive alien species allowing natural regeneration (TE, pp3). <b>However</b>, the last PIR(2005) states that “clarity is required from SANParks on how it intends to ensure that adequate financial provision is made for the ongoing clearing of alien invasive vegetation in the Table Mountain National Park.” . It is unclear from the TE if this has been subsequently addressed.</li> <li>• Upgrading of Environmental education stimulates visitor demand and interest. For example, the Park operates environmental education and outreach programs involving 24,000 visits by local schoolchildren per year.</li> <li>• Improved fire management: the levels of fire-preparedness are significantly higher than at project inception and fire services are much better organized (TE, pp36). Improved effectiveness in fire detection and suppression has dramatically reduced the probability that very large fires will occur. (TE, pp6)</li> <li>• Capacity building amongst potential contractors to carry out clearing of alien species, footpath maintenance and other park-related tasks. (TE, pp3)</li> <li>• Knowledge management: The existing Park Environmental Information System (EIS) was upgraded and consolidated to incorporate the results of management research. (TE, pp3)</li> </ul>	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: HL</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: HL</b>

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<p><b>1. Production of a public good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of a financially and institutionally viable Park and a ‘model’ Trust Fund, protecting globally significant flora and related fauna has provided critical public knowledge.</li> <li>• The Park itself, with its effects on the environment, prevention of wildfires, and increased environmental education is a public good.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Demonstration - The CAPE strategy</b> and its implementation have influenced landscape and bioregional planning in a number of other parts of South Africa and the world, including the Sub-tropical Thicket Ecosystem Project, the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Project, the Grasslands Biome Project, the Eastern African Marine Ecoregion (Kenya, Tanzania and Mozambique), the Central Annamites (Vietnam), an Eastern Africa Coastal Forests, as well as the dryland ecoregional programs of WWF. The Strategy has resulted in two new Programs funded by the GEF. (TE, pp15)</p>
<p><b>3. Replication</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In at least 80% of cases, TMF funding has served as seed funding, leveraging resources from other sources and building partnerships. (TE, pp8)</li> <li>• Project processes and outputs have had significant influence on GoSA institutions and management practices beyond the immediate project implementers (TE, pp15)</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Scaling up</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total domestic co-financing exceeded the appraisal target 118% allowing scaling-up of the current project.</li> <li>• The Trust Fund has provided catalytic resources for over 60 projects (many are community based) amounting to \$2.5 million in the past 6 years. In at least 80% of cases, TMF funding has served as seed funding, leveraging resources from other sources and building partnerships.</li> <li>• The Cape Strategy has resulted in two new Programs funded by the GEF. (TE, pp15).</li> </ul>

#### **4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE**

<p><b>A. In retrospect, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b></p> <p><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>According to the TE, the project benefited from a flexible design and Log-frame. As a result there was fine tuning of many of the indicators. Project implementation had to take into account management changes especially as the national park was being consolidated and formed from the multitude of local governments under whose jurisdiction parts of the Park were under. (TE, pp14)</p>
<p><b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b></p> <p><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>All three components undertake regular in-house and independent reviews, incorporating stakeholder participation. The TMNP Integrated Environmental and Management System (IEMS, based on ISO 14000). provides the basis for ongoing data capture and management monitoring for the Park (TE, pp16) This system represents South African best practice, and has served as a model for implementing environmental management systems throughout SANParks (TE, pp8).</p>
<p><b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b></p> <p><b>Rating: U/A</b></p>
<p>M&amp;E and Environmental Information System account for 38% of Consultant Services (\$3.4 million of \$91.2 million Procurement Arrangements was allocated for Consultant services, of which \$1.3 million was for M&amp;E and EIS). The actual (Vs appraisal) amount for M&amp;E services is not available. TE (pp 20)</p> <p>The PAD mentions that a full-time staff will be designated "Manager, M&amp;E and Evaluation" and will be supported by a GIS/IS specialist. (PAD, pp7) No information is available on whether this was position was instituted.</p>
<p><b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? U/A</b></p>

#### **4.5 Lessons**

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p><b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b></p>
<p>The TE provides a number of lessons learned, some include:</p>

*Take advantage of post-conflict opportunities to influence policy and practice:* This GEF investment in South Africa in the immediate post-conflict period took advantage of the “window of opportunity”, offered by the fluid policy and institutional environment, to catalyse a paradigm shift in the way in which biodiversity conservation is undertaken, establishing the conditions for more effective conservation in the country.

*Avoid over-design:* The project benefited significantly from a broad-brush Logframe, which clearly set out the objectives and KPIs but avoided detail (10% design and 90% implementation). This created sufficient flexibility and robustness to allow for adjustments where necessary and facilitated innovative approaches and solutions. A free hand was given to the architects of the project to be innovative and to take risks.

*Use limited resources to catalyze projects and leverage other sources of funding:* TMF works on the principle that a small amount of funding can catalyze significant outcomes through appropriate co-funding and project partnerships. This also leverages stakeholder commitment and supports sustainability.

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** 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 the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

#### 4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	S
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	HS
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	U
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	MU

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes X:

No:

Explain: Given the high sustainability and outcome ratings it would be useful to follow-up on project impacts and to ascertain lessons that be replicated by other projects.

#### 4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

PAD,1998 and PIR, 2005