

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

### 1. Project Data

| Summary project data                                   |              |   |                        |
|--|--------------|---|------------------------|
| GEF project ID   |              | 1516  |                        |
| GEF Agency project ID                                  |              | UNDP 2204 WB 075997   |                        |
| GEF Replenishment Phase                                |              | GEF- 3  |                        |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)       |              | UNDP, World Bank  |                        |
| Project name   |              | C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project (BCSD)   |                        |
| Country/Countries                                      |              | South Africa  |                        |
| Region   |              | AFR   |                        |
| Focal area   |              | Biodiversity  |                        |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives |              | Arid and Semi-Arid zone Ecosystems<br>Coastal, Marine, Freshwater Ecosystems<br>Forest Ecosystems<br>Mountain Ecosystems  |                        |
| Executing agencies involved                            |              | South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI, previously the National Botanical Institute) [Lead Executing Agency]<br>Cape Nature (CN) [Executing Agency]<br>South African National Parks (SANParks) [Executing Agency]<br>Wilderness Foundation [Executing Agency]<br>CAPE Coordination Unit (CCU), established by SANBI to coordinate project.<br>Rhodes University [sub-executing agency]<br>Eastern Cape Parks Board (ECPB) [sub-executing agency] |                        |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement                                  |              | Wilderness Foundation [executing agency]<br>World Wildlife Fund Marine Programme [project partner for the MPA component]  |                        |
| Private sector involvement                             |              | None noted.   |                        |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)             |              | 4/30/2004   |                        |
| Effectiveness date / project start                     |              | 7/26/2004   |                        |
| Expected date of project completion (at start)         |              | 10/31/2009  |                        |
| Actual date of project completion                      |              | 10/30/2010  |                        |
| Project Financing                                      |              |   |                        |
|  |              | At Endorsement (US \$M)   | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant                              | GEF funding  |   |                        |
|  | Co-financing |   |                        |
| GEF Project Grant                                      |              | 9 (WB) + 2 (UNDP)   | 9 (WB) + 2 (UNDP)      |
| Co-financing   | IA/EA own    |   |                        |
|  | Government   | 26.93   |                        |
|  | Other*       | 17.5  |                        |
| Total GEF funding                                      |              | 11  | 11                     |
| Total Co-financing                                     |              | 44.13   | 84.37                  |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)    |              | 55.13   | 95.37                  |
| Terminal evaluation/review information                 |              |   |                        |
| TE completion date                                     |              | 4/20/2011   |                        |
| TE submission date                                     |              | July 2011   |                        |

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Author of TE</b>                          | Philip Tortell, Consultant |
| <b>TER completion date</b>                   | 01/13/2014                 |
| <b>TER prepared by</b>                       | Dania Trespalacios         |
| <b>TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)</b> | Joshua Schneck             |

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria   | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF EO Review |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Project Outcomes</b>                          | S         | S                      | Not rated                   | HS            |
| <b>Sustainability of Outcomes</b>                | L         | L                      | Not rated                   | L             |
| <b>M&amp;E Design</b>                            | MS        | S                      | Not rated                   | S             |
| <b>M&amp;E Implementation</b>                    | MS        | S                      | Not rated                   | S             |
| <b>Quality of Implementation</b>                 | S         | HS                     | Not rated                   | S             |
| <b>Quality of Execution</b>                      | S         | HS                     | Not rated                   | S             |
| <b>Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report</b> |           |                        | Not rated                   | HS            |

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Cape Floristic Region (CFR) is the smallest and richest of the world's floral kingdoms and entirely contained within South Africa. It is a global biodiversity hotspot because of its rich levels of floral diversity and high degree of threat, especially to lowland habitats which are under pressure from conversion for agriculture and urban development. The key threats include: habitat loss and fragmentation due to urban expansion and agricultural development; invasive species; inappropriate fire management; over-abstraction of surface and underground water; and over-exploitation of natural resources.

This BCSD project occurs in the context of the larger, 20-year Cape Action for People and the Environment (C.A.P.E.) Programme, and is one of several GEF funded projects intended to support the first five years of this Programme.

The Global Environmental Objective of this project is synonymous with that of the CAPE Programme: to ensure that the conservation of Cape Floristic Region and adjacent marine environment is secured by 2024. The BCSD project targeted mainly foundational and intermediate institutional and coordinating activities.

In terms of immediate environmental objectives, the project aimed to expand the protected area network by 400,000 ha (including three additional terrestrial protected areas, two marine protected areas, two estuaries and two freshwater systems), and improve the management of protected areas with endangered species. The protected areas include the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, the Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve, the Garden Route Initiative and the Kogelberg Biosphere and Marine Reserve.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The role of the Project is to catalyze and drive the implementation of the C.A.P.E. Programme by enhancing the policy and institutional framework for conservation in the

CFR and by undertaking carefully targeted conservation demonstrations in selected biophysical, socio-economic and institutional contexts.

The project had 2 immediate objectives:

- 1) Establishing a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities, through:
  - a. institutional strengthening
  - b. conservation education
  - c. program and project coordination, management and monitoring
- 2) Piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management of the CFR, through:
  - a. protected areas
  - b. biodiversity economy and conservation stewardship
  - c. watershed management

The BCSD project also aimed to contribute to poverty mitigation and economic growth.

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

There were **no** changes in either the Global Environmental Objectives or the 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.

|                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.1 <b>Relevance</b> | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|

The project outcomes are consistent with the biodiversity focal area strategies, including the improvement of sustainability of protected area systems, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into sectors.

The project is in line with country priorities. The CAPE 2000 Strategy was created by the Government of South Africa to protect the biological heritage of the CFR and to ensure that biodiversity conservation was mainstreamed into economic development and poverty alleviation strategies. This Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development (BCSD) Project was designed to support the first phase of the CAPE Program.

|                   |                                    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|

The project outcomes are commensurate with the expected outcomes. The project successfully achieved all of the main objectives described in the initial Project Appraisal Document, which include:

- All C.A.P.E. signatory institutions directly support implementation of the Project
- The number of registered civil society stakeholders participating in the Project increases by 30%
- A CFR-wide conservation education strategy is successfully designed and implemented across the Project area
- The Baviaanskloof, Cederberg and Garden Route protected areas have been consolidated
- The number of jobs directly associated with conservation and nature-based tourism in Project intervention sites increases by 20%
- Spatial development frameworks in six representative lowland sites incorporate conservation priorities
- Five-year targets for protected area status for irreplaceable Broad Habitat Units in Lowland areas and watersheds are met as defined by the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy

The TE notes that some of these objectives exceeded expectations (TE pg 36-37), and declares the BCSD a successful project. Most products have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies at both national and provincial levels.

The TE considers whether the project outcomes appropriately respond to the project objectives of enhancing the policy and institutional framework for conservation in the CFR, and finds that “some indicators are not completely specific or relevant to the Objective” (TE pg 35-37). However, the TE ultimately finds that the project objectives have been achieved, as indicated by Close-out reports, the PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, consultations and field visits.

Because the project targeted many foundational and intermediate products related to capacity and institution building, the full impact of the project will accrue in time and is yet to be demonstrated.

|                |                             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.3 Efficiency | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|----------------|-----------------------------|

The World Bank’s Implementation Completion and Results Report notes that “implementation of the BCSD Project was efficient in terms of leveraging GEF funds and cost-effective in terms of achieving the project objectives in general and specific biodiversity conservation targets in particular.” The TE notes that the project time was extended by a year, though it does not give a reason for this extension, and also notes that financial management of the project was satisfactory.

All project objectives were either achieved or exceeded with the initial level of GEF funding planned. There was a considerably large amount of co-funding, enough to potentially cover for any inefficiencies.

The UNDP TE notes that the execution and the execution and implementation arrangements for this project were complex, since they involved two implementing agencies and three sub-executing agencies, and a range of key partners in government and civil society. (UNDP TE pg. 19) Despite this complex structure, there were no major implementation or execution difficulties. Rather “the high level of cooperation and partnerships was a noticeable feature of this project.” (UNDP TE pg.19) This is evidence of a particularly efficient project.

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: <b>Likely</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

The TE notes that the sustainability of the project products is “generally very likely” and notes the serious efforts made towards ensuring this sustainability. The results achieved under Immediate Objective 1 will make a significant contribution to a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities. It notes that it is too early to tell whether the piloting initiatives carried out under Immediate Objective 2 achieved “enhancement of CFR conservation”.

Most products have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies at both national and provincial levels. The TE notes that some institutionalization of project outcomes is dependent on funds and financial stability that is not yet secure. The TE also notes that ecological sustainability is likely to continue due to the stewardship scheme, management plans, the widespread use of the METT, etc, in place.

## 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?

Co-funding for this project reached US \$84 million. This project was complemented by funding from the UNDP-GEF Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative Project; the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund; and the Table Mountain Fund. The latter two funded a variety of activities supporting civil society and capacity-building in the CFR. The amount of co-funding pledged far exceeded the GEF requirement and the amount actually delivered was even more impressive. However, neither the TE or the World Bank’s ICR mention that this co-funding was essential to the achievement of objectives.

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 was extended for a year. It is unclear why the extension was necessary. The delay did not affect the project's outcomes or sustainability, and none of the reviewed documents assign importance or a negative effect to this extension.

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 BCSD project was part of a larger and lengthier national 20 year plan. Both the TE and the World Bank's ICR comment that the project benefitted immensely from the support provided by the larger CAPE Programme to the BCSD project. The project's sustainability also benefits from the CAPE Programme, as there is an infrastructure in place that is directly invested in ensuring the continuation of project outcomes.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

|                                    |                             |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b> | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

The project M&E Plan comprised an impressive, comprehensive matrix which more than satisfied GEF requirements. Program monitoring was budgeted in the original Program Document. The matrix has served as an effective basis for monitoring performance, reporting progress and informing management to take any necessary corrective action. The only weakness of this approach was that the M&E matrix indicators were weak and unhelpful, and often distracted from measuring the outcomes and objectives that would indicate progress. At times the project seemed to set aside the Indicators and work effectively towards the Outcomes.

|                                   |                             |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b> | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Project reviews and evaluations were performed periodically during the project. Despite the lack of a discrete organizational set up for M&E, including dedicated personnel or assigned budget, the M&E process has been well executed. The TE very thoroughly evaluates the project's monitoring and evaluation planning and execution, according to 13 M&E parameters, including presence and relevance of indicators for each expected outcome, presence of discreet budget and time frame for M&E activities, and provisions for mid-term and terminal evaluations. The TE numerically rates each of the 13 GEF parameters for assessment of M&E plans, and awards the project a score of 28, out of 39. The implementation of such a thorough and specific M&E plan may have contributed to the successful completion of all of the main objectives described in the initial Project Appraisal Document, as is described in the assessment of outcomes above.

## 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.

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b> | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|

The execution and implementation arrangements for the project were complex. They involved two GEF Implementing Agencies, and a main Executing Agency with three sub-Executing Agencies. The Project was also supported by a range of other key partners, including central, provincial, local government and NGOs, all very actively involved. Thus the success of this project indicates a successful implementation of an unusually complex project.

The two implementing agencies, UNDP and World Bank, provided project guidance and oversight through their joint supervision and monitoring of implementation, field visits to project areas, periodical project reports and general project support. The agencies standardized all project reporting and shared all technical project documents. The TE produces convincing evidence that management and control over financial operations has been carried out successfully by the World Bank and UNDP, and that “close collaboration between the Bank and UNDP, including joint implementation support missions, ensured that the Project was managed holistically.”

|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b> | Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|

This was a complex and multi-layered project, with both government and non-government organizations serving as executing agencies. These agencies were in turn coordinated by The CAPE Coordinating Unit. The TE lauds the project implementation and coordination as efficient, cost effective and “with good leadership and excellent team spirit”, and the financial management as diligent and effectively.

## 8. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE does not mention any key lessons or good practices, but does make many recommendations to the coordinating agency of the CAPE program.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides an explicit list of specific recommendations for SANBI, the coordinator of the CAPE program that will continue after this project. They are:

- Safeguard its own coordination function to maintain collaboration, cooperation and alignment
- Broaden the range of active stakeholders to include others whose action/inaction has a bearing on biodiversity conservation, such as Agriculture
- Invest the necessary effort and resources to extend the work to Municipalities, and to ensure the meaningful involvement of grassroots communities
- Continue building capacity within government institutions as well as in the private sector and at community level
- Provide for Fine-Scale Planning to be updated regularly and managed effectively
- Instigate at national level those activities that were piloted successfully by BCSD
- Recognize that MPAs have different needs from terrestrial PAs, and provide for them
- Explore the applicability of the impressive tools developed by BCSD to other situations in South Africa, the region and further afield
- Seek institutional champions e.g. for Stewardship, Fine-Scale Planning, financial incentives and other successful products and services
- Recognize financial and budgetary constraints and seek innovative sustainable financing
- Lobby for State funding and State involvement where other avenues are not successful
- Apply a special focus on the estuarine, coastal and marine environment, and a special focus on the tourism sector as a potential income earner and ally for biodiversity conservation



## 9. 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)

NOTE: There are various documents produced by both UNDP and WB that may be considered terminal evaluations. This Terminal Evaluation Review considers the Terminal Evaluation to be the 65 page "C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project Terminal Evaluation Report", by Philip Tortell, July 2010.

| 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 lists all relevant outcomes and impacts, and explicitly rates each one in an easily manageable matrix. The TE is also careful to clarify why certain ratings were assigned, and where evidence originates. | HS        |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?         | The report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete and consistent and the ratings are well substantiated.  | HS        |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?   | The report discusses the degree to which project outcomes are likely to continue after the life of the project, and explains why.   | HS        |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?                                      | The TE does not list lessons learned, but does provide recommendations to the executing agency tasked with maintaining project outcomes.  | MS        |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?                                     | The TE includes exact amounts disbursed to each of the executing agencies, including cofinancing amounts.   | HS        |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:   | Particularly compared to other TEs, this TE explicitly and clearly evaluates the project's M&E components, and the degree to which GEF's requirements for M&E are met.  | HS        |
| <b>Overall TE Rating</b>  |   | <b>HS</b> |

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f)$$

$$0.3 \times (6 + 6) + 0.1 \times (6 + 4 + 6 + 6) = 5.8 = \text{HS}$$

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

This TER was completed using:

- World Bank Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) (April 2011)
- GEF Project Brief (April 2003)

