

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1782		Review date:		
		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	0.902	0.450
Project Name:	Richtersveld Community Biodiversity Conservation Project	IA/EA own:		
Country:	South Africa	Government:		
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	1.572	1.572**
Operational Program:	OPI: Arid/Semi-Arid Ecosystems; Focal area: Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	2.474	2.022
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Dept. Environmental Affairs & Tourism, Richtersveld Municipality	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Feb. 2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: March 2007	Actual: March 2009
TER Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 60	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 24
Author of TE:		TE completion date: Dec. 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):

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

**GEF PMIS records co-financing amounts as \$1.166 M.

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	MU	U	N/A	U
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	U (HIGH RISK)	N/A	U
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	N/A	N/A	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	MS	MU	N/A	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

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

This terminal evaluation report should not be considered a good practice. It is too brief to be a useful tool for identifying how and why the project was unable to get off the ground. As such it doesn't provide much guidance for how to design future projects focusing on the Richtersveld.

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

The TE report notes that the executing agency made ineligible expenditures/ineligible use of grant funds after the

project's closing date. The World Bank team in S. Africa and the National Treasury has requested reimbursement of these funds, but so far has not had a satisfactory response. This may slow the disbursement of funds to other GEF projects in S. Africa.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The global environmental objectives as noted the Project Document was "to protect globally significant biodiversity in the Succulent Karoo biome" and to establish a "strong system of community-based biodiversity conservation in partnership with key stakeholders."

There were no changes to global environmental objectives during implementation.

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)?)

As noted in the Project Document, the development objectives of the project were to "support biodiversity planning of the region, reduce pressures on the ecosystem through community based natural resource management" and "support at pilot level the development of biodiversity-based enterprises and promote awareness raising."

Specific project objectives listed in the Project Document were:

1. Produce a conservation and environmental management plan and development strategy for the Richtersveld.
2. Develop a "community conservancy" and support the development of a network of conservation areas.
3. Support the development of nature-based businesses that require conservation of the region's biodiversity assets.
4. Ensure that the community and relevant institutions are capacitated to implement community based natural resource management. This is a cross cutting theme addressed in objectives 1, 2 and 3 above.
5. Promote awareness about the importance of the region's biodiversity.
6. Develop an environmental monitoring and community-based rapid environmental response system.

Project activities were divided among six components focusing on:

- (i) Conservation planning framework and environmental planning and development system;
- (ii) Support to the establishment of the proposed conservancy and network of conservation areas [**revised** to "establish and invest in protected areas and community-based biodiversity conservation"]
- (iii) New livelihoods based on eco-tourism and biodiversity based opportunities;
- (iv) Environmental awareness raising and education;
- (v) Biodiversity monitoring and community-based rapid response system; and
- (vi) Project management support.

Revisions: The 2004 national Biodiversity Act did not recognize "communal conservancy" as category of protected area. Therefore **Objective 2/Component 2**, were revised to "establish and invest in protected areas and community-based biodiversity conservation" and support nomination of the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape as a UNESCO World Heritage Site (a category recognized under the above Act). This revision was approved by the IA. There were no changes to other objectives or components during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
		X			
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)	
	X				

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>The project’s design and objectives were relevant to the aims of the GEF Focal Area on Biodiversity and the goals of OP1: Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems. Project objectives were also consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity (ratified by S. Africa in 1995). Project objectives were also consistent with national policies regarding community based natural resource management, prevention of land degradation, poverty alleviation, and conservation of globally significant biodiversity (i.e. the National Environment Policy, the Biodiversity White Paper, the Transfrontier Conservation Area with Namibia, community Integrated Development Plans). Project objectives were approved by the Dept. of Environment and Tourism.</p> <p>The two main outcomes from this project, an environmental planning framework and development of a biodiversity monitoring system, are relevant to the GEF focus on biodiversity and national priorities for sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity conservation.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: U
<p>The TE report only briefly describes project implementation and the extent of achievement of project outcomes, therefore this review cannot provide a detailed assessment of project effectiveness or impacts.</p> <p>Based on information in the TE report, this project has made some strides towards the objectives stated in the Project Documents, but output was far below what was expected. In light of the very limited achievement of outcomes, this review concurs with the TE report in rating effectiveness as Unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Under Component 1, the project has conducted studies of the proposed conservancy area, collected baseline information, and developed maps that are available for the Richtersveld Community Property Association. The recommendations for land use management devised by the project have been incorporated into the municipal and regional planning frameworks.</p> <p>Under Component 2, the project supported the creation of a World Heritage Site in the Richtersveld. However there were no other “tangible” outputs in terms of investments or work towards community based management.</p> <p>Under Component 3, the project conducted a feasibility study on biodiversity-friendly business opportunities, and developed a marketing plan to support such businesses. However there is no indication of investment in such businesses or creation of jobs.</p> <p>Under Component 4, the project was supposed to rehabilitate 4 museums as environmental/tourist centers, as well as conducting environmental education and media campaigns. However, the only output under this component is a preliminary study on the renovation of the 4 museums.</p> <p>Under Component 5, a biodiversity monitoring system has been designed and some related training has been carried out with members of the Municipal staff. However, the project has not been able to establish baselines or actually implement monitoring.</p>	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: U
<p>The project was granted two extensions (a total of 30 months) and over its 5-year implementation period achieved very few of the expected outputs. Based on information in the TE report, the executing agency had insufficient capacity to manage the project and carry out activities. In light of the very slow pace of implementation, only half the original grant amount, approximately \$450,000, was disbursed to the project by closing. Efficiency is therefore rated Unsatisfactory.</p>	

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
<p>No sources of sustained financing for any project outcomes were identified in the TE report. The proclamation of a World Heritage Site may attract investment for implementing the planning framework and biodiversity monitoring system developed under this project.</p>	
b. Socio political	Rating: MU
<p>The project lands are communally owned under a Community Property Association (CPA). Based on the TE report,</p>	

participation by members of the CPA (the stakeholders) was limited and awareness of project objectives/outcomes is not widespread. The project has not impacted local livelihoods and has not generated sufficient interest to sustain and implement outcomes.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
The institutional framework for sustaining project outcomes will depend on the arrangements (still unresolved) to manage the World Heritage Site. Authority over the area is divided between the executing agency, the Richtersveld Sustainable Development Company, the local Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape Association and the national-level Council for Sports, Arts, and Culture. There is some risk that the local level organizations, particularly the executing agency, do not have the administrative capacity to sustain project outcomes. However, the involvement of a national agency may bolster local capacity.	
d. Environmental	Rating: MU
In this system of communal land ownership, poor herd management practices and overgrazing are the most important environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. Without community level investment in sustainable livelihoods and enforcement of a grazing plan these risks remain significant.	

4.3 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?	
The co-financing committed in the Project Document was \$1.572 M, from the Conservation International (CI), GTZ/Transform, SANParks, the municipal budget, and Poverty Relief funding. GEF records indicate that the co-financing amount was \$1.16M. The Project Document notes that the amount of realized co-financing was "very limited" without exact numbers. As implementation was very slow, only the municipality and CI contributed to the project. No information is available on the type or amount of co-financing from CI. Co-financing from the municipality, in the form of office space and overhead, was important for achieving project outcomes.	
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?	
<p>The project suffered from delays throughout implementation. The executing agency, the Richtersveld Sustainable Development Company (RSDC) faced difficulties in hiring and retaining skilled project staff and consultants. Lack of project management capacity, high staff turnover and learning curves for new staff slowed implementation.</p> <p>Legal disputes over the ownership of the Richtersveld and the rights of the Community Property Association (CPA) continued until 2007. This delayed project activities regarding implementation of the planning framework.</p> <p>The proclamation of the World Heritage Site and the subsequent appointment of the Council for Sports, Arts and Culture as management authority for the Site delayed the project further. The municipality and the Council are still in discussion to finalize a management system for the Site.</p>	
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.	
Country ownership of the project has been limited. The Dept. of Environmental Affairs and Tourism proposed the project on behalf of the Richtersveld Municipality and helped facilitate disbursement of funds. During implementation, there was no support or guidance to the Municipality from this Dept. or from SANParks, which manages the Richtersveld national park. Greater guidance from the national government, particularly in finding and hiring qualified staff, and enhancing municipal capacities, might have led to improved project outcomes.	

4.4 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 Project Document included an M&E plan as well as a log-frame with relevant indicators for each objective and component. The project budget included sufficient funding for M&E activities as part of the Project Management Unit. The indicators could have been more precise. For indicators such as "increase in area of globally significant	

biodiversity” or “number of jobs and investment created in biodiversity friendly activities” there were no established baselines against which to measure progress.

b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): UA

The TE report does not evaluate implementation of the project’s M&E system. There is no information on whether any M&E activities (reporting, supervision) were carried out as planned.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MU

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU

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.

The implementing agency for this project was the World Bank team in S. Africa. Based on information in the TE report, the project design was quite relevant to national and GEF priorities. However, the timing of the project and the choice of executing agency are questionable. There was no clear legal and institutional framework governing the Richtersveld at the time of project proposal. The peoples of the Richtersveld were involved in a legal battle on ownership and restitution rights. The Community Property Association was only recently created and governance arrangements between it and the Richtersveld Municipality were unclear.

The executing agency, the Richtersveld Municipality, did not have the capacity for this type of project and required “intensive Bank support.” Consequently, the pace of project implementation was very slow. Although the Bank provided support for all procurement activities, the level of supervision and management inputs from the Bank were inadequate during the first two years of the project. It was only during the last 24 months before closure that the Bank pushed the executing agency to hire more qualified staff and achieve some outputs. The TE report does not discuss performance with regard to monitoring and reporting.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) MU

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.

The executing agency for the project was the Richtersveld Sustainable Development Company (RCSD), an entity created within the Richtersveld Municipality to execute this project. As noted above, the RCSD and the Municipality did not have adequate administrative capacity to execute this project. The TE report notes that the Municipality faced “severe difficulties” finding and retaining qualified staff and consultants for this project. Greater support from the IA and from national government partners could have helped the Municipality to develop the necessary capacity. As a result, project implementation was slow. It only during the last two years that the project team was able to produce some key studies and plans. The TE report does not assess the quality of reporting or risk management.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

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.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Integrate biodiversity considerations into development planning, in particular the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and establish an environmental planning and development framework to implement the conservation plan.	Conservation planning framework and environmental planning system established in partnership with key stakeholders. Conservancy established to preserve areas of endemic biodiversity	A strong system of community-based biodiversity conservation operating in the project area. Community conservancy, a network of conservation areas and grazing plan implemented.	Strengthened protection and management of biodiversity in the project area. Area under protection more than doubled. Reduced pressures on the ecosystem; regeneration of some affected areas.
Support to create a community conservancy and a network of community-based conservation areas.	Bio-monitoring system and community-based rapid environment response system established.	Removal of barriers to the growth of sustainable businesses and eco-tourism.	Realization of benefits from conservation and improved economic conditions for local communities.
Support to design and implement a monitoring system and a community based rapid response system.	Feasibility studies of sustainable businesses; investment on a pilot basis.	Enhanced awareness of the region's biodiversity.	Growth and investment in sustainable businesses.
Identification of barriers to investment in sustainable biodiversity-based businesses.	Environmental awareness infrastructure in place, awareness materials distributed and used.	Bio-monitoring system and community based rapid response system operational.	
Public education and environmental awareness activities.			

b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?

Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to *impact drivers* (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

This project had few outputs and consequently few outcomes or impacts. The only impact noted in the TE report was the successful nomination of the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Other impacts may include enhanced capacity of the executing agency and greater awareness of biodiversity concerns in the community, but the TE report does not provide sufficient information to evaluate these impacts.

Information is insufficient to fully evaluate impact drivers. Local institutional capacity and the local political economy are clearly important factors influencing impacts, but these are outside project control.

c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?

While arrangements to manage the WHS were still on-going at the time the project closed, risks to the sustainability achieved impact, the WHS site, is low. SANParks, either alone or in collaboration with a local group, will manage the WHS site.

As local capacity is very weak, it is unlikely the project will have any further likely impacts or build on the few outputs (environmental planning tools, studies on sustainable businesses, and the bio-monitoring system) that were achieved. There is small chance that whoever manages the WHS site may use these outputs in developing a new management plan.

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?		X	
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)		X	
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?		X	
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
No negative impacts were noted in the TE report or in the PIRs.			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?		X	
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?		X	

6. 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

1. Initiating a project where legal aspects in terms of land ownership remain unresolved during a good part of the life of the project is a serious constraint and should be avoided.
2. The obvious lack of suitable institutional capacity of the implementation agency required close support by the task team but Bank's transaction cost are simply too high for such kind of operation.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Under the condition that the Government can finalize the process of handing-over WHS management to the local community an NGO's or a bilateral development agency with on the ground presence is needed to follow up with appropriate support. Private-sector involvement, i.e. in nature-based tourism, could as well assist in skills development

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

and in the urgently needed diversification of local income generation.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 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.

No other sources were consulted.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criterion 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.

7.2 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 TE report provides a brief assessment of outcomes under each component. Discussion of impacts is brief.</p>	MS
<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 TE report is internally consistent, but lacks sufficient detail to adequately substantiate its own ratings. There are no IA ratings.</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report briefly mentions overall sustainability. There is no discussion of a project exit strategy.</p>	MU
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are supported by evidence, but are not comprehensive. There are no lessons regarding project design or implementation.</p>	MS
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No, the report does not present actual project costs or actual co-financing amounts.</p>	U
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report does not evaluate the project M&E system.</p>	U

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

No other sources were consulted.