

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF ID:	20		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA ID	836	GEF financing:	0.74	0.74
Project Name:	Conservation Planning in Thicket Biome	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Country:	South Africa	Government:	0.00	0.00
		Other*:	0.12	0.18
		Total Cofinancing	0.12	0.18
Operational Program:	OP1	Total Project Cost:	0.86	0.92
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Terrestrial Ecology Research Unit, University of Port Elizabeth The Institute for Plant Conservation, University of Cape Town	Work Program date		05/06/1999
		CEO Endorsement		07/21/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		06/14/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: June 2004
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 12 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date: 03/23/2005	TE submission date to GEF OME:9/21/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 6 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

GEFME 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). GEFME 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. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project outcomes	S	NA	NA	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	NA	NA	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	NA	NA	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes, but with some qualifications. This terminal evaluation adequately covers most of the important issues, however, it does not provide ratings for the indicators.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The project proposal document for CEO Approval is not available at either the GEF PMIS database (or through an externally accessible GEF project database) or at the World Bank's project database.

According to the TE the project's goal was to: *"To promote the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the Thicket Biome."* There is no information to suggest whether there were changes in the global environmental objective of the project during its implementation.

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

According to the TE, the project has following development objectives:

- *"To provide a detailed spatial analysis of the various thicket types.*
- *To assess, together with key stakeholders, the extent of transformation.*
- *To develop, together with key stakeholders, an understanding of the threats.*
- *To locate and design, together with key stakeholders, potential conservation areas to achieve explicit representation goals.*
- *To suggest, together with key stakeholders, explicit conservation actions, in priority order.*
- *To provide information for incorporation into regional Structure Plans and national Environmental Management Frameworks*
- *To provide planning guidelines for the relevant working group of the national committee for Environmental Co-ordination.*
- *To provide a capacity building service in GIS-based conservation planning, especially in the institutionally weakened Eastern Cape.*
- *To guide investors from the public and private sectors in the selection of land for thicket biome-based commercial ventures.*
- *To create an awareness of the value and plight of the Thicket Biome."*

The above listed objectives have been listed as grant objectives in the 2003 PIR, and as Global Environmental Objectives in the 2002 PIR. Other than a minor change in the development objective pertaining to "GIS-based conservation", where the objective was modified as GIS potential was too limited, there was little change in the development objectives during project implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE following outcomes and impacts, which on most instances are just outputs, were achieved vis-à-vis the stated project development objectives:

- To provide a detailed spatial analysis of the various thicket types: The vegetation mapping exercise produced comprehensive analysis of thicket types. Whereas previously only 5 types were recognized, now 112 types have been described and mapped.
- To assess, together with key stakeholders, the extent of transformation: The extent of thicket transformation, caused by a range of factors, has been spatially assessed with the help of key stakeholders.
- To develop, together with key stakeholders, an understanding of the threats: In collaboration with the key stakeholders, a good understanding of the threats to thicket has been developed and spatially expressed.
- To locate and design, together with key stakeholders, potential conservation areas to achieve explicit representation goals: With assistance from the key stakeholders a

Conservation Priority Map has been prepared. The map identifies and ranks areas that are important for conducting ecologically sustainable land-use practices.

- To suggest, together with key stakeholders, explicit conservation actions, in priority order: Explicit conservation actions were identified and prioritized in a strategy workshop, which was attended by key stakeholders.
- To provide information for incorporation into regional Structure Plans and national Environmental Management Frameworks: The spatial planning guidelines from the project were made available to local, provincial and national government agencies tasked with land-use planning activities, including the compilation of spatial planning frameworks.
- To provide planning guidelines for the relevant working group of the national committee for Environmental Co-ordination: The planning guidelines were provided to the biodiversity section of the National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism for incorporation into the national planning framework and to inform the activities of Working Group 1 of MinTech and the CEC.
- To provide a capacity building service in GIS-based conservation planning, especially in the institutionally weakened Eastern Cape: A series of capacity building workshops, well attended by the decision makers and planners from public and private sectors, were organized at three locations. While scope of the GIS based conservation planning was reduced due to severe capacity constraints, as an alternative activity a handbook was compiled to make the project planning tools more accessible to local government planning authorities.
- To guide investors from the public and private sectors in the selection of land for thicket biome-based commercial ventures: A framework and co-operative strategy for conserving landscapes and enhancing livelihoods in the Thicket Biome was developed. In addition, a preliminary set of explicit guidelines, focusing on a spatial component, were developed for potential investors of the game-based ventures.
- To create an awareness of the value and plight of the Thicket Biome: The project significantly increased the general awareness on the value and plight of the thicket biome, both within and outside the project area, through an outreach program comprising a media campaign and development and release of project related literature.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts **Rating: S**

A Relevance

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

Projects outcomes were consistent with the focal areas operational program strategies. The projects global environmental objective was to “promote the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the Thicket Biome” which is consistent with the biodiversity focal area’s priorities. Further, the reported project outcomes are also likely to lead to impacts that are consistent with the focal area/operational program strategies.

S

B Effectiveness

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurate 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)?**

Most of the reported outcomes were commensurate with the expected outcomes. Only outcomes on capacity building service through a GIS-based conservation planning were not commensurate. After it became apparent that scope for GIS based conservation planning was much lower than had been anticipated, corrective measures were taken. The component was altered to include compilation of a handbook on conservation planning. Thus, it could be said that overall the project outcomes were commensurate with the expectations.

S
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>The TE has not compared the efficiency performance of the project with other similar projects. A 12 month delay in completion of the project could have reduced the project cost-effectiveness despite it meeting its objectives in substantial measures but since this issue has not been explicitly addressed in the TE it is not possible to grade project results on this dimension.</p>
UA

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
According to the TE, National Biodiversity Institute has assumed the responsibility for carrying on with the activities propagated by the project, along with other bioregional planning projects in the area. However, TE qualifies it by informing that even though the NBI is committed to continue to following up with project activities, it faces challenges in securing the necessary resources (human, financial, technical) to make meaningful progress. Additional funds that became available due to a favorable exchange rate have enabled the project to facilitate further catalyzation. Although availability of additional funds due to exchange rate fluctuations had not been anticipated, TE opines that its availability will ensure project's sustainability. Thus, there is only a limited risk to sustainability of project's outcomes.	
B Socio political	Rating: L
According to the TE, the project has enjoyed support of the national, provincial and local government agencies involved in biodiversity and land-use planning. Further, the planning guidelines developed as part of the project have been integrated into the planning policies and frameworks of all these agencies. Based on the information provided by the TE, EO concludes that the socio-political sustainability of the project is satisfactory. Based on this it could be inferred that there is very little socio-political risk that may affect the sustainability of project's outcomes.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
The TE informs that the national, provincial and local government agencies have integrated the planning guidelines recommended by the project into their planning policies and frameworks. However, in some cases at the local municipal level, severe paucity of capacities has prevented in making these policies operational. Further, the project outputs have formed the basis for the compilation of a provincial conservation plan in the Eastern Cape; this plan informs the province's growth and development plan. Based on the evidence cited by TE, EO concludes that Institutional Framework and Governance related risks are low and that the performance of the project on this dimension is satisfactory.	
D Environmental (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: UA
The TE has not covered the issue of environmental risks to sustainability of the project outcomes.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: L
B Socio political	Rating: L
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
D Environmental	Rating: UA

Catalysis and Replication

- i. **Production of a public good:** The project did produce new knowledge on conservation planning for thicket biome. According to the TE, the information generated on conservation assessment and stakeholder participation components of the project is very good and could easily be replicated outside the project area with minor adjustments for local conditions.
- ii. **Demonstration:**
- iii. **Replication:** According to the TE, some components of the project such as systematic conservation planning will be widely replicated in other parts of South Africa.
- iv. **Scaling Up:**

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

<p>A. In retrospect, was the M&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&E activities)</p>	Rating: NA
<p>The TE has not addressed this issue. Further, since the project appraisal documents submitted for CEO Endorsement are not available at PMIS, and externally accessible project database of World Bank or the GEF, this issue could not be addressed.</p>	
<p>B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives?</p>	Rating: S
<p>Based on the information provided in the TE it is inferred that a well functioning M&E system was in place during project's implementation. According to the TE, a steering committee was established to monitor the progress of the project. The committee met every six month and reviewed the annual business plan and progress report for the period. In addition, quarterly work plans and progress reports were prepared. The TE further informs that independent reviewers were appointed to prepare two interim assessments, and a final comprehensive assessment. In its section monitoring and evaluation, the TE states that the progress and achievements of the project were assessed by comparing measurable products against baseline information on project indicators. This implies that a well functioning system for collection of information on key indicators was in place. The TE also states that the project progress was also peer reviewed to facilitate 'development' of the project. It informs that no changes were made in the review process during the course of the project.</p>	
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was there existing capacity or was this capacity built to implement the M&E plan?</p>	Rating: S
<p>The TE report has not addressed the issue of sufficiency of the M&E activities directly. In 'Annex 1' of TE, budget and actual expenditure for various project activities have been listed. However, these activities have not been classified on the basis of whether they were conducted as part of the M&E exercise. This said some of the activities such as Project Reviewer and Biological Survey that are generally associated with monitoring and evaluation were listed in the annex and well funded. Also, since TE mentions that M&E activities were conducted as per the plan, it could be inferred that M&E was sufficiently budgeted and there was enough capacity (in house or outsourced) to carry out M&E activities.</p>	
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?</p> <p>Insufficient information has been provided in the TE on some dimensions of M&E, especially quality of the M&E plan at entry. Hence it is difficult to draw conclusions.</p>	

4.4 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

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?

Following lessons mentioned in the TE could have an application for other GEF projects:

- For similar projects it should be ensured that the project team has proven abilities in project management, field and remote research, conservation planning, public participation, capacity building (training) and information dissemination.
- Key stakeholders should be identified and consulted during both project development and implementation.
- For success in mainstreaming the outcomes of complex and technical conservation assessments it is essential that these outcomes are presented in an accessible and easily understandable form and that influential persons champion the cause.
- Institutional capacity and political stability are important for operationalization of findings of such projects.
- Education and training are important for successful mainstreaming of bioregional planning products.

4.5 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.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

No such information was available to the reviewer.

4.5.2 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?	MS
Ratings have not been provided.	
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	S
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?	S
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	MS

4.6 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:	No:
	X

Explain: The project outcomes can be easily verified. The connection between outcomes and impacts in a conservation planning project – where one would expect lot of lag time – will be difficult to establish.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No such issue has been mentioned.

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

The Terminal Evaluation Report

PIR 2002

PIR 2003