

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		260	
GEF Agency project ID		245	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme	
Country/Countries		Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe	
Region		Regional	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM-Short Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		IUCN-ROSA; Southern Africa Development Community Forestry Sector (SADC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/25/2000	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/14/2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		8/14/2005	
Actual date of project completion		10/31/2007	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.022	0.022
	Co-financing	0.45	0.45
GEF Project Grant		4.48	4.48
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	1.6	1.6
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.79	2.79
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		4.50	4.5
Total Co-financing		4.84	4.84
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		9.34	9.34
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		10/2008	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Stephanie Hodge and Mac Glovinsky	
TER completion date		11/06/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	U	N/A	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of Execution	MU	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to “promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in Southern Africa” (PD, pg.4).

In Southern Africa, the biodiversity is characterized by a very high country species richness (Angola, South Africa), a wide range of important sites of high endemism (Lake Malawi, Mount Mulanje, Namibia Desert, Maputo land and the fynbos of the southwestern Cape), many existing and potential RAMSAR and World Heritage sites, (Victoria Falls, Manas Pools, Bengweulu Swamps, Kafue wetlands, Lochinvar, St. Lucia, Okavango Delta). There are a large number of rare and threatened species (TE, p.15).

While most of the countries of the region have established extensive protected area systems in order to safeguard much of this biodiversity, a significant number of threats still remain (PD, p.4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is to “strengthen regional biodiversity planning, interstate cooperation and information exchange” (PD, pg.4).

The project involves nine key countries of the southern African region in a collaborative programme of activities related to national implementation of the CBD. The programme is designed to improve cooperation and to build capacity both within and between participating nations and to integrate sustainable use into biodiversity conservation and other sectoral programmes (PD, Annex 1).

The project’s objective as given in the logframe (PD, Annex 1) is to establish capacity and institutional mechanisms to enable Southern African Development Community (SADC) members to collaborate in regional biodiversity conservation, control and prevention of Invasive Alien Species and application of Access and Benefit Sharing Principles.

There are 5 immediate objectives given in the logframe:

- (1) Improve the availability and accessibility of biodiversity information and its application in conservation planning and management

- (2) Achieve cross-sectoral national and regional cooperation and coordination in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
- (3) Enhance national and regional capacity for coordination and implementation of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use activities
- (4) Integrate effective policies and practices relating to the sustainable use of biodiversity into all national and regional planning and programmes
- (5) Develop financing mechanisms to ensure the continuity of regional cooperation in biodiversity management.

In addition, the project assists the participating countries to implement their objectives and obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (PD, p.5).

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

According to the final PIR (pg.19), the project logframe was revised after the Mid-Term Evaluation. The MTE recommended that the logframe should be refocused on eight major activities with particular emphasis upon the themes of alien invasive species and access and benefit sharing. Moreover, management oversight and implementation arrangements were changed. At first the project was based in Malawi, and then it was moved to Botswana. Before the MTE, the project was executed by SADC, and technical support was given by IUCN. After the MTE revision, the project came under national execution with IUCN-ROSA as the lead execution agency, all the funds were channeled through IUCN-ROSA (TE, pg.14). The five project components remained the same (TE, pg. 3).

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.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project is relevant to GEF priorities and the national priorities. It responds to the trends of biodiversity deterioration in the region, as identified in National Environmental Action Plans, National Conservation Strategies, or Green Plans, produced by SADC countries. The project aims at building national capacity, regional self-reliance and cooperation in the implementation of the CBD in southern Africa. It addresses key elements of the GEF Operational Programme for Biodiversity, and targets action at the ecosystems level in the region. According to the PD, the approach and the expected outcomes are in line with the COP to CBD priorities, as well as with the GEF Operational Strategy. The project provides direct support to national implementation of articles from the CBD, for example articles 5, 6, 7, 10, etc. (PD, pg.10). This project also helps the countries to prepare National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). And it also improves transboundary management of ecosystems (Art. 6,8, 17 and 18 of the CBD). Finally, the project catalyzes the production of national Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, provides a regional forum for biodiversity expertise, and facilitates sharing of information relevant to trans-boundary ecosystems and migratory species; therefore it supports the National Enabling Activities relevant to the CBD (PD, pg.10).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The Terminal Evaluation rates project effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER assesses the same rating for project effectiveness. The effectiveness is rated based on the indicators of the post mid-term 2003 Ioframe. The project achieved most of its stated outcomes including piloting a successful knowledge sharing platform for regional knowledge and information exchange. However, some components that were important for the achievement of other project components were not realized, especially the Centers of Excellence (TE, pg.21).

On one hand, the project achieved most of its stated outcomes and according to the PIR, it had a significant impact at the regional level (PIR, p.18). The project successfully piloted a knowledge sharing platform for regional knowledge and information exchange. It facilitated member states' participation in the development of regional products and services and consequently supported national capacities and global benefits. The project also piloted institutional mechanisms for regional collaboration; it developed regional norms and standards that supported national biodiversity policies. According to the TE, the "the project achieved its aim, laying the groundwork for effective regional cooperation and knowledge sharing through SADC, demonstrating the value of SADC services through developing norms and guidelines" (TE, pg.4)

However, an important objective of the project was not been achieved: in particular, institutions that were expected to deliver training components of the project could not be financed through SADC resources until they had been declared Centres of Excellence (TE, pg.32). In the project design, the sole mechanism for providing technical and knowledge support to the regional expert teams on IAS and ABS. was the establishment of the Centres of Excellence (CoE). However, these centres of excellence have not been endorsed, and therefore, the training programmes could not start. The

establishment of those centers was the Indicator 1.2, and many of project objectives depended on the CoE (Indicators 1.7 Training projects, Indicator 2.1 Centres of excellence etc.)

Finally, the databases and Information System are still hosted on the project website, the project generated considerable data and developed an effective information system, however, these have not been made operational because of limited funding available

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The efficiency of the project is rated Moderately Satisfactory, because the project experienced financial problems that led to delays in implementation.

In 2004, after the MTE, the project was transferred from UNDP’s Malawi office to the UNDP Botswana country office. At that time UNDP was also migrating to a new financial management system. There were uncertainties around the project balance during this transition stages, and this led to unexpected financial problems in April 2007 that disrupted project activities. This also impacted the relationship between project’s stakeholders (TE, pg.5).

According to the TE (pg.5), “by the time additional funding became available by the UNDP to cover the shortfall in question (February 2008), the loss of face and the important relationship between the IUCN and SADC was compromised and exit strategy was left outstanding”. Therefore, the last few months of project implementation were affected. The uncertainties about the budget balance made it difficult for the project manager to focus on implementation, and this also impacted project sustainability.

These financial issues led to some delays in implementation. The project management unit was put in place 6 months after the scheduled start date, because the first financial disbursement from UNDP Botswana happened 6 months after it was requested. Therefore most country level activities started with a 6 months delay. Moreover, due to the closure of project activities, the regional consultations to establish Centres of Excellence could not be conducted, and the reduction in the number of Centers of Excellence could not be endorsed.

The TE mentions that in the long-run the necessary adjustments were made and no GEF funding was in any way misused or misdirected (TE, pg.30).

Other delays occurred that were not directly linked to the financial issues of the project. The products that required high-level political endorsement did not coincide with set sitting schedules of relevant approval organs (the Integrated Committee of Ministers and Council). For example, the Regional Biodiversity Strategy had to wait for the next sitting that was a year later (TE, pg.21). The TE also determines that at times the project was slow to accomplish outputs, and most indicators were met after the planned deadline (TE, pg.21). And there was a slow start of the project due to the lack of project-dedicated staff (TE, pg.32).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
--------------------	-----------------------------

Sustainability of project outcomes is rated as unlikely in the terminal evaluation. This review however, rates the sustainability of project outcomes as moderately unlikely. This is mainly due to the exit-related activities that were halted by the financial issues described in the efficiency section (See above). Moreover, the lack of the establishment of Centers of Excellence limits the likelihood that project outcomes will continue post project.; additional resources are needed to bridge the project to other related activities, and to finalize uncompleted project products.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Financial Sustainability: **Moderately Unlikely**

Because of early termination of project funds, some elements and outcomes are left in limbo and do not have concrete future financing (TE, pg.24). Some sources of financing were identified and currently fund other projects: the Japanese Policy and Human Resources Development Fund put in \$3.7 million into the Tran frontier Conservation Area and Tourism Fund Project, IDRC has awarded \$543,716 to the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) at the University of Zimbabwe etc. however no funds were directly allocated to the continuation of this project.

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Unlikely. The project has created the basis for developing knowledge services, networking and policy. Knowledge products and case studies were developed and conducted that, if continued and made electronic, documented and networked, could lead to the realisation of project objectives and particularly outcome. However, according to the TE, the website is not dynamic enough, and is not completed in a way for knowledge sharing success.

Institutional Sustainability: Unlikely

The project aimed to create standing institutional arrangements and infrastructure at SADC for regional knowledge exchange which would support national capacity building. At the time of project completion, the structures were not in place. The knowledge products were not integrated into SADC functions or divisions, and there had been no follow-up strategy for the implementation of the regional biodiversity strategy that was completed (TE, pg.6).

The main problem with sustainability is the failure of establishing the Centers of Excellence and the lack of regional training projects. Overall the partnerships were good, but the one between SADC and the Centers of Excellence that is critical for project's sustainability did not occur (TE, pg.23).

Environmental Sustainability: Unable to Assess. No environmental risk are reported in the TE.

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?

There is no information on whether co-financing affected project outcomes.

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 initial estimated duration of the project was until 2004, but this was revised to July 2007, corresponding with the termination of the activities (TE, pg.14).

According to the TE (pg.14), there was a long delay between planning post MTE activities and the actual implementation of activities. "It was as if a new project was being set up, and there was also the problem of logistics and gaining the authority to spend from Malawi".

Other delays occurred due to the change in implementation management from UNDP Malawi to UNDP Botswana country office (see efficiency section). The delays resulting from this change led to an early disruption of activities. These delays strongly affected project's sustainability. The most critical activities for project' exit strategy could not be realized, and therefore project's sustainability is unsure.

After the transfer of coordination unit from Malawi to Botswana, a no-cost extension of the project until July 2007 on the basis of a US \$628,000 work plan was approved (TE, pg.16).

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:

Senior government officials from the ministries of environment in the participating countries were members of the project steering committees therefore it positively affected country ownership. Moreover, at the national level, the process was more inclusive, with membership from government agencies, academia and the civil society. However, according to the TE "the connectivity with the technical advisors at the regional level was weak and the national level's facilitation for their functioning was less adequate, presumably due to budgetary constraints" (TE, pg. 22).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

No rating is provided for M&E Design in the Terminal Evaluation. This TER assesses a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory for M&E Design using information found in the PD, and based on the fact that much of the M&E Design was left unfinished for development after project implementation began.

In the logframe provided in the Project Document, the Technical Committee was expected to provide the monitoring and evaluation based on semi-annual progress and assessment reports. These were to be prepared by the Project Implementation Unit and submitted with each semi-annual work plan. A set of indicators measuring effectiveness, efficiency and impact were to be developed and agreed during the first 6 months of the project. A more comprehensive assessment of those indicators was expected to be undertaken annually. Regional experts were to provide more detailed analyses of the progress and impact within individual countries, and recommendations for improving country level impact. There was a budget allocated for the M&E in the PD (PD, pg.16).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The M&E implementation is Moderately Satisfactory. This is mainly due to the fact that the recommendations given by the Mid-Term Evaluation regarding M&E was given full consideration. However, a new logframe produced following the MTE still had some weaknesses.

After MTE completion, a new logframe was developed and outlined indicators for achieving results around the five targets. According to the TE, in the new logframe, the indicators for the activities related to strengthening institutional capacity building were not explicit and sometimes very vague (TE, pg.4). The performance indicators were adequate but the capacity building target is insufficiently developed. In addition, the TE mentions that most indicators were not met according to the timeline proposed in the amended log frame, implying that their time-scale was too ambitious (TE, pg.6). In addition, the systems were inadequate for process and outcome monitoring across all countries and regionally. The countries with strong capacities got more support and attention while the countries with weaker capacities got less.

According to the revised project support document, after MTE, regional experts should have provided more detailed analysis of the progress and impact with individual countries and recommendations for improving country level impact. However, the TE found that most indicators, if achieved, were achieved after the intended deadline. The TE believes that could result from "either an overambitious log frame,

M&E recommendations that were not gauged to project capacity in their recommendations, or an insufficient implementation of M&E suggestions into project functions” (TE, pg.32).

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.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

According to the TE, UNDP’s effort in support of IUCN-ROSA was above average. Even with the financial issues, UNDP tried to ensure that the financial resources were available for the refocused phase of the project (TE, pg.28). The situation was impacted not only by the uncertainty about the funds remaining but also by the change in financial systems; UNDP staff was not fully proficient with ATLAS since it had been just introduced (TE, pg.30).

However, according to the TE, at the national level UNDP was very involved and in touch with IUCN, the executing agency. Additionally, at the regional level, UNDP was very helpful in giving policy guidance to the implementation process. The UNDP Country Office in Botswana provided day-to-day oversight and implementation support (TE, p.37).

Therefore, even though there were issues with disbursement of funds that led to some delays, the quality of implementation is rated Satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---	-----------------------------------

At first, the project was to be coordinated by a Programme Implementation Unit based under the SADC Forestry Sector Technical Coordination Unit. It was expected that the PIU would work closely with officers from the SADC Forestry Sector and an advisor from IUCN ROSA (PD, p.9). According to the TE, the SADC secretariat provided all necessary administrative and logistical support that facilitated regional communication, and IUCN-ROSA ensured that the technical team was in place at the management unit on time. However, the TE mentions that “the selection of the task force was arbitrary and there was a lapse in the adherence to the logic frame indicators” (TE, pg.28).

After the MTE, the IUCN took a direct executing role through a dedicated Project Implementation Unit on behalf of SADC, while oversight and in-country support were provided by the UNDP Botswana Country Office. IUCN would therefore be the executing agency. According to the TE, the location of the PIU outside of the SADC offices was not ideal, especially for sustainability and for strengthening SADC capacity. Another issue was that the project manager was wearing too many hats, representing the IUCN, UNDP, and SADC at the steering committee meetings. This therefore was a problem for “positioning and advocating ownership of decision making processes within SADC” (TE, pg.29). There were also important challenges in financial oversight and planning which resulted in tensions between partners involved in implementation, execution, and oversight – IUCN, SADC, GEF, UNDP Botswana and UNDP Malawi (TE pg. 5).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No environmental changes are reported in the TE or in the PIR.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

In August 2006, SADC Council approved the unfreezing of three posts in the Environment and Sustainable Development Unit of the Food and Agricultural and Natural Resources Directorate.

A Senior Project Manager responsible for natural resources was recruited in 2007

At their meeting in Botswana in April 2007, SADC Ministers of Environment recommended the creation of a trans-frontier conservation area (TFCA) post within the Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (TE, pg.24)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change.

“Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Draft regional training modules on IAS and ABS were produced (TE, pg.18).

South Africa published a school textbook on ABS (TE, pg.18).

Targeted training and awareness was provided to project assistants from Member States at the Project Management Unit and to IAS and ABS experts at regional meetings and workshops (TE, pg.18).

A document entitled ‘Regional analysis and guidelines on ABS agreements, legislation and institutional frameworks for biodiversity management in Southern Africa’ was produced, published and widely circulated (TE, pg.19).

The project played a pivotal role in backstopping the SADC Secretariat and raising the profile of environmental issues to politicians and technocrats in the region (TE, pg.23).

b) Governance

The 2007 work plan was incorporated into the business plan of the FARN directorate

Guidelines for the prevention and management of invasive alien plants in Southern Africa, as well as a guideline on ABS agreements, legislation and institutional frameworks were produced and circulated. These guidelines should be anchored on existing regional protocols (TE, pg.23).

An SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy was approved by the Integrated Committee of Ministers (ICM) in June 2006 and endorsed by SADC Council in August 2006 (TE, p.20).

SADC positions on the 13 high priority regional issues on the COP 8 agenda were adopted as Africa positions at the conference as the latter had no pre-prepared positions.

Based on experiences from COP 8, a document providing guidelines on SADC’s engagement with Multilateral Environmental Agreements was produced, published and widely circulated. The guidelines were subsequently used by the region to prepare for COP meetings on Climate Change (2006) and on CITES (2007) (TE, pg.20).

A regional biodiversity strategy was produced, disseminated and partially integrated into national planning for some participating project countries. However, the key outcome of

mechanism for continued regional collaboration (an integral element of the project as highlighted in the 2004 MTE) was only partially realized (TE, pg.39).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There was no unintended impact reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Guidelines on SADC's engagement with MEAs were used by the region to prepare for the Conference of Parties (COP) on Climate Change (2006) and CITES (2007) (TE, pg.28).

Guidelines on ABS agreements, legislation and institutional frameworks influenced Botswana to include ABS issues in its Environmental Management Bill and Zimbabwe to amend its Environmental Management Act to incorporate ABS provisions. (TE, pg.28).

The Japanese Policy and Human Resources Development Fund have put in \$3.7 million into the Tran Frontier Conservation Area and Tourism Fund Project. The project is aimed at conserving biodiversity in the Southern Africa region by maintaining large, intact natural ecosystems and ecological linkages that span national boundaries. (TE, p.24).

IDRC has awarded \$543,716 to the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) at the University of Zimbabwe for a five-year project entitled 'Local level scenarios planning, iterative assessment and adaptive management.' The project is targeted at rural communities in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Mozambique living within the Great Limpopo Tran frontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA) (TE, p.24).

SANREM/USAID awarded Zambia \$1.2 million for a multidisciplinary project entitled 'Developing a participatory socio-economic model for food security, improved rural livelihoods, watershed management and biodiversity conservation in Southern Africa'. (TE, p.24).

The Government of Botswana gave its Aquatic Weed Control Unit a budget of \$178,000 for the control of invasive alien aquatic weeds with emphasis on the Chobe River Basin (TE, p.24).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The following lessons are given in the TE (pg.8):

- (1) There is a need to take into account the considerable delays that can occur when dealing with complex projects that straddle structures at different level – national, sub-regional and regional.
- (2) Knowledge distillation does not mean knowledge absorption. Before the capacities can be strengthened or built, symmetries and asymmetries in existing national capacities must be understood and mapped.
- (3) Strategies for sustainability are multi-pronged. Depending on a single output to achieve many other project outputs was a high risk. The project should have been more balanced in this regard, as sustainability needs planning and consideration, especially early negotiation with high level decision makers, advocacy and gauging of the political willingness for action.
- (4) Knowledge management tools and approaches require technical inputs. The project design experimented with innovative knowledge management approaches (KMAs). When it is supported by effective networking and “working models” in which community members and partners are active, it can be highly successful as a capacity building and environmental management tool.
- (5) The executing agency ought to take best practices up to a policy level. In a strategic dimension, good quality monitoring systems should be integrated into corporate vision, country strategy and results-based management at SADC.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE (pg.10):

- (1) SADC requires technical assistance to develop a proper exit strategy. A consultancy should have been considered to assist SADC develop a plan for implementing its regional biodiversity strategy, mobilize resources and link to other initiatives.
- (2) The knowledge products and services piloted in SABSP should be finalized. Project products can be made available on the SADC website (which should be upgraded). Linkages need to be made to other initiatives.
- (3) The regional expert network and stake holder’s networks should be maintained by SADC. The networks address regional biodiversity issues and strengthen national capacities. Linking to the regional information management system is an efficient way to develop supportive infrastructure.
- (4) SADC’s capacity for knowledge sharing and supportive technology is an area that still needs to be strengthened in order to support its role as a regional knowledge facilitator and source of regional technical expertise. There is opportunity to build on the momentum gained from the project.

- (5) IUCN is planning a new project to support the regional biodiversity plan which offers a good opportunity to continue momentum and successes of the project. UNDP/GEF, UNEP and UNDP Botswana can provide inputs to the IUCN project design mission, if feasible.

10. 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)

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 report contains a very detailed assessment of project outcomes, outputs and activities. It details how outcomes and objectives were changed after MTE, and shows the strengths and weakness of both project documents.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and focused on issues related to funds disbursement. The evidence is complete. However, the ratings are not given for all the categories (only for sustainability and effectiveness)	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project sustainability is well assessed, especially the reasons for the lack of project exit strategy are explained.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidences, and they are well detailed.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the costs and gives a budget summary. However, there is no breakdown per activity. There were financial issues in the project and therefore the actual budget may have not been easy to gather.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system at Entry and during implementation is well assessed. The MTE recommendations are described in details and the consequences of this MTE are given.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

$$0.3*(5+4) + 0.1 *(5+5+4+5) = 2.7 + 1.9 = 4.6$$

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