

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF ID: 659		Review date:		
		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Sustainable protected area development in Namaqualand	GEF financing:	0.750000	0.750
Country:	South Africa	IA/EA own:	0	
		Government:	2.125	4.9
		Other*:	2.505	5.751
		Total Cofinancing	4.6300	10.651
Operational Program:	1	Total Project Cost:	5.87800	11.41
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	South African National Park, CEPF, Working for Water, Poverty Alleviation and Coastcare financing, Dept of Environment and Tourism	Work Program date		
		CEO Endorsement		03/29/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		05/31/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: 12/31/05
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years and 1 month	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 5 years 6 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 years and 5 months
Author of TE: Chris Warner (also the TM)		TE completion date: 05/12/06	TE submission date to GEF EO: 6/29/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1.5 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

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

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

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

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? On balance this is fairly good MSP which follows the same format at FSP Bank ICRs, however, it fails to provide ratings for sustainability and M&E. It also fails to adequately explain the projects 2.5 year overrun.

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

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

Overall Objective: To promote the sustainable development of PAs in Namaqualand.

Sub-objectives:

1. Identify and establish PA system for conserving the globally significant biodiversity of Namaqualand
2. Provide training for, and involvement of local communities in park development, thereby improving attitudes towards conservation as an alternative to communal grazing
3. Assess the values of different forms of land use.

Any changes during implementation? Yes

Sub-objective 2 – during the implementation it was realized that the objective was not well phrased. Therefore, the objective was re-worked to (i) encouraging land owners to conserve biodiversity and (ii) building support for the Park amongst the community. This was needed because communal lands (grazing) are not significantly present in Namaqua Park area whilst commercial agriculture is. In addition a wider outreach program was needed. Further objective 3 – this objective should have been considered an activity rather than as an objective as it was a relatively minor part of the project.

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

Same as above

Any changes during implementation? No

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

Overall Objective – S

Sub-objectives

1. **Identify and establish PA system for conserving the globally significant biodiversity of Namaqualand – HS**

The TE (page 2 – 4) indicates that the project exceeded the predicted targets for Hectares converted to PA status (318,201) by over 22,000ha – 340,874 –approximately 6.8% of the region. The project played a leading role in improving the conservation of Namaqualand through the incorporation of land into formally protected areas. Furthermore a program of supporting farmers to adopt biodiversity friendly farming has been initiated. This will effectively add to the area under conservation.

The project successful negotiated with farmers and mining companies to add to the land under Namaqualand PA from 980ha to 150,000ha. The PA will ensure the protection of 1,232 plant species; 102 are red listed and 47 are endemics. The project also supported the creation of the Namaqualand Marine PA covering 970,000ha. The formal proclamation of the park is planned in 2007/2008

2. **Training for, and involvement of local communities in park development, thereby improving attitudes towards conservation - S**

The project has been successful in several ways – firstly surrounding communities perceive the park as an economic and social asset. The park has injected US\$1.3 million in wages into the surrounding community and provided training for 883 individuals (page 9) from 16 communities (environmental training). The training ranged from first aid courses, field guiding, recording of oral histories, chainsaw operation, life skills, financial management, basic literacy to small tourism business management.

The project created approximately 351 jobs although most of these are contract / short-term. Only 4 are permanent contracts with SANParks. The poverty alleviation impact of the project was through wages and short term training.

Farmers now hold regular meetings with the Park staff, and a solution to nuisance animals has reduced stock losses. The people and conservation team engaged six high schools, two commercial farmers unions, two communal farmers associations, provincial government depts., local business and tourism operators. Commercial farmers in a key corridor have agreed to sell their land into the park. Agreements are negotiated and being implemented. Funds have been made available.

But spontaneous initiatives for conservation based businesses have not grown as expected. One new full time guesthouse has opened up apart from seasonal guesthouses.

3. Assessment and valuation of different forms of land-use – U

The activity was academic in nature and of little practical use to SANParks. The objective should have been listed as an activity in the project design and not an objective due to the small budget involved (US\$30,000)

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes: Overall score – 14/3 = 4.67

A Relevance	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
<p>The project was relevant to OP1 / SP1 and SP2 in terms of promoting the establishment of the regional PA system and conservation in adjacent productive landscapes. Furthermore, the project was consistent with the Bank CAS and the Africa Region Environment Strategy including support for the global environment and poverty reduction – although its impact on poverty reduction is not sufficiently detailed and sustainability of socio-economic impacts is far from sustainable as most of the short-term impact was generated by the presence of the 'project'.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
<p>The project was very effective at generating clear conservation benefits in terms of exceeding targets for conservation protection and catalyzing a greater appreciation of conservation by farmers. The ICR rates the capacity building activities – HS (at impact level) – this seems to be justified as most of the training was narrowly focused on park management and operations, with little targeted toward socio-economic development. The ICR does report that the training and other outreach activities improved community / farmer support for the park and conservation in general.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MS
<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 and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	

There is some inconsistency in the project reporting (see page 12). The ICR states total project cost was approximately US\$6m including co-finance and the GEF grant. However, based on the table it appears far more co-finance was raised than expected giving total co-finance in excess of US\$10m. Furthermore, there is no explanation in the ICR of the project time over-run or delays. The project exceeded expectation particularly on the conservation objectives (by over 22,000ha) and the overall costs per hectare are low (34US\$). However, given the somewhat unusual overrun in time and lack of adequate explanation of expenditure the project is only marginally satisfactory.

Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? It is likely that outcomes relating to sub-objective 1 will lead to long-term impacts, however, those of sub-objective 2 have been largely generated by the project itself – e.g., training and short-term employment and do not seem to be particularly sustainable.

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.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
<p>The cost of establishing and maintaining the park cannot be self-sustained through tourism revenues. However, the park (along with the other dryland parks) are cross-subsidized by SANParks from other profit making parks in the system (e.g. Kruger). Hence, plus SANParks is well supported by the South African Government. In the long term the risk to financial sustainability is deemed to be low.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: L
<p>The project secured a forum for local community inputs into the park management, and there is an ongoing</p>	

SANParks supported 'people and conservation' awareness and outreach program, it also further catalyzed a plan to develop opportunities for communal co-management areas adjacent to the park to highlight future benefit for communities	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
The park is institutionally supported by SANParks. Strong partnerships have been established with Conservation International Namaqua Wilderness Corridor Initiative, and the Northern Cape Provincial Government Departments of Education, Agriculture and Tourism. There are also ongoing relationships with DeBeers Namaqualand Mines (the major private sector operator in the region). The Bank does not envisage any further technical support will be need for institutional or other aspects as sustainability is largely galvanized.	
D Environmental	Rating: L
The Park meets the objective of conserving 6.5% of the areas critical habitat. The ecological sustainability is ensured for the foreseeable future with the extension down to coastal areas and the establishment of the MPA. The park will be sufficiently large enough to ensure the evolutionary process.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE: overall score 16 / 4 = 4

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

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good - The project has succeed in conserving a global public good.
2. Demonstration - Not applicable
3. Replication – Not applicable
4. Scaling up – Not applicable

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

A. In retrospectation, 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) Rating: U/A
The ICR reports against agreed indicators and so indicates that the original M&E plan was practicable and sufficient. However, there is no formal assessment hence no firm conclusions can be drawn
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? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? Rating: U/A
Again, this is implicit. There is no formal assessment of the M&E system so it is not possible to accurately assess.
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: U/A
The ICR does not provide information
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Unable to assess

4.5 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?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project design should include M&E requirements upfront • More intensive and frequent supervision is required (6 month supervision is not enough) • The success of the Bank environmental program in South Africa needs to be communicated internally and externally

- Park planning must sensitively incorporate all key stakeholders.
- The differing concerns and needs of stakeholders need to be addressed through a variety of involvement actions

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

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

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

Not applicable

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report / Overall rating = 3.5	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	4
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	3
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	4
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	4
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	4
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	2

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

Yes:

No: X

Explain: ICR is fairly comprehensive in its treatment of outcomes. The projects impacts could be followed up in a future country portfolio evaluation.

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

Not applicable

Reviewer's comment: I agree with this TER.