1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		762	
GEF Agency project ID		P052367 - P052368	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Maloti/Drakensberg Conservation & Development	
Country/Countries		Lesotho, South Africa	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program, Strategic Objectives		OP 4 – Mountain Ecosystem	
Executing agencies involved		Lesotho: Ministry of Environment, Gender and Youth Affairs (MEGYA) in collaboration with Ministries of Agriculture, Tourism and Works South Africa: Nature Conservation Services in KwaZulu-Natal, Free State and Eastern Cape, and South African National Parks in collaboration with Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		Apr 24, 2000	
Effectiveness date / project start		Nov 27, 2002	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Dec 31, 2007	
Actual date of project completion		Dec 31, 2009	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.348	0.348
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		15.25	14.637 (trustee dataset)
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	17.9	0.825 (ZA) 3.4 (LS) **4.225 Total**
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.4	0.4
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		15.6	14.985
Total Co-financing		18.3	4.625
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		33.898	19.61
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		For Lesotho (LS) June 24, 2010 For South Africa (ZA) June 29, 2010	
TE submission date		(Same as TE completion date.)	
Author of TE		Environment and Natural Resource Management Unit, Africa Unit	
TER completion date		November 18, 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)			

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	**MS**	**MU (LS)**	**MU**
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	**Moderate**	**Sig (LS)**	**ML**
M&E Design	N/A	**NR**	**Modest (LS)**	**MU**
M&E Implementation	N/A	**NR**	**Modest (LS)**	**UA**
Quality of Implementation	N/A	**MU**	**U (LS)**	**MU**
Quality of Execution	N/A	**S**	**MU (LS)**	**MS**
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	**S (LS)**	**S**

Note – At the time of the TER, WB IEG ratings were available for the Lesotho portion of the project only.

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity in the Maloti-Drakensberg trans-frontier mountain range. The Maloti-Drakensberg trans-frontier area is rich in biodiversity and species endemism. It is threatened by excessive livestock grazing, crop cultivation on steep slopes, uncontrolled burning, alien invading species and human encroachment. (PD pg. 1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to contribute to community development through income generation from nature-based tourism. (PD pg. 2) An exchange of expertise and experience from South Africa's well-managed park systems and community conservation programs to Lesotho would assist this country in developing its border conservation areas.

The project's key performance indicators are:

1. Globally significant biodiversity maintained and enhanced through protection for key habitats and indicator species.
2. Expanded protected areas system in place with adequate buffer zones and community involvement.
3. Sehlabathebe National Park in Lesotho formally established and conservation management and development plan agreed and under implementation.
4. Community initiatives in nature-based conservation financially viable and benefit transfers working.
5. Joint declaration by the Government of Lesotho and South Africa of a transfrontier conservation area incorporating Sehlabathebe National Park, the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg Park, and additional areas as appropriate.
   (PD pg. 4)

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

There were **no changes** in the Global Environmental and Development Objectives of this project.

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 consistent with the GEF Biodiversity focal area. It's goal is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity in the Maloti-Drakensberg trans-frontier mountain range. The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation and specifically with Operational Program 4 for Mountain Ecosystems. Consistent with this program, the project will address conservation and sustainable use in a trans-frontier mountain ecosystem in southern Africa, which is under increasing human pressure and threat of degradation. The Drakensberg highlands are an area of high biodiversity and cultural value. This area is one of 200 Global Ecoregions proposed by World Wide Fund for Nature, and it has been designated as an Afromontane Regional Center of Endemism. The uKhahlamba-Drakensberg Park has been listed as a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention, and a substantial part of the project area is proposed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and Peace Park.

The project is also in line with the country priorities of Lesotho and South Africa. The project supports Lesotho's National Environmental Action Plan of 1989, National Action Plan to Implement Agenda 21, National Environmental Policy of 1996, National Strategy on Lesotho's Biological Diversity of 1999, National Livestock and Range Management Policy of 1996, and Lesotho's national tourism aspirations. The project also supports South Africa's Environment Management Policy, and the white paper on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of South Africa's Biological Diversity. The project addresses the root causes of South Africa's biodiversity loss by expanding biodiversity conservation into community lands through linkages with improved range management and community income generation linked to biodiversity conservation. (PD pg. 5-8) The TE confirms the project's relevance: the project's global objectives, design components and implementation activities remained fully consistent with global, regional and national conservation and management priorities. (TE ZA pg. 8)

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The goal of the project was to protect the biodiversity in the uKhahlamba mountains through a two-pronged approach:

1. identifying, zoning, and protection of biodiversity areas of high significance; and
2. establishing alternative livelihoods for the affected population. (PD Annex 4 pg. 7-8)

There are two Terminal Evaluations, denoted ZA for South Africa, and LS for Lesotho. Below, the project's 8 components, and expected outputs, are listed by component (Project Document pg. 10-17, Annex 1, Annex 4), and the project's achievements are reported.

Component, and Expected Outputs	**Achieved?**
Component 1- Project management & trans-frontier collaboration Objective: to establish strong bilateral coordination mechanisms to support the ecosystem management approach in the Maloti-Drakensberg area.	**Mostly.**
• A bilateral collaboration forum; a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding, and a Steering Committee.	Yes (TE ZA pg. 18)
• Project Coordination Committees (PCCs), Project Coordination Units (PCUs), and Financial Management Committees (FMCs) established in Lesotho and South Africa	Yes (TE ZA pg. 18)
• Joint technical working groups, joint workshops to develop and implement action plans	Not reported.
• Communication linkages, including a GIS-based Knowledge Management system served by trained staff;	Yes (TE LS pg. 19)
• Joint management activities related to fire protection, rescue service, staff training and nature-based tourism such as marketing, booking and visitor planning.	Mostly
• Monitoring and evaluation system designed and implemented	Not reported.
• Communication strategy: project web site, media liaison, press briefing, communication and publicity	Yes (TE ZA pg. 19)

Other project achievements:
- Joint security task force. (TE ZA pg. 18)
- Joint bearded vulture protection group. (TE ZA pg. 18)

The TE for South Africa notes that the outcome of this component exceeded appraisal expectations, and succeeded in establishing a well functioning trans-frontier cooperative mechanism with high level political support. (TE ZA pg. 18) Overall the component has achieved its objective to establish strong bilateral coordination mechanisms to support the ecosystem management approach in the Maloti-Drakensberg area.

The TE for Lesotho also reports significant success for this component, but reports some noticeable project shortcomings. Towards the later stages of the project, the PCU in Lesotho lost support from government ministries, and lost several qualified staff. (TE LS pg. 18)
By project end, no clear institutional mechanism, such as a national secretariat, had been established with appropriate staff and funding to continue the trans-frontier cooperative mechanism, thus sustainability of this component is not assured. (TE LS pg. 19)

Component, and Expected Outputs	**Achieved?**
Component 2- Conservation Planning Objective: to build capacity for trans-frontier conservation and development and allow for adequate planning, zoning, protection and management.	**Mostly**
• Preparation of a harmonizing conservation planning strategy at a landscape level, involving stakeholder consultations and relevant authorities.	Yes (TE ZA pg. 20)
• Complete biodiversity assessment of priority areas.	Yes (TE LS pg. 19)
• Design a participatory biodiversity monitoring system to ensure that data on trends can be derived for areas across the landscape.	No. (TE LS pg. 20)
• Design a protected area system, and design and implement a conservation strategy for the	Yes (TE ZA pg. 20, TE

PA system. Formulate a biodiversity conservation program for the project area.	LS pg. 8)
• Recruit and train field assistants from local communities to assist in surveying, and eventually monitoring. Assemble a core professional support team for biodiversity conservation.	No Data

Other project achievements:

- 20-Year Conservation and Development Strategy for the target area in Lesotho and South Africa, and conservation plans for Priority Biodiversity areas in Lesotho (TE ZA pg. 20, TE LS pg. 19)
- Cultural Heritage Assessment and Protection Strategy (TE ZA pg. 20)
- MDTP Trans-frontier Security Strategy and Security Working Group (TE ZA pg. 20, TE LS pg. 19)
- Identification of two new PAs: Senqu Sources Protected Area (SSPA), Liqobong Protected Area (LPA). Disputes over resource rights and management in the LPA area are preventing the establishment of that PA. (TE LS pg. 19)
- Development of a cultural heritage strategy for Lesotho.(TE LS pg. 19)
- Partial preparation of a bioregional zoning plan for the Maloti-Drakensberg Trans-frontier Conservation Area (MDTFCA).

The TE for Lesotho reports that the outputs specified for this component were largely achieved in Lesotho. (TE LS pg. 19) High quality conservation plans were produced for the bioregion. However, although resource user participation was promoted during many of the planning processes, the participatory biodiversity monitoring system specified in the Project Document was not achieved. (TE LS pg. 20) The project did not train new staff for specialized planning functions, and the TE notes that it is unlikely that the specialist staff employed by the Project Coordination Unit will continue in employment with Lesotho's Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture.

The TE for South Africa reports that the project fully achieved its objective to establish and build capacity for a trans-frontier conservation planning mechanism for the Maloti-Drakensberg area. The project has also made significant achievements in advancing the cultural heritage and addressing trans-frontier security issues, which ensures a higher likelihood of sustainability after project end. (TE ZA pg. 21)

Component, and Expected Outputs	**Achieved?**
Component 3 – PA Management Planning Objective: to prepare plans for existing protected areas and proposed conservation areas.	**Mostly**
• PA management planning. ○ Initiate the process of development and zonation planning for the identified proposed conservation areas. ○ Revise, update and expand the overall development and zonation plan for existing protected areas ○ Park planning support team (working with the biodiversity conservation support team)	Yes (TE ZA pg. 21, TE LS pg. 20)
• PA business planning. ○ Revise the management plan for SNP and prepare a business plan ○ Prepare a management plan and business plan for proposed community conservation areas, using a participatory, community-based approach	Yes (TE ZA pg. 21, TE LS pg. 20)

Other project achievements:

- Integrated Management Plan for 9 protected areas based on Concept Development Plan and Stakeholder Workshop, including Strategic Management Plan or Time-bound Action Plan and Business Plans
- Establishment of the Maloti Drakensberg Trans-frontier Park linking Sehlabathebe National Park in Lesotho and the Ukhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site on the South African side; and
- Management Plans for Non-statutory Protected Areas.

The TE for South Africa rates this component as satisfactory, and notes that the establishment of the Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Park, linking Lesotho's Sehlabathebe National Park and South Africa's uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site was a major achievement of the project. (TE ZA pg. 21)

The TE for Lesotho reports that although much of the protected area planning was satisfactorily completed, the intended business planning for protected areas was only completed the Sehlabathebe National Park, and it has not achieved its intended purpose of generating greater benefits those available from cattle production. (TE LS pg. 21)

Component, and Expected Outputs	**Achieved?**
Component 4- Conservation Management in Existing Protected Areas Objective: to develop strategies to address continuing threats and residual impacts in protected areas in South African and Lesotho, including alien plant infestation, soil erosion, inappropriate fire management regimes, inadequate security, over-grazing, poor waste management and poor management of cultural resources.	**Partly**.
In South Africa, the design and implementation of an alien invading species control program, that would include: • employment and capacity-building of local communities • development of entrepreneurial opportunities using materials from clearings • rehabilitation and maintenance of management roads, paths and tracks • implementation of a fire management regime • improve wildlife security programs, including training/equipping of field rangers • improve management of large herbivores and priority/threatened species	Partly Achieved. (TE ZA pg. 23-26)
In Lesotho, improvements to Sehlabathebe National Park (SNP), including: • New infrastructure: new office building, new nature interpretation facility, new dormitory for school groups • Staff improvement: upgrading of staff skills, employment of a resident ecologist. • Improvement of administrative, communication and power facilities • Implementation of a fire management program • Park maintenance: upgrading of fencing, and acquiring necessary vehicles for park management.	Partly achieved. (TE LS pg. 21-22)
No populations of threatened species in decline, extent of alien plant invasion reduced significantly, sustainable range management in key areas.	Partly achieved.
Rock art sites protected.	Not reported.
Effective anti-poaching, effective visitor management and rescue service, prevention of illegal grazing, institutionalize social fencing	Not achieved.
Component 5 - Conservation Management outside of Protected Areas Objective: to improve conservation of natural resources on communal lands and promote sustainable use for range management areas. To facilitate the establishment of Managed Resource Areas (MRAs) building on an earlier governmental program on range management.	**Partly**.
• Improved range condition and basal cover.	Not reported.

• Implement education program on grazing management.	Not reported.
• Resource management plan for improved range condition and animal productivity in place within two years of project implementation.	Not achieved.
• Activities include: overall strategy, alien plants, erosion of management tracks and paths, cultural heritage management, range management and infrastructure for community-based training programs.	Partly achieved.

Other project achievements:

- Strategic environmental assessment, zoning plan, official approval and management plan for the Senqu Sources PA. (TE LS pg. 20)
- Limited reintroduction of indigenous plant species into the Sehlabathebe National Park. Implementation of priority conservation actions, notably fire prevention measures and invasive species removal, in the Bokong Nature Reserve, the Tsehlanyane National Park and the Menkhoaneng and Botha-Bothe Plateau cultural heritage sites.(TE LS pg. 20)
- Implementation of the transfrontier security strategy. (TE LS pg. 20)
- The Development of Policies and Best-practice Guidelines for: Management of Living Heritage Sites, and Fire and grazing management in South Africa (TE ZA pg. 23)
- A number of Community Conservation Management Pilot Initiatives including the: Greater Clarens Strategic Environmental Assessment, Clarens Bioregion Conservancy, Upper uThukela Community-Led Resource Management Project, Hlatikhulu Vlei Land-use Zoning, Hillside Community Tourism node, Pholela/Oribi Conservation Area, and Ntsikeni-Coleford Corridor Concept Development Plan; (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Bearded Vulture Protection through strategic habitat assessment and development initiative. (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Establishment of three Managed Resource Areas, at Khomo-Phatšoa (Qacha's Nek district), Mokhotlong-Sanqebethu (Mokhotlong) and 'Moteng (Botha-Bothe), and development of management plans for each. (TE LS pg. 22)

The TE for South Africa groups Component 4 and 5, and rates both together as moderately satisfactory. Some of the activities in these components were implemented in a disconnected manner, and would have benefited from increased attention to effectiveness and suitability. The TE states that a consistent conservation management framework was not provided in the Project design, but should have been developed during Project implementation. (TE ZA pg. 26)

Regarding Component 4, the TE for Lesotho notes that although the project did build a visitor and information center, these have stood unused for two years, and have begun to deteriorate, because the project has not ensured the ability of the recipient Government to operate this infrastructure. Due to administrative, financial and capacity issues, there will be a delay before these facilities begin to perform their intended roles. (TE LS pg. 22) Road infrastructure has not been completed, the tourist facilities and attractions are not being marketed, thus there is no additional income generation. (TE LS pg. 22)

The TE for Lesotho rates the outcomes for Component 5 as moderately satisfactory. The project focused on a model for sustainable resource use across 3 Management Resource Areas (MRA). (TE LS pg. 23) Preparation of the MRA plans developed into an excessively technocratic exercise. As a result, only 5% of the resulting documents contain actual resource management plan, only focusing on rotational pasture management. The TE notes that the rest of the MRA planning effort is not likely to have lasting value. (TE LS pg. 23) Resource user institutions and roles in sustainable range management were reinforced. However, the project was unable to

consolidate a sustainable, broader institutional approach to the integrated management of all natural resources (rather than grazing only). The excessively technical resource management plans, and the project's inability to establish a formal legal status for resource users' management role, were shortcomings of the project. (TE LS pg. 24)

Component, and Expected Outputs	Achieved?
Component 6 - Community involvement Objective: to enhance community involvement in the other components of the project by promoting stakeholder collaboration, ownership and responsibility for decisions and activities related to the project. The component would build on the experience with community conservation programs in KwaZulu-Natal and the Golden Gate Highlands National Park. Community conservation programs will serve as an entry point for communication, conflict resolution and development programs, and build and maintain trust between communities and conservation agencies.	**Mostly**.
• Promote conservation extension and alternative livelihoods consistent with biodiversity conservation objectives.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 24)
• Support staff and equipment needs for 3 Community Conservation Centers in each country, coordinated by a professional social ecologist with a support team of conservation extension staff, including community extension officers, 10 community facilitators per center.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 24)
• Preparation of training materials, visual aids within 12 months. Annual training of trainers' workshops for EOs and community facilitators. Workshops with at least 50 herdboys p.a. At least 1 training workshop for principal and local chiefs & VDCs and livestock owners p.a.	Partly. (TE LS pg. 24)
• Employ and train community facilitators to work with local communities. Workshops with at least 50 herd boys. At least 1 training workshop for principal and local chiefs & VDCs and livestock owners. Targeted training will develop skills related to conservation and cultural and nature-based tourism. Possible areas for support include the establishment of pony trekking stations, training local guides for nature and cultural heritage (e.g. rock art) interpretation services, training in basket weaving, pottery and other craft production and marketing advice, and propagation and sale of medicinal and ornamental plants.	Partly. (TE ZA pg. 26)
• Establish Community Conservation Forums.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 24, 27)

Other project achievements:

- In Lesotho, generation of environmental conservation and biodiversity awareness in communities and schools. (TE LS pg. 24)
- In Lesotho, the creation of 3 Community Conservation Nurseries, and the Mokhotlong Community Conservation and Development Trust. (TE LS pg. 24)
- In South Africa, a formal community liaison mechanism with 6 protected areas. (TE ZA pg. 26)
- In South Africa, generation of environmental conservation and biodiversity awareness in communities and schools through the development and distribution of Environmental Education Tool Boxes. (TE ZA pg. 26)

The TE for Lesotho rates this component as moderately satisfactory. Although the project created audio-visual education materials on biodiversity threats, natural heritage and tourism, there was no regular use of the materials in most schools by project end. (TE LS pg. 24) Only one of the established nurseries was fully operational by project end, due to late commencement of operations. However, the TE notes that community involvement was crosscutting throughout all project components, and that the project has successfully achieved community participation throughout many project activities, including conservation planning,

management and implementation. The indirect impact of this approach is certainly far more valuable than its direct outputs. (TE LS pg. 25)

The TE for South Africa rates this component as satisfactory, although there is no reference to specific project outputs specified in the Project Document.

Component, and Expected Outputs	Achieved?
Component 7 - Nature-based tourism Objective: to promote local economic development through ecotourism, and assure increased commitment to conservation through empowerment, development of tourism attractions and products, and marketing and investment strategies.	**Partly.**
• Provide incremental financing for planning for visitor management and sustainable tourism development, and providing training	Partly.
• Provide training for agency staff and local community members in marketing and service skills to promote community ecotourism initiatives. At least 100 community entrepreneurs and 10 civil servants trained each year starting in year 2.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 26, TE ZA pg. 30)
• Develop models and capacity to support the involvement of local communities in tourism developments associated with existing protected areas and proposed community conservation areas.	Yes (TE LS pg. 27)
• Provide direct employment opportunities, and create an enhanced opportunity for the involvement of local communities in economic opportunities based biodiversity conservation. At least 200 people employed in local nature-based tourism enterprises by end of year 2	No (TE LS pg. 9)
• Encourage private sector developers to partner communities and the conservation agencies to build the necessary capacity.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 27)
• Support small incremental costs associated with development of regional tourism information, an awareness program for nature-based tourism.	Partly
• Other outputs: o Tourism forum developed o Local tourism plans community areas finalized. o No. of km hiking & 4x4 trails installed p.a. o At least 2 village nurseries installed by end of year 2, with additions of 2 every year thereafter.	Yes.

Other project achievements:

- Development of a Tourism Strategy for the Maloti Drakensberg Trans-frontier Area, and for Lesotho in general, including assessment of adventure tourism possibilities, and birding routes. (TE ZA pg. 27, TE LS pg. 25)
- Specific Concept Development Plans for: Relocation and Development of the Sani Pass Border Post, Witsieshoek Mountain Lodge, Golden Gate Interpretative Centre (TE ZA pg. 27)
- Development of a Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) system. (TE ZA pg. 27)
- In Lesotho, tourism plans for Sani Pass, Liphofung Cultural Heritage Site and SNP. (TE LS pg. 25)
- In Lesotho, a National Framework for Issuing Concessions in the Tourism Sector was developed and approved by stakeholders. TE LS pg. 25)
- In Lesotho, community and private sector capacity building and training. (TE LS pg. 25)
- In Lesotho, a National Strategic Framework for Tourism was finalized with MTEC management and involvement of key stakeholders. The strategy addresses four major aspects for improving tourism industry in the MDTFCA: (i) product development, infrastructure, human resources and policies; (ii) investment; (iii) marketing; and (iv) management. (TE LS pg. 27)

The TE for South Africa rates this component as satisfactory. The TE notes that the expectations under this component for South Africa were vague and slightly inappropriate, and thus the implementers took the initiative to further far reaching initiatives of strategic importance for both long-term tourism and for benefit transfers. (TE ZA pg. 29)

Lesotho and South Africa collaborated closely with the key tourism stakeholders to formulate a common branding for the Maloti-Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation Area, and signed a MoU for a common brand and joint marketing between the Lesotho Tourism Development Corporation, SANParks, Tourism KZN, EKZNW, and the tourism marketing agencies in the Free State and Eastern Cape provinces. (TE ZA pg. 27)

However, the TE for Lesotho rates this component as moderately unsatisfactory, because it is difficult to assess the extent to which the project's outputs have generated additional growth, and because communities are still not well linked through a systematic promotion and advertisement program. (TE LS pg. 26)

Component, and Expected Outputs	**Achieved?**
Component 8 - Institutional development Objective: to assure sustainability of other results by providing for an adequate institutional structure to inherit and maintain them.	**Mostly**.
• Support for coordinated land use decision making	Not reported.
• Support development of national and local institutions for nature conservation and PAs.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 27-28)
• Staff training program implemented.	Yes. (TE LS pg. 27)

Other project achievements:

- Work on legislation for the sector, resulting in a new Environment Act and a Nature Conservation Bill. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Early planning efforts to achieve a system of integrated community and district planning for Lesotho. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Review of the system of Environmental Units in line ministries that is meant to support the work of MTEC. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Funding of degree programs for three Government staff, as well as short courses for seven Government staff and 12 project personnel. (TE LS pg. 27)

The TE for Lesotho rates the performance of this component as moderately satisfactory. The TE notes that the project had substantial institutional development achievements, particularly in the development of bilateral structures and procedures for enhanced cooperation between Lesotho and South Africa for joint biodiversity conservation. (TE LS pg. 27) Institutional development was also achieved at a community and national level. (TE LS pg. 27-28) However, despite the project's activities, Lesotho's Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture still lacks the capacity to fulfill its intended functions with regard to biodiversity conservation, especially the management of protected areas. (TE LS pg. 28) The sustainability of the institutional development achieved will depend on ongoing support, which is likely but not guaranteed.

The TE for South Africa rates this component as satisfactory. It documents more than 300 people trained in various capacities (management, education, tourism).

In addition to these project components, the project document lists 5 key outcomes:

a) Globally significant biodiversity maintained and enhanced through protection for key habitats and indicator species.
b) Expanded protected areas system in place with adequate buffer zones and community involvement.
c) Sehlabathebe National Park in Lesotho formally established and conservation management and development plan agreed and under implementation (applicable in Lesotho only);
d) Community initiatives in nature-based conservation financially viable and benefit transfers working; and
e) Joint declaration by the Government of Lesotho and South Africa of a transfrontier conservation area incorporating Sehlabathebe National Park, the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg Park, and additional areas as appropriate.
(PD pg. 4)

All of these key outcomes were successfully achieved.

In summary, most of the major components of this project were achieved. The project achieved: (i) a functioning trans-frontier conservation mechanism for the Maloti Drakensberg area; and (ii) an improved conservation management system for a significant number of protected areas in and around the Maloti Drakensberg and for selected non-protected areas outside existing protected areas. (TE ZA pg.9) The project implemented operational management plans in many PAs, with corresponding human and financial resources for implementation, and resulting significant improvements in management effectiveness. (TE ZA pg. 12) The project has made a substantial contribution to natural resources protection and biodiversity conservation in South Africa. (TE ZA pg. 8) In Lesotho, the project has made a substantial contribution to biodiversity protection and has raised public awareness and understanding of the importance of biodiversity conservation. (TE LS pg. 8) The project has improved national and bilateral institutional capacity and cooperation between South Africa and Lesotho. (TE ZA pg. 8)

Although there significant project shortcomings in Lesotho, the project has made significant achievements that counterbalance the shortcomings. Through this project the value of conservation and its potential for tourism and local livelihoods is well recognized both for formally protected areas as well as for outside areas through improved management of grassland areas. (TE LS pg. 8) Implementation of an overarching 20-year conservation and development strategy linked to national policies developed during the lifetime of the project has started, and will be implemented through 5-year action plans. (TE LS pg. 8) At project start, Lesotho counted only 3 PAs, of which only one was gazzeted. By project end, a system of protected areas covering 134,815 hectares, of which 14,299 hectares fall under the IUCN category II, is in place. All of these areas have appropriate management plans with implementation of priority actions initiated. (TE LS pg.8 8)

The TE for South Africa notes that the project has largely achieved its global environmental objective, and in some regards even exceeded expectations. The profound conservation managements systems put in place under the Project including both national as well as bilateral mechanisms provide a solid foundation for the biodiversity protection of the Maloti-Drakensberg Mountains and beyond. (TE ZA pg. 11) The project effectiveness is rated moderately satisfactory.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

The large number of eight components made implementation of this Project very complex to implement, however, a simplification was never formalized.

The project was affected by delays and cost changes. Although the project was approved in 2001, it became effective only in November 2002 in South Africa and February 2003 in Lesotho. Weaknesses in managing procurement activities added delays during implementation. The project's closing date was extended twice, from December 31, 2007 to Dec. 31, 2008, and finally to December 31, 2009. (TE ZA pg. 4, TE LS pg.4) Unclear design and inappropriate cost estimates resulted in significant reallocation of project funds between components. (TE LS pg. 4) The Sehlabathebe National Park Environmental Centre was completed two years behind schedule, could not deliver benefits during the project period, and lacked further technical support and supervision by the project. (TE LS pg. 21)

It seems many of the project's inefficiencies stemmed from a complicated set of components that were not well planned or delineated at project start, and were not simplified or restructured during project implementation. (TE LS pg. 4) Financial management was affected by a lack of clearly identified and budgeted project activities by components at the design stage. This made appropriate reporting of the use of funds against the designed activities and costs impossible and affected management decisions and fund management throughout project implementation. (TE ZA pg. 7)

Regular audits were carried out indicating that there were no cases of fraudulence in the use of funds. (TE ZA pg. 7) During project design, neither financial nor economic analyses were prepared. No standard cost benefit or cost effectiveness parameters were calculated, and would be extremely difficult to calculate ex-post. However, cost effectiveness was likely sub-optimal accounting for the delays and sub-optimal design of the project. Two years of extension have contributed to the high percentage of management costs of about 25% of the total investment costs. (TE ZA pg. 10)

For these noticeable shortcomings, efficiency is rated unsatisfactory.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE for South Africa reports that "not only sustainability, but further developments and protection management improvements are likely", and that a second phase of this project entirely managed and financed by South Africa is already under implementation. (TE ZA pg. 11) However, it seems the sustainability of project achievements in Lesotho are less assured.

Financial Risks –(Likely)
In South Africa, basic government financing of conservation agencies is secured, but budget constraints are possible for the provincial agencies. At project end, not all agencies had released their financial contributions for the next five years, but this is a temporary budgetary process problem and not a threat to sustainability. (TE ZA pg. 7) The decrease in tourism due to the financial crisis has been moderate and is expected to be compensated by the tourism increase for the 2010 soccer world cup. (TE ZA pg. 13) The economic benefits from conservation are well

documented and particularly high for the project areas providing significant downstream environmental benefits. (TE ZA pg. 13)

Socio-political Risks –(Moderately Likely)
The governments of South Africa and Lesotho are committed to continue conservation and development operations in the Maloti-Drakensberg region through implementation of a 20-year trans-frontier conservation and development strategy. The Inter-Agency MOU is an important demonstration of South Africa and Lesotho's agencies to their commitment to the continuation of MDTP in a second phase. (TE ZA pg. 7)
The private sector is highly interested in ensuring that conservation efforts are sustained as this increases the attractiveness of the areas for tourism. The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry is equally committed, as it depends on the project area as a major source of water. However, land owners in the surrounding areas might change production system towards less conservation supportive systems (crops, plantations). (TE ZA pg. 13)
The South Africa government shows a strong commitment to continue with the implementation of the 20-year conservation strategy. However, Lesotho has been slow to put a functioning counterpart secretariat and budget in place. (TE ZA pg. 13)
Lesotho seems to have greater socio-political risks. One of the reasons for the under-performance of nature-based tourism in Lesotho was selection of the locations according to political preference instead of tourist routes. ((TE LS pg. 7)

Environmental Risks- (U/A)
The TEs do not discuss specific environmental risks, and do not directly address the environmental pressures listed in the Project Document.

Institutional Risks –(Moderately Likely)
In South Africa, a coordination unit is in place to ensure project continuation. The Lesotho Government committed to the establishment of a permanent Secretariat, but the process of transferring the responsibility for post-completion operations was not fully achieved at project end. Lesotho's Parks Division of the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture (MTEC) is proposed to take over this responsibility, but the appropriate staffing and funding was not in place by project end. This puts the sustainability of project achievements and implementation of the 20-year strategy in jeopardy. (TE LS pg. 6) However, South African agencies have made a commitment to play an active role ensuring that coordination mechanisms in Lesotho are maintained at appropriate levels at all times. (TE ZA pg. 7, 14)
Implementation of the security strategy through the Bilateral Security Working Group is well established. The working group meets quarterly and has proved to be one of the most enthusiastic groups setting its meetings a year in advance with good attendance to the meetings. The management and business plans for the PAs are "well received living documents", and though some were not signed by project end due to bureaucratic delays, their implementation was begun. The TE reports that the management system for the Maloti Drakensberg Trans-frontier Park linking Sehlabathebe National Park in Lesotho and the UKhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site in South Africa is well established, and run by a Joint Management Committee that meets quarterly on a rotational basis for meetings between the two countries. (TE ZA pg. 7-8) There is strong interest from a large number of conservation agencies in South Africa to join the inter-agency MoU and provide political and financial support for the second phase of this project. (TE ZA pg. 13)
The legal and institutional system in South Africa is supportive of Payment for Ecosystem Services schemes. The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry provided additional funding to the study and indicated they are already incorporating some of the study findings into their

water pricing policies. The Ezemvelo KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife agency is developing a proposal for fundraising and benefit transfer mechanisms for the implementation of PES schemes. The National Water Act makes provision for levies to be charged for catchment management. (TE ZA pg. 8)

In Lesotho, there are no satisfactory operation arrangements in place for the facilities constructed by the project in the SNP. The visitors' arrival centre, constructed in 2007, remains unused, and there is no clear decision on how the center will be operated. (TE LS pg. 7) Successful longer-term implementation of project successes depends on an appropriate legal framework. The new Environment Act and the Nature Conservation Bill are significant improvements. (TE LS pg. 7) However, by project end, no clear institutional mechanism such as a national secretariat had been established with appropriate staff and funding to continue the trans-frontier cooperative mechanism, thus sustainability of this component is not assured. (TE LS pg. 19)

The Government of Lesotho remains committed to the management of rangelands and other natural resources by user groups, and the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation can be expected to continue promoting Grazing Associations and supporting those that operate in MDTP areas. However, the more ambitious concept of Managed Resource Committees as umbrella user bodies managing resources on behalf of Community Councils and/or Principal Chiefs has not been wholeheartedly adopted, and the process of enshrining such arrangements in Community Council by-laws is yet incomplete. (TE LS pg. 7)

Some external support will be provided by the four-year GEF-funded Sustainable Land Management Project that was recently approved and is likely to start operations in early 2010. Partly with the assistance of this new project, the MFLR can be expected to continue developing policy and legal arrangements for enhanced range management by resource users and their local government authorities. (TE LS pg. 7)

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?

Although the Project Document discusses co-financing, the TEs of both Lesotho and South Africa provide minimal information on cofinancing other than the amounts that each of the country governments contributed to project financing. (PD pg. 4, TE ZA/LS pg. 17) Thus there is insufficient information to answer the question of the importance of co-financing.

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?

There were various delays in project implementation, and two project extensions as a result of these delays. It seems the prevalent cause was poor project design and planning at the initial stages, and a lack of capacity for certain project components. The delays significantly affected the project's outcomes and sustainability.

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:

Country ownership in both South Africa and Lesotho was very high, which significantly affected the project's outcomes, and especially the project's sustainability. A strong commitment from South Africa to ensure the sustainability of project gains even after project completion is especially important for Lesotho, which lags in capacity and resources.

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**

Both of the TEs report that the M&E Design at entry was less than satisfactory. To begin, the planning stages of the project did not provide a concise design tool with clearly defined outcomes, indicators and measurable targets. (TE ZA pg. 6, LS pg. 5) This is evident in this TER's Effectiveness section, in which the project's listed expected "outcomes" are sometimes indicators, sometimes outputs, and often not mentioned at all in the TEs. Both countries modified the outcomes and activities of various components throughout project implementation, to best suit the needs of the recipient, but neither restructured the project outcomes, or indicators. The TEs note that a concise design tool with clearly defined outcomes, indicators and measurable targets, in combination with an effective monitoring and evaluation system, could have supported management decisions. Instead, the design did not include an M&E plan. (TE ZA pg. 6, LS pg. 5)

According to the PAD, Component 1 would address M&E through a six-monthly review of results. A short section on M&E in the PIP listed five key development impact indicators pointing out that "a major task of the initiation phase will be the formalization of the logical framework of the project, including all activities and the measurable indicators of performance". As mentioned in the Effectiveness section above, neither of the TEs recounted the five key impact indicators. Following the mid-term review a revised Results Framework was produced, showing revised targets, but these revisions were never formally endorsed by the World Bank in a restructured project. (TE ZA pg. 6)

No baselines were identified at appraisal. Several of the Key Indicators were extremely difficult to measure, or unrealistic: for example, it was highly unlikely that changes in maintaining endemic species or viable populations of threatened species were likely to be evident over the relatively short life of such project. (TE ZA/LS pg. 6)

M&E design at entry had noticeable shortcomings, and is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The important advancement in this project was the incorporation of the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) to evaluate PA management, which is now used on a regular basis as a self-assessment tool in South Africa and Lesotho. (TE ZA/LS pg. 6) Lesotho mentions an evaluation of the training provided at the Tourism in South Africa. (TE LS pg. 26) No other information is found in either TE on the implementation of M&E. Therefore, this category is not rated.

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: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE rates the quality of the World Bank's project implementation as moderately unsatisfactory.

The World Bank appropriately chose a favorable political environment, and made a good decision to implement the project as two separate projects in each country to be implemented in parallel. However, the WB did not adjust the project documentation accordingly, resulting in significant inconsistencies in the design documents and confusion during implementation. (TE ZA pg. 4, 5) This was especially problematic for a large project with many complex components. Many project activities could not be logically assigned to specific components- this is clear in the TEs, as project activities listed under a specific component in the Project Document are reported under another component in the TEs. Cost tables with clearly specified and budget activities under each component were not made available to the implementers. The preparation of a practical Project Implementation Plan (PIP) was delayed and the PIP finally produced was of limited help to the implementers. (TE ZA pg. 5) There was a delay of about 20 months between project appraisal and project approval, and another 14 months between approval and project effectiveness. (TE ZA pg. 5)

A mid-term review carried out in 2005 largely ignored these issues. A restructuring, which would have benefited the project, was not carried out. (TE ZA pg. 5)

In addition, some of the project's components were outdated, or not fully agreed with the recipient Government and implementing agency. The original eco-tourism and community activities proved inappropriate in the South African context and were replaced by supporting the stewardship program and a Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) as a new benefit transfer mechanism. As a result of the poor project design, there was an ad-hoc decision making and management process. Over time the national steering committee, different participating

agencies and the PCU identified priorities and activities for the individual components, which finally resulted in a partial redesign of the project. (TE ZA pg. 5)

The lack of a consistent design framework affected project implementation, and caused delays in the implementation of key activities. Important opportunities were also lost regarding: (a) better integration of project activities; (b) better balance between conservation and development as aimed for by the two project objectives; and (c) better balance between planning on one hand and implementation of plans delivering tangible outputs on the other hand. (TE ZA pg. 5-6) The TE notes that infrastructure development was compromised by delays on the side of both the government and the World Bank (whose issue of 'no objection' statements for procurement took months longer than necessary). (TE LS pg. 21)

Due to these significant shortcomings, the quality of project implementation is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The executing agencies in South Africa were the Nature Conservation Services in KwaZulu-Natal, the Free State and Eastern Cape agency, the Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife agency (EKZNW), and South African National Parks in collaboration with Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. These agencies signed a national level inter-agency Memorandum of Understanding that ensured a broad involvement and ownership of all major Government stakeholders and agencies in the Project. (TE ZA pg. 14) Through EKZNW these agencies provided and continue to provide the support for the Project Coordination Unit to adequately manage the Project and to continue implementation of the second phase. (TE ZA pg. 13, 14)

The TE rates the overall executing agency performance in South Africa as satisfactory, due to the satisfactory performance of the government and implementing agencies during project implementation, and also due to the advancement of project achievements into a second phase beyond project completion. (TE ZA pg. 15) The TE reports that the technical strength and conceptual thinking of the implementing agencies, a positive political environment, strong local ownership, and their experience and conviction to do the right thing at the right time were success factors during project implementation. (TE ZA pg. 5, 15) The EKZNW and its PCU recognized weaknesses in the project design, and pro-actively made proposals for appropriate changes. This pro-activity and flexibility has significantly contributed to making many project interventions more relevant to the South African context. The PCU was staffed with technically competent and dedicated professionals, which have established excellent relationships with their partners in Lesotho and a broader community of conservation practitioners, including international organizations. (TE ZA pg. 15) Lack of experience, training and appropriate procurement planning caused some delays of procurement processes, with one case of a "mis-procurement", but in general, the TE notes that the overall implementation performance in South Africa was very commendable. (TE ZA pg. 15)

The executing agencies in Lesotho were the Ministry of Environment, Gender and Youth Affairs, and the Ministries of Agriculture, Tourism and Works. The TE reports that, despite substantial achievements, there were moderate shortcomings in implementation of the component. (TE LS pg.20)

Most of the planning work was done by consultants under contracts that lacked a strong capacity-building element. As a result, Lesotho institutions have not gained capacity for planning, and the technical sophistication of the planning processes and products renders them largely inaccessible to resource users and may impede clear acceptance and action by government authorities. (TE LS pg. 20) Major reasons for the under-performance of nature-based tourism in the project area are: (i) poor planning and selection of the locations, which were placed according to political preferences instead of strategic locations; (ii) a lack of integration of these activities with other project components; and (iii) poor marketing of these tourist products. (TE LS pg. 7) Towards the later stage of the project, the PCU capacity was significantly reduced, and key staff left due to the growing uncertainty about transitional arrangements. This severely affected staff moral and motivation. (TE LS pg. 5)

Balancing the satisfactory performance of the agencies in South Africa, and the moderately satisfactory performance of the agencies in Lesotho, overall project execution is rated moderately satisfactory.

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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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.

The following evidence for environmental change is reported in the TEs:

- The METT clearly confirms that protected area management effectiveness has significantly improved as a result of the project in all but one PA. most significant improvement of 30% in the Matatiele Nature Reserve. (TE ZA pg. 6)
- Establishment of the Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Park linking Lesotho's Sehlabathebe National Park and South Africa's Ukhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site on the South African side. (TE ZA pg. 21)
- Integrated Management Plan for 9 protected areas, including Strategic Management Plan or Time-bound Action Plan and Business Plans. (TE ZA pg. 21)
- The establishment of the formal protected area Matatiele Municipal Nature Reserve in 2007. (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Bearded Vulture Protection through strategic habitat assessment and development initiative. (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Establishment of three Managed Resource Areas, at Khomo-Phatšoa (Qacha's Nek district), Mokhotlong-Sanqebethu (Mokhotlong) and 'Moteng (Botha-Bothe), and development of management plans for each. (TE LS pg. 22)
- Wetland management initiatives, including inventory, classification, erection of notice boards and collaboration with the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Ministry of

Natural Resources on preparation of a comprehensive wetland restoration program. (TE LS pg. 22)

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 South Africa, the project has trained more than 300 people in tourism, education and natural resource management, and has employed many of these people in project activities. Various Community Conservation Management Pilot Initiatives yielded positive results, including the: Greater Clarens Strategic Environmental Assessment, Clarens Bioregion Conservancy, Upper uThukela Community-Led Resource Management Project, Hlatikhulu Vlei Land-use Zoning, Hillside Community Tourism node, Pholela/Oribi Conservation Area, and Ntsikeni-Coleford Corridor Concept Development Plan; (TE ZA pg. 23)

In Lesotho, the project has provided support to a number of nature-based tourism enterprises that it has helped rural people. However, the prospects of further meaningful support following project termination are poor. (TE LS pg. 7) The Government of Lesotho remains committed to the management of rangelands and other natural resources by user groups, and the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation can be expected to continue promoting Grazing Associations and supporting those that operate in MDTP areas. (TE LS pg. 7)

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: The TEs report the following changes in capacity:

- The project established the Matatiele Municipal Nature Reserve, and provided a reserve manager, the appointment and training of 6 field rangers, the procurement of goods related to the establishment of the reserve, and clearing of alien plants within the reserve, for which 30 community members were trained and employed. (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Construction of a visitor arrival/information center and a 72-bed Environmental Centre in Sehlabathebe National Park, ready for handover to Government in December 2009. Eight kilometers of road were rehabilitated in the park, along with 1 km of hiking trail. Five hiking trail bridges were built. (TE LS pg. 20, 21)
- Strategic environmental assessment, zoning plan, official approval and management plan for the Senqu Sources PA. (TE LS pg. 20)
- An ecological study of the Maloti minnow and other fish in the Tsoelikane river (SNP). (TE LS pg. 20)
- Establishment of the Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Park linking Lesotho's Sehlabathebe National Park and South Africa's Ukhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site on the South African side. (TE ZA pg. 21)

- Integrated Management Plan for 9 protected areas, including Strategic Management Plan or Time-bound Action Plan and Business Plans. (TE ZA pg. 21)
- The establishment of the formal protected area Matatiele Municipal Nature Reserve in 2007. (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Preparation of a management plan for Sehlabathebe National Park, the Menkhoaneng and Botha-Bothe Plateau cultural heritage sites, and a joint management plan for the SNP and the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site. (TE LS pg. 20)
- Initial preparation of a general business planning framework for protected areas in Lesotho.
- Preparation of a business plan for Sehlabathebe National Park. (TE LS pg. 20)
- Initiation of some rehabilitation and development works proposed by the Sehlabathebe National Park management plan, including limited reintroduction of indigenous plant species, clearance of 10 ha of invasive plant species in and around the park and implementation of fire prevention measures. (TE LS pg. 20)
- Implementation of priority conservation actions, notably fire prevention measures and invasive species removal, in the Bokong Nature Reserve, the Tsehlanyane National Park and the Menkhoaneng and Botha-Bothe Plateau cultural heritage sites. (TE LS pg. 20)
- Establishment of three Managed Resource Areas, at Khomo-Phatšoa (Qacha's Nek district), Mokhotlong-Sanqebethu (Mokhotlong) and 'Moteng (Botha-Bothe), and development of management plans for each. (TE LS pg. 22)
- Wetland management initiatives, including inventory, classification, erection of notice boards and collaboration with the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Ministry of Natural Resources on preparation of a comprehensive wetland restoration program. (TE LS pg. 22)
- In Lesotho, generation of environmental conservation and biodiversity awareness in communities and schools. (TE LS pg. 24)
- In Lesotho, the creation of 3 Community Conservation Nurseries, and the Mokhotlong Community Conservation and Development Trust. (TE LS pg. 24)
- Project trained agency staff and local community members in marketing and service skills to promote community ecotourism initiatives. (TE LS pg. 26)
- Development of a Tourism Strategy for the Maloti Drakensberg Trans-frontier Area, and for Lesotho in general, including assessment of adventure tourism possibilities, and birding routes. (TE ZA pg. 27, TE LS pg. 25) Specific Concept Development Plans for: Relocation and Development of the Sani Pass Border Post, Witsieshoek Mountain Lodge, Golden Gate Interpretative Centre (TE ZA pg. 27)
- Development of a Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) system. (TE ZA pg. 27)
- In Lesotho, tourism plans for Sani Pass, Liphofung Cultural Heritage Site and SNP. (TE LS pg. 25)
- In Lesotho, community and private sector capacity building and training. (TE LS pg. 25)
- Early planning efforts to achieve a system of integrated community and district planning for Lesotho. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Review of the system of Environmental Units in line ministries that is meant to support the work of MTEC. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Funding of degree programs for three Government staff, as well as short courses for seven Government staff and 12 project personnel. (TE LS pg. 27)
- In South Africa, Nature reserves staff received training in biodiversity monitoring techniques, management plan development and implementation, legislative framework, use of laboratory equipment, information technology, Geographical Information Systems and map interpretation, video and photo equipment, etc. (TE ZA pg. 12)

b) Governance: The TEs report the following changes in governance:

- Implementation of the transfrontier security strategy. (TE LS pg. 20)
- The Development of Policies and Best-practice Guidelines for: Management of Living Heritage Sites, and Fire and grazing management in South Africa (TE ZA pg. 23)
- Development of Managed Resrouce Area by-laws, submitted but not yet approved. A process to integrate these draft by-laws for natural resource management by Community Councils has been started for Khomo-Phatšoa only. (TE LS pg. 22)
- In Lesotho, a National Framework for Issuing Concessions in the Tourism Sector was developed and approved by stakeholders. TE LS pg. 25) A National Strategic Framework for Tourism was finalized with MTEC management and involvement of key stakeholders. The strategy addresses four major aspects for improving tourism industry in the MDTFCA: (i) product development, infrastructure, human resources and policies; (ii) investment; (iii) marketing; and (iv) management. (TE LS pg. 27)
- Work on legislation for the sector, resulting in a new Environment Act and a Nature Conservation Bill. (TE LS pg. 27)

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.

An important unexpected outcome of the Project includes the development of new conservation instruments for formally protected and communal areas such as PES. The study work conducted under the Project as a collaborative effort between experts and a wide range of stakeholders explores potential environmental services (clean water, carbon sequestration and biodiversity) articulating the market partners perceptions and positions in such potential markets. Development of concrete market mechanisms is on the way. (TE ZA pg. 12)

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.

The following project activities were adopted at scale:

- Management plans for protected areas were mainstreamed throughout Lesotho and South Africa. **Mainstreamed- Adopted**
- Payments for Ecosystem Services Schemes became established in South Africa. **Mainstreamed- Adopted**

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 TEs for South Africa and Lesotho lists the following lessons learned:

- Trans-frontier cooperation in biodiversity conservation can be achieved through parallel implementation that takes into account the uniqueness of the countries involved, while maintaining synergies for cross-learning and collaboration. Such a design allows sovereign decision making and sufficient freedom to choose specific implementation speed and processes, while generating the necessary level of national ownership. While the trans-frontier cooperation was fully accomplished with significant transfer of knowledge from the advanced conservation and tourism experiences in South Africa, Lesotho was able to deliver on its own achievements. This appears a particularly suitable model in the context of countries that differ in size and development status. (TE ZA pg. 15)
- In countries with high local capacity it is of particular importance to closely involve local institutions in project design and detailed preparation. In South Africa, the local capacity was high and many project design concepts were developed during project implementation by the local institutions and implementers, but some concepts proved inappropriate for the local situation. (TE ZA pg. 15)
- Frequent changes in task management during project design and implementation can cause serious disruption, when task managers are leaving without finishing important milestone tasks. Examples under this project were the finalization and agreement on the logical framework at the design stage, the completion of the restructuring of the project at mid-term, and the time consuming design and procurement process of the environmental center at the later stage of the Project. . (TE ZA pg. 16, TE LS pg. 15)
- Using the synergies in the overall development portfolio allows exploiting the full development opportunities of a project. This project has benefited from the trans-frontier collaboration agenda between Lesotho and South Africa in the water transfer sector and extended this agenda to nature conservation. Similarly the Project would mutually benefit from other projects and programs. It has built the ground for private sector tourism development and in that area a linkage is desirable and emerging with the World Bank-funded Private Sector Competitiveness Project. Further mutual support could be envisaged in the area of resource management by the recently approved GEF-funded Sustainable Land Management Project and the new World Bank IFAD agricultural development project, which is currently under preparation. (TE LS pg. 15)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TEs for South Africa and Lesotho lists the following lessons learned:

- Long-term operational arrangements of investments should be carefully assessed before prior to entering into investments for buildings or infrastructure. (TE LS pg. 15)
- Restructuring of the project should be done as soon as a need arises. . (TE ZA pg. 16, TE LS pg. 5)
- Changes in task management require particular management oversight. . (TE ZA pg. 16, TE LS pg. 15)
- A well prepared logical framework [monitoring framework] should be the backbone of project design and should be fully agreed prior to project implementation. Such framework needs to clearly show the linkages between components and their outcomes with the overall environment objective. (TE ZA pg. 15, TE LS pg. 15)
- Objectives, indicators and targets need to be realistic, helpful for management and take into account the time-frame of project implementation. A baseline not only helps to measure success, but also disciplines the designers to pay attention to realistic and measurable indicators. (TE ZA pg. 16, TE LS pg. 15)

- Good project design and detailed preparation is necessary especially when local implementation capacity is low. The design should be simple and should take into account local institutional and human capacity. It is not advisable to expect major tasks to be completed between appraisal and effectiveness (e.g. condition of effectiveness). Moreover, such gaps indicate lack of readiness of the project. (TE LS pg. 15)

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?	Both of the TEs report on relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, often to very fine detail. However, neither of the TEs reports on all of the expected project outcomes listed in the Project Document.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and convincing, and the ratings are well substantiated.	**HS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability concerns are addressed throughout both TEs, and are reported on thoroughly.	**HS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive, and supported by the evidence.	**HS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TEs report the project costs by activity and in total, but insufficient information is provided on co-financing.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Neither of the TEs provides sufficient information to evaluate the M&E implementation. There is insufficient discussion on M&E in general.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(11) + 0.1(18) = 3.3 + 1.8 = 5.1$ ~

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

The only documents available to the TER writer were the Project Document and two Terminal Evaluation.