GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	03/09/2010
GEF Project ID:	789		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	96	**GEF financing:**	15.46	15.45
Project Name:	Integrated Management of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME)	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Angola, Namibia, South Africa	Government:	15.97	15.97
		Other*:	7.59	19.26
		Total Cofinancing	23.56	35.23
Operational Program:	OP8, Focal Area – International Waters	**Total Project Cost:**	39.02	50.68
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	UNOPS, Country governments	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Feb 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: Feb 2007	Actual: Mar 2008
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Ines Angulo	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 73	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 13 months
Author of TE: Andrew Cooke		TE completion date: May 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: May 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 0

* 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	**HS**	**HS**	**N/A**	**S**
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	**L**	**L**	**N/A**	**ML**
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	**N/A**	**S**	**N/A**	**MS**
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	**HS**	**S**	**NA**	**S**
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**S**

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

No. The terminal evaluation provides a comprehensive assessment of project outcomes and impacts relative to objectives. However the report relies extensively on stakeholder surveys, provides no assessment of the sub-projects, and does not present total project costs (or budget).

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

No such findings were noted in the terminal evaluation report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

As stated in the project document, the global environmental objective of the proposed project was to promote "environmentally sustainable development and management of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) environment, including living resources and water quality, so as to obtain the utmost long-term benefits for the human populations of the region, while protecting human health, ecological integrity and preserving options for use and enjoyment of the BCLME for future generations." (p. 30)

The project aimed to build a better model of the relationship between regional variability and global change and thus improve the models for marine resource utilization. The potential long-term environmental benefits from the project included the protection of fragile coastal biomes and the maintenance of a diverse marine ecosystem.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

As stated in the project document, the long-term objective of the project was to "undertake the array of priority measures as identified in the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and the Strategic Action Program (SAP), in conjunction with the on-going efforts of the participating countries, donors, regional organizations, industry, NGOs and other affected interests, to bring about the integrated, sustainable management and protection of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (p. 6)."

The project sought to assist the countries (Namibia, Angola, S. Africa) in the development and implementation of a regional approach to the problems of marine habitat loss and degradation, and to reduce the uncertainties currently associated with human exploitation of the system. The expected outcomes of the project were (i) a sustainable mechanism for co-operation embodied in an international legal and policy framework for co-operation in protection and sustainable use of the BCLME environment; (ii) improve countries' capacities to work together within this new framework; (iii) establish projects (measures) that will ensure a more sustainable future for the EEZ and coastal zone (p. 28).

The project document (section IV) specifies five outputs:
1. Effective intra and inter-project coordination and support through the establishment of a Program Coordination Unit (PCU) leading to the creation and functioning of the Interim Benguela Current Commission, and the identification of, and provision of resources for, Lead Agencies and Inter-ministerial Committees in each of the participating countries.
2. Creation of the necessary mechanisms for, and steps undertaken to develop real-time management capability to better sustain and utilize the resources of the BCLME.
3. Improved understanding of BCLME environmental variability, ecosystem impacts created by environmental variability, and thus improve predictability as a means of strengthening the management of fish-stocks.
4. Undertake preliminary steps to maintain BCLME ecosystem health and effectively manage pollution as a means to safeguard fishery and other resources.
5. Recruitment of additional donors and increase the level of co-finance during project implementation.

The development objective, expected outcomes, and outputs were revised at a stakeholders' workshop on 18th June 2003 to produce a more realistic document aimed at addressing the outputs of the SAP. The original log-frame in the ProDoc was found to be over ambitious with some outputs and indicators poorly matched and defined. As noted in the 2008 PIR, the original long term objective revised was to the broader development goal of "maintaining integrity of the BCLME through integrated trans-boundary ecosystem management (p. 51)." The expected outcomes were consolidated to a single outcome (or purpose) "countries have the understanding and the capacity to use a more comprehensive ecosystem approach and to implement sustainable measures," and a clear set of indicators was devised to measure progress toward this outcome (i.e. harmonization of legal frameworks, coordinated enforcement of regulations, implementation of SADC protocols, capacity for ecosystem management, introduction of ecosystem approach). The outputs were revised as follows (from the 2008 PIR):

Output 1 - Eliminating establishment of National Inter-ministerial Committees, fixing a single lead agency for each country and revision of the SAP in year 4, while introducing the "Activity Centres" and "Advisory Groups";
Output 2 – Revising 'creation of mechanisms' and 'steps undertaken to develop real time management capability' to 'enhancement of sustainable management and utilisation of resources', omitting specific references to mining and drilling impacts, conservation of species and habitats and non-target species (shifted to Output 4) while adding a series of specific (and challenging) targets for the management of MLRs;
Output 3 – General sense retained while omitting specific references to 'targeted training' and a 'programme to mitigate' the effects of HABs;
Output 4 – General purpose retained, omitting reference to development of specific measures to address oil spills, deteriorating water quality and habitat destruction while adding a series of specific targets regarding MARPOL, mining impacts, EWS, a series of mini-projects, vulnerable species assessment, biodiversity conservation plans etc.;
Output 5 – Expansion from donor recruitment to increase co-finance adding reference to an overall plan to increase donor and country resource commitment.

The most significant revisions were to introduce the Activity Centres and Advisory Groups which brought a new operational logic to the project structure, resulting in the clearer allocation of activities between marine living resources, ecosystem variability and biodiversity, ecosystem health and pollution. The revisions also brought greater clarity to the logical framework and defined clear output indicators which undoubtedly helped to guide project coordination unit with implementation and reporting. However, the new logical framework still did not identify specific project activities (subprojects) or link them to particular indicators.

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

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
X		X		

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance **Rating: S**

The BCLME project and its outputs were highly relevant not only to national and regional concerns, but also to international concerns about sustainable development and the joint governance of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) in relation to activities such as predicting ecosystem behaviour, managing fish stocks and addressing industrial pollution of fisheries (due to mining and oil extraction). The project was designed in response to the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)/Strategic Action Program (SAP) signed by ministers of project countries during the project preparation phase and project objectives were well aligned with country priorities. The need for a co-operative resource management framework was evident from the environmental perspective and was fully supported by the participating countries.

The project was of particular significance to addressing marine environmental problems world wide and to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (in particular MDG8) in Africa. It also provides a case study that can be used for other LMEs globally. The project has contributed to international environmental goals such as those of Chapter 17 of Agenda 21, the WSSD Plan of Action of 2002 and the objectives of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The project was also consistent with GEF goals and strategies under OP-8 and the International Waters focal area.

This project also complemented the GEF funded BENEFIT project, which aimed to strengthened country capacities in marine science and foster collaboration between the marine/fisheries research institutions of the three countries. At the close of the BCLME project, both projects were merged through the creation of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC). Project outcomes have contributed substantially to global environmental goals and objectives. The establishment and ratification of Benguela Current Commission (BCC) by Angola, Namibia, and S. Africa has laid the foundations for maintaining the integrity of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem. Project activities have contributed to the improved understanding and better conservation of one of the world's most productive and important

marine environments.

b. Effectiveness **Rating: S**

The BCLME Program was the largest LME project in Africa in terms of funding and as noted in the TE report the most ambitious. The project has successfully achieved most targeted outputs/outcomes and made significant progress towards meeting the objective of establishing trans-boundary ecosystem management, even though actual management systems are not yet in place. The main achievement is the creation of the Benguela Current Commission, which represents multiple sectors in the three countries directly engaging in the sustainable management and utilization of the transboundary resources associated with the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem. The BCC, which carries the legal weight of a treaty, was formally signed of the by the governments of Namibia, Angola and S. Africa in 2007.

The project has made significant achievements in each of the 5 output areas. Intra- and inter-program co-ordination and support was achieved through the creation of 3 separate activity centers (ACs) and 6 technical advisory groups (AGs), to guide and direct project activities. The TE report notes that the ACs and AGs have been very effective in coordinating project activities and in managing the transfer of activities to the newly created BCC. A study was conducted on human capacity, training, and infrastructure needs for trans-boundary management and a draft capacity development strategy was proposed, but not formally adopted. The project has successfully integrated capacity building, typically as hands-on training, into every sub-project and this remains the model for the follow-up project SAPIMP to be implemented by the BCC.

In the area of sustainable management and utilization of trans-boundary marine resources, the project has made good progress toward a functioning system of joint-management (TE report, p.53-54). Joint surveys have been conducted for two species and there are plans to extend national surveys across their borders. Joint working groups on conservation and management of shared stocks are established, although they are not yet fully regional and not formalised. It has been agreed that the groups will continue working under coordination of the ecosystem committee of BCC. There are no operational management plans (OMPs) at the regional level, but OMPs have recently been introduced for several trans-boundary species in Namibia and the prognosis is good for extending such plans to the regional – or at least bilateral – level. The project has fallen short of the targeted goal of annual reports on the state of the ecosystem and fish stocks, but the TE report notes that this was an ambitious target. The first State of Stocks Review 2007 has been completed and updated to early 2008. An annual State of the Ecosystem report has not been produced although this remains a goal for the BCC under the SAPIMP project. The project has established a shared environmental information system (SEIS), which is partially functional and will provide a very useful monitoring tool for the BCC. The SEIS website will be populated with the latest batch of State of Environment indices from the three countries.

Steps have been taken towards the establishment of a regional mariculture policy. S. Africa and Namibia have national mariculture policies in place. Nevertheless, there is no formally adopted regional policy and mariculture remains primarily a national concern. The BCC is aware of the potentially serious impacts of mariculture and will be pursuing a regional policy on the issue. Angolan participation in a regional policy may be unrealistic because Angola's priority is fresh water aquaculture. The project has also promoted the upgrading of quality & sanitary standards for aquaculture products in the region. Namibia has updated its regulations and Angola is underway, but the TE report notes that it will be a very long process to meet international standards (p. 133).

In the area of environmental variability and its impacts, the TE report notes that the project has made major progress in terms of assessment and predictability. Through numerous sub-projects, a vast amount of baseline ecosystem information was collected and key parameters identified to best describe the ecosystem. This has been critical for improving the understanding of variability in the BCLME and the data will form the core of the SEIS model. The project has also invested in developing models to predict the impacts of extreme climate events. The project has put in place the elements for an early warning system for harmful algal blooms (HABs). The system is not yet operational at the regional level. At the national level, human health warning plans are in place. Namibia and in S. Africa are actively monitoring HABs, and Angola has phytoplankton and biotoxin monitoring programs. The TE report notes that marine resource managers in the BCLME are beginning to use the project's monitoring data, the SEIS, and the fish stocks report for management purposes (p. 56)

The project has initiated the preliminary actions to maintain BCLME health and enhance effective pollution management, but only a few of the initiatives have been formalized through regional agreements. The establishment of a regional marine biodiversity conservation management plan is underway. The project has accomplished the main activities include the identification and mapping of existing data on the species, communities and biotopes in the offshore, intertidal and shallow sub-tidal areas of the BCLME region. Sites of future MPAs have been identified in all three countries, in the case Namibia new MPAs have been legislated at the national level. The project has developed a draft framework for managing land-based source of marine pollution, including guidance on implementation, protocols assessing baselines, and a long-term pollution monitoring program in the BCLME region. An inventory and critical

assessment of the available data on land-based marine pollution sources in Angola, Namibia and South Africa has been compiled. A set of recommended water and sediment quality guidelines has been established for coastal areas of all three countries with best practices for implementation. A joint assessment was made of the effluent from diamond mining and recommendations developed for mitigating effects on the marine ecosystem. A Regional Oil Spill Contingency project has also been finalised and recommendations have been made to be carried forward to the BCC/SAPIMP phase. On this point, there are clear efforts to harmonize regional policy on controlling and mitigating spillage.

The project has been highly successful in securing increased donor participation and co-financing, particularly for the next phase. Ministers recently agreed to increase the countries' annual cash contributions to the BCC, equivalent to an increase of up to 25% in relation to the country contributions to BENEFIT while it was still running. The project contributed to the realization of significant financial commitment made by the countries (USD50mil) to the work of the BCC and counterpart management activities and also assisted the countries' efforts in securing financial contribution from Norway and Iceland to support the BCC's Science Plan and Capacity Development Plan, respectively. The project has actively disseminated results and findings to the broader community through publications, multi-media presentations, and symposia**.** The Benguela Symposium, convened together with BENEFIT, presented key findings to both scientific communities and donor communities with an aim of stronger partnership building. The Project's website (www.bclme.org) is a source of extensive scientific information generated and or collected by the project, necessary to adaptively manage fisheries within the LME using an ecosystem based approach.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

The BCLME program was the largest large marine environment project in Africa based on GEF funding, both on a total and on a per country basis. The GEF contribution to BCLME was $15.45 Million including the cost of project design. A true assessment of efficiency would compare the project's cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects African LME projects, however there is insufficient information in the TE report for this.

Based on the 2008 APR, total project cost was $50.68 Million. The TE report only contains actual cost information for the GEF grant amount (Table 6). Approximately 40% of the GEF grant was used to finance sub-projects across all output areas. The large majority of project activities were conducted through over 100 sub-projects. These sub-projects were only precisely formulated after the project began and are not described in the SAP, project document or listed in the project logical framework. Another 45% of the GEF grant went to purchase instrumentation and other equipment (excluding vehicles). The remainder was allocated to project missions and sundries. Based on information in the TE report financial management of the project was sound overall.

The project officially closed one year later than planned in March 2008, following two 6-month extensions. The extensions permitted the project to complete certain sub-projects and eased the transition of project activities to the newly formed BCC. Despite the year long project extension, the budget remained within the original amount of the GEF grant.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

While it is too early assess the project's environmental impacts, the project has had tremendous impacts on national and regional capacities for trans-boundary management of the BCLME. The project has established strong working relationships between scientists and resource managers from the three countries, generated the scientific information needed to strengthen management of the LME, and catalyzed paradigm a shift from species-based to ecosystem-based management of marine resources. The project has enhanced institutional and individual capacities, and established a legally constituted Benguela Current Commission (BCC) to serve as a regional forum for informing and delivering future management actions in the ecosystem. In this context, the TE report notes that the project has been extremely successful in shifting the management focus from a country-centric to LME-(and thus region-) centric approach. This has helped put in place the building blocks for future collaborative management of the LME.

Assessment of environmental indicators (measures of ecosystem integrity) provides mixed evidence of the project's environmental impacts, but to a large extent these indicators were not realizable within the project time frame. The BCLME project can claim some improvement in the status of threatened species, notably for seabirds affected by industrial long line fishing and the bronze whaler shark. But, to date there has been no demonstrated halt to the decline in shared stocks, several of which have worsened considerably during the project period, nor have alien invasive species been brought under control. In terms of ecosystem carrying capacity and productivity, indicators suggest that conditions in the BCLME are declining for the traditionally targeted species (2008 PIR, p. 11).

Nevertheless, the project's monitoring of these environmental indicators has pushed governments to consider policy alternatives in an effort to preserve what remains of the ecosystem. All three governments are issuing fishing licences for a greater variety of species, and most importantly they are promoting the development of aquaculture as a source of

alternative livelihoods among coastal communities. In Namibia, recent mining leases have been issued with pro-active environmental management plans. Linked to this, the overall management plan for allocation of mining concessions has taken account of the spatial and temporal patterns of impact, resulting in an overall reduction in environmental impact by the Namibian marine mining industry.

In addition, the BCLME project has contributed significantly to the development of two other GEF proposals related to the sustainable management of resources in the BCLME: 1) the proposal to support institutional strengthening of the newly created BCC necessary to achieve its stated purpose; and 2) a proposal addressing the unsustainable seabird by-catch and proposing reforms to realize a more sustainable and by-catch friendly ocean-to-table supply chain.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	**Rating: L**
Project outcomes are very likely to be sustained through the newly established BCC, a joint commission organized and funded by the participating countries. The financial sustainability of the BCC is secured for the coming 5 years, with a reasonable expectation that country contributions will continue thereafter. The BCC has garnered sustained funding from the governments of Angola, Namibia, and S. Africa, as well as funding from other nations such as Iceland, Norway, and France. Some project activities will be supported through the Strategic Action Plan Implementation Project (SAPIMP), being executed by the BCC and funded through GEF/UNDP. In Angola the national policy is pro-environment but the government clearly lacks resources to implement all the BCLME recommendations without assistance.	
b. Socio political	**Rating: L**
The strong political commitment to sustain project outcomes is demonstrated by the accord over the establishment of the BCC and the level of co-financing/funding that the three countries have provided. The private sector (mining and oil companies) were involved in several project activities and are likely to support continued harmonization of policies on pollution avoidance and best practices. International support for sustaining project outcomes is also strong. Research organizations from several countries participated in or co-financed project activities, and have invested in future BCC activities. Although the board of the BCC includes fishing industry representatives, the project has not actively involved the fishing industry or populations depending on the exploitation of marine resources. This may create difficulties in the implementation of a regional approach to natural resource management. There is also a concern that the relative political priority of environmental issues may shift under immediate political pressures.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: L**
The project has been very successful in achieving institutional sustainability through establishment of the BCC, which has strong backing from each participating country. This will help to ensure the effectiveness of the BCC as a regional advisory body. The BCC will also provide necessary technical expertise at the national level and support the development of sustainable national environmental policy. The BCC will execute the SAPIMP project, and support the implementation of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) style management plans. Namibia has already implemented an EAF at the national level and the other countries are considering EAF plans. The only notable risk to sustainability identified in the TE report is that the recent closure of the BCLME programme, and particularly closure of the PCU and Activity Centres which have been so important in driving the programme, will result in a substantial slow-down of momentum across all outcomes. Whether this happens will depend on the country governments, key government staff and the individuals selected for key posts in the BCC.	
d. Environmental	**Rating: ML**
Ecosystem variability, whether induced by climate variability or other factors, poses a serious risk to the sustainability of the project's environmental impacts.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good The project has vastly enhanced scientific understanding of the BCLME through data collection and modeling efforts. The project has also contributed to the development of baseline data for a wide variety of environmental parameters, which is being used to improve decision-making by natural resources and fisheries managers in all three participating countries.
b. Demonstration Project results, lessons, and good practices have been widely disseminated through print and digital publication, the website and a film. The project has led several regional conferences on LME management, and participated in

international conferences. BCLME has demonstrated effectively, to project constituents; governments and the international community, that a proper understanding of how the ecosystem functions is the foundation for management. In relation to international conventions, BCLME has helped to promote EAF as a tool for implementing UNCLOS objectives, and has provided leadership in promoting the role of LMEs under the Regional Seas Convention (specifically the Abidjan Convention).

c. Replication

At the international level, BCLME has become a global example for LME projects and many aspects of its approach are or will be reproduced in other LME programs. Perhaps most significant of these is the concept of an LME Commission. This has been directly adopted in the GCLME, whereas on the case of CCLME and ASCLME it has been considered and remains a possible eventual outcome of those projects.

BCLME's communication approach is being replicated internationally. The BCLME "branding" has been adopted by all the African LMEs, which all now have logos and a corporate communication style. The BCLME style newsletter, posters and potentially the BCLME book are candidates for future replication. The creation of a BCLME brand and identity has undoubtedly been a factor in its success in promoting the "whole system" approach.

The EAF project is also being replicated to an extent. Lessons from the EAF experience has enabled FAO to refine its template for a general EAF process which will be used in other regions of the world. FAO has called the BCLME project a "flagship" for EAF and that it is "at the cutting edge globally". Based on the EAF experience in BCLME, WWF has developed a training program on EAF for application in other regions. Namibia is already developing EAF-based management plans for commercial stocks. At the level of the sub-projects, the top predators' project has led to a global seabird-fisheries project to be funded by UNDP-GEF.

d. Scaling up

The project has promoted system-wide changes regionally and nationally. The establishment of the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) underscores the project's successful promotion of trans-boundary approaches to ecosystem management. Although the regional management system is not yet operation, all the elements are in place. At the national level, the project has affected national management practice and governance to varying extents. Namibia has developed a series of EAF-based fisheries management plans, declared MPAs around offshore islands, and adopted an Environmental Management Act (2008) which better regulates continental and marine mining. In Angola, the project has influenced the development of National Fisheries Law (2004) to specifically include an ecosystem approach, and the development of an offshore MPA (pending approval). The effects on S. African national policy have been minor.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The proposed co-financing amount in the project document was $23.56 Million, approximately 60% of the total project cost of $39 Million. The actual co-financing of $35.23 Million realized by the project exceeded the proposed amount, and was close to 70% of the total project cost of 50.68 Million (2008 PIR, p.54).

The actual contribution from the three countries, $15.97 Million, was the same as the amount proposed in the project document. Country contributions included both cash and in-kind financing. The TE report does not contain cost-breakdowns for co-financing, but does suggest that country contributions were substantial, given the active involvement of two or three ministries and several institutions in each country, the considerable volume of project work in the countries and the numerous meetings that were held internationally. Proposed contributions from DANCED ($0.039 M), BENEFIT ($6.3 M), SADC ($0.80 M), and Port Authorities ($0.47 M), a total of $7.6 Million were realized. The TE report estimates that the contribution from BENEFIT, which included ship-based surveys, likely exceeded the proposed amount.

Based on the 2008 APR, the project leveraged additional *in-kind* co-financing of $11.67 Million from other sources including the FAO ($0.09 M), French IRD & NOAA ($10.5 M), Luderitz farmers ($0.03 M), Angolan oil companies ($0.05 M), De Beers Marine ($0.50 M) and other international agencies ($0.50).

Based on information in the TE report, BCLME has helped create favourable conditions for the establishment of ACCESS (Southern African Climate Change Centre) and has leveraged around 50 million Norwegian Kroner (about $US10 million at today's rates) from the *Nansen* programme and over $US2 million from Germany over the duration of the BCLME programme. There have also been leverage benefits to HABs training and LOW work, and most

recently funding for the BCC science programme (over $US10 million).

b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was granted a two 6-month extensions, and closed in Mar 2008. The extensions were necessary to achieve project outcomes, as there was a required transition period to develop institutional structures for the Benguela Current Commission and to implement the SAP. Additional time was also needed to complete some sub-projects and to hold a final seminar or conference to report back to stakeholders in July 2007.

c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

The project has benefited from a high level of country ownership both in terms of achieving outcomes and in terms of sustainability. The BCLME project design was the subject of a country-owned preparation process resulting in agreement on priority trans-boundary issues (TDA), a program of action to address them (SAP), and a project document endorsed by national GEF operational focal points. The project itself was driven by a steering committee with three representatives from each country, and the three activity centers, one in each country, which were led by national directors. The project has resulted in ministers signing an interim agreement for the establishment of the Benguela Current Commission, confirming country political support for sustaining project outcomes.

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

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MS

The project document includes a detailed logical framework and implementation timeline (workplan). Outputs and outcomes (purposes in the log-frame) are described in detail; however the project document lacks a detailed description of the intended project *activities*. The indicators selected to measure progress towards objectives and purposes are not quantifiable and difficult to assess. Furthermore, the linkages between project activities, outputs, objectives and indicators of the logical framework were not well described in the original project document.

In addition to the logical framework, the project document specified that the project would be supervised and evaluated through Project Performance and Evaluation Review the Tri-Partite Reviews, and annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) of the GEF. Process Indicators, Stress Reduction Indicators, and Environmental Status Indicators were to be developed once the project started.

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

Once project implementation commenced, the original log-frame as produced in the project document was found to be overly ambitious with outputs and indicators poorly matched and defined in places. Some revisions were subsequently made at a stakeholders' workshop on 18th June 2003 to produce a more realistic document aimed at addressing the outputs of the SAP. The TE report notes that the revisions introduced "an assortment of new indicators which had little or no basis in the text of the project document and which did not render any more explicit the linkages between the project activities and output indicators (p. 96)." The TE report also notes that several indicators (i.e. decline in invasive species, increase in productivity) were ambitious for the given project timeframe. It should also be noted that these indicators are really impact measures, and do not provide a good picture of the project's progress towards objectives or achievement of outcomes.

The project did implement the revised M&E plan in an effective manner. The only area where M&E was lacking was in the area of the sub-projects. The project was not able to effectively monitor or evaluate all the sub-projects. A collection of executive summaries of the sub-projects was produced, but this did not link the sub-projects to outcomes and indicators.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?
The project document allocated $0.16 M for M&E activities. Based on information in the TE report, this amount was inadequate considering the regional scope of the project and the number of sub-projects involved.

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?
M&E funding during implementation appears to have been timely. The mid-term evaluation, the tri-partite reviews, and the final evaluation were conducted in a timely manner. The overall M&E budget was insufficient as noted in b.1.

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?

The monitoring system provided feedback through the mid-term evaluation and annual reviews. Recommendations stemming from the mid-term evaluation were implemented during the project's remaining timeframe by the project coordinating unit and the steering committee.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

The project's M&E system cannot be considered a good practice.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

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

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

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

The project was implemented by the UNDP office for the South African region and executed by UNOPS, through the New York office. This division of responsibilities permitted UNDP to focus on supporting the execution of the project, while the administrational details were managed by UNOPS. During the project design phase, UNDP had supported a Trans-Boundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), which led to a multi-country agreement on a Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The BCLME project was developed as a means to implement the SAP. The TE report notes that the drawback of this approach to project design has been the that BCLME has had to "focus primarily on filling knowledge and policy gaps, rather than taking concrete action toward trans-boundary management (p. 97)."

In addition to UNDP supervision, the project was also guided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which consisted of 15-20 persons, including country representatives from each of the three key sectors (fisheries, mining, environment), BENEFIT, SEAFO, SADC, UNDP, UNOPS, the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) and AC Directors.

Based on information in the TE report, UNDP has played a strong leadership role, and it has kept the project team focused on objectives. UNDP closely monitored project progress, assisted with the preparation of Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and provided strategic guidance as necessary (p.108). Following the mid-term evaluation, UNDP and the Project Steering Committee (PSC) supported implementation of the main recommendations, (i) rapid establishment Interim Benguela Current Commission (IBCC) and (ii) development of tools and mechanisms for trans-boundary ecosystem management (p.81). Based on the reviews of the PIRs, reporting by UNDP has been detailed, and largely positive.

UNDP also provided a particularly important role in assuring the smooth transition to the next phase through securing funding for the SAPIMP follow on project early enough to ensure that there was no significant suspension of activities upon termination of the BCLME project.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[1] (rating on a 6 point scale) S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

UNOPS-New York was the executing agency and provided administrative services throughout the project. Based on information in the TE report UNOPS support was universally acclaimed by stakeholders as highly efficient, supportive, and responsive (p. 108).

Activities were managed by the project coordination unit (PCU), based in Namibia, and the three thematic activity centers (ACs), one in each country. The PCU was staffed by the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), and 2-3 administrative support staff. According the terminal evaluation report, the PCU was efficient and provided adequate support, given the rather low staffing level.

The activity centres comprised a Director, sometimes supported by national consultants and an administrator. With such a small project team, most project activities were actually carried out by contractors. The Activity centres were responsible for the management and administration of the many sub-projects in their sphere of activity across all three BCLME countries. The TE report notes that (i) the ACs were very understaffed and (ii) the staff was undercompensated (p. 109). The number of sub-projects that the ACs had to manage appears to have precluded work on other aspects of the project. The sub-project selection process was not fully transparent, and no report was prepared outlining the project design and selection process or relating the sub-projects to trans-boundary concerns.

In addition to the PCU and ACs, there were national focal points in each country, and six technical advisory groups (AGs) to guide the PCU, and later the BCC, on SAP implementation. The AGs were supposed to decide on the relative

[1] Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

allocation of sub-projects, selecting which sub-projects would be tendered and which would be directly assigned to BENEFIT or research programs in the region. However, due to poor coordination between the Activity Centers and the Advisory Groups, in practice the AGs played less of a role than intended (p. 99).

While overall project implementation was highly effective and responsive to changing stakeholder needs, the project could clearly have benefitted from a greater number of permanent staff in the PCU and ACs. This would have permitted the CTA and the AC Directors to devote more time to achieving project objectives, garnering support at the national level, and the operationalization of a trans-boundary management system for the BCLME.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

Project design

1. The stepwise establishment of a Large Marine Ecosystem Commission for the governance and management of an LME is a promising institutional approach, but has yet to be fully tested. A science-based approach to a fundamental understanding of the ecosystem is essential but should be complimented by management-orientated demonstration actions. The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) adds a valuable compliment to LME projects and the systematic integration of EAF in LME projects is recommended. Management changes are difficult to achieve in a first project phase – any such targets should be realistic and not included if in doubt. Harmonisation of law and policies between countries is not a realistic or useful objective in the context of LME projects which should focus on actual cooperation through operational plans.
2. A TDA/SAP cycle during the PDF-B phase can be highly beneficial but should be considered as preliminary and should be reiterated during project implementation. A preliminary SAP is beneficial but it should include EcoQOs and a Vision Statement and should be updated during project implementation. The time lag between project conception and full project implementation via the PDF-B process is excessive and must be reduced substantially.
3. LME programmes should avoid excessively numerous subprojects, focussing instead on a smaller number of concrete demonstration actions. 1st iteration LME projects should endeavour to produce a full set of ecosystem state indicators to pass on to the subsequent operational phase.
4. Potential obstacles to project implementation, such as the language barrier or administrative or logistical issues, should not be underestimated or ignored and should be actively addressed in project design. Where countries are unequal participants the project must include intensive measures to "level the playing field".
5. The project logical framework should truly reflect what the project designers and managers intended, using indicators that are realistically achievable. Substantial logical framework revision should be avoided unless accompanied by revision of the project document itself; the linkages to any existing TDA or SAP should remain explicit. Indicators conditional upon the successful performance of other projects should only be included where the arrangements for collaboration are very solid.

Project implementation

1. The use of a multiple subproject approach can be beneficial to implementation and output quality but subprojects should be explicitly linked to project logical framework, limited to a manageable number and the results fully synthesised before project end. The feasibility of subprojects should be carefully assessed and any assumptions (such as the need for sharing of information) addressed in advance through protocols or other suitable agreements.
2. When making use of the multiple subproject approach, care should be taken to ensure transparent and equitable allocation of projects and contracts should include penalty clauses for late delivery. A tendering process based on specific requirements developed by technical teams is generally preferable to a more open "call for proposals" approach. Integration of capacity building into subprojects is an effective way to improve capacity.

Stakeholder participation

1. The use of thematic Activity Centres at the country level can be highly beneficial to project implementation but should be done in a way that does not compromise participation of national institutions. The integration of all sectors in the PSC if feasible is highly beneficial but is not a substitute for national level integration through National Inter-ministry Committees.
2. Partnerships with other programmes and cooperation between donors are highly beneficial but should be proactively pursued and formalised from the start. Industry stakeholder participation is essential and should be actively promoted from the start of the project design process. LME projects should have an active communications program and make use of "branding" to promote a sense of regional identity with the

ecosystem.

3. Capacity building and the achievement of concrete outputs cannot be effectively combined without a very well integrated capacity building strategy. Capacity building needs a strategic plan which should be undertaken at the TDA/SAP stage rather than await the project implementation stage. Any capacity building strategy needs to be designed in such a way as to encourage national staff to stay in the system. Projects should ensure that hiring of consultants does not undermine the capacity of the very institutions the project is supposed to support.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. The BCC should complete the synthesis of all the sub-projects linking them to indicators in the BCLME logical framework and the SAP. This would advantageously be supported by those most familiar with the project, such as the former CTA and AC directors while they remain available.
2. A meeting of BCLME experts and national focal points should be convened to define a provisional set of ecosystem state indicators for the BCLME, as a legacy to pass on to the BCC to test and refine over the coming years. It is important to perform this soon before some of the senior experts involved retire or younger ones move on to other positions. UNDP/GEF should also maintain a working group on operational ecosystem monitoring systems. The BCLME project got very close to establishing operational monitoring systems for HABs, LOWs and Benguela El Ninos – it would be a major setback if this valuable progress was to be lost through delay awaiting the implementation of the BCC science plan and the SAPIMP project. It is therefore recommended to maintain a working group on this theme in the interim to ensure that BCLME achievements are fully capitalised in the future.
3. In order to bring BCLME into line with best GEF IW practices it is now necessary to update the TDA and develop an updated SAP with modern features including a clear vision statement and EcoQOs and to put financial "mechanisms" in place. It is recommended that the BCC should establish a working group with immediate effect to begin the process of reviewing the original TDA and SAP and identify the requirements for achieving a full update.
4. Apply knowledge in management approaches and mechanisms, focusing on trans-boundary resource management across the LME. It is very important that the BCC, through the science plan and the support of SAPIMP, makes deliberate use of the knowledge gathered by BCLME in developing trans-boundary management approaches and mechanisms. he BCLME project has got very close to operational monitoring systems for HABs, LOWs and BCLME El Niños – every effort should be made to perfect these systems such that they become fully operational.
5. BCC needs to be proactive in this respect, and to develop a manual or other tool addressed to managers enabling useful information to be used effectively.
6. There is a need for the BCC to work with governments at both the national and regional level, with a particular emphasis on building capacity in each country for fisheries management, addressing the disconnect between trans-boundary fisheries research and management and reinforcing the linkages between the scientific working groups on fisheries (at the national level) and the BCC (at the trans-boundary level). Given the rather diffuse capacity impact of BCLME it is especially important that the BCC with SAPIMP support works towards a truly strategic and planned approach to capacity building, including developing a clear road-map for institutional and individual CB&T targets.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

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 document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The report contains a very detailed and comprehensive assessment of outputs, outcomes, and impacts relative to objectives, based largely on stakeholder surveys.	HS
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and	

the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report did not contain any evidence gaps or inconsistencies, but the organization could have been improved. No major evidence gaps were noted.	S
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report discusses the potential risks to project sustainability along several dimensions, and suggests steps forward for the project and for the BCC.	S
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are supported by the evidence, but could be more comprehensive. Two lessons not mentioned are that (i) projects of this scope and complexity require larger staffs to effectively achieve objectives; and (ii) conducting two projects like BENFIT and BCLME in tandem leads to valuable synergies and linkages.	MS
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report includes actual project costs only for the GEF grant. Total project costs and actual co-financing amounts are not included in the report.	MS
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The M&E evaluation is fairly brief. It does not provide much detail on which aspect of the M&E system was most problematic, or which indicators were the most flawed.	MS

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.