

Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas Phase I

(Cape Verde Protected Areas Project, Phase I)

GEF Sec Project ID: 1124

Atlas Project Number 00012226-7

PIMS # 1382

TERMINAL EVALUATION

13th July – 6th August 2009

Final Report (28 September 2009)

Presented by:

Tamar Ron (team leader) and Charles Yvon Rocha

Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas, Phase I

Financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through the United Nations
Joint Office in Cape Verde (UNJO)

In partnership with
General Direction of Environment, under the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and
Marine Resources
US Peace Corps
German Cooperation Agencies BMZ and GTZ

Project short name:	“Cape Verde PAs - Phase I”
GEFSEC Project ID:	1124
UNDP PIMS No.:	1382
Atlas Project Number:	00012226-7
Project Duration:	48 months
Beneficiary Country:	Cape Verde
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity
GEF3 Strategic Priority:	Biodiversity
Date of Entry into Work Programme:	02 August 2002
Project Document Signature Date:	01 October 2003
Date of First Disbursement:	April 2004
Original Planned Closing Date:	30 Sept 2007
Revised Planned Closing Date:	30 June 2009
Executing Modality:	National execution (NEX)

Acknowledgements

We thank UNJO – Cape Verde for organizing the mission and for the pleasant providing of all of the required logistic and administrative support. We thank especially Jose Levy for the continuous support of the mission and the good advice throughout. We thank Eunice Gomez, Anna Paula Leguay and Adalgiza Silves for their help with the mission implementation, and we thank Petra Lantz, the Resident Representative for her special tips. We thank Fabiana Issler the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor for her advice, and for her very thorough and useful comments on the draft report. We are especially grateful to the NPCU team, and particularly to Maria Teresa Vera Cruz for all the information and help in completing the mission and the report. We also thank José Jorge Ortet Fernandes, Maria José da Cruz Brasão, Leao Carvalho and Marcelino Jose Perreira Semeiro (Lino) for their added information and support. We thank the teams of Serra Malagueta NP and Monte Gordo NP for their help with the field visits and with essential information, and especially Joao Monteiro Mascarenhas, Silvino Rubalo, Ivani Duarte and Nelson de Rosalio Santana. We are grateful to Guido Corno for his input, and to Abdelkader Bensada, the former project CTA, who made the effort to advise us from Amman. Finally, we are grateful to all the people consulted, for their contribution (the full list is annexed: annex II).

Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
List of Acronyms.....	4
Summary.....	5
1. Introduction.....	9
1.1. Objectives of the final evaluation.....	9
1.2. Methodology used.....	9
2. Project Context and Design.....	10
2.1. Context.....	10
2.2. Project design.....	11
2.3. Project’s intended impact, in the context of the development goals.....	13
2.4. Project strategy.....	14
2.5. Project Budget and Financial Planning.....	14
2.5.1. Project budget.....	14
2.5.2. Financial planning.....	15
3. Findings and evaluation of outcomes.....	16
3.1. Evaluation of outcomes in relation to project strategy, intended impact and design.....	16
3.2. Project Implementation.....	17
3.2.1. Project duration and implementation milestones.....	17
3.2.2. Roles and responsibilities in project implementation.....	17
3.2.3. Financial data, budget, expenditure statement and efficiency.....	21
3.2.4. National and local ownership.....	29
3.2.5. Project monitoring and evaluation system.....	33
4. Results.....	34
4.1. Achievement of the project objectives.....	34
4.2. Achievement of the project expected results.....	36
4.3. Summary of assessment of progress achieved by the Project.....	47
5. Project Impacts and Sustainability.....	49
5.1. Policy and legal framework.....	49
5.2. Institutional framework.....	50
5.3. Sustainability of the two established pilot Protected Areas and their management.....	50
5.4. Capacitated Protected Areas management staff.....	50
5.5. Local communities’ participation in sustainable management of natural resources.....	51
5.6. Decision makers, stakeholders and general public support to the PAs concept.....	51
5.7. Eco-tourism development and revenues for the Protected Areas and communities.....	51
5.8. Financial sustainability.....	52
6. Lessons Learned.....	52
7. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	54
7.1. Conclusions.....	54
7.2. Recommendations.....	55
ANNEXES	
ANNEX I: Consulted Documents.....	58
ANNEX II: People Consulted.....	61
ANNEX III: The Project Logical Framework.....	64
ANNEX IV: The Terms of Reference of the Final Evaluation.....	71
ANNEX V: The Final Evaluation Power Point Presentation.....	77
ANNEX VI: Short Profiles of the Evaluators.....	78
ANNEX VII: GEF Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tools.....	79

List of Acronyms

CVPAP	Cape Verde Protected Areas Project
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
CO	Country Office
PA	Protected Area
NP	Natural Park
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
TE	Terminal Evaluation
ProDoc	Project Document
SMNP	Serra da Malagueta Natural Park
MGNP	Monte Gordo Natural Park
GoCV	Government of Cape Verde
NPCU	National Project Coordinating Unit
PC	Project Coordinator
MADRRM	Ministerio do Ambiente, Desenvolvimento Rural, e Recursos Marinhos
DGA	Direcção Geral do Ambiente
MAA	Ministerio do Ambiente e Agricultura
PAA	Protected Areas Authority
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DGASP	Direcção Geral de Agricultura, Silvicultura e Pecuária
UNJO	United Nations Joint Office
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NEX	National Execution
NBSAP	National Biodiversity strategy and Action Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PIR	Project Implementation Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
DGT	Direcção Geral de Turismo
INIDA	Instituto Nacional de Investigação e Desenvolvimento Agrário
INDP	Instituto Nacional para o Desenvolvimento das Pescas
UNDP-GEF RTA	UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTC	Project Technical Committee
LSC	Local Site Committee
CM	Camara Municipal
ENDU	Environmental Natural Disasters Unit
FMZ	Forestry Management Zones
DGP	Direcção Geral das Pescas
MIT	Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
WWF	World Wide fund for Nature
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
DGPOG	Direcção Geral de Planeamento, Orçamento e Gestão
SIGOF	Integrated System of Budgetary and Financial Management
GIS	Geographic Information System
METT	Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tools

Summary

The Cape Verde Protected Areas Project (CVPAP) Phase I project, implemented by the Government of Cape-Verde, and supported through partnership with GEF-UNDP, was aimed at conserving globally significant biodiversity, through an integrated approach, in and around two selected Protected Areas, created through the project. It was also aimed at contributing to sustainable development and poverty alleviation in the project's zone of influence. Apart from its primary conservation focus the project was also designed so that it would contribute to halting and reversing existing degradation of land and water resources, within and around the selected protected areas.

This final evaluation of Cape Verde Protected Areas Project – the originally designed Phase I - is aimed at examining the concept, design and implementation of the project. The report focuses on lessons learned and on recommended way forward to ensure sustainability and long-term impact of achievements. The evaluation was based mainly on a desk-top-based review of the project documentation and on interviews with various actors. Short visits were realized to the two Protected Areas, Serra Malagueta Natural Park (SMNP) and Monte Gordo Natural Park (MGNP), aimed at identifying and assessing field-based impacts and issues.

The CVPAP Phase I project implementation focused mainly on the creating of two pilot terrestrial protected areas, and on establishing the conditions for the integrated management of natural resources in and around them. The two sites, selected from 47 important sites listed in Law 3/2003, were Serra Malagueta and Monte Gordo.

The overall development goal of the project was the conservation of globally significant biodiversity; the reduction of land and water degradation and desertification in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde; and contribution to poverty alleviation through sustainable use and management of natural resources in the area of the project's influence. The project objective was defined as follows: The Government of Cape Verde, in partnership with local communities will conserve globally significant biodiversity in six newly established protected areas, and in surrounding landscapes, by developing and applying new strategies for ecosystem protection and sustainable resource management.

The Project Intended Outcomes (as defined in the ProDoc, in order to meet the project objective):

Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas

Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems

Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management

Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management

Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities

Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals

The main global importance of Cape-Verde's terrestrial biodiversity is in the unique island ecosystems, with a combination of mountainous and coastal landscapes, and with an array of endemic species (mainly plants, birds and reptiles). The main threats to terrestrial biodiversity in Cape-Verde, are: invasive species, over-exploitation of indigenous flora and fauna and land degradation.

Although the project design was composed of both upstreaming and downstreaming activities, the approach adopted during implementation has favored mainly the downstreaming components of

creating pilot Protected Areas and focusing on activities within them. The project was aimed at conservation of globally and nationally important terrestrial biodiversity in Cape-Verde, as well as reduction of land degradation, through the creation of a national system of protected areas. Two of the protected areas defined by the 2003 law were established and successfully operationalized by the project. Moreover, the project focused on establishing the knowledge base, partnerships, and integrated management plan for the operation of these two Protected Areas. The project also targeted capacity building of the Government and other relevant stakeholders to manage Protected Areas. It also contributed to raising the awareness of the decision makers, the general public, and specific target groups in Cape-Verde, to the importance of Protected Areas, as well as to their potential role in poverty alleviation, especially in and around them, through sustainable use of natural resources and through tourism development.

The General Directorate of Environment (DGA) at the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources (MADRRM, previously the Ministry of Environment and Agriculture, MAA) is responsible for the creation and management of protected areas in Cape Verde, and was the governmental department responsible for the execution of the CVPAP. Although not a defined intended output of the evaluated project, a concept was developed for the establishment of an autonomous (*Organismo Autonomo*) Protected Areas Authority (PAA) that will be responsible for the management of a national system of protected areas. However, there is still no agreement about the exact nature of this authority, its institutional status, degree of autonomy and function within the existing framework, the mechanisms to enable its financial sustainability, and its intended role and mandate. The establishing, capacitating and financing of an adequate institutional set up for the management of a national system of protected areas will be a key task of the follow-up project.

The project established the following institutional set-up to enable a participatory approach to decision making processes in both the central and the local levels: Project Steering Committee, responsible for project oversight and approves the annual project work plans and budget; Project Technical Committee, providing technical oversight and input to the project; and two Local Site Committees intended to act as a ‘support structure for project execution’ and are the intermediate level between the project staff and local communities.

Considering the baseline situation, it is evident that a remarkable progress was made toward introducing the actual concept of protected areas and their integrated co-management, as an essential instrument for biodiversity conservation, into Cape Verde, and toward creating the conditions to establish a network of protected areas in the country. The project results had further contribution to halting land and water degradation and to poverty alleviation through sustainable management of natural resources, within the project’s areas of influence. However, since the project was originally designed as phase I, and a second phase was designed to follow, the evaluated project did not include an adequate exit strategy to secure sustainability of the positive results and enable a smooth transfer of the two parks from management by the project to the full responsibility of the government. Moreover, most of the project’s achievements were with a down-streaming focus, and most of the impact was concentrated mainly within and around the two created protected areas.

Protected Areas legislation was adopted and disseminated. Other essential environmental and land-tenure legislation and policies are still required. Park limits and management plans were approved legally for both PAs. Capacity and awareness of decision-makers and of key actors, in relation to PAs, increased. The establishing of an “autonomous PAs authority” was discussed (though long-term responsibilities for park management are not yet consolidated and agreed). Decision-making is still over-centralized. Some of the local governments report on insufficient involvement in decision making process, resulting with the lack of a feeling of ownership. Local communities are involved

in decision making related to specific activities that directly concern their participation, but not in the overall management of the PAs. Sustainability of governmental PAs financing mechanism is not guaranteed yet.

Project and park personnel, relevant government staff, and community participants, were trained and capacitated in key aspects, related to the PAs' management, however, not in accordance with an overall strategic training/capacity building programme. Baseline studies and monitoring on ecological and socio-economic aspects of the two pilot PAs were implemented and data compiled, published and distributed. Park management plans and specific strategic plans were elaborated and adopted for the two PAs, and their implementation initiated.

The most prominent achievement of the project is the creation and operation of the first two PAs in the country. Another remarkable achievement of the project was the training and capacitating of committed and highly motivated technical teams in both PAs. However, their continued and long-term involvement in park management was not secured. The PAs infrastructure was partly installed and another part is still in construction. Expenditures on infrastructure, and especially on headquarters facilities (SMNP), was disproportionate (based on information received from the NPCU, 37.2% of the total budget was spent on infrastructure, and 73.0% of the infrastructures budget was spent on constructions. However, it should be noted that no additional funds from GEF, besides what had originally been planned, went into infrastructure construction in 2009, and most of these additional funds were diverted from Government's funds. There is need for improved planning and budgeting in future cases. Local communities participate and benefit from improved park management practices. An innovative water management system was installed in both parks.

Community participants were sensitized and trained to participate in various sustainable management practices. Pressure on indigenous flora and fauna was reduced. Invasive species control programmes were implemented and endemic species rehabilitation measures taken, with the participation of local communities. Local associations participate in local committees (but not in the project's steering committee or technical committee). Improved water management practices were implemented. Special focus was given to education and participation of local schools. Small grants programmes were implemented through consultation with communities. There is need for improved overall strategic planning, consolidation and monitoring of these activities.

The project contributed to improving local agriculture, livestock, and water management practices. Micro-credit programmes and related training were implemented through consultation with communities, and through partnership with existing relevant financial institutions. Eco-tourism and related revenues in the two PAs increased, and local participants were trained in eco-tourism-related income generating activities. The project also supported the marketing of community products. There is still need for improved overall strategic planning, consolidation and monitoring of micro-credit programmes, and of eco-tourism strategic planning, marketing and related activities.

Public awareness campaigns were successfully implemented. Various national and international media channels were mobilized. Information was disseminated through publications, exhibitions and websites of the project. Focus was given to education activities, and to educating teachers, and productive partnerships were established with schools around the two protected areas. Decision makers, including government members and diplomats, were sensitized, and a group of active parliament members was established. A successful cooperation was implemented with Peace Corps, though better results could be achieved through improved communication channels. There is need for a more strategic overall planning of awareness and education programmes, and there is need for more focus on establishing active partnerships and cooperation with national and international NGOs.

It is evident that the project had a number of impressive results. Most importantly, the project has created the first two protected areas in Cape Verde, established the conditions for their function, and initiated activities for enabling integrated co-management of natural resources in and around them. Comprehensive baseline information was compiled and management plans were elaborated and adopted for the two parks. Moreover, the project has successfully introduced the concepts of protected areas and sustainable management of natural resources, as key and feasible instruments for conservation of nationally and globally important biodiversity in Cape Verde, with overwhelming support of decision makers, key stakeholders, and the general public. The project has created several valuable assets for biodiversity conservation in Cape Verde. These include mainly: the support achieved at all levels for the protected areas concept; the two established pilot protected areas; the involved communities' support to their integration in sustainable management practices; and maybe most important – a team of committed, capacitated and highly motivated national technical staff, capable and willing to take the leadership in developing a network of protected areas in the country.

The main weakness of the project is embedded in its weak exit strategy, combined with the lack of sufficient focus on up-streaming and strategically planned activities, and on sustainability-inducing activities, through the project's implementation. It should be noted though that the project was designed as Phase I to be followed by Phase II, and therefore an exit strategy was not required at the design stage. However, it is essential to pay attention and provide an immediate response to the serious risks resulting from the later replacement of the Phase II with another follow up project, and especially from the unplanned time gap between the two projects. If continuity and sustainability of the project achievements will not be maintained and strengthened through dedicated follow-up project/s and activities, there is a high risk for their rapid degradation, resulting with adverse impacts, and a long-term loss of national confidence in the process.

Almost all of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation, were of the opinion that the project failed to secure the long-term continuity and sustainability of its results and achievements. Sustainability of most of the achievements listed above will therefore depend on follow-up activities. If such measures will be taken, through specific dedicated activities, as well as integrated in the follow-up project design and activities, the important impacts of the CVPAP Phase I results can be maintained and their continuity can be secured.

Several lessons learned from the evaluation of the CVPAP Phase I, that may serve to help in the design of follow up projects and future activities for biodiversity conservation in Cape Verde, as well as for the design of similar GEF projects elsewhere, are detailed. 23 general and more specific recommendations are listed, aiming mainly to provide guidance to capitalizing on the project's achieved results and assets, and to enabling the continuity and sustainability of its achievements, and a long-term impact, as well as recommended approach and activities to enhance the achieving of the project's goal.

Summary of assessment of progress achieved by the Project:

Outcome	Rating	Justification (summarized)
1	S	Outcome partially achieved, with some remarkable results
2	MS	Outcome partially achieved
3	HS	Outstanding achievements
4	S	Remarkable progress but need for more strategic planning
5	S	Remarkable progress but need for more strategic planning
6	HS	Outstanding achievements
Project's overall rating	S	Remarkable achievements and progress but need for more strategic planning, and for more sustainability-inducing focus

1. Introduction

1.1. Objectives of the final evaluation

According to UNDP's and the GEF's policies and procedures, all full-size and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo both a mid-term and a final evaluation. Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It also identifies/documents lessons learned and makes recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other GEF-financed projects, implemented by UNDP. (from the final evaluation Terms of Reference).

The CVPAP Phase I project, implemented by the Government of Cape-Verde, and supported through partnership with GEF-UNDP, was aimed at conserving globally significant biodiversity, through an integrated approach, in and around two selected Protected Areas, created through the project. The project responded to GEF focal area: Biodiversity conservation, and to GEF3 strategic priority: Biodiversity conservation. It was also aimed at contributing to sustainable development and poverty alleviation in the project's zone of influence. Apart from its primary conservation focus the project was also designed so that it would contribute to halting and reversing existing degradation of land and water resources, within and around the selected protected areas.

This final evaluation of Cape Verde Protected Areas Project – the originally defined Phase I - is aimed at examining the concept, design and implementation of the project. It specifically analyzes the relevance and impact of the project approach, as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation. The report focuses on lessons learned and on recommended way forward to ensure sustainability and long-term impact of achievements.

The evaluation assesses the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and analyzes the methods used, the progress that was made, and optional measures to achieve the defined objectives through follow-up project/s or actions to be taken by the various related actors. This report also includes detailed feasible recommendations and lessons learnt for future comparable UNDP/GEF projects. The final evaluation report assesses the contribution of the project to the defined national and global environmental goal and objectives (as detailed in chapter 2.3.).

The full Terms of Reference of the final evaluation is annexed to this report (Annex IV).

1.2. Methodology used

The evaluation was realized by a team of two independent consultants: an international consultant (team leader), Dr. Tamar Ron and a national consultant. Dr. Charles Yvon Rocha (a brief professional profile of the two consultants is annexed: Annex VI).

The mission of data collection initiated on 13 July and was realized during 3 weeks (15 days) in Cape-Verde. At the end of the mission a power-point presentation was given to UNDP, Government representatives, the Project Coordinator and several other key stakeholders, highlighting the main findings and lessons learned (the Power-Point presentation is annexed to this report: Annex V). The mission was then followed by the elaboration and writing of this full report.

The evaluation was based mainly on a desk-top-based review of the project documentation and on interviews with various actors. People interviewed included members of the project team in Praia

and in the two sites, as well as representatives of UNDP, Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources, other line Ministries, Municipalities surrounding the two National Parks, beneficiaries among the communities surrounding the two National Parks, NGOs, and members of the project's steering committee, technical committee and local committees. A list of people consulted and a list of documents consulted are annexed to the report (Annex II and Annex I, respectively).

Short visits (2 days each) were realized to the two Protected Areas, Serra Malagueta NP and Monte Gordo NP, aimed at identifying and assessing field-based impacts and issues. The visits were also used to interviewing current and former project and park staff in the two National Parks, project beneficiaries among local communities, and representatives of the relevant local municipalities.

The report reflects the information collected through the desk-top study of documentation and the field visits, as well as the views expressed by the various people interviewed, so that a participatory approach was used to forming the conclusions and recommendations. All aspects of the report were also discussed at length between the two consultants, and the report reflects the agreed view of both. The national consultant, though, focused more on the financial aspects and institutional support, and the international consultant on all the other aspects of the project design and implementation. The report was further revised, in accordance with comments received from the UNDP CO Programme Officer and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor.

The extent to which the intended outcomes, as defined in the results framework of the project document, were achieved is analyzed, using the originally designed output targets and indicative activities as reference indicators. An appraisal score is attributed to the achievement of each outcome, in accordance with the GEF guidelines in conducting terminal evaluations, using the following scale: highly satisfactory, satisfactory, marginally satisfactory, marginally unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, and highly unsatisfactory.

The evaluation focuses specifically on lessons learned and on recommendations for future approach to improve the achievement of the objectives and intended results, and to improve the design and implementation of future similar GEF projects.

2. Project Context and Design

(based on the Mid-Term Evaluation, 2007, on the ProDoc, and on the final evaluation's Terms of Reference).

2.1. Context

The biodiversity and ecosystems of Cape Verde have been continuously overexploited since the first Portuguese settlers arrived on the islands in the late 1400s. Native vegetation continues to be cut for fuelwood and (to a lesser extent) timber and selected native plants harvested for medicinal and traditional ritual uses. Heavy grazing of vegetation and overexploitation of water resources by domestic animals, particularly goats, continue to have a significant impact on managed and wild ecosystems in Cape Verde. These have been compounded by the introduction and spread of aggressive non-native species of plants, including *Lantana camara*, *Fulgeraea gigantesca* and *Dicrostacys cinerea*, which have spread from agricultural areas to adjacent wild lands throughout Cape Verde, and reforestation projects that have used exotic tree species planted for erosion control, predominantly *Pinus*, *Eucalyptus*, *Acacia* and *Prosopis*. Although Cape Verde is composed largely of fragile dryland ecosystems, water catchment and distribution and soil management systems are poorly developed, so that much of the limited water supply is not captured for human use but flows directly to the ocean and erosion and soil exhaustion are commonplace. The Cape Verdean flora

consists of 621 species, of which 240 are indigenous, with 61% of species introduced (representing one of the highest totals in the world for a flora of comparable size), and 84 endemic species.

Rural communities rely heavily on intensive and unsustainable exploitation of natural resources and have increased their use of resources in previously inaccessible areas (i.e. steep mountain areas). Poor knowledge and availability of alternatives for sustainable use, a lack of basic business skills, and the complete lack of access to credit in almost all rural communities in the country prevents the situation changing. Other barriers to addressing the situation include: government emphasis on economic development priorities over conservation actions; undeveloped legal and policy frameworks for conserving and sustainably utilising biodiversity at both national and local levels, including reforestation policy that promotes exotic over native species; weak law enforcement; a complex and unclear land tenure system (rural inhabitants see little reason not to exploit resources as long as they remain “free” under open-access regimes); poor financial, technical, managerial capacity and resources in agencies responsible for sustainable natural resource utilization, and poor coordination between these groups; poor knowledge among local populations of ecosystem functioning and the impacts of human activity on fragile dryland ecological areas; and poor community participation in decision-making processes that affect their local area.

The project, first planned as Phase I of the CVPAP, focused on the creating of two pilot terrestrial protected areas, and on establishing the conditions for the integrated management of natural resources in and around them. The two sites, selected from 47 important sites listed in Law 3/2003, were Serra Malagueta and Monte Gordo.

The Serra Malagueta mountain range runs through the north and northeastern part of Santiago Island, and contains the island's greatest number (28) of endemic plant species, 14 of which are classified as threatened on the Cape Verde Red List. Endemic fauna species include *Buteo buteo bannermani*, *Apus alexandri*; *Falco tinunculus*; *Halcyon leucocephala* and *Sylvia atricapilla*. The project site covers an area of 774 ha along the western escarpments of the ranges, ranging in altitude from 800 to 1,064 meters. This area includes the most significant forest zones on the island of Santiago. The most important threats to Serra Malagueta are land clearance for agriculture and the disappearance of native habitat due to invasions of exotic floral species.

Monte Gordo covers an area of 952 hectares, ranging from 900 and 1312 m, located in the western mountains of São Nicolau and includes a large representative sample of a humid ecosystem on the island, as well as one of the most important agricultural mountain ecosystems on Cape Verde. Ecosystem variation is very high in this area, from dry zones in the south and southwest to heavily vegetated zones in the north and northeast that benefit from cloud-derived moisture and heavy rainfall. Of the fauna and flora species inventoried in the area, 46 are endemics (representing 56% of the total species found in the region), and 12 of these endemic species are in the Cape Verde Red List.

It should be noted that when the project document was originally prepared, the areas of SMNP and MGNP were estimated at 2,600 and 3,500 has respectively. This ended up to be a gross overestimation. Field work finally settled the areas in 774 and 952 has respectively.

2.2. Project design

The CVPAP (originally designed as Phase I and Phase II projects) has been designed to conserve globally significant biodiversity and address the threats and barriers listed above through the creation of a system of protected areas encompassing a representative sample of terrestrial ecosystems and endemic species and subspecies of flora and fauna that are unique to Cape Verde. At the same time, the project aimed to halt and reverse existing degradation of land and water

resources within the protected areas and their adjacent landscapes. The formulation of the CVPAP came about as a result of long-standing concerns about the future of the native and globally important biodiversity of Cape Verde given the threats and barriers outlined above.

The project aimed to ensure full participation for local communities, NGOs, and other stakeholders in the design and implementation of conservation plans, resource management activities, and the creation of income-generating alternative livelihood options. The program has been explicitly designed to undertake significant capacity building strategies to empower public and private institutions in Cape Verde in their efforts to conserve island ecosystems and undertake long-term adaptive management against potential future degradation of Cape Verde's environment.

The evaluated project was conceived as a medium-term program to be implemented as Phase I, during 2004-2008, and to be followed by a Phase II project. Phase I was designed to focus primarily on the institutional, policy and legal frameworks, community based natural resource management, and on building capacity (long and short term training, exchanges, mentoring, etc.) at local and national levels for managing the PA system, with the establishment of two pilot Natural Parks, one on the island of Santiago (Serra da Malagueta) and the other on São Nicolau (Monte Gordo).

The Phase II project was intended to focus primarily on establishing the remaining four terrestrial parks (of 6 PAs which were the focus of the CVPAP). It was planned to also work with government, local communities, private sector and NGOs to identify and implement mechanisms for financial sustainability of project results. Some capacity building, as well as on-the-ground activities with communities would continue as needed. Other aspects of the project would be consolidated as needed (e.g. consolidating legislation and policies as needed; testing new forms of alternative livelihoods, and new approaches to sustainable natural resource management). It was planned that the GEF increment would gradually diminish in Phase II, to be replaced by government direct financing of all recurrent costs, and by private sector and local community investments.

The Project Document (ProDoc) was signed by the UNDP Resident Representative on 1 October 2003 and the first disbursement occurred in April 2004. The Project Coordinator (PC) was recruited in September 2004. Other key staff – the two site Managers, the financial manager and the CTA - were recruited in late 2004. Project implementation was through the UN Country Office (UNDP CO, now the UN Joint Office or UNJO) and project execution through National Execution (NEX). The designated institution is the Directorate of Environment (DGA) of the then Ministry of Environment and Agriculture (MAA, now MADRRM).

A Mid-Term Evaluation was carried out during 28 May – 30 July 2007 and the Final Mid-Term Evaluation report was accepted on 20 November 2007. Most of the project activities terminated in December 2008, when the management of the two Protected Areas was transferred to the Environment Department (DGA), however, the Project Coordination Unit in Praia continues to function as a transitory phase until the commencement of the follow-up project. The project is still considered as operational (including the implementation and finalization of this terminal evaluation), however, in 2009 the Government assumed full responsibility for the project staffing expenditures as well as some of the management expenditures.

Upstreaming/downstreaming approach:

Finding the adequate balance between activities directed toward governmental-level capacity building, strategizing and forming policies and legal frameworks, or “governance frameworks” (upstreaming activities) and between activities aimed at creating on-the-ground immediate impact (downstreaming activities), is always a challenge in any protected areas management project design. While the upstreaming activities usually seem more attractive in offering an opportunity to

achieve impact at national or even regional level, projects that are too upstreaming oriented may often result with merely a pile of very nice documents but with hardly any on-the-ground implementation and impact, if at all. Such projects may adversely impact continuity and sustainability by elevating expectations which are eventually not fulfilled. On the other hand, projects that are too downstreaming oriented, while they indeed result with immediate visible on-the-ground impact, may suffer from a lack of an overall guiding strategic approach, as well as from weak sustainable support at the government level, and thereby also fail to secure the required continuity and sustainability of achievements. An adequate balance of upstreaming and downstreaming activities, adapted to the specific baseline conditions, can be key to enabling sustainability and long-term continuity of achievements.

Although the CVPAP's design was composed of both upstreaming and downstreaming components, the approach adopted during implementation has favored the downstreaming components of creating pilot Protected Areas and focusing on activities within and around them, while less focus was given to establishing the up-streaming framework for securing continuity, sustainability, and extension of the down-streaming achievements. The project design (in the PRODOC) emphasised both the governance frameworks (outcomes 1, 2 and 6) and the on-the-ground immediate impact (outcomes 3, 4, 5 and 6). Upstreaming activities were implemented mainly early in the project duration and some key upstreaming results were indeed achieved, however, eventually project implementation focused more on the downstreaming activities and impacts, resulting with reduced sustainability.

2.3. Project's intended impact, in the context of the development goals:

Overall Development Goal of the project:

- The conservation of globally significant biodiversity.
- The reduction of land and water degradation and desertification in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde.
- Contribution to poverty alleviation through sustainable use and management of natural resources in the area of the project's influence.

Project Objective (as defined for the originally planned Phase I and Phase II):

The Government of Cape Verde, in partnership with local communities will conserve globally significant biodiversity in six newly established protected areas, and in surrounding landscapes, by developing and applying new strategies for ecosystem protection and sustainable resource management.

Main global importance of Cape-Verde's terrestrial biodiversity:

Unique island ecosystems, with a combination of mountainous and coastal landscapes, and with an array of endemic species (mainly plants, birds and reptiles).

Main threats to terrestrial biodiversity in Cape-Verde:

- Invasive species
- Over-exploitation of native flora and fauna
- Land degradation

Project Intended Outcomes:

(as defined in the ProDoc, in order to meet the project objective)

Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas

Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems

Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management

Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management

Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities

Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals

The CVPAP is a Full-sized Project that primarily addresses GEF's Strategic Priority 1 within the Biodiversity Focal Area ('Catalyzing sustainable protected areas', known as BD1), but also has relevance to GEF's Land Degradation Focal Area.

2.4. Project strategy

The project was aimed at conservation of globally and nationally important terrestrial biodiversity in Cape-Verde, as well as reduction of land degradation, through the creation of a national system of protected areas (in line with the Cape Verde NBSAP, 1999). Two of the protected areas defined by the 2003 law were established and successfully operationalized by the project. Moreover, it focused on establishing the knowledge base, partnerships, and integrated management plan for the operation of these two Protected Areas. The project also targeted capacity building of the Government and other relevant stakeholders to manage Protected Areas. It also contributed to raising the awareness of the decision makers, the general public, and specific target groups in Cape-Verde, to the importance of Protected Areas, as well as to their potential role in poverty alleviation, especially in and around them, through sustainable use of natural resources and through tourism development.

2.5. Project Budget and Financial Planning

2.5.1. Project Budget

The total project budget is: US\$ 9,772,500. In the ProDoc this is broken down according to:

Direct inputs	US\$
GEF (excluding PDF-B)	3,585,600
UNDP	465,000
Gov Cape Verde	2,152,100
Subtotal	6,202,700
Direct co-financing	
Gov Cape Verde (in kind)	1,379,800
Peace Corps (in kind)	200,000
Subtotal	1,579,800
Parallel negotiated co-financing	
USAID	170,000
France	720,000
BMZ and GTZ (Fogo)	500,000
EU-FED	600,000
Subtotal	1,990,000
Project Total	9,772,500

2.5.2. Financial Planning

- *Financial Plan for the Phase I Project (Based on the ProDoc)*

Table 1 shows the overall financial plan for the first project (Phase I), by Outcomes component. The total project cost for the first project is estimated at \$10,119,000, including GEF funding (37%), Government of Cape Verde cash and in-kind funding (37%), and other co-financing (26%).

However, the absorptive capacity is good, as there are no other similar programmes in the country that could compete for the same human resources. The first phase had a strong emphasis on raising awareness and capacity building, which enhanced the absorptive capacity. Furthermore, the full programme was spread over a relatively long period, with two distinct projects, giving the opportunity to readjust the scale if necessary as the programme unfolds.

The ProDoc Annexes 2-11-A and 2-11-B provide the detailed indicative breakdown of financing for each activity in the first project that has been negotiated during the PDF B stage with all relevant partners.

Table 1: Project Output Budget – phase I (All figures in US\$) – Based on the ProDoc

Project Outputs/Activities	GEF	GoCV (*)	UNDP	Other Co-finance (**)	Total
Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas	157,400	951,600	100,000	130,000	1,339,000
Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems	347,400	682,500	0	0	1,029,900
Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management	2,237,900	310,400	0	270,000	2,818,300
Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management	630,600	897,900	50,000	980,000	2,558,500
Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities	83,600	454,300	170,000	680,000	1,387,900
Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals	128,700	235,200	145,000	260,000	768,900
Total (excluding PDF B)	3,585,600	3,531,900	465,000	2,910,000	9,772,500

* GoCV contribution includes both DGIS funds (\$2,152,100) and in-kind (estimated \$1,379,800).

** Other direct co-financing has been negotiated with: USA, France, Germany and EU-FED.

3. Findings and evaluation of outcomes

3.1. Evaluation of outcomes in relation to project strategy, intended impact and design

The concept of creating a network of Protected Areas is rather new to Cape Verde and can support the conservation of both terrestrial and marine globally and nationally important biodiversity. The CVPAP Project, through its strategic approach, was designed to help introducing the Protected Areas approach into Cape Verde. Therefore, concentrating on the down-streaming aspects of creating two pilot protected areas, and establishing the knowledge base, conditions and capacity for their integrated management, had clear advantages. The adopted down-streaming focus could also support raising awareness, by demonstrating to the government, to local communities and to other stakeholders, the potential contribution of protected areas and their integrated management to sustainable development and poverty alleviation inside the protected areas and around them. The specific planned project activities were aimed also at halting land and water degradation in the project's area of influence. Up-streaming impact of the project was designed to take place through the first two defined outcomes, related to policies, legal and institutional frameworks and to capacity building, as well as through sensitization of decision makers, key actors and the general public (outcomes 1 and 6).

It is the opinion of the authors of this report that the outcomes and expected results for this project (Phase I), and especially the design of outcomes 3-6, were in fact adequate, considering the initial baseline information and conditions. Even if they aimed high, and not all could be achieved, they gave good direction and guidance to the implemented activities, and therefore should not be defined as "too ambitious". The remarkable progress of the project toward achieving its goals and objectives, and especially in regard with these four outcomes, reflects on the adequacy of their design. It could be useful if the expected results of outcomes 1 and 2 (the upstreaming components) would focus more on institutional capacity building and on establishing and capacitating the required institutional set-up (already in Phase I) to enable the government to undertake the management of a national network of protected areas, as well as an adequate institutional set-up (at national and local levels) to enable strengthening of a participatory approach to decision making processes on all aspects and to implementation. Such components could support establishing sustainability already at this stage.

The project design did not enable sufficient sustainability building activities (mainly due to its initial planning as Phase I to be followed by a second phase). Especially, it did not provide sufficient support to the establishing of a firm national framework and institutional set-up at governmental, local government, and local leadership levels, to continue and extend the integrated management of a network of protected areas, or even of the two pilot protected areas created. The time gap between the implemented project and the follow up project, following the change of planning and cancellation of Phase II, while Phase I was lacking an appropriate exit strategy, can lead to degradation of positive project results and achievements, and even to an adverse impact of loss of confidence and feeling of ownership among national and local partners, following the project's termination.

Therefore, the initial phased planning of the project, if implemented, could provide an adequate solution for a smooth exit and transfer of the two established parks management from the project to government responsibility. At the same time Phase II would ideally support building the required government capacity, institutional set-up and legal and policy frameworks, as well as financial mechanisms, to enable such a smooth transfer and sustainability for management of a national protected areas network. In the current situation it is essential to design and implement an immediate response to enable smooth transfer first to the follow up project, taking into account the time gap, and eventually to full government responsibility.

3.2. Project Implementation

3.2.1. Project duration and implementation milestones:

The Project Document was signed on 1 October 2003. First disbursement was realized on April 2004, and the project implementation was then expected to continue until early/mid 2009. The Inception Phase started on September 2004 and continued until February 2005. Following delays in the project initiation, the revised and agreed actual project starting date was 1 December 2004, with the closing date set for 30 December 2008, and with the duration of the implementation planned for a total of four years. However, while most of the project activities terminated in December 2008, when the management of the two Protected Areas was transferred to the Environment Department (DGA), the Project Coordination Unit in Praia continues to function as a transitory phase until the commencement of the follow-up project, and the project is still considered as operational (including the implementation and finalization of this terminal evaluation). However, in 2009 the Government assumed full responsibility for the project staffing expenditures as well as some of the management expenditures. Operational closure is now planned for December 2009.

The first Annual Work Plan (AWP) was submitted in March 2005 and the first Project Implementation Report (PIR) was submitted in July 2005. In affect the project terminated on December 2008, but the implementation of several activities as well as the operation of the project coordination unit, was still on-going during the realization of this final evaluation, in July-August 2009. The Mid-Term Evaluation was realized during June – July 2007, and the final Mid-Term Evaluation report was accepted in November 2007.

3.2.2. Roles and responsibilities in project implementation

Initially, the UNDP-GEF Cape Verde Protected Areas Programme aimed at conserving globally significant biodiversity through the creation of a system of protected areas. The programme was designed to also contribute to reversing existing trends of degradation of land and water resources within the protected areas and adjacent landscapes. The CVPAP was aimed to support local communities, NGOs, and other stakeholders to ensure their active involvement in the design and implementation of Protected Areas conservation plans, resource management activities, and the creation of income-generating alternative livelihood options. The programme was explicitly designed to undertake significant capacity building for national staff, empower public and private institutions in Cape Verde in their efforts to conserve island ecosystems and undertake long-term adaptive management against potential future degradation of Cape Verde's environment. Implementation of the full programme was intended to play a crucial role in achieving sustainable development and poverty alleviation in and around the selected protected areas, while establishing the first network of Protected Areas in the country.

The stakeholder involvement and participatory management of Protected Areas Management is yet at its very initial stage in Cape Verde. The preparation of the ongoing GEF-UNDP programme entailed extensive consultations with stakeholders at all levels in recent years. Local communities and authorities, state resource management agencies, private sector interests, and international donors all participated in various mechanisms (e.g. village meetings, municipality meetings, interviews, ZOPP workshops) for stakeholder input into the design of the programme. A principal objective and focus of the establishment of the first Protected Areas by DGA, with GEF-UNDP support, was to ensure the participation of local communities in the sustainable management of their own resources and in the creation and operations of the proposed protected areas. To achieve this objective, existing community associations (primarily farmer and livestock herder associations)

were strengthened, and new community associations were be created where necessary. These associations participated as members of Local Site Committees, at each of the project sites.

Participatory approach to project design: The proposed project is the product of extensive consultations with stakeholders undertaken during the development process. The most detailed of these consultations were efforts to involve the local communities at each proposed project site in the overall project design. Additional community input into the project design was achieved through a series of logical framework workshops during the process. Attendees included members of farmer's and livestock herder's associations, local elected officials, local staff of resource management agencies, and other community leaders. Following this national level workshop, site-level logical framework workshops were held in each community under the supervision and guidance of project staff. Municipal authorities in all six project areas have been involved in all the steps of the project design process, including participation in workshops, discussions with project staff on institutional and legal issues relating to the creation of protected areas, and received materials produced by the project for awareness building about the benefits of conservation and sustainable resource management at each site.

At the national level, numerous state agencies were consulted. Consultations were undertaken with state tourism institution to discuss tourism promotion and infrastructure, with DGASP (forestry) to discuss coordination between the protected areas and adjacent state forest lands (including the transition to reforestation with endemic species on state forest lands), with INIDA (research) to discuss biodiversity monitoring and collaboration in use of research facilities and botanical gardens. Consultations were also carried out with the National Chamber of Commerce to gather the input of private sector interests.

Participatory approach to project implementation: A major objective and focus of the full programme was to ensure the participation of local communities in the sustainable management of their own resources and in the creation and operations of the six protected areas. To achieve this objective, existing community associations (primarily farmer and livestock herder associations) were supported and new community associations were created where necessary. These associations, in turn, participated as members of Local Site Committees established at each of the project sites. These committees were aimed to improve the capacity of local associations and municipalities to assess natural resource issues and contribute to management decisions with PA authorities; to secure the agreement of local populations and municipalities on proposed zoning schemes and sustainable use regulations; and to negotiate and establish revenue sharing systems between parks and local communities and local authorities. Project staff and consultants included expertise in participatory and adaptive management.

Public awareness and education on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity has been addressed in Cape Verde, by NGOs and by the Ministry of Education. For the most part, these programmes have been disseminated through regional environmental programmes implemented in schools. The programme strengthened education and awareness on biodiversity values and the need for conservation, in particular, of rural farmers and livestock herders who depend most heavily on natural resources, and who are the source of many of the threats to biodiversity and soil and water quality.

Key Partners / Stakeholders and institutional arrangements

UNDP Country Cooperation Framework

The united nations CCF for Cape Verde seeks the promotion of effective and responsible management of natural resources and the environment through: i) support of the elaboration and implementation of a national action plan on the environment, ii) education and training of local

communities to improve participation in the creation and management of protected areas, and iii) reinforcement of institutional capacities through technical assistance and training of government agents and civil society for a better coordination of the strategies and program regarding management of natural resources.

UNDP CO support to the project

The UNDP-CO provided supervisory services on behalf of the GEF. The support from UNDP CO in Cape Verde (now the UNJO) was to invest a considerable amount of time and resources, principally through its Environmental and Natural Disasters Unit (ENDU, created in January 2006), in supporting the CVPAP with project management including promoting the project at senior government and international donor meetings, acting as a conduit for technical advice from UNDP-GEF and others, providing financial management and administration capacity building through specific training. Support from the CO was also provided in the form of staff recruiting support, international staff management, procurement, financial monitoring and support, training of national staff in financial procedures.

As an Implementing Agency of the GEF, UNDP earns a fee from the GEF for each project. The fee is aimed at reimbursing the costs incurred by UNDP, both in headquarters and in the Country Office (CO), in support to project development and supervision and monitoring of project implementation. (based on the Delegation of Authority, 8.9.2003).

As a project co-financer in the context of CVPAP, UNDP have provided core resources as co-financing for the programme. This is estimated at \$465,000 for Phase I.

UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination

The Support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination was implemented in full cooperation with the UNJO-Cape Verde as the UNDP/GEF Implementing Agency. The UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination provided technical support and guidance in the project design, in developing a detailed plan of action, and during the whole period of the project implementation. UNDP/GEF was one of the main financers (with the GovCV) of the project.

Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources

- **The General Direction of the Environment (DGA)** is currently charged with the responsibility of creating and maintaining the protected areas, and eventually establishing a PA Authority (law n.3, 2003). The DGA is Cape Verde's first explicitly environmental agency, charged with defining environmental policies and coordinating their implementation. The original mandate is currently being widened to reflect DGA's role in establishing Protected Areas). At site level the DGA role, with support from the GEF-UNDP Protected Areas project, was to pilot the establishment and operation of PA management boards. These would include a wide range of stakeholders and their composition would vary from case to case, however always including: representatives of local communities, municipality, NGOs, private sector, PA management team, representatives of relevant ministries, and other stakeholders.
- **Center for Agriculture, Silviculture and Animal Husbandry (DGASP):** This agency is responsible for managing forestry resources throughout Cape Verde with the dual goals of conservation and productive development. DGASP's main activity is the establishment of Forestry Management Zones (FMZs), a significant component of the country's efforts to reduce soil erosion and conserve water resources. DGASP also promulgates rules and regulations for forest use and soil conservation. DGASP operates reforestation programs throughout the country, with funding from bilateral and multilateral donors and operational funding from the state budget.

- **National Institute of Rural Development (INIDA):** This institute is responsible for research, experimentation and development in the areas of agronomy and natural resources technology. INIDA's Department of Environmental Science conducts resource inventories and characterizes natural habitats based on their production potential, carrying capacities, and state of degradation. INIDA also studies the socio-economic impacts of drought and desertification and makes inventories of fauna and flora in specific areas. Finally, INIDA also participates in public education and awareness programs, including publication of the magazines "Birds of Cape Verde" and "endemic Plants and Indigenous Trees of Cape Verde", of which 20,000 copies were distributed in schools around the country.

Ministry of the Economy, Growth and Competitiveness

Among its responsibilities, this ministry is charged with developing and implementing a national plan for tourism development, which includes programs and priority actions to develop and promote tourism in natural protected areas.

Ministry of Infrastructure and Transportation (MIT):

The MIT defines and formulates regulations and planning in the area of land management and cartography, and is charged with developing supporting mechanisms for coherent and objective policy applications in the management of ecosystems.

Municipal Chambers (Câmaras Municipais):

The CMs are playing an increasingly important role in parallel with the ongoing administrative decentralization process in Cape Verde. Most recently the national Environmental Action Plan was developed largely at CM level, incorporating plans and recommendations for the establishment of protected areas.

Local associations

Existing farmer and livestock herder's associations in Cape Verde traditionally have focused exclusively on strategies to improve socio-economic conditions, with little regard or understanding of environmental or resource sustainability issues. These associations represent an already existing and potentially powerful mechanism for educating resource users and empowering them to adopt sustainable practices, but association leaders themselves need to be educated on basic strategies and techniques relevant to their particular local environments and resources. Furthermore, these associations have little interaction with state resource managers. In addition, resource user associations have almost no experience in communication strategies and sharing lessons learned among each other.

Non-governmental organizations in Cape Verde also play an important role in environmental conservation, by filling some of the roles that state agencies are unable to undertake due to resource constraints.

According with the MTE, and based on the TE-PAP meetings and field visits, the CVPAP enjoys strong support from local communities around the two parks but has not yet developed or reinforced significant relationships with the national NGO community (environmental, rural development and poverty alleviation), private business sector, government or local agencies or other development agencies, and there has been relatively little linkage with research institutions.

Peace Corps – Cape Verde: (a US government programme, operating as an NGO) is a permanent partner of the project and provided significant support through volunteer experts in relevant aspects, but reported on under-utilization of their offered support, which could be improved through strengthened communication mechanisms.

Project governance strategy

The Governance Strategy adopted by the CVPAP was to solve the issue of the involvement of key partners with the project. For the effect, advisory and decision structures had been created, for instance, the **Project Steering Committee**, the **Project Technical Committee**, and the **Local Site Committees**. These structures should serve as a platform for the establishment of the protected areas co-management process.

Partnership strategy and plan

As noted in the MTE, the CVPAP needed to improve a development of a Partnership Strategy and Plan. In fact, the CVPAP approach to partnerships has been rather *ad hoc*, with little strategic thinking, planning or coordination over project partnerships. There is no specific written Partnership Strategy, only brief notes on stakeholder participation in project implementation. A Partnership Strategy and Plan should be developed to clearly identify the key partners and stakeholders, their role in the project, what relationships need to be built and how, who has responsibility for specific partnership development, how partnership activities should be programmed, what resources (staff, training, financial, logistic) are needed, and how best to communicate between the project and the partners (so linked to the Communication Strategy). Each site should also develop their own partnership strategy and plan that sets out the key local partners and stakeholders, participation process, identifies the financial, personnel, and training needs to enable the stakeholders to effectively participate in the project, how best to communicate between the project and the partners, and defines activities, progress and impact indicators and targets, responsibilities and budget.

3.2.3. Financial data, budget, expenditure statement and efficiency

Final finance and co-finance information is included in the PIR 2009 (provided by the GEF-UNDP and UNDP CO on September 2009), and presented in Tables 2 and 3 below.

From January 2009, the Protected Areas' budgetary management and operation had been assumed by the GoCV.

Outline financial data and basic analysis

Based on the NPCU Outline financial data (as provided by the NPCU on July 2009), the TE had elaborated a Matrix (Table 4), and noted the following comments:

1. There are some differences between the financial information included in the PIR 2009 (September 2009), and financial information received from the NPCU (July 2009). It is essential that the project's financial information would be consolidated and reconciled, through a thorough financial analysis.

Nevertheless, Table 4 is still relevant for assessing the overall balance between expenditures on the different outcomes

2. It is recommended to integrate Project Consolidated Matrix spending (disbursement), based on the Project Outputs / Activities, in the elaboration of the national financial Reports.

3. An imbalance between investments and sustainability-inducing activities is noted. For example, in accordance with further information received from the NPCU (July 2007), 37.2% of the total budget was spent on infrastructure (73.0% of which was spent on constructions). Expenditures on project management and park management (Table 4: Outcomes 7 and 3) were 14.8% and 50.8% while expenditures on reinforcing communities participation, alternative livelihoods, and sensitization activities (Outcomes 4, 5 and 6) were only 1.4%, 7.5% and 1.9% respectively. Better

financial management would be required for improved allocation of funds between the various outcomes and activities, with more focus on sustainability-inducing activities.

4. Specifically, for example (based on information received from the NPCU, 29.9.2009), a total of 1,164,398 USD was spent only on the construction of the center facility in Serra Malagueta NP, during 2007-2009. (751,139 USD of this amount was covered by GEF-UNDP and UNDP CO funds, however of 169,495 spent on this component during 2009, only 2,406 USD was from UNDP CO and 0 from UNDP-GEF).

5. It is hereby recommended that future planning and budgeting of infrastructure constructions in protected areas would favor more basic facilities made from local materials, with minimal expenditures, and that budgets would concentrate more on sustainability-inducing activities.

6. Moreover, only 15.7% of the expenditures were spent on up-streaming activities (Tale 4: Outcomes 1 and 2), strengthening our notion that project implementation favored concentrating efforts on down-streaming activities.

Table 2: Project Finance Information

(Based on the final project PIR, provided by UNDP-GEF and UNDP CO, September 2009)

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor[9]	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B, PPG)	Amount committed in Project Document[10]	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization	Estimated Total Disbursement to June 30, 2009	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
GEF Contribution	GEF	\$0.340	\$3.586		\$3.638	\$3.586
Cash Cofinancing – UNDP managed						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency		\$0.465	\$0.026	\$0.470	\$0.491
	Govt		\$2.152		\$2.094	\$2.152
	DAO			\$0.111	\$0.002	\$0.111
	UNICEF			\$0.010	\$0.004	\$0.010
	UNFPA			\$0.010	\$0.002	\$0.010

Cash Cofinancing – Partner Managed						
	Other partners: USAID, France , BMZ and GTZ (Fogo), EU-FED.		\$1.990	\$0.000	\$1.990	\$1.990
In-Kind Cofinancing	Govt		\$1.380		\$1.380	\$1.380
	Peace Corps		\$0.200		\$0.200	\$0.200
Total Cofinancing		\$0.000	\$6.187	\$0.157	\$6.141	\$6.343
Total for Project 2008		\$0.340	\$7.760	\$0.000	\$6.050	\$7.760
Total for Project 2009		\$0.340	\$9.773	\$0.157	\$9.779	\$9.929

As a response to a request from the Government, additional funds were committed to the project during the final year, 2009. These were regular UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and Delivery as One funds. Additionally, the Government took full responsibility of payment of salaries of national staff affected to national coordination and protected area sites. All funds will be used up by the end of 2009.

Table 3: Co-financing
(Based on the final project PIR, provided by UNDP-GEF and UNDP CO, September 2009)

Co financing Type/Source	IA own Financing Mill US\$		Government Mill US\$		Other Sources Mill US\$		Total Financing Mill US\$		Total Disbursement Mill US\$	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant	0.465	0.622	2.152	2.152			2.617	2.774	2.617	2.774
Credits							0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Loans							0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Equity							0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
In-kind			1.380	1.380	0.200	0.200	1.580	1.580	1.580	1.580
Non-grant Instruments							0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Types					1.990	1.990	1.990	1.990	1.990	1.990
Total	0.465	0.622	3.532	3.532	2.190	2.190	6.187	6.343	6.187	6.343

Table 4: Expenditures for Budgetary Headings of the CVPAP – Phase I (All figures in ECV and equivalent in USD)
(Elaborated based on the financial information received from the NPCU, July 2009)

Calculated by rate at the elaboration of this report, September 2009: 1USD=76.63ECV

Project Outputs/Activities		2004 ECV USD	2005 ECV USD	2006 ECV USD	2007 ECV USD	2008 ECV USD	2009 ECV USD	Total ECV USD
Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas	Laws			3,743,680 48853,9	764,240 9973,1			4,507,920 58827,0
Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems	Training/Capacity Building NPCU	5,193,485 67773,5	19,305,542 251931,9	12,601,828 164450,3	22,951,440 299509,8	16,324,729 213033,1	16,869 220,1	76,393,893 996918,8
Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management	Park Management	120,458 1571,94	18,224,913 237830	38,992,602 508842,5	85,094,480 1110459	102,417,013 1.336.513	17,438,709 227.570	262,288,175 3.422.787
Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management	Communities			1,695,256 22.123	4,456,480 58.156	847,932 11.065	73,995 966	7,073,663 92.309
Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities	Alternatives for communities			960,000 12.528	10,159,920 132.584	27,341,917 356.804		38,461,837 501.916

Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals	Sensitization and Publication			2,797,200 36.503	4,960,000 64.727	2,000,232 26.102		9,757,432 127.332
Outcome 7: Project Management		7,940,006 103.615	1,298,549 16.946	20,227,377 263.962	18,814,624 245.526	31,307,355 408.552	1,060,513 13.839	80,648,424 1.052.439
Others (CTA)			5,075,811 66.238	3,853,335 50.285	12,257,376 159.955	15,728,195 205.249		36,914,717 481.727
Sub Total		13,253,949 172.960	43,904,815 572.946	84,871,278 1.107.546	159,458,560 2.080.889	180,239,178 2.352.071	18,590,086 242.595	516,046,061 6.734.256
Grand Total								516,046,061 6.734.256

3.2.4. National and local ownership

Policy and legal framework:

Law 3/2003 provides the national legal basis for the establishment of a national system of protected areas in Cape Verde, with a list of 47 important sites. The legal framework defining the boundaries, operation and regulations of the two pilot protected areas created through this project and their buffer zones, was drafted and adopted by the Government of Cape Verde, within the framework of the project's results. Both protected areas were classified as Natural Parks, (corresponding with IUCN Category II).

The project also assessed the issue of land tenure in and around the protected areas, and a comprehensive study was conducted (De Witt and Ferreira 2006) resulting with important recommendations. The MTE (2007) recommended to: *“Implement recommendations of the De Witt and Ferreira (2006) report, with a full cadastre at both SMNP and MGNP (including maps) in partnership with the municipalities, and develop co-management agreements with landowners especially for parcels of land where park infrastructure and ecotourism development will occur, with incentives to develop sustainable land use by owners and those who rent”*. On the other hand, in fact the project was not originally responsible for the implementation of all of the recommendations that came out of the Land tenure study. However, in October 2008, as recommended by De Witt and Ferreira's report and by the MTE, a report was elaborated on registration of land tenure and land use in Serra Malagueta NP. This study enabled identification of land owners in this park, and initiation of negotiations with them. Due to the importance of this issue, it is recommended that the follow-up project should include the evaluation and implementation of all of the relevant recommendations.

Institutional framework for the management of a Protected Areas national system:

The General Directorate of Environment (DGA) at the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources (MADRRM, previously the Ministry of Environment and Agriculture, MAA) is responsible for the creation and management of protected areas in Cape Verde, and is the governmental department responsible for the execution of the CVPAP.

Although not a defined intended output of the evaluated project, a concept was developed for the establishment of an autonomous (*Organismo Autonomo*) Protected Areas Authority (PAA) that will be responsible for the management of a national system of protected areas. Discussions on setting up such an authority started in 2006 after the conclusion of a study to assess preliminary feasibility. The proposed concept was then revised during 2008 and presented in January 2009 to the Ministry of Environment, and to other relevant decision makers, stakeholders and interested partners. Following comments from the Minister, it was revised again and submitted to DGA in June 2008. No further formal information was received from the Ministry. The project coordinator received informal information from the DGA that delays were caused by financial reasons. The establishing of the PAA is referred to in the existing national legislation (Law 3/2003), as a possible alternative to PA management by the DGA. However, there is still no agreement between the various leading entities of the project, within the government, and even within the DGA, about the exact nature of this authority, its institutional status, degree of autonomy and function within the existing framework, the mechanisms to enable its financial sustainability, and its intended role and mandate. The MTE pointed further confusion in relation to the nature of this authority/unit, in the various project related documents. The establishing of an agreed and adequate national institutional set up for the management of a national network of protected areas would be a key task of the follow-up project.

The Project has established a coordination unit (NPCU) which could ideally serve as the basis for the future autonomous authority, or of an alternative agreed institutional set-up for the management

of a national network of protected areas. Management teams recruited and capacitated in both protected areas, could similarly serve as the basis for future Governmental management units for the long-term management of these two parks and the establishment of new protected areas. However, the transfer of the protected areas to the government's management, combined with much reduced available funds, ended up with loss of some of the capacitated men-power, whose employment in the project and the protected areas was terminated. The renewed and continued employment of the project and protected areas staff, that was recruited and capacitated through the project, could be essential for enabling the sustainability of the project's achievements.

The project institutional framework to enable a participatory approach in decision making:

The project established the following institutional set-up to enable a participatory approach to decision making processes in both the central and the local levels:

PSC: Project Steering Committee

The PSC has responsibility for project oversight and approves the annual project work plans and budget. It was chaired by the Director of the DGA. Participation in the PSC included representatives of the DGA and other relevant departments of the Ministry of Environment, UNDP, other project partners, the local governments, and the Project Coordinator.

PTC: Project Technical Committee

The PTC provides technical oversight and input to the project. It was chaired by the project's Protected Area Planning Specialist. Participation in the PTC included representatives of DGA, other departments of the Ministry of Environment, other line Ministries, UNDP, other project partners, and the Project Coordinator.

LSC: Local Site Committees

The two Local Site Committees (at SMNP and MGNP) are intended to act as a 'support structure for project execution' and are the intermediate level between the project staff and local communities. They were composed of representatives from the local communities within and around the parks, municipal authorities, and representatives of the local project team.

Involvement of local Governments:

Local Governments' involvement was enabled mainly through their participation in the Local Site Committees. However, it should be noted that representatives of part of the relevant local governments expressed their feeling that they are not sufficiently involved in decision making processes, as related to activities in and around the two protected areas. They expressed their interest to increase their involvement and contribution both at the decision making and implementation phases of locally based activities.

Local communities' involvement and ownership:

Significant effort was directed by the project at confidence building activities, raising awareness and building capacity among local communities in and around the two pilot protected areas, to take part in the sustainable management of natural resources. The communities' involvement in both protected areas, and especially in SMNP, is among the prominent project achievements. Communities in both areas were interested in the continuation of the related project's activities. Beneficiaries among communities in SMNP have expressed clearly their feeling of ownership over the process, their full participation in decision making, and their interest and belief in their own capacity to continue with at least part of the activities even if both project and government support would be much reduced. Beneficiary community members around MGNP were more skeptic and felt less ownership over the decision making and implementation process. They expressed their interest to continue with the activities, but would rather select a different way of implementation

(their comments referred specifically to the selected micro-credit agency attitude, which they reported as stress-inducing).

Capacity building through the project:

Among the main achievements of the project was the capacity building of key actors. Various training courses and personal mentorship with international experts (recruited international consultants as well as Peace Corps volunteers) were given to the two teams recruited in both pilot protected areas, including park management personnel, and personnel specialized in ecological monitoring, community development, and ecotourism. The project thus supported the building and training of a pool of national capacitated participants in the further creation and long term management of a national protected areas system. As mentioned above, however, no measures were taken to ensure the continued involvement of the staff trained through the project, in the protected areas management, following the project's termination and with the transfer of responsibilities to the government (such measures could include for example, designing at the initiation of the project, a clear and detailed agreement, between the GEF, UNDP CO, the government, and the recruited staff members, concerning among other aspects, the securing of future employment of staff trained through the project, in protected areas management in the country for a defined duration, as well as securing the adequate enabling work conditions). The present situation, combined with reduced salaries following the transfer of project personnel to the governmental payroll, resulted with that some staff members continued with the same work and responsibilities, but with governmental salaries, while others were moved to different positions, which resulted with reduction in their motivation. The overall result was the degradation of this very important achievement of the project. Some of the former and current project personnel indeed expressed deep disappointment. Ideally, it would be essential to establish the mechanisms to secure the continued employment of trained and qualified protected areas management staff, and to secure the conditions that would enable it, as part of an exit strategy within a project design. However, due to the original design of this project as Phase I, it did not include an exit strategy. It is therefore recommended here that the follow-up project would address this issue, and that other immediate actions would be taken by the government to solve this situation and capitalize on the important human resource factor until the initiation of the follow-up project.

Relevant training in several aspects, was also given to participants among the local communities, and increased their capacity to take part in the development of sustainable alternative livelihoods and in the sustainable management of natural resources in and around the parks. Some training was given through the project also to DGA staff and to technicians of the relevant local governments.

A more strategic approach that would define in advance the capacity building requirements of all relevant actors, and a comprehensive training plan to address these requirements, could serve more effectively the local and national capacity building to manage a national system of protected areas.

Raising awareness through the project:

Possibly the most impressive and effective achievement of the project, besides the actual creation and management of the two pilot protected areas, was the introducing of the actual concept of protected areas into Cape Verde, and with enthusiastic support at all levels.

The project concentrated efforts at raising awareness of decision makers, key stakeholders, the general public and essential specific target groups, to the importance of biodiversity conservation and of integrated sustainable management of natural resources, and especially to the role of protected areas in achieving these objectives.

These efforts resulted in remarkable results, and thus the project in fact served “to put the protected areas on Cape Verde’s map”, in more than one way. Enthusiastic acceptance of the protected areas

concept and a strong will to continue developing protected areas in Cape Verde was expressed by almost all of the people interviewed for this final evaluation.

Specific effort was directed at sensitization of decision makers among the government members, parliament members, diplomatic corps, and local governments, as well as at local communities and schools, all with successful results.

Government's financial commitments and budget:

As pointed by the MTE, the project log-frame identifies the need for a framework and plan for sustainable financing of the protected area system in Cape Verde. An expected result for outcome 2 is: "*Long-term state budget support secured. Framework for long term sustainable financial mechanism.*" Yet, no long-term state budget for the protected areas has been agreed so far. Government disbursement though, although delayed at times, does show government commitment to the project and to the on-going management of the protected areas. Such commitment was also expressed in the interviews with relevant government entities.

Moreover, another expected result for outcome 2, "*Visitor/user fees and penalties/fines*" was only partially implemented. Such fees (and fines), if well managed, can contribute significantly to promoting financial sustainability both at PA level, and at the national PA system level, but also cannot be relied upon as a permanently available source.

From our interviews with governmental entities responsible for the protected areas budget nationally and within the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources, it seems that there is a general belief that an adequate budget needs to be allocated only "*until the protected areas will become financially sustainable through tourism revenues and international contribution*". It should be clear that while tourism revenues from the protected areas should indeed be encouraged, promoted, and well managed to be used to support the protected areas operation, both at the PA level, and at a national PA system level, they can never be relied upon as a substitute to a permanent government budget for protected areas. The very sensitive and fluctuating nature of tourism as an income source (as experienced even in countries where tourism, and specifically eco-tourism, is well established, and yields considerable benefits at all levels) must be taken into consideration. Moreover, eco-tourism in Cape-Verde is expected to attract rather specific target groups, which can make it even more vulnerable to fluctuations impact. A permanent government budget should therefore provide the reliable basis for securing the salaries of the protected areas staff, the day-to-day maintenance and management of the parks and facilities, and the on-going activities of integrated natural resources management, in a national system of protected areas. Tourism revenues and international donations should not be regarded as a reliable permanent source, but rather should be used mainly for promoting special management activities, as required in the protected areas, and with focus on sustainability-inducing activities and benefits to local stakeholders.

Two main issues arise, in relation with the government budget, namely: 1. an update adaptation of the management of a national system of protected areas to the SIGOF (*Integrated system of Budgetary and Financial Management of the Ministry of the Finances*); 2. A budgetary plan for more than one year at a time for the management of the PAs, considering existing constraints of procedures and mechanisms, in the separation of the State Operational Budget and Budget of Investments.

In this transition phase and transference of the PAs Management to the Government and Guardianship of the Sector, NCPU and NPs depend on the Budget of Functioning and Investment of the State. The Budgeting process for government funding is quite time consuming, and at every

step there is some degree of reduction to the original budget request put forward by the local MADRRM branches.

For example, according to the DGPOG/MADRRM, the Budget for 2009 was renegotiated with the Ministry of Finance, in coordination with the Ministry of the Environment and Agricultural Development, to allow eliminating basic and complementary running costs of the PAs, specifically of the SMNP and MGNP.

The DGPOG confirmed that the budget of the PAs management, with technical and financial support for the natural parks, is being included in the Government Environment Cluster, through the Investments Program of 2010.

The different relevant national entities responsible of the PAs Management, interviewed for the Final Evaluation, had agreed to prepare with much caution and strong political support the process of enabling an autonomy of the entity that will be responsible for PAs management, in the institutional, technical and financial aspects, in order to guarantee the sustainability of the management of a national system of Protected Areas.

3.2.5. Project monitoring and evaluation system

Considering that the CVPAP was the first UNDP-GEF Biodiversity project in Cape Verde, and that it established the first protected areas in the country, and introduced the protected areas system as a new concept to the country, it is rather simple to identify its main achievements. When the project initiated there were no protected areas established in the country; there was very low capacity among the government and other key national actors to create and manage protected areas; the availability of qualified personnel to conduct the various tasks related to park management was very limited; awareness to the importance of biodiversity conservation and specifically to globally important biodiversity in Cape Verde was almost non-existent at all levels; rare and endemic species were over-utilized; and local communities were not aware of the need and option to develop alternative sustainable livelihoods that are compatible with conservation requirements; there was also almost no eco-tourism in national parks, and most relevant actors were not familiar with this concept and opportunity.

Progress made through the project's activities was therefore qualitatively identifiable easily, even without using subtle indicators. On the other hand, since this project was designed during 2002/2003, the use of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound) indicators and quantifying of results, as used in currently designed projects, was lacking then (as noted by the MTE). Yet, a detailed analysis of the project's results can lead to a set of lessons learned, from which recommendations can be derived for required follow up projects and activities in Cape Verde, as well as for the design and implementation of similar projects elsewhere.

As noted by the MTE, the project's monitoring system at site level was based mainly on monthly reports on project activities, followed by email and telephone discussions between the senior NPCU staff and CTA and the Site Coordinator, in addition to project monitoring visits (usually one per month to SMNP and one every two months to MGNP). The site teams also produced annual project reports. The NPCU produced the annual project reports, which were then presented to the PSC, with the work-plan for the following year.

The principle project monitoring and reporting tool of UNDP and UNDP-GEF was the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR), drafted by the CTA and Project Coordinator, and reviewed and analysed by the UNDP-CO team and UNDP-GEF RTA. Annual project retreats were held with

the participation of most of the project's staff, for group identification and sharing of conclusions and lessons learned. Progress on development of the two parks was monitored through the GEF BD1 Tracking Tool. This has been completed three times, once in June 2006 and again in June 2007. The Tracking Tool was now completed again by the Project Coordinator and the UNJO, and is annexed to this report (annex VII)

The MTE detailed an evaluation of the executed monitoring and on its shortcomings, at the various required levels. It further commented that "results-based monitoring and management are new approaches in Cape Verde that are not well embedded in government management culture".

The original log-frame presents 68 indicators. As indicated by the MTE, this is a large number of indicators for a logframe, the three objective indicators do not include a good biological impact indicator, and some of the Outcome indicators are essentially repeated and many are not SMART. The MTE proposed an alternative set of project progress and impact indicators. However, availability of both baseline information and data collected, as required to monitor the project's results in accordance with these indicators, was too limited. The drastic changes proposed by the MTE to the logframe, at objective and outcome level, would require an unprecedented resubmission of the ProDoc to the GEF Council. Such a drastic move would not be justified, especially considering the overall good progress of the project.

4. Results

4.1. Achievement of the project objectives

Project Objective: The Government of Cape Verde, in partnership with local communities, will conserve globally and nationally significant biodiversity in six newly established protected areas and in surrounding landscapes, by developing and applying new strategies for ecosystem protection and sustainable resources management

National objective: to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity resources

Global objective: to safeguard biodiversity of global importance and contribute to reduce global environmental impacts from loss of biodiversity at the local level

Main progress toward achieving the project development objectives:

- Two pilot protected Areas (SMNP and MGNP) were created, and their operation established (as a key outcome of Phase I).
- Park teams and offices were established in the two pilot protected areas, and a central coordination unit (the NPCU) in Praia.
- Conservation of globally important biodiversity within and around the two protected areas was enhanced. Uncontrolled utilization of indigenous flora and fauna was reduced. A programme for invasive (and other exotic) species control and reforestation of endemic species is implemented and on-going. Implemented activities contribute also to halting land degradation.
- The legal framework defining the boundaries, operation and regulations of the two pilot protected areas and their associated buffer zones, was drafted and adopted by the Government of Cape Verde.
- Baseline studies were conducted and an impressive body of information on the two pilot protected areas was compiled and distributed, including ecological and socio-economic studies, inventories and GIS-based mapping, as well as further specific studies, and including important new ecological knowledge.

- Management plans were elaborated and adopted for the two pilot protected areas.
- Basic Country Assessment for the financial sustainability of protected areas was completed in 2005, and the allocation of an adequate permanent budget is being discussed within the government, however, financial sustainability of a national system of protected areas is still not secured.
- Feasibility study for the creation of a Protected Area Authority was discussed at the PSC and within the government, however, there is still no agreement on the exact nature, function and status of this authority, and its long-term operation and funding mechanisms are not secured. (Yet, as noted above, this was not an expected result of the evaluated project).
- Local Site Committees were established in the two pilot protected areas, as a mechanism to involve local governments and local communities in the decision-making processes. Local community members are involved and benefiting from sustainable use and management of natural resources in and around the two protected areas, and in developing alternative sustainable livelihoods.
- Alternative sustainable water management system was developed and operated for communities and schools in the two protected areas.
- Capacity building and training of key actors among project staff, government and local stakeholders was one of the project's main achievements, though not through a strategic comprehensive capacity building plan. Trained and motivated teams were established in the two protected areas, but no measures were taken to ensure the continued long-term involvement of the trained personnel.
- Key stakeholders, decision-makers, the general public, and specific target groups were sensitized through a comprehensive effort, including specific education programmes in schools, use of the mass media, and specifically targeted awareness raising activities, resulting with remarkable support at all levels to the two established protected areas, and to the concept of a national network of protected areas, as a mechanism to support biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources in Cape Verde.
- The Government of Cape Verde committed to provide permanent funding for the continued operation of protected areas. Further fund raising efforts for future extension and management of the protected areas were initiated. However, financial sustainability is not yet secured.

Assessment of progress toward achieving the project development objectives:

Rating the project progress toward achieving the defined development objectives, according to the GEF guidelines (HS - highly satisfactory, S - satisfactory, MS - marginally satisfactory, MU - marginally unsatisfactory, U - unsatisfactory, HU - highly unsatisfactory), it is our opinion that the adequate rating is S (satisfactory). Considering the baseline situation, it is evident that a remarkable progress was made toward introducing the actual concept of protected areas and their integrated co-management, as an essential instrument for biodiversity conservation, into Cape Verde, and toward creating the conditions to establish a network of protected areas in the country. The project results had further contribution to halting land and water degradation and to poverty alleviation through sustainable management of natural resources, within the project's areas of influence. However, the project did have some weaknesses as well. Partly as a result of the replacement of Phase II with another follow-up project, and therefore also with an unplanned time-gap, while an adequate exit strategy was lacking due to the original phased planning, the project did not secure the

sustainability of the positive results and the enabling of a smooth transfer of the two established parks from management by the project to the full responsibility of the government. Moreover, most of the project's achievements were with a down-streaming focus, and most of the impact was concentrated within and around the two created protected areas, while up-streaming impact was not sufficient to support creating the sustainability of achievements.

4.2. Achievement of the project expected results

Assessment of progress toward achieving the project expected results:

The analysis of results is based on the Intended Outputs (Outcomes 1-6), as defined in the Results Framework of the ProDoc. The indicators listed are based on the Output Targets and Indicative Activities, in the Results Framework. The results listed are based on the MTE (for results achieved until mid 2007), project reports, studies and website, and personal communication of the Project Coordinator. As noted by the MTE, some of the indicators are repetitive. Therefore, the listing of results for each indicator is also somewhat repetitive. Assessment is rated for each indicator, in order to facilitate the rating of each outcome. However the outcomes assessment is not based simply on summing up of assessments of all indicators related to each outcome, but does take into account the differential weight and importance of the different indicators for each outcome, and eventually the overall progress towards achieving each result was assessed. Assessment rating is done according to the GEF guidelines (HS - highly satisfactory, S - satisfactory, MS - marginally satisfactory, MU - marginally unsatisfactory, U - unsatisfactory, HU - highly unsatisfactory).

Table 5: Assessment of progress

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas	New Laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Decreto- Lei Nº3/2003</i>: legal framework for protected areas – revision DLNº 44/2006 - <i>Decreto – Lei Nº3/200329/2006</i> - Regulations for the two Protected Areas <i>Decreto – Regulamentar Nº 10/2007</i> <i>Decreto – Regulamentar Nº 19/2007</i> - <i>Resoluções Nº 40/2008 e Nº 41/2008</i> approved: adoption of the Management Plans of SMNP and MGNP 	S
	Media dissemination of legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5,000 booklets on protected area system printed and distributed - 10 TV campaigns, radio campaigns, articles in journals and newspapers - Publication and distribution of legislation - Project website 	HS
	Advocacy group for biodiversity conservation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Rede Parlamentares para o Ambiente</i> - a garden of endemic species was created in the parliament - 3 <i>Clubes Ambientais</i> in schools 	S
	Agreement of collaboration with each relevant ministry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreement with INIDA for production of endemic plants - Agreement signed with DGASP for use of endemic species for reforestation in and surrounding PAs - Agreement with DGASP for the management of Fogo Natural Park - <i>Delegação do Tarrafal/São Miguel – MADRRM</i> - <i>Unidade de Coordenação Nacional de Filatelia – MIT</i> - <i>Comissão Regional de Parceiros – ME</i> - No specific agreements were made with most of the relevant line ministries 	MU
	New land tenure systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline assessment of land tenure issues around PAs completed - Land tenure study produced by consultants in December 2006, and detailed recommendations presented, but not implemented yet - Land tenure registry and land use planning in the two parks (2008) - Discussions held with land-owners especially in MGNP 	MU

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		- Need for a comprehensive approach, negotiations, and careful revision of policies and legislation	
	Decision-makers sensitized on the importance of biodiversity and protected areas	- Project website (www.areasprotegidas.cv) established and widely advertised. - 2 more specific websites established in 2008: one for each PA (www.ecoserramalagueta.cv and www.ecosaonicolau.cv) – the sites have not been maintained, though - Contribution to national exhibition on biodiversity - Wide range of educational materials published - Workshop to launch project held March 2005 with over 60 participants from relevant ministries - Briefing meetings to parliamentarians (22) and ministers (3) on project activities and objectives - Visit of Prime Minister to MGNP with presentation by staff on PAP and Park aims - Visit by 12 women parliamentarians involved in environmental issues to Fogo - Guided visits to the parks of 22 Parliament members; 3 Ministers; the President of the National Assembly; 5 Presidents of <i>Câmaras Municipais</i>	HS
	Native tree species used for reforestation.	- Only native species are now used by DGASP in new reforestation schemes in and surrounding the 2 parks - 5 endemic tree species are raised in nurseries established and operating through the project in the two parks. (<i>Tortolho, Mato botão; Língua de vaca, Losna e Dragoeiro</i>) - These plants are used for reforestation in and around the two parks. More than 50,000 endemic plants were planted	HS
	Biological pest control.	- Surveys undertaken by project in communities around the two parks, which show that pesticide use is not a problem around either park	N/A
	Germplasm bank and/or botanical garden management programme for native plant varieties	- 5 endemic tree species are grown in nurseries established and operating through the project in the two parks, for reforestation programmes	HS
	Environmental impact assessment guidelines.	- EIA legislation was improved in March 2006 with input from project team and DGA - EIA legislation was published - No EIA guidelines were elaborated - Limited MADRRM capacity	MU
	Capacity to monitor/enforce EIAs.	- Training was given to 3 DGA technicians, but capacity is still limited	MU
	Legal recognition of common property management	- Legal advisory team recruited by DGA - Land tenure report completed in December 2006 but conclusions not yet implemented	MU
	Incentives for appropriate private land tenure negotiated	- TOR for legal advisory team developed - Ongoing implementation of first experimental case of incentive for appropriate private land tenure in one of PAs - Discussions were held with land owners, especially in and around MGNP - Improved agriculture and livestock practices were discussed with land owners	MU
	Joint Forest Management Policy Paper	- Not implemented	U
	Policies of forest and rangeland protection outside PAs	- Consultant on rangeland management contracted to provide a study on livestock management and sustainable grazing in buffer zone - Development of policies outside PAs: not implemented	MU

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
	Halving of cases where sectoral ministries promote non-sustainable programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DGA EIA team recruited, and 3 technicians were trained, but capacity is still limited - No specific agreements or discussions were held with other ministries in regard with non-sustainable programmes 	U
Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems	Training and increased capacity for ecosystem management. Protected Areas managers and staff trained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project staff participated in more than 30 training courses - Training courses were given to staff of NPCU, SMNP, MGNP, DGA, DGASP, INIDA, and technicians of the 4 <i>Câmaras Municipais</i> - All planned short term training courses were realized - Park staff members were mentored through the realization of studies, management activities, and plans development, jointly with experts - 6 <i>Monitores Ambientais</i> from the two parks trained in Canary Islands, march 2008 - Short training courses to parks staff on project elaboration, development and evaluation - Short training for parks staff in statistics and research methodology - A short course given by NPCU to parks staff on Protected Areas planning - English courses for guides (<i>guias ambientais</i>) - French courses for project and DGA staff - Training of two park technicians in environmental education in Spain - Training of one project technician in fire control, by INIDA - PAP supported some costs for two DGA staff for MSc degrees in environmental sciences at universities in Brazil - Short training courses on GIS in 2006 - GIS training for technicians of DGASP, DGA, local NGO and Project technician in 2008 - training of 14 field surveyors for socio economic data collection - Short-term courses in US for DGA staff member on natural resource management in 2006 and for Project Coordinator on project management in 2007 - 3-month training course for guards and 6 months for rangers provided through EU-funded project - Training needs analysis carried out in April and May 2007 of all PAP staff, but training was not given in accordance with a strategic overall capacity building plan - No measures were taken to secure continued involvement of trained staff in park management 	S
	PA Coordination Unit (PACU) established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU) was established in Praia and two site offices were established in SMNP and MGNP, all with capacitated and motivated teams. - A concept of <i>Organismo Autônomo</i> as a permanent governmental PA management authority is being discussed within MADRRM - No measures were taken to secure the continued employment of capacitated staff in protected areas management 	S
	Strategic plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Plans were elaborated for SMNP and MGNP and legally approved - Project staff supports the elaboration of a Management Plan for Fogo Island NP - The Management Plans were discussed at <i>Reunião dos Altos Representantes</i> (RAR) - Specific strategic plans were elaborated in both parks, including: Monitoring plans; Communication plan; Eco-tourism plan; land-use plans - Joint plans were developed with other government agencies 	S
	Information sharing and coordination mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internet access in both project sites, and regular email communication with NPCU - Project website established with many project documents available 	S

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for download - 2 more specific websites established in 2008: one for each PA - GIS system with A3 plotter and project databases established at SMNP and MGNP but not available at NPCU in Praia - Information collected through the project used for DGA's system of environmental information (SIA) and website - On going information sharing between the two parks - sharing of meteorological information with <i>Direcção de Meteorologia</i> - Regular visits of Project Coordination in both sites - Exchange visits and information sharing between staff of SMNP, MGNP and Fogo NP - Government staff visits and briefing in the two project sites 	
	Visitor/user fees and penalties/fines.	- Entrance fees collection initiated only in SMNP with 900\$CV collected in first 4 months	MU
	Long-term state budget support secured. Framework for long term sustainable financial mechanism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since the termination of the project in December 2008, the two parks operation and staff fees are covered by the Government. - The Government has committed to secure a budget for the operation of Protected Areas in Cape Verde, but a specific budget was not allocated yet, and a framework to secure a long-term sustainable financial mechanism for a National network of Protected Areas, is still not in place. - Basic Country Assessment Report was completed. 	MS
Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management	Natural parks formally established, staff hired, infrastructure in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two protected areas, Serra Malagueta NP and Monte Gordo NP, were created and formally established through the project - Staff was hired for the two protected areas - Reception and offices headquarters built in SMNP - Un-proportional investments in infrastructure at SMNP, and specifically in the luxurious headquarters facilities - Reception and offices headquarters planned in MGNP. Currently renting the office. - Logo for each park designed and entrance signs for the parks erected - Education centres (<i>Centros Ambientais</i>) established in both parks - Campsites, trails, signs, access roads rehabilitation, and tourism services constructed or in advance construction in both parks 	HS
	Managers and staff trained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Managers and staff in both protected areas were trained through participation in specific courses and through mentorship with international consultants and national experts - Specific training on collection of meteorological data and on GIS provided by international consultants - Study visit to the Canary Islands in December 2006 for 3 members of the NPCU staff and 6 from the two project sites - 2 technical staff from SMNP and MGNP attended training course in management planning organized by the WWF-MCCP 	S
	Baseline studies on ecological factors; and on socio-economic issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An impressive volume of information on biodiversity, ecological and socio-economic issues, and geographic based information, was compiled through the project (partly also available on the project website). - Ecological baseline studies were completed in both sites, published and distributed - Inventories of birds and reptiles, invertebrate surveys, and various specific studies were produced - Forest inventory and mapping, and vegetation surveys were realized - Study of functional relationships between ecosystem structural components and services - Ongoing data entry into Excell databases and GIS analysis and mapping at both sites - Herbarium and insect collections established in both parks 	HS

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies on environmental education needs was done in schools in both parks - Socio-economic baseline studies were completed in both sites, published and distributed - Graduate/post-graduate theses (<i>Estagios</i>) realized in the protected areas (3 students of environmental engineering; 2 students of the <i>Instituto Superior de Agronomia de Portugal</i>; one theses was approved of a student from Germany in 2009; an M. Sc. Theses is planned on fog water capture) 	
	Regular bi-yearly inventories of Flora and Fauna. Database created. GIS-based natural resource monitoring. Regular inventorying of BD and LD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Database created and GIS analysis and mapping in place in both protected areas, with ongoing biological and sociological data entry - Monitoring plans developed for both protected areas - Monitoring of soil erosion in MGNP - Monitoring of endemic plant species in both parks - Monitoring of specific endemic bird species (e.g. <i>Ardea purpurea</i> in SMNP) - Monthly monitoring of meteorological data in MGNP 	S
	PAs classified into management zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boundaries of both parks and buffer zones agreed with local communities (documented) - Line of park boundary demarcated on ground and introduced into legislation in both protected areas - Zoning studies classified 3 management zones in SMNP and 4 management zones in MGNP, based on socio-economic, ecological and land-use data, within the framework of the parks management plans 	S
	Steering Committees for community participatory management of PAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local site committees (LSCs) established at SMNP and MGNP - Communities participate in decision making through the LSCs, and through direct discussions with park staff, but mainly in relation to activities concerning them directly (such as the small grants and micro-credit programmes), and not on activities related to the actual park management - Beneficiaries among communities in SMNP expressed satisfaction with their involvement in selection of relevant mechanisms, while beneficiaries among communities in MGNP were not satisfied and felt that selected mechanisms were imposed on them. 	MS
	Revenue sharing system with local communities and municipalities negotiated and established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local communities benefit from tourism-related activities, with the park's support, as well as from direct support by the project - No system was established to secure park revenue sharing 	U
	Capacities and institutional mechanisms for local government and communities enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training was given to members of local communities, in relation to implementation of the micro-credit and small grants programmes, and in relation to improved agriculture, livestock, water and land management practices. - Local community members were involved in the baseline studies - PAP provided advice on proposal writing to Society of Serra Malagueta for (successful) application to French Embassy for a grant to construct 20 water storage tanks for the community - Local site committees (LSCs) established at SMNP and MGNP, and Municipal representatives also participate in the Project Technical Committee (PTC), but still very limited participation of both local governments and local communities in decision making in relation to the actual park management. 	MS
	PA master plans and sub-plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Plans were elaborated for SMNP and MGNP. These management plans give excellent guidance for initiating the parks management, as well as allow long-term revision as a response to changing conditions - Specific strategic plans were elaborated in both parks, including: 	S

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<p>Monitoring plans; Communication plans; Eco-tourism plans; land-use plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A participatory approach to park management planning is only very partially implemented, and conditions for participatory decision making with all relevant stakeholders and full co-management with local stakeholders, are not in place. However, the project helped introducing the actual concept of co-management into Cape Verde 	
	Modelling of soil erosion and land degradation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No models were developed of soil erosion and land degradation - Consultant from INIDA undertook study in Nov-Dec 2006 at both parks developed recommendations for soil and water conservation 	U
	Sharing of experiences with others outside Cape Verde	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministerial agreement developed between MAA and Canary island government partner (2006) - Contacts established between the Environmental Department of Fuereventura in Canary Islands and the project (2006) - Contact began with International Institute for Environmental Awareness, Spain (2006) - Liaison with botanist at University of Edinburgh/University of Coimbra - National Project Coordinator participated in the 6th Conferencia Atlantica de Medio Ambiente and gave presentation on PAP project in Cape Verde (2005) - Training of two park technicians in environmental education in Spain (2008) - 6 <i>Monitores Ambientais</i> from the two parks trained in Canary Islands (2008) 	S
	Visitor/user fees and penalties/fines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entrance fees collection initiated only in SMNP with 900\$CV collected in first 4 months 	MU
	Trust fund for PA system. Long-term state budget support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Government has committed to secure a budget for the operation of Protected Areas in Cape Verde, but a specific budget was not allocated yet, and a framework to secure a long-term sustainable financial mechanism for a National network of Protected Areas, is still not in place. - A Trust Fund for PAs system was not established - The NPCU and project staff engaged in specific fund-raising efforts and activities 	MU
Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management	Stakeholder associations able to engage in management decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 Local communities farmer associations established: Associação de Serra Malagueta; Jovens Unidos para o Ambiente; Associação de Monte Gordo - 2 community development associations (ACDs) were established - Regular and on-going interactions between park staff and local communities and associations - Local community members expressed satisfaction with their interactions with project staff and with their representation by the associations - Village meetings conducted at both parks focusing on the biodiversity conservation, sustainable development, and environmental problems and their solutions - Local associations involved in decision making on issues related to direct community involvement, but not on other issues related to biodiversity and park management - Communities and schoolchildren participate in clean up campaigns around MGNP (2008) - E.g., 86 people participated in 5 meetings in and around SMNP for sensitization about trails and signs (2008) 	MS
	Local stakeholders trained and educated on sustainable resource management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness and education campaigns and constant park staff interactions with local communities, resulted with sensitization of the communities to the importance of biodiversity conservation and to sustainable natural resource management practices. - 2 community members participated in a course for tourist guides 	HS

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<p>level III (2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 27 community members from SMNP were trained in small business management, micro-credit function, and animal health (2008) - 4 communities around MGNP and 5 communities around SMNP were educated about micro-credit and small business management - 23 craft artists from SMNP were trained in personal and business characteristics, identification of business opportunities, and basic accounting (2008) - 27 community members participated in a study visit to <i>Concelho de S. Domingos - Lagoa, Godim e Colonato</i> (2008) - 25 community members from SMNP were trained in rapid and participatory diagnostic (2008) - 17 community members from SMNP were trained in conflict management - 20 community members from SMNP and 21 from MGNP were trained in use of <i>Sisal</i> for craft (2008) - 15 community members from MGNP were trained in paper recycling and use for craft (2008) - Community members were trained in fire control - 25 Members of the Associations and technicians of the <i>Câmaras Municipais</i> received specific training in sustainable resource management - 4 workshops on water and soil conservation held in Nov and Dec 2006 at both parks, attended by 60-80 people (fog-collecting nets established at SMNP) - More than 350 local stakeholders have attended workshops and training sessions on biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource management - Fire management and first aid training offered at SMNP in May 2007 and MGNP planned for July 2007 with places for at least 15 local people to attend - GIS training and support provided to technical department in the Municipality of Tarrafal by PAP consultant - Technical support, e.g.maps, by the Ecological Monitoring Teams to local partners and private sector e.g. Millenium Challenge Account, DMAA, Empreite Figueiredo) - No overall capacity building strategic plan was developed to enable participation of local communities and local governments in park management planning and in co-management of park resources and sustainable use of natural resources 	
	Micro-grant facilities for non-profit sustainable use of biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 16 Micro-grant and micro-credit projects initiated with communities around SMNP and MGNP, including: 1 irrigation project; 4 installations for raising pigs; 6 corals for improved management of goats (previously free-ranging); 5 <i>Hortos Escolares</i> - Family heads around SMNP received a drip irrigation system on an area of 2,976m² to produce vegetables (pumpkin, tomato, cabbage, pepper, carrot) (2008) - Family heads around MGNP received enclosures for their (previously free-ranging) goats and a small installation for the production of cheese. The facilities were constructed by community members (2008) - 63 families near MGNP received 4,000 fruit trees produced by the Park for the creation of community plantations 	S
	Farmers in PA-adjacent areas use conservation farming,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Socio-economic study in 2006 showed that 3-5% of farmers supported by local association and DGASP are using sustainable farming with no chemical fertilizers throughout terraces 	S
	Sustainable livestock and pasture management and monitoring systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study on pasture and livestock management completed in 2006 by INIDA expert - Free ranging goats moved to 6 corals near MGNP 	U

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
	<p>Rational techniques for charcoal and wood cutting demonstrated for communities</p> <p>Community woodlots for fuelwood and fodder</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Model for sustainable wood cutting developed as part of forestry resources and management study at MGNP (Oct 2006 – Mar 2007) - Training in woodlot management techniques provided by long-term international consultant to staff at MGNP in 2006, and replicated at SMNP - Local communities offered cut wood from forest plantation management programmes at MGNP and can keep invasive species e.g. Lantana cleared as part of exotic species control programme at SMNP for use as fuelwood 	S
	<p>Communities participate in state reforestation activities and are given sustainable use rights for wood and forest resources.</p> <p>Community woodlots created using endemic or non-invasive species.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local communities participate in reforestation programmes - Community members participated in the reforestation of an area of 9ha with 12,256 endemic plants around MGNP (2008) - Both parks have well-managed endemic plant nurseries, which provide source materials for the replanting programmes - Endemic plants also grown in several more nurseries, some of local land-owners, and in school gardens - PAP supports nurseries and then buys endemic plants from nurseries of local communities at a symbolic cost - <i>Dragoeiro</i> Reforestation projects of MADRRM Delegation in Sao Nicolau with communities around MGNP - <i>Phoenix</i> Reforestation project of DGASP with local communities - 62 women of local communities participated in production of more than 25,000 endemic plants for reforestation in SMNP (2008) - 12 men and 1 woman of local communities participated in production of 5,037 endemic plants for reforestation in MGNP (2008) - 3,000 endemic plants were planted at SMNP in 2006 - 13 rangers from local communities participated in the first reforestation activities producing more than 3000 endemic seedlings in 2006, and totalling an estimated 10,000 seedlings by mid-2007. - Forest resource and management study completed in 2006 	S
	<p>Invasive flora reduced.</p> <p>Communities test techniques for eradication of invasive flora, using crafts and tools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation of communities in manual clearing of <i>Lantana</i> and <i>Fulcraea</i> (paid by GEF funding) - Community members and forest guards participated in <i>Lantana</i> and <i>Sisal</i> manual eradication in both parks (2008) - 8 people from local community employed as PAP workers at MGNP to remove invasive species - Two eradication campaigns implemented by local communities and Scouts Club in February 2006 involving c.50 people - Park (PAP) rangers from local communities are engaged in eradication campaign of <i>Fulcraea</i> - Use by communities in of <i>Fulcraea</i> for craft - Training for community members by peace corps volunteer in use of invasive species for craft - 20 community members from SMNP and 21 from MGNP were trained in use of <i>Sisal</i> for craft (2008) - Only a few techniques were tested and there was no cost-effectiveness analysis 	S
	<p>Hunting and harvesting pressure reduced.</p> <p>Children in project areas are aware of problem of hunting of threatened species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 25 visits were made in 2006 to various schools around the two parks by PAP site staff, focusing on the role of students in biodiversity conservation and finding solutions to environmental problems including hunting - 17 visits of all of the schools in Sao Nicolau were realized to MGNP (2008) - 21 teachers in Sao Nicolau received training in environmental education - Presentation by National Project Coordinator on biodiversity conservation in Cape Verde at Instituto Superior de Engenharia e Ciencias do Mar Polytechnic (ISECMAR) - Schools around the two parks receive support in various 	S

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		sustainable management practices, including vegetable gardens, drip irrigation systems, endemic species nurseries, fog water capture panels. - A survey for evaluation of level of environmental education was realized in schools around MGNP (2008) - Communities and schoolchildren participate in clean up campaigns around MGNP (2008)	
	Local communities replace use of agro-chemicals with biological pest control.	- N/A - Socio-economic study showed that local farmers do not use chemical pesticides	N/A
	Soil and water conservation practices.	- Water conservation practice introduced to communities and schools, through the use of drip irrigation, and through fog water capture and treatment, using an innovative practice with simply installed panels, in both project sites - 16 for water capture panels were installed (in both sites) - 6 of the fog water capture panels were installed for communities' management near SMNP in 2008. - Base-line socio-economic study showed that at least 20% of local farmers used water conservation techniques prior to the project initiation, but needed support (which was provided by the project) - Communities participated in specific DGASP reforestation programmes near MGNP aimed at halting land degradation	S
Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities	Alternative livelihood programs.	- More than 250 beneficiaries of 54 families from SMNP received 4,700\$CV and more than 68 beneficiaries in 17 families from MGNP received 6,380\$CV, in small grant programmes (2008) - Micro-grant and micro-credit projects initiated with communities around SMNP and MGNP, including vegetable gardens (both parks), drip irrigation, livestock (9 cattle projects, 12 pig projects, 1 goats project , around SMNP, 3 livestock projects around MGNP), endemic plants nurseries, small business (4 bottling spirits projects, one commerce business around SMNP and one around MGNP) - Local communities benefit from tourism-related activities, with the park's support, as well as from direct support by the project - Training was given to members of local communities, in relation to implementation of the micro-credit and small grants programmes, and in relation to improved agriculture, livestock, water and land management practices. - Community members from both sites received short-term training in tourism related income generating activities (eco-guides; crafts from recycling materials; crafts from invasive species; sawing cloths); in small business management, accounting and micro-credit management; in livestock and agriculture sustainable practices; and in sustainable biodiversity land and water resources management - Communities in both sites participate in income-generating activities related to reforestation with endemic species and invasive species control - The project supported construction of housing for two old community members around MGNP (2008)	HS
	Credit and savings system for profit-generating micro-projects operating.	- 6 people from MGNP and 52 from SMNP received micro-credit (645,000 and 3,514,500 \$CV, respectively, and 18 more people from SMNP are planned to receive further 1,040,000\$CV) to develop alternative livelihood programmes, including agriculture, livestock and small businesses (2008) - Micro-credit programmes were implemented through partnership with existing for-profit financial institutions (MORABI & FAMILICOS), and included a package of sensitization, training and provision of the micro-credit. - Most beneficiaries around SMNP reported on satisfaction and success, and initiated returning the credit	MS

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most beneficiaries around MGNP reported on stress induced by the micro-credit conditions, which resulted in fact with an adverse impact for the community members involved. 	
	Eco-tourism regulations and programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecotourism strategy was elaborated for each park - No national tourism strategy, weak national capacity and data availability - PAP staff at both parks collecting data on visitors and providing to national tourism agency - Identified visitor trails at both parks in construction – implemented or planned - Training of PAP rangers on conservation and tourism (6-month EU-funded course held on Boa Vista with training provided by consultants from Canary Islands) 	MS
	Local income from tourism increased in and around the parks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism and income from tourism in and around the parks increased through the establishment of the parks, but still very limited. - E.g., according to statistics of the first 9 months of 2008, a total of 3,123 visitors were recorded in Serra Malagueta NP (2,746 nationals and 386 foreigners from 9 countries) - Need for a strategic marketing programme - Some income received from sale of craft and products of local community members, with benefit for both the park and the communities - SMNP participated in an exposition of communities craft at the Centro Cultural Francês, with benefit of 80,000\$CV (2008) - SMNP participated in an environmental fair with 35,000\$CV benefit from communities craft (2008) - Craft of community members from both sites was marketed through an exposition of <i>Associação Zé Moniz (AZM)</i>, 2008 - Craft products of communities around SMNP were presented in an exposition through partnership with <i>Fundação Amílcar Cabral</i> (2008) - Community members from both sites received short-term training in tourism and craft related income generating activities - Parks benefit from entrance fees (only SMNP), selling maps, guided tours 	S
	Local farmers have increased crop yields and restored soil fertility. Local farmers have diversified production and are cooperating in marketing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A drip irrigation system was installed near SMNP on an area of 2,976m², for 15 diversified vegetable gardens (including tomato, pumpkin, cabbage, pepper, carrot). The programme is successful and the beneficiaries are satisfied. 	S
Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals	Public awareness campaign.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 awareness campaigns were implemented during 2008 in schools and in the two parks - Project exhibition with posters held in Praia and at the two parks - One-week campaign inaugurated by the head of local municipality and held at sites - One-week campaign was inaugurated by the Minister of Environment and held in Praia - Presentations given by PAP staff on Biodiversity Day (22 May 2007) and Environment Day (5 June 2007), and joint activities with local people at the two sites for ‘Women’s Day’, ‘Tree Day’, ‘Water Day’, and others - Clean-up campaigns with communities and schools in both parks - 4 films on aspects of the project produced in cooperation with Austrian film-makers - Project website with project publications; various project publications and brochures distributed; use of mass media (TV and radio campaigns, and articles in newspapers and journals –national 	HS

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
	Sales of PA field guides and maps	<p>and international)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small maps of the two sites produced showing trails and contours (using GIS system), given to municipalities, schools and visitors - 10,000 brochures (5,000 for each park) with maps and marking of trails were produced (2008) - E.g., educational material sold at MGNP with benefit of 40,000\$CV (2008) 	HS
	Environmental education curricula.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies on environmental education levels and needs, were realized in schools around MGNP - Package of educational materials (2000 booklets, 500 brochures, 2000 T-shirts, maps) developed by the project - First edition of project newsletter 'O Tortolho' published in 2006 - Schools around both parks benefit from project support for vegetable gardens, drip irrigation systems, fog water capture panels, and storage. The children grow their own food and experience water management and agriculture sustainable practices. - Schools in both sites participate in clean-up campaigns, and in growing endemic plants in nurseries - 25 visits were made in 2006 to various schools around the two parks by PAP site staff, focusing on the role of students in biodiversity conservation and finding solutions to environmental problems including hunting - 17 visits of all of the schools in Sao Nicolau were realized to MGNP (2008) - 21 teachers in Sao Nicolau received training in environmental education (2008) - 2 environmental clubs and 1 committee of environmental education established in schools around MGNP 	S
	Parliamentarians and decision - makers educated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A permanent environmental support group was established among parliamentarians (<i>Rede Parlamentares para o Ambiente</i>), and a garden of endemic species was planted in the parliament - A total of around 50 parliament members visited the parks and around 15 active in the environment network - Visits of the Prime Minister to both parks - Visit by 12 women parliamentarians involved in environmental issues to Fogo - Guided visits to the two parks and briefing on project activities and objectives of the parks for 22 Parliament members; 3 Ministers; the President of the National Assembly; 5 Presidents of <i>Câmaras Municipais</i> - A visit of Senegalese and national parliamentarians of the African Parliamentarians Network for the Environment (2008) - A visit of the Executive Secretary of UNCCP and team, with national parliamentarians, in SMNP (2008) - A visit of UN RR and 40 UN staff (2008) - A work visit of the President of the National Assembly and 20 parliamentarians in MGNP (2008) - A visit of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, technicians of the Ministry, and members of the Diplomatic Corp (a total of 30 participants) in SMNP and the creation of a "diplomatic garden" of endemic plants (2008) - A visit of the presidents of the <i>Câmaras Municipais</i> of Ribeira Brava and Tarrafal in MGNP (2008) 	HS
	NGO partners for conservation supporting project activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact was made with several national NGOs (<i>Amigos da Natureza; Jovens Unidos na Protecção do Ambiente (JUPA); Clube dos Amigos do Monte Gordo</i>), but no strategic partnerships were established. - Craft of community members from both sites was marketed through an exposition of <i>Associação Zé Moniz (AZM)</i>, 2008 	MS

Intended Outcomes	Indicators	Results	Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Craft products of communities around SMNP were presented in an exposition through partnership with <i>Fundação Amílcar Cabral</i> and the film “<i>Serra Malagueta um pulmão de Santiago</i>” was presented (2008) - Local associations participate in LSCs and in decision making relating directly to community involvement, however, they are not represented in the PSC or PTC and do not participate in decision making in relation to the overall park management - WWF-Cape Verde participated in the PTC, but no partnership was established, which could provide technical support and international advocacy to the project and parks. 	

4.3. Summary of assessment of progress achieved by the Project

Objective: S

(see details in chapter 4.1.)

Result 1: S

Outcome was partially achieved. Some up-streaming issues still need to be addressed. Protected Areas legislation was adopted and disseminated. Other essential environmental and land-tenure legislation and policies are still required. Park limits and management plans were approved legally for both PAs. Capacity and awareness of decision-makers and of key actors, in relation to PAs, increased. The establishing of an “autonomous PAs authority” was discussed. Responsibilities for park management are not yet consolidated and agreed, and decision-making is still over-centralized.

Result 2: MS

Outcome was partially achieved. Key issues still need to be addressed. Project and park personnel, relevant government staff, and community participants, were trained and capacitated in key aspects, related to the PAs’ management, however, not in accordance with an overall strategic training/capacity building programme. Baseline information on the two pilot PAs was collected, published and disseminated. Park management plans and specific strategic plans were elaborated and adopted, and their implementation initiated. Transfer of responsibilities over the established parks management from the project to the government is not yet sustainable and needs strengthening. Over-centralization of decision-making is still not resolved. Some of the local governments report on insufficient involvement in decision making process, resulting with the lack of a feeling of ownership. Local communities are involved in decision making related to specific activities that directly concern their participation, but not in the overall management of the PAs. Sustainability of governmental PAs financing mechanism is not guaranteed yet.

Result 3: HS

Outstanding achievements, though some issues still need to be addressed. The most prominent achievement of the project is the creation and operation of the first two PAs in the country. Another remarkable achievement of the project was the training and capacitating of committed and highly motivated technical teams in both PAs. However, their continued and long-term involvement in park management was not secured. Studies and monitoring of ecological and socio-economic aspects were implemented and data compiled, published and distributed. Management Plans elaborated for SMNP and MGNP give excellent guidance for initiating the parks management, as well as allow long-term revision as a response to changing conditions and accumulated information. The PAs infrastructure was partly installed and another part is still in construction. Expenditures on infrastructure, and especially on headquarters facilities (SMNP), was disproportionate (see chapter

3.2.3). There is need for improved planning and budgeting in future cases. Local communities participate and benefit from improved park management practices. An innovative water management system was installed in both parks. Sustainable financial mechanisms for long-term PAs management, are still not established.

Result 4: S

Remarkable progress was achieved, with a significant contribution toward achieving the project's goal, but there is need for more strategic planning. Community participants were sensitized and trained to participate in various sustainable management practices. Pressure on indigenous flora and fauna was reduced. Invasive species control programmes were implemented, and endemic species rehabilitation measures taken, with the participation of local communities. Local associations participate in local committees (but not in the project's steering committee or technical committee). Improved water management practices were implemented. Special focus was given to education and participation of local schools. Small grants programmes were implemented through consultation with communities. There is need for improved overall strategic planning, consolidation and monitoring of activities.

Result 5: S

Remarkable progress was achieved, with a significant contribution toward achieving the project's development goals, but there is need for more strategic planning. The project contributed to improving local agriculture, livestock, and water management practices. Micro-credit programmes and related training were implemented through consultation with communities, and through partnership with existing relevant financial institutions. Eco-tourism and related revenues in the two PAs increased, and local participants were trained in eco-tourism-related income generating activities. The project also supported the marketing of community products. There is still need for improved overall strategic planning, consolidation and monitoring of micro-credit programmes, and of eco-tourism strategic planning, marketing and related activities.

Result 6: HS

Impressive achievements, however, there is need for more strategic planning. Public awareness campaigns were successfully implemented. Various national and international media channels were mobilized. Information was disseminated through publications, exhibitions and websites of the project. Focus was given to education activities, and to educating teachers, and productive partnerships were established with schools around the two protected areas. Decision makers, including government members and diplomats, were sensitized, and a group of active parliament members was established. A successful cooperation was implemented with Peace Corps, though better results could be achieved through improved communication channels. There is need for a more strategic overall planning of awareness and education programmes, and there is need for more focus on establishing active partnerships and cooperation with national and international NGOs.

Implementation strategy and approach: S

The mostly down-streaming implementation approach resulted with outstanding practical achievements. However, the replacement of Phase II with a follow-up project and a time-gap while no exit strategy was in place due to the original phased planning, resulted with high risk for continuity and sustainability of the achievements. A more strategic overall planning of essential activities, and more up-streaming focused activities, could improve achievement and sustainability of key results and the project's goal.

Stakeholder participation and public involvement: MS

A participatory approach to natural resources management is a new concept for Cape Verde. As such, the progress made in this respect through this project is remarkable. However, there is still a long way to go in order to achieve a full participatory co-management of natural resources in and

around protected areas, and full participation of stakeholders, especially at the local level, in the decision making process concerning the overall management of the parks and their surroundings (and not only in issues concerning directly the local communities involvement, as was implemented in this project).

Monitoring and Evaluation: S

(see details in chapter 3.2.5.)

Sustainability: MU

(see details in Chapter 5)

Overall Project Assessment: S

It is evident that the project had a number of impressive results. Most importantly, the project has created the first two protected areas in Cape Verde, established the conditions for their function, and initiated activities for enabling integrated co-management of natural resources in and around them. Comprehensive baseline information was compiled and management plans were elaborated and adopted for the two parks. Moreover, the project has successfully introduced the concepts of protected areas and sustainable management of natural resources, as key and feasible instruments for conservation of nationally and globally important biodiversity in Cape Verde, with overwhelming support of decision makers, key stakeholders, and the general public. The project has created several valuable assets for biodiversity conservation in Cape Verde. These include mainly: the support achieved at all levels for the protected areas concept; the two established pilot protected areas; the involved communities' support to their integration in sustainable management practices; and maybe most important – a team of committed, capacitated and highly motivated national technical staff, capable and willing to take the leadership in developing a network of protected areas in the country. The main weakness of the project is in its failure to secure sustainability of its achievements, partly as a result of the later replacement of Phase II with a follow-up project and a time-gap while no exit strategy was in place due to the original phased planning, combined with the lack of sufficient focus on the up-streaming activities, and on sustainability-inducing activities. If continuity and sustainability of the project achievements would not be maintained and strengthened through dedicated follow-up project/s and activities, there is a high risk for their rapid degradation, resulting with adverse impacts, and a long-term loss of national confidence in the process.

5. Project Impacts and Sustainability

Almost all of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation, were of the opinion that the project failed to secure the long-term continuity and sustainability of its results and achievements. Sustainability of most of the achievements listed above will therefore depend on follow-up activities. If such measures will be taken, through specific dedicated activities, as well as integrated in the follow-up project design and activities, the important impacts of the PAP's results can be maintained and their continuity can be secured. Specific impacts and sustainability of the main project's components are analyzed here:

5.1. Policy and legal framework

The project's contribution to national legislation on protected areas in general, and specifically to adequate legislation for the two pilot protected areas, is one of the project's important and long-term impacts. It can also serve as a first step toward promoting the elaboration of further required legislation. Other essential legislation and forming of national policies are required in relation to biodiversity conservation inside and outside protected areas, other environmental aspects, and especially in relation to land tenure, ownership and rights over land, natural resources, utilization of natural resources, and traditional knowledge. More detailed regulations are required to set the exact rules of activities allowed and prohibited in various categories of protected areas. An overall study

of existing and required legislation can provide guidance for way forward in continued elaboration of the required legislation.

5.2. Institutional framework

The project established a national coordination unit and two site units, operating within the framework of DGA. These can serve as a first step toward the creation of a national Protected Areas Authority, and specific Park administration and management units. Although not an expected result of Phase I, The project also initiated and promoted a governmental discussion on the nature, function, budget, and institutional status of a Protected Areas Authority. However, there is still no agreement on the nature of this authority within the government, and even within MADRRM. The creation of such an authority is essential to secure sustainability of project results and especially of protected areas management and conservation. Due to the later change of the original phased planning of the project, there was no exit strategy for Phase I. Such a strategy could ideally include focusing project and government attention on creating the PAA, and on enabling a smooth transfer of the protected areas management from the project to this authority. Moreover, the existing institutional framework and decision making processes in relation to the project's activities and park management is too centralized, and does not enable the implementation of a real participatory approach. Centralized decision-making processes do not induce a feeling of ownership, and may result rather with alienation of key project stakeholders, and thereby with reduced sustainability, and degradation of achievements.

5.3. Sustainability of the two established pilot Protected Areas and their management

The creation and demonstrated operation of the two first pilot protected areas in Cape Verde is a major contribution of the project to achieving the development goal, and its impact is undisputable. This impact in around the two protected areas is clear, but the actual impact is much wider, in providing a good model of protected areas, and their successful operation with desirable results, to all stakeholders concerned, and to national and global conservation objectives. These two parks and their operation and achievements, in and around them, served to introduce the actual concept of protected areas as a key instrument for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, in Cape Verde, and as a first step toward the development of a network of protected areas in the country. The continuity and sustainability of the two protected areas, however, was not secured through the project, and are at high risk following its termination. It is essential that follow up activities will secure the continued successful operation of the two established parks, as a very high priority. Failing to do so, may lead to rapid degradation of the achievements in and around these protected areas, and thereby to an adverse impact throughout the country. That is, in addition to the planned establishing of new protected areas, and of establishing the PAA and financial sustainability for the management of a national network of protected areas.

5.4. Capacitated Protected Areas management staff

One of the most important assets created by the project, with optional long-term remarkable impact on biodiversity conservation and protected areas in Cape Verde, was the recruitment, training and mentoring of a capacitated, committed and highly motivated national technical team. The staff recruited and capacitated through the project is capable and willing to take the leadership in developing a network of protected areas in the country. The focus given to training national staff, and to recruiting international consultants for their mentoring and training, and not only for actual implementation of studies and activities, resulted with a very positive and potentially long-term impact on the country's capacity to protect its biodiversity. Much added value was provided by the training of a number of community members around the parks, and their consequent recruitment as park staff. However, no measures were taken through the project's design or implementation or during the transfer of the protected areas from the project to government management, to secure the continued long-term employment of the capacitated and already experienced staff. In order to capitalize on the project's established assets, it is essential to take immediate measures to secure the

continued involvement of at least most of the staff that was capacitated through the project, in the on-going management of the already established two parks, and in the further development of a national network of protected areas, including both the protected areas planned in the follow up project, and HQ planning and strategizing positions. Such measures can include the open recognition of the protected areas' staff considerable contribution and dedication, the careful consideration of possibilities to provide improved work conditions and salaries, similar as much as possible to those provided during the project, and real efforts to recruit again the project's staff members that left (or were removed from) their positions in the parks.

5.5. Local communities' participation in sustainable management of natural resources

The participatory approach to decision making processes concerning biodiversity conservation, and the participation of local communities in sustainable co-management of natural resources, are new concepts for Cape Verde. As such, they were successfully introduced through the project. The introduction and successful implementation of the integrated co-management concept in the two pilot protected areas can obviously have a considerable and long-term impact on the development of a national network of protected areas and of sustainable co-management of natural resources in and around them. The sensitization and dedicated training provided to community members on various aspects related to sustainable natural resources management and to the development of various sustainable income generating activities, supports significantly the sustainability of this impact. The small grants and micro credit programmes was also an important contribution, although a more strategic approach was required to establish these programmes in a more sustainability-inducing manner. The institutional mechanisms developed through the project were not sufficient to establish real de-centralized and participatory decision making processes on the overall park management planning and implementation. Moreover, no exit strategy was designed and implemented to secure the long-term participation and benefits of communities from on-going activities of sustainable management of natural resources, and other sustainable alternative livelihoods, following the termination of the project and the financial support provided. It is therefore essential to secure the continuity of the parks' activities (and their sufficient budgeting) that are related to enabling sustainable management, and especially sustainable livelihoods and benefits of local communities, in and around the protected areas. While aiming to maximize sustainability of income-inducing activities, continued technical and financial support must be secured until such sustainability is achieved.

5.6. Decision makers, stakeholders and general public support to the PAs concept

The project directed much effort, with considerable success, to sensitizing and educating decision makers, key stakeholders and the general public in Cape Verde, to the importance of biodiversity conservation, and to the concepts of a protected areas network and sustainable integrated management of natural resources. The potentially long-term impact of these extensive and comprehensive education and awareness efforts is a key contribution to enabling the development of a national network of protected areas. Degradation of other achievements of the project, which may result if continuity of activities would not be secured, as described above, may lead eventually also to the degradation of the achieved support to the PAs concept, at all levels.

5.7. Eco-tourism development and revenues for the Protected Areas and communities

First conditions were established, through the project, for the development of eco-tourism in Cape Verde, and especially for developing tourism in and around the protected areas. However, while the baseline conditions for substantial eco-tourism development in and around protected areas were established through the project, there is still need to secure the continuity of efforts and activities in order to enable a prominent impact. Well established eco-tourism, and through partnerships with communities, can serve as a key instrument to enable sustainability of protected areas operation and biodiversity conservation. A national strategic approach should now be established to enable the development of sustainable eco-tourism in and around Protected Areas in the country, in full

partnership with the local communities. Such a strategy should address, among other issues, measures for maximizing revenues, without compromising conservation requirements, and measures to secure fair benefit sharing with the partnering communities. On the other hand, the sensitive and fluctuating nature of eco-tourism should be considered, and consequently it should not be relied upon as a future only or even main financing mechanism.

5.8. Financial sustainability

Financial sustainability was planned as an outcome of the full CVPAP, rather than Phase I, and indeed was not established at this stage. This situation, with the time gap between Phase I and the new follow-up project, results with a risk to the achieved progress. The Government has committed to allocate a permanent budget in order to enable the on-going and permanent operation of the protected areas in Cape Verde by the end of the CVPAP. So far the exact financial mechanisms and actual budget were not yet approved and secured. Since December 2008, the Government undertook the financial responsibility to enable the basic on-going function of the two established protected areas. While conditions for enabling financial sustainability are considered as a priority, they were not established yet, during the project or following its termination. Some effort was directed at mobilizing further financial support from other sources, however, these efforts also did not yield a sustainable financial mechanism, yet. Moreover, the management of the project's budget in the two protected areas created, focused more on establishing infrastructure (especially the luxurious headquarters facilities in SMNP, with disproportionate expenditures), instead of focusing on sustainability-inducing components. In discussions with entities responsible for the Government's budget and for the MADRRM's budget, the governmental commitment to enable the continuity of the protected areas basic function, was clearly expressed. However, there is still need to secure a sufficient permanent budget which will enable continuity and extension of sustainability-inducing activities and achievements, for biodiversity conservation and co-management of natural resources, in and around a national network of protected areas, already established and planned. Specifically, it is also important to consider carefully the required financial conditions to enable the employment of qualified national staff, as well as continuity of activities related to supporting the development of communities' sustainable livelihoods. It should be noted that while tourism and other park activities may yield considerable revenues in future, for both the park and communities, this source is not stable or reliable, and a permanent governmental budget must still be secured. Mechanisms to allow the direct channelling of park revenues back into the parks operation and activities (including mechanisms for fair benefit sharing with the communities) should also be developed, as an additional source.

6. Lessons Learned

Several lessons learned from the evaluation of the CVPAP Phase I, that may serve to help in the design of follow up projects and future activities for biodiversity conservation in Cape Verde, as well as for the design of similar GEF projects elsewhere, are listed here:

Sustainability and continuity:

A project's long-term impact is dependent on its sustainability. Sustainability and continuity of project's results should be secured, both through its design and through its implementation. A project's design and budgeting should focus on sustainability-inducing activities, as well as include a feasible exit strategy for each outcome. Solutions for specific aspects requiring continuity, following a project's termination, should be considered throughout the project's implementation.

Exit strategy:

An important lesson learned through this evaluation process, is the key role of a good and feasible exit strategy in securing continuity and sustainability of project's achievements. In this case it was the result of the original phased planning, followed by a later cancellation of Phase II. However, as

a general lesson learned, an exit strategy must be built-in as an integral part of a project design, and should address the measures for securing continuity of each of the project's results. The absence of an adequate exit strategy for a project, can result with degradation of results and even adverse impact, following its termination.

Up-streaming/down-streaming focus:

While down-streaming focus of project's activities have clear advantages in producing prominent and practical results at the local level, and a potential to produce thus an important impact at the national and global levels as well, it is essential to direct significant efforts at the up-streaming aspects, especially in a pioneering project, such as the CVPAP. Especially, a project of this nature should focus on establishing the adequate institutional, financial, and comprehensive legal frameworks and capacities for enabling the long-term mechanisms of protected areas management and biodiversity conservation in the country. While the two selected parks were small, the demonstrative role of their successful operation through co-management approach was in fact important in providing up-streaming impact through raising awareness and national support to the concept.

Strategic planning:

While an opportunistic approach to the implementation of various activities can maximize available opportunities, especially in a pioneering project such as the CVPAP, a more strategic approach can improve the overall project's achievements and long-term impact. Overall strategic planning, built-in the project design, should be used to address such aspects as capacity building requirements at all levels, improved stakeholders' capacity to participate in decision making and implementation processes, a strategic development of sustainable livelihoods, and an overall national and site-specific eco-tourism strategic planning. Moreover, a strategic re-evaluation and overall planning and prioritizing of the country's whole protected areas system, within the context of national and island-specific developmental master plans, can be most desirable, prior to continued development of specific protected areas.

De-centralization of decision making processes and a participatory approach:

The existing institutional culture in many countries, including Cape Verde, favours centralized decision-making processes, which are easier and cheaper to implement. However, since long-term, successful and sustainable management of natural resources requires the development of a strong feeling of ownership, by all stakeholders, and in particular at the local level, it is essential to develop and maintain participatory decision making and implementation mechanisms on all aspects of the protected areas development and management. A participatory approach also provides an added value of capitalizing on a wider knowledge-base and experience. The full involvement of all of the relevant governmental sectors is essential, as well as the securing of full participation of local governments in the whole process, from the first design to all stages of implementation. Most important is the development, adequate budgeting and implementation of mechanisms enabling full participation of local communities representation in the design of all aspects, implementation, and on-going evaluation.

Extending partnerships:

The design and implementation of such a pioneering project, with potential prominent impact on long-term biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources in the country, could benefit significantly from capitalizing on availability of potential partnerships. A wide range of partnerships could provide the project, and the follow-up parks operation, a wide national and international acceptance, support and visibility, as well as technical and financial added support, and a wide consultation forum. Such partnerships could be established, for example, with international environmental NGOs operating in Cape Verde (WWF), international NGOs that may be interested to initiate operation in Cape Verde, international aid agencies and donors, national and

local NGOs and associations (with an added value of their capacity building and strengthening), private sector, etc.

Clear agreements between project partners, staff and stakeholders:

Agreements between all project's partners should be well designed prior to project's initiation and should be as detailed and as clear as possible. Especially a very detailed agreement (possibly as an added annex to the ProDoc) should be elaborated in advance between the key partners of the project (the Government, UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF) and address in advance and in great detail all aspects, including the exit strategy of the project and such issues as continuity of project's activities and use of project's resources following its termination, continued employment of staff trained by the project, etc. Agreements with other project partners (e.g., Peace Corps, micro-credit agencies) should be developed together and include very detailed terms of reference and conditions. Recruited staff Terms of Reference should also be very detailed and include reference to the optional future employment and conditions following the project's termination. Specific staff issues, (e.g. the employment of people in remote places distant from their original residence, and their conditions during and after the project), should also be addressed in advance and in detail. The development of clear agreements with various stakeholders, including other governmental sectors, local governments, etc, are also desirable, and detailed agreements with the representation of local communities are essential. These agreements should also address such issues as rights over resources, resource use, traditional knowledge, inputs, fair benefit sharing, etc. Any grey areas left in agreements when they are signed, may form future conflicts, resulting from differentiated interpretation.

On going communication between project partners, staff, and stakeholders:

In addition to clear and detailed agreements with all relevant project's partners, stakeholders and staff, in advance, it is essential to maintain on-going formal and informal communication channels. Such on-going communication can help resolve any misunderstandings or differential interpretations as soon as they arise. It can particularly maximize cooperation between the various project actors, and thereby maximizing project's achievements and impacts. Specific mechanisms need to be developed and maintained (and budgeted) to enable the required on-going communications channels.

Financial strategic planning:

A strategic approach to project budgeting should be built-in into the project's design, and evaluated and revised throughout the project's implementation. The project's strategic financial planning should focus on sustainability-inducing expenditures, preventing and resolving significant unexpected expenditures, minimizing costs of infrastructure and services, enabling attractive work-conditions for qualified staff and their continuation following the project's termination.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1. Conclusions

The CVPAP Phase I project provided prominent contribution to achieving the defined development goal of conservation of nationally and globally important biodiversity. It also contributed to poverty alleviation within its specific area of influence, through sustainable management of natural resources. It created the first two Protected Areas in Cape Verde, and promoted their legal framework. Outstanding results with down-streaming focus were achieved through the project's activities, in and around the two pilot protected areas. Moreover, through dedicated awareness and education efforts, and through the demonstrating of the two parks' operation, the project established a wide and overwhelming national and local base of support to biodiversity conservation in general

and to developing a national network of protected areas, in particular. In effect, the project “put the protected areas on Cape Verde’s map”, and in more than one way! Specifically, the project created the conditions to enable sustainable management of natural resources in and around the two protected areas. An impressive volume of knowledge base on the two sites was compiled through the project. A capacitated and highly motivated national technical team was established, capable and willing to take the leadership in the development of a national network of protected areas. Conditions were established to enable the active participation and benefiting of local communities around the protected areas, from sustainable management of natural resources and from the development of other sustainable livelihoods. The main weakness of the project is in its failure to establish the conditions for the continuity and sustainability of its achievements. This is embedded in a weak exit strategy, combined with the lack of sufficient focus on up-streaming activities, and on sustainability-inducing activities, through the project’s implementation. It should be noted though that the project was designed as Phase I to be followed by Phase II, and therefore an exit strategy was not required at the design stage. However, it is essential to pay attention to the serious risks resulting from the later replacement of the Phase II with another follow up project, and especially from the unplanned time gap between the two projects. The project’s impact is therefore dependent on the implementation of follow-up activities aiming to secure the continuity of its results. Failing to secure continuity of activities and a smooth transfer to governmental operation of the protected areas, may lead to rapid degradation of achievements, and thereby to an adverse impact and long-term loss of local and national confidence. The long term impact of the project is dependent of the establishment of governmental institutional and financial capacity and sustainability for the development and on-going function of a national network of protected areas. Continued support in the operation of the two protected areas created is essential. A more strategic approach to the design and implementation of specific activities, and a more participatory and decentralized approach to decision making and implementation process could also result with improved sustainability and increased long term impacts.

7.2. Recommendations

The following recommendations are aimed mainly at providing guidance to capitalizing on the project’s achieved results and assets, and to enabling the continuity and sustainability of its achievements, and a long-term impact, as well as recommended approach and activities to enhance the achieving of the project’s goal. They can also contribute to future design of other similar or follow-up projects and activities, in Cape Verde and elsewhere. The recommendations are not listed in accordance with the project’s intended results, but rather in accordance with their attribution, initiating with the more general recommendations and finalizing with several specific recommendations.

1. To establish a national Protected Areas Authority, to achieve a wide basis of agreement, through a participatory consultation process, and to produce the legal instrument, to define its exact function, composition, institutional status, degree of autonomy, authorities and responsibilities of the central and site-specific units, and financial mechanisms.
2. To establish a permanent governmental financial mechanism/budget, to enable the development and on-going operation of a national network of protected areas, and a Protected Areas Authority.
3. To establish further financial mechanisms to enable the on going management of the protected areas and their surroundings.
4. To realize a strategic re-evaluation and overall planning and prioritizing of the country’s whole protected areas system, within the context of national and island-specific developmental master plans, prior to continued development of specific protected areas.

5. To develop a strategic national and site-specific planning approach to specific activities, including the elaboration of national and site-specific strategies for: legislation; institutional capacity building; park staff capacity building and training; communities involvement in income-generating sustainable alternatives and related capacity building and training; small grants and micro-credit programmes; awareness and education; and eco-tourism development and marketing. Future activities in these aspects should be designed and implemented in accordance with the strategic planning.
6. To develop tourism and related activities in and around the protected areas, within the framework of a national eco-tourism strategy, to be developed, aiming to maximize tourism revenues for the protected areas and communities, and minimize tourism adverse impacts.
7. To enhance a participatory approach to decision making and implementation processes, regarding all aspects of park management and natural resources management with all relevant stakeholders, and with focus on local communities, thereby also induce a feeling of ownership.
8. To enhance decentralization of decision making processes and park management implementation.
9. To increase the cooperation with other relevant governmental sectors and with local governments, and to enhance their participation in projects' and activities' design, implementation, evaluation and revision.
10. To reinforce, through a strategic plan, the capacities of relevant governmental departments, local governments, and local associations and communities, to take part in participatory decision making and implementation processes.
11. To promote extension of partnerships, aiming to establish a wider national and international support base, to extend opportunities for technical and financial support, and to establish a wide consultation forum. These can include more partnerships with international NGOs (initiating with WWF-Cape Verde, and attracting others that are not yet involved in the country), aid agencies and donors, national and local NGOs and associations, private sector, etc.
12. To design clear and detailed agreements with all of the project's partners and staff, as well as with relevant stakeholders, referring also to issues concerning the period following the project's termination, and as much as possible without leaving "grey areas" that are open to differentiated interpretations.
13. To establish regular and open on-going communication channels with project partners, staff and relevant stakeholders.
14. To take into account climate change impacts in the design and implementation of future activities in and around protected areas.
15. To provide continued support to the on-going function of the two created protected areas, and to continuity of activities in and around them, during 2-3 more years, aiming to enable smooth transfer to a PAA's responsibility.
16. To include a built-in adequate exit strategy, aiming to secure sustainability, in the design of any future project.

17. To address land-tenure issues in protected area, in accordance with De Witt and Ferreira 2006 recommendations (as also recommended by the MTE), and through negotiations and establishing of an adequate legal framework
18. To re-evaluate, strategically plan, and periodically revise, the protected areas operational budgets, aiming to increase focus on sustainability-inducing activities, and reduce expenditures on infrastructure and services.
19. To design and develop modest infrastructures in protected areas, and in particular modest headquarters facilities, based mainly on local material. Such an approach would not only reduce expenditures but would also provide a desirable message to visitors, donors, staff, government and local communities.
20. To establish adequate work conditions that would attract and enable the recruitment and long-term employment of qualified and committed park management personnel.
21. To promote and enable the continued involvement of staff capacitated through the project, in protected areas management, and to provide the adequate conditions. (Especially, to enable the continued employment of capacitated and motivated project staff members that are interested to remain in the parks, e.g. the former coordinator of Monte Gordo NP).
22. To re-evaluate and revise the micro-credit and small grant programmes and partnering agencies, through a participatory consultation with the local communities, and in accordance with an overall strategic plan. Especially, the micro-credit systems provided by for-profit agencies need to be monitored, re-evaluated and re-considered (e.g. beneficiaries near Monte Gordo NP reported on a system that introduces stress, rather than support, into their lives)
23. To recruit a legal adviser to the protected areas, tasked to minimize legal threats (for example, through establishing indemnity forms for visitors in protected areas).

As noted by the UNDP-GEF RTA, recommendations 1-12, 14, 18 and 23, have already been addressed in the design of the new follow-up project.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: Consulted Documents

- Bernasconi L. (2007). Serra Malagueta - Relatório Florestal – Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and around Protected Areas (Phase 1) Governo de Cabo Verde / GEF / UNDP. Praia – Cabo Verde.
- Bernasconi L. (2007). Monte Gordo- Relatório Florestal – Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and around Protected Areas (Phase 1). Governo de Cabo Verde / GEF / UNDP. Praia – Cabo Verde.
- Boughtflower A. (2006). Ornithological Report; Serra Malagueta, Monte Gordo. Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management In and Around Protected Areas (Phase 1), Government of Cape Verde/GEF/UNDP, Serra Malagueta, Cape Verde.
- Cabral D., Duarte I., Santana N., Graziani P. (2008) . Projecto de Areas Protegidas –. Relatório de Cadastro de Posse, Uso e Aproveitamento da Terra no Parque Natural de Monte Gordo. Gestão Integrada e Participativa dos Ecossistemas nas Areas Protegidas e Envoltentes (Fase I). Governo de Cabo Verde / GEF / UNDP. Monte Gordo, S. Nicolau, Cabo Verde.
- Cardoso J., Oceanografica (www.oceanografica.com) (Undated). Estratégia de Comunicação para as Areas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/GEF/PNUD
- Cesarini D., Furtado A. (2006). Preliminary Ecological Report – Serra malagueta Natural Park – Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura, Direcção Geral do Ambiente, Projectos Areas Protegidas.
- Cesarini D., (2007). Plano de Monitorização – Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta – Gestão Integrada e Participativa dos Ecossistemas nas Areas Protegidas e Envoltentes (Fase I) – MAA/GEF / PNUD, Praia, Cabo Verde, 193 p.
- Cesarini D., (2007). Formação para as Equipas Técnicas e Analise de Diagnostico Ambiental no Planeamento das Areas Protegidas – Projecto das Areas Protegidas – GEF / UNDP – Direcção Geral do Ambiente/ Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura. Praia, Cabo Verde.
- De Wit and Ferreira A. M. (2006). Land Tenure Study - Serra Malagueta and Monte Gordo. PAP, DGA/MAA. 49 pp.
- Furtado A., Carvalho A., Monteiro P. (2008). Relatório de Cadastro de Uso e Posse de Terra – Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta – Projecto Areas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. D.G. Ambiente / MADRRM.
- Forte I., Varela de Pina L. Varela Perreira J. E., Mendes Furtado M. (2008) Plano Estratégico de Ecoturismo 2008-2013 – Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta
- GEF (undated). Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One: “Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas”. 26 pp.
- GEF (2006). The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Evaluation Document nº 1. The Global Environmental Facility.
- GEF (2008). Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations – Evaluation Document nº 3. The Global Environmental Facility.
- Gomes Semedo A. (2009). Relatório de Micro-Crédito do Projecto Areas Protegidas – Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta – FAMI-PICOS.
- Governo de Cabo Verde (2008). Resolução nº 40/2008 de 08 de Dezembro 2008 – I Serie, Nº 45 – B.O da Republica de Cabo Verde – 8 de Dezembro de 2008 – Sobre os Planos de Gestão dos Parques Naturais de Serra Malagueta (Ilha de Santiago) e Monte Gordo (S. Nicolau).
- Government of Cape Verde/UNDP (2003). Project Document - Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas, Phase I. 213 pp.

Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas. Cape Verde Protected Areas Project, Phase I. Atlas Project Number GEF 12226-7, UNDP 12226 PIMS # 1382. Mid Term Review. 28th May – 30th July 2007. Final Report (November 2007).

Lima P.A.S., Borges L.C. (2008). Serviço Nacional para a Gestão e Conservação das Areas Protegidas (Proposta) + Anexos : Nota justificativa para elaboração do Diploma Legislativo de Criação do Instituto Nacional de Gestão das Areas Protegidas (INGAP) – Estatuto do Pessoal do INGAP – Estatuto Orgânica do INGAP ????

Ministère de l’Agriculture, Alimentation et Environnement – SEPA. (1999). Stratégie Nationale et Plan d’Action sur la Biodiversité. Cap Vert.

Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/Direcção Geral do Ambiente and UNDP-GEF (2005). ‘Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas’. Inception Report. PAP. 36 pp.

Ministério do Ambiente Agricultura e Pesca (2005). Decreto Lei No. 56/2005 que aprova a Orgânica do Ministério – B.O. I Serie nº 34 – 22 de Agosto 2005.

Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/Direcção Geral do Ambiente (2007). Projecto Areas Protegidas. Relatório de Actividades do Parque Natural de Monte Gordo.

Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/GEF/PNUD-Projecto Areas Protegidas (Undated). Plano de Gestão do Parque Natural de Monte Gordo.

Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/GEF/PNUD-Projecto Areas Protegidas (2008). Relatório Técnico de Pesquisa (DRAFT) : Uso medicinais e tradicionais de plantas endemias, indigenas e exoticas de Monte Gordo. Parque Natural de Monte Gordo, S. Nicolau, Cabo Verde.

Ministério do Ambiente e Agricultura/GEF/PNUD-Projecto Areas Protegidas (2008). Relatório Técnico : Avaliação do nível de conhecimento escolar sobre ambiente na Ilha de S. Nicolau. Parque Natural de Monte Gordo.

Monteiro P.D., Forte I. (2006) – Relatório Socio-economico – Serra Malagueta – MAA/GEF/PNUD – Projecto das Areas Protegidas.

Office of the United Nations Funds and Programmes in Cape Verde. UNDP/GEF (2009). Protected Areas Project in Cape Verde. Back to the Office Report. Serra da Malagueta. 24-25 July 2009. pp.

Office of the United Nations Funds and Programmes in Cape Verde. (2009) UNDP/GEF. Protected Areas Project in Cape Verde. Back to the Office Report. São Nicolau, 04-05 August 2009. pp.

Ottosson U. J. 2007. Mid Term Evaluation of the WWF Marine and Costal Conservation Project in the Republic of Cape Verde. DGA/MAA - WWF Cape Verde, 27 pp.

Projecto Areas Protegidas (2005). Relatório de Implementação do Sistema de Informação Geografica para a Gestão das areas Protegidas de Serra malagueta (Ilha de Santaigo) e Monto Gordo (S. Nicolau).

Silva de Carvalho M. L. , Araujo S. (2006). Terceiro Relatório Nacional sobre o Estado da Biodiversidade em Cabo Verde. MAA/DGA/UNDP-GEF.

UNDP-GEF/PAP (2008). Project Implementation Review/PIR - Annual Performance Report / APR - Biodiversity. Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management In and Around Protected Areas, Phase I. Cape Verde. 60 pp.

Zandri, E., King, K., and Vera-Cruz, M.T. (2005). Financial Sustainability for National Systems of protected Areas. Project Preparation. Cape Verde. Basic Country Assessment. MAA/DGA/UNDP/UNDP-GEF. 35pp.

Websites:

- www.areasprotegidas.cv
- www.sia.cv
- www.ine.cv
- www.oceanografica.com
- www.unccd.org
- www.millenniumassessment.org

- <http://www.conservation.org/>
- <http://www.ecotour.org/>
- <http://www.world-tourism.org/>
- <http://www.uneptie.org/>
- <http://www.newtourism.com/>
- <http://www.biodiv.org>
- <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>
- <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodologies.htm>

ANNEX II: People Consulted

Jose Levy, Programme Manager, Environment and Natural Disaster Prevention Unit, UNJO, Praia

Maria Teresa Vera Cruz, National Coordinator of the project, NPCU/DGA, Praia

Fabiana Issler, Regional Technical Advisor for Biodiversity, UNDP Environment and Energy Group (EEG), GEF Regional Coordination Unit, Pretoria, South-Africa

Manuel Leao Carvalho, (was responsible for the technical coordination for the elaboration of the management plans for the two protected areas), NPCU/DGA, Praia

Petra Lantz, UN Resident Representative, Praia

Moises Antonio Borges, Director Geral, Direccao Geral do Ambiente (DGA), MADRRM, Praia

Vera Figueiredo, Directora de Servicos de Informacao e Qualidade Ambiental, DGA, MADRRM, Praia

Nuno Ribeiro, Directora de Servico de Gestao de Recursos Naturais, DGA, MADRRM, Praia

Adylson Sousa, Director de Servico de Assuntos Juridicos, Inspeccao e Avaliacao de Impacte Ambiental, DGA, MADRRM, Praia

Ivone Andrade Lopes, Direccao Regional, INDP (former Directora Geral, DGA, former National director of the Project, and former Chair of the Project Steering Committee), MADRRM, Praia

Carlos Monteiro, GEF Political Focal Point, MADRRM, Praia

Emiterio Ramos, Director Geral, Direccao Geral da Agricultura, Silvicultura e Pecuaria (DGASP), Ministerio do Ambiente, Desenvolvimento Rural e Recursos Marinhos (MADRRM), Praia

Armundo Goncalvez, Director Geral do Planeamento, Orcamento e Contas, MADRRM, Praia

Dalia Gomes, Tecnico, Direccao Geral de Desenvolvimento Turistico (DGDT), Ministerio de Economia, Crescimento e Competitividade, Praia

Virna Ramos, Tecnico, DGDT, Ministerio de Economia, Crescimento e Competitividade, Praia

Manuel dos Santos Pinheiro, Director Geral, Direccao Geral do Planeamento (DGP), Ministerio das Financas

Guido Corno, International Consultant, (Environment and Climate Change – Follow-up Project Proposal Development), UNJO

Abdelkader Bensada, former project CTA, Amman, Jordan

Joao gomes Duarte, Presidente, Camara Municipal de Sao Miguel (Santiago)

Enio Fontes, Coordenador do Plano Ambiental Municipal, Camara Municipal de Sao Miguel (Santiago)

Pedro Correia, Assesor do Presidente, Camara Municipal de Sao Miguel (Santiago)

Ilce Amarante, Vereadora, Camara Municipal de Sao Miguel (Santiago)

Idana Soraya Furtado, Delagada do MADRRM, Santa Catarina (Santiago)

Vital Tavares, Responsavel de Ambiente, Agricultura, Desenvolvimento Comunitario, Pecuaria, Pesca, Energia e Agua, Camara Municipal de Santa Catarina (Santiago)

Joao Domingas Correia, Presidente, Camara Municipal do Tarrafal (Santiago)

Jose Pedro, Vereador na area do Ambiente, Camara Municipal do Tarrafal (Santiago)

Joao Monteiro Mascarenhas, Director do Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta, DGA

Silvino Rubalo, Coordenador do Desenvolvimento Comunitario, Parque Natural de Serra Malagueta

Jose Luiz Martns, former Project Coordinator of Serra Malagueta NP, DGA, Santa Catarina

Flores Vindo Furtado, former technician, Segment Ecologico, Serra Malagueta, DGA, Santa Catarina

Felisberto Rodriguez da Silva, Presidente da Associacao, Agro-Gongon, Serra Malagueta, and 12 beneficiaries from the Association

Adilson Cesar Fortes Dias Melicio, Delegado do MADRRM, e Vereador da Camara Municipal, Ribeira Brava, Sau Nicolau

Ivani Duarte, Responsavel, Seguimento Ecologico, Monte Gordo NP

Nelson de Rosalio Santana, Tecnico de Desenvolvimento Comuniario, Monte Gordo NP

Franciscana da Luz Sequeira, Monitora Ambiental, Monte Gordo NP

Silvino da Graca Brito, Guia, Monte Gordo NP

Florianio da Cruz Duarte, Guia, Monte Gordo NP

Jose Duarte Monteiro, Guia, Monte Gordo NP

Lazaro Antonio Sa, former Project Coordinator of Monte Gordo NP, MADRRM, Sao Nicolau

Jose Santos, micro-credit beneficiary, Cabecalinho, Monte Gordo

Jermana Cabral, micro-credit beneficiary, Cabecalinho, Monte Gordo

Saturin Soares, micro-credit beneficiary, Cabecalinho, Monte Gordo

Antonio Husario da Cruz, micro-credit beneficiary, Hortelao, Monte Gordo

Damasio Joaquim Soares Silva, micro-credit beneficiary, Hortelao, Monte Gordo

Henry Weiss, Country Director, Peace Corps, Praia

Ana Lisa Santos Silva, Directora de Programa, Desenvolvimento Comunitario/Desenvolvimento de Pequenos Negocios, Peace Corps, Praia

Celeste Benchimol, National Coordinator, Marine and Coastal Conservation Project, WWF, Praia

ANNEX III: The Project Logical Framework

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Project Development Objective: The conservation of globally significant biodiversity and the reduction of land degradation and desertification in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde.</p>	<p>Populations of endemic and native species within project areas are maintained at stable levels and native vegetation ecosystems are maintained or expanded</p> <p>Soil and water resources within project areas are conserved</p>	<p>Biological monitoring</p> <p>Resource monitoring</p>	<p>Endemic and native species populations have capacity to maintain or recover</p>
<p>Project Immediate Objective: The Government of Cape Verde, in partnership with local communities, will conserve globally and nationally significant biodiversity in six newly established protected areas, and in surrounding landscapes, by developing and applying new strategies for ecosystem protection and sustainable resource management.</p>	<p>1. National system for protected areas and six protected areas operating</p> <p>2. Long-term funding for protected areas system operations is ensured</p> <p>3. Local communities sustainably manage soil, water, and flora/fauna resources and participate in PA planning and management</p>	<p>1. Regulations and management plans</p> <p>2. Budget allocations and fund accounting records</p> <p>3. Project reports and independent evaluations</p>	<p>Government resources to finance long-term recurring PA systems costs are provided</p>
<p>Outcome 1: Policy, legal framework and capacities in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas</p>	<p>Law on Protected Areas and Law on Protection of Fauna and Flora enacted within first 6 months</p> <p>Various media (television, radio and newspapers) have disseminated information on new laws within six months of legislation being enacted</p> <p>At national level, at least one advocacy group (lawyers, artists, businessmen, civic clubs, etc.) for biodiversity conservation created by end of year 1</p> <p>At least one meeting held and one agreement of collaboration with each relevant ministry signed within first 6 months</p> <p>New land tenure systems in place on private lands around parks by end of year 2 (for first two PAs) and by end of year 6 (for remaining four PAs)</p> <p>At least 20 decision-makers educated on importance of biodiversity and protected areas by end of year 2 ½</p> <p>DGASP using native tree species in all reforestation projects in vicinity of PAs by end of year 3</p> <p>MAP actively supporting biological pest control in adjacent landscapes to PAs by end of year 3</p> <p>One national Germplasm bank and/or botanical garden managing</p>	<p>Legal documents</p> <p>Media monitoring report</p> <p>Advocacy group meeting notes</p> <p>Signed agreements with relevant ministries</p> <p>Project documents</p> <p>Training and seminar reports</p> <p>DGASP reforestation workplans and evaluations</p> <p>MAP pest control workplans and evaluations</p> <p>Germplasm bank/botanical garden reports</p> <p>Guidelines published; monitoring reports</p> <p>Training and seminar reports</p>	<p>Government development objectives continue to be supportive of conservation and sustainability</p> <p>State resource management agencies cooperate with conservation/sustainable management objectives</p>

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>program for native plant varieties established by end of year 5 Environmental impact assessment guidelines implemented by end of year 1</p> <p>Also, by end of phase 1 : Two new Laws (on Protected Areas and Law on Protection of Fauna and Flora) enacted; Legal recognition of common property management achieved; Incentives for appropriate private land tenure negotiated; Joint Forest Management Policy Paper formulated; Policies on forest and rangeland protection outside PAs adopted; EIA guidelines established and applied by DGA to all activities requiring EIA; Halving of cases where Sectoral Ministry promote non-sustainable programs</p> <p>And by end of phase 2 : Consolidate implementation of legal and institutional frameworks; Any new issues and policies related to BD conservation and LD covered that may arise; Joint Forest Management Policy Paper adopted; No cases where Sectoral Ministries promote non-sustainable programs.</p>		
<p>Outcome 2: Institutional framework in place for participatory management of ecosystems</p>	<p>At least 2 long term training initiated by end of year 1, and at least 10 short training completed by end of phase 1. PACU (Protected Areas Coordination Unit) formally established and operational by end of year 2 At least 4 strategic plans developed by PACU (BD, SLM, tourism, and monitoring and enforcement) by end of year 2, and operational by beginning of phase 2 Information sharing and coordination mechanisms in place between PACU and PAs, state resource agencies, and international partners by end of year 2 Policies and regulations on visitor/user fees and penalties/fines in place by end of</p>	<p>DGA capacity assessment report</p> <p>Report on PACU organizational development (admin., fin., tech.) Strategic plans</p> <p>Signed agreements with partners</p> <p>Training and seminar reports PACU documents</p> <p>GoCV budget PACU documents</p>	<p>Sufficient numbers of professional PA staff with long-term commitment to PA system are found</p>

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	year 2 Long-term state budget support secured by end of year 6 Framework for long term sustainable financial mechanism developed by year 4, and funding mechanisms in place and operational by end of phase 2		
Outcome 3: Two natural parks created and under participatory community management	Natural parks formally established, staff hired, infrastructure in place (2 by end of year 3, 4 by end of year 5 ½) At least 30 Natural parks managers and staff trained in PA management by end of phase 2 Baseline studies on ecological factors completed by end of year 1 and end of year 5 Baseline studies on socio-economic factors completed by end of year 1 and end of year 5 Zoning classification completed and implemented in the 6 PAs by end of year 5 Steering committee for community participatory management of PAs established and operating at the beginning of establishment of each PA Revenue sharing system with local communities and municipalities negotiated and established by end of year 4. Capacities and institutional mechanisms for local government and communities enhanced, showing concrete instances of joint management and important decision making in all PAs by end of year 6 6 PA master plans and sub-plans implemented by year 5 Regular bi-yearly inventories of flora and fauna conducted in 6 PAs, and data base created by end of phase 1 Modelling of erosion and land degradation in all projects sites and baseline rates of LD established by end of phase 1 Regular inventorying of BD and LD show impact of project by end of phase 2 At least 10 instances of sharing of experiences with others outside Cape Verde by end of phase 2 PA systems for visitor/user fees and penalties/fines implemented in all PAs by end of year 5 Trust fund for PA system in place	Legal documents Training and seminar reports Baseline reports Baseline reports PA planning documents Committee meeting minutes Planning documents Monitoring data Coordination agreement PA regulations Fund documents GoCV budget	Sufficient numbers of professional PA staff with long-term commitment to working in remote PAs are found Community members actively support and participate in PA planning and management

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>by end of year 7 Long-term state budget support for PA management (staff, operations) secured by end of year 7</p>		
<p>Outcome 4: Strengthen capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable integrated, participatory ecosystem management</p>	<p>At least 12 Local farmer and herder associations able to engage in management decisions collectively related to BD and LD issues by end of year 4 At least 600 Local stakeholders trained and educated on sustainable resource management At least 6 Mini-grant facilities for non-profit sustainable use of biodiversity operating in all local communities adjacent to all PAs, and giving clear evidence of sustainable use by end of year 5</p> <p>By end of phase 1 : At least 10% of farmers (conservation farming, composting, horticulture, etc.) At least 4 Pasture Management Committees have adopted management plans, and facilitated implementation of land rehabilitation (vegetation enrichment, water catchments, grazing rotations) and pasture monitoring. System of payment of grazing and watering fees in improved pastures developed and tested in at least 2 sites. At least one community woodlot created in each project site using endemic or non-invasive species; Rational techniques for charcoal and wood cutting demonstrated for communities around 2 PAs. Soil and water conservation techniques (including bunding, windbreaks, live hedges) applied on 10% of farmland. At least 6 local communities participate in State reforestation activities and are given sustainable use rights for wood and forest resources. At least 5% of farmers test alternatives to agro-chemicals, including biological pest control. At least 2 communities test techniques for control of <i>Fulgcraea</i>, and eradication of Lantana including use as crafts</p>	<p>Signed agreements and meeting reports</p> <p>Education curricula and training reports</p> <p>Pasture management committee minutes and monitoring reports</p> <p>Project resource monitoring reports</p> <p>Project resource monitoring reports</p> <p>DGASP resource monitoring reports</p> <p>Farmer surveys and field analysis</p> <p>Monitoring reports</p> <p>Local population surveys; species monitoring reports</p> <p>Grant facility reports</p>	<p>Global warming will not worsen long-term weather conditions or extreme events (e.g. droughts) to a degree that prevents effective resource conservation</p> <p>State resource management agencies cooperate with conservation/sustainable management objectives</p>

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>and tools. Children in at least 4 schools in project zone aware of problem of hunting of threatened species and pledge not to hunt them.</p> <p>By end of phase 2: Testing and fine-tuning of at least 5 appropriate techniques with the local communities for grazing, sustainable use, and adaptive management of natural resources; More intensive and diversified farming systems adopted among at least 50% of farmers All Pasture Management Committees have adopted and implemented management plans. System of payment of grazing and watering fees in improved pastures operational and receipts feed into community micro-funds. All community woodlots produce enough fuelwood to cover 30% of rural energy needs. Adoption of rational techniques for charcoal and wood cutting result in a savings of 20% of woody biomass. Soil and water conservation techniques applied and erosion reduced by 50% in all project areas. All local communities have sustainable use rights in State Reforestation plots in project zone. At least one successful environmentally friendly pest management technique adopted among 20% of farmers in project zone. Density of <i>Fulgcræa</i> reduced by 20% in project zone, and incomes increased as a result. Hunting and harvesting pressure on threatened species reduced by 40%.</p>		
<p>Outcome 5: Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities</p>	<p>At least 6 communities have developed a Strategy and Options for Alternative livelihood programs, including training and awareness raising by end of year 4 At least 6 Community-based Credit and Savings Schemes adapted to local conditions designed, capitalised and operating by end of year 4</p>	<p>Strategic plans Project documents/reports Project documents/reports; marketing plans and materials Project documents/reports Credit/savings system</p>	

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>Regulations and models for rural tourism and local involvement applied in all PAs by end of year 6.</p> <p>Ecotourism regulations and programs are in place at each PA at the creation of each PA</p> <p>Income from tourism visits have increased by 50% (compared to Fogo in 2002), by end of year 7</p> <p>Local incomes from tourism (crafts, lodging, etc.) increased by 50% by the end of the project.</p> <p>Credit and savings system for profit-generating micro-projects operating in all requesting communities, with no micro-projects showing negative impacts on the environment, by year 6</p> <p>Local NGOs, private sector, and/or Municipalities have created and are operating an “investment advice facility” and a public environmental information service to ensure environmental sustainability, in each PA zone, by the end of year 6</p>	reports	
<p>Outcome 6: National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals</p>	<p>At least two major public awareness campaigns on environment and PAs completed by year 3, including two training sessions for journalists, dissemination of print/audio/video media materials, creation and sales of PA field guides and maps, and promotion of PAs in public and private tourism publications</p> <p>Sales of PA field guides and maps for all PAs generates at least \$4000 per year in revenue starting in year 4</p> <p>Education curriculum and demos/competitions for biodiversity conservation developed for High School and elementary School by year 3, and applied in at least 20 schools all over the country by year 6</p> <p>At least 10 Parliamentarians and decision-makers educated on and supporting biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource use by year 4, and the majority of Parliamentarians and decision-makers supporting biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource use by the end of the project.</p> <p>NGO partners for conservation supporting project activities, with</p>	<p>Training session reports; publications and media materials</p> <p>Teaching materials/curricula; project reports</p> <p>Seminar reports; policy and legislative documents</p> <p>Cooperation agreements with NGOs; NGO plans and reports</p>	<p>Legislative and policy decision-makers support conservation and resource management goals</p> <p>Effective local NGOs emerge that are supportive of environmental goals</p>

Project Objective and Components	Verifiable Indicators	Source of Verification	Assumptions
	at least one NGO at each project site actively promoting project environmental objectives by year 2		

ANNEX IV: The Terms of Reference of the Final Evaluation

Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas, Phase I

Financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through the United Nations Joint Office in Cape Verde (UNJO)

In partnership with
General Direction of Environment, under the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources
US Peace Corps
German Cooperation Agencies BMZ and GTZ

Project short name:	“Cape Verde PAs - Phase I”
GEFSEC Project ID:	1124
UNDP PIMS No.:	1382
Atlas Project Number:	00012226-7
Project Duration:	48 months
Beneficiary Country:	Cape Verde
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity
GEF3 Strategic Priority:	Biodiversity
Date of Entry into Work Programme:	02 August 2002
Project Document Signature Date:	01 October 2003
Date of First Disbursement:	April 2004
Original Planned Closing Date:	30 Sept 2007
Revised Planned Closing Date:	30 June 2009
Executing Modality:	National execution (NEX)

1. Introduction

Project Brief Description

In partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Government of Cape Verde is currently implementing an integrated programme which aims at conserving globally significant biodiversity in Cape Verde through the creation and consolidation of the national system of protected areas (PAs). The system encompasses five of Cape Verde’s nine islands and targets a representative sample of six critical terrestrial ecosystems that are unique to the archipelago. The programme was designed to significantly strengthen capacities for PA management in the country in its efforts to conserve the island’s ecosystems and undertake long-term adaptive management against potential future degradation of Cape Verde’s environment. It is also expected to contribute to sustainable development and poverty alleviation in the project’s zone of influence as well as to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

Apart from its primary conservation focus, the integrated programme was generally slated to also contribute to halting and reversing existing degradation of land and water resources within the protected areas and adjacent landscapes at the same time that it promotes the creation of income-generating alternative livelihood options for local communities that live in the surroundings of the PAs.

The integrated programme was designed to last seven to eight years divided into two subsequent phases, which were both pipelined at the November 2002 GEF Work Programme. The approval of the Phase II (initially planned for 2009-2012) would normally be linked to the successful implementation of the Phase I, as assessed through its final evaluation.

The project to be evaluated (1382 Cape Verde PAs Phase I) covers the first phase of the mentioned long-term intervention and has been under implementation since late 2003. With changing policies in the GEF, but also internally in Cape Verde, specific priorities for the longer-term expansion of the country’s PA system changed and the ‘phased’ approach focusing strictly on terrestrial ecosystem was dropped in favour of a wider and more inclusive approach.

Hence, the focus of the follow-up project to be financed by the GEF (currently under preparation) is on an overall consolidation of the national PA system, including both terrestrial and marine PAs.

Given that the new pipeline project (4176 Consolidation of Cape Verde's PAs) does not necessarily constitute a 'second phase', but rather a follow-up project to 'Phase I', the automatic approval based on a positive assessment by the final evaluation no longer applies. The new project needed to be conceived and pipelined under the GEF4 financing cycle. Still, the GEF is conditioning the CEO Endorsement of the new project (planned to be submitted by July 2009) to submittal of the final evaluation of the GEF3 'Phase I' project (as of GEF Secretariat's Review Sheet).

The '1382 Cape Verde PAs Phase I' project is implemented by the Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources¹ through the General Direction of Environment (DGA) on the basis of national execution modalities and the support of UNDP as GEF implementing agency. DGA is the institutional focal point, responsible for project implementation and facilitation of operational procedures with the Office of the United Nations Funds and Programmes (representing UNDP in Cape Verde) and other funding partners.

The Cape Verde PAs Phase I project has been implemented over a four-year period, having effectively started in April 2004 (first disbursement) and expected to end in early/mid 2009. The primary focus has been on the institutional, policy and legal frameworks, and on building capacity (long and short term training, exchanges, mentoring, etc.) at local and national levels for managing the PA system. The key outcome of Phase I is the establishment of two pilot PAs, one in Santiago Island (Serra da Malagueta) and another in São Nicolau Island (Monte Gordo). The project, which became the core of a protected area authority to be created, assumed since 2006 several tasks linked to supporting the management of the Natural Park in Fogo Island, which receives German co-funding.

Project Sites

Serra Malagueta: The Serra Malagueta mountain range runs through the north and northeastern part of Santiago Island, and contains the island's greatest number (28) of endemic plant species, 14 of which are classified as threatened on the Cape Verde Red List. Endemic fauna species include *Buteo buteo bannermani*, *Apus alexandri*, *Falco tinunculus*, *Halcyon leucocephala* and *Sylvia atricapilla*. The project site covers an area of 774 ha along the western escarpments of the ranges, ranging in altitude from 800 to 1,064 meters. This area includes the most significant forest zones on the island of Santiago. The most important threats to Serra Malagueta are land clearance for agriculture and the disappearance of native habitat due to invasions of exotic floral species.

Monte Gordo: This area is 952 hectares ranging from 900 and 1312 m located in the western mountains of São Nicolau and includes a large representative sample of a humid ecosystem on the island, as well as one of the most important agricultural mountain ecosystems on Cape Verde. Ecosystem variation is very high in this area, from dry zones in the south and southwest to heavily vegetated zones in the north and northeast that benefit from cloud-derived moisture and heavy rainfall. Of the fauna and flora species inventoried in the area, 46 are endemics (representing 56% of the total species found in the region), and 12 of these endemic species are in the Cape Verde Red List.

Applicable Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

According to UNDP's and the GEF's policies and procedures, all full-size and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo both a mid-term and a final evaluation.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other GEF-financed projects, implemented by UNDP.

Project Goal, objective and its context

The development goal of the project (although referred to in the project document as 'objective') is the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and the reduction of land degradation and desertification in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde.

The operational (or immediate) objective of the project was thus defined:

¹ Formerly, the Ministry of Environment and Agriculture (MAA).

The Government of Cape Verde, in partnership with local communities, will conserve globally and nationally significant biodiversity in six newly established protected areas, and in surrounding landscapes, by developing and applying new strategies for ecosystem protection and sustainable resource management.

In order to meet the project objective, six outcomes were identified:

1. Policy & legal framework in place for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas
2. Institutional framework in place for participatory management of protected areas
3. Two and later four national parks created and under participatory community management
4. Strengthened capacity of local actors, and promote sustainable resource management
5. Local communities benefiting from alternative livelihood opportunities
6. National stakeholders aware and supportive of environmental conservation goals

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) for the project was carried out in June 2007. The MTE found good progress in many of the project objectives. More specifically, project outputs linked to the policy and legal framework for conservation of biodiversity and management of protected areas, as well as those linked to the environmental education awareness program for local and national stakeholders had produced positive results. The MTE also made several important recommendations, including an extension of the project duration, so that the project goals could be met and project activities become sustainable in the long run.

2. Objectives and Principles of the evaluation:

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to examine the conception, design, implementation modality, efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and analyze the methods used and the ways in which progress was made. The evaluators are also requested to prepare detailed, analytical and feasible recommendations and lessons learnt for future comparable UNDP/GEF projects.

In line with applicable the GEF's, UNDP's and UNEP's evaluation policies, this final evaluation will be undertaken according to the following principles:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

3. Scope of the Evaluation

The following elements will be covered by this evaluation:

1. Assess progress towards attaining the project's contribution to achieve national and global environmental objectives (national objectives are to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity resources while the global objectives remain to safeguard biodiversity of global importance and contribute to reduce global environmental impacts from loss of biodiversity at the local level). Assess the results and achievements of the Project in the period June 2007 (date of the last evaluation) to December 2008. In particular, the mission should focus on the following aspects:

- List the main achievements of the project and assess their effectiveness in addressing the biodiversity conservation and human development issues of the both target protected areas.
- Assess whether the project has produced its outputs effectively and efficiently and identify the major factors, which have facilitated or impeded the progress of the project in achieving its goal and desired results.
- Assess the recent developments and current status of conservation policies connected to the project goals and sustainability of project outcomes.
- Determine the effect of the project on target groups, and in particular the quality, usefulness and sustainability of the project's achievements and outputs in terms of improving the capacity of local staff for the sustainable management of biodiversity of both protected areas.
- Determine the degree of support given by the Government of Cape Verde (GoCV) in integrating the project objectives and goals into the national development program and other related projects.

- Assess whether GoCV's inputs, at national and local level, were sufficient and how they should be improved.
 - Assess the contribution of the UNJO Country Office and the role it has played as catalyst in mobilizing co-funding to the GEF project and in promoting and facilitating the implementation of other bi-lateral development projects in both sites.
2. Identify the main lessons learned during implementation, identify the major impediments encountered and make specific recommendations to address these findings. Describe these main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
- Strengthening country ownership/drivenness on protected areas and ecosystems conservation especially in terms of commitment of the local people and their institutions, local and national governments and other key conservation partners
 - Strengthening stakeholder participation in the process of applying participatory integrated conservation and development approaches.
 - Transfer of knowledge gained through this project in management of PAs.
3. Assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes and benefits after termination of GEF and other funding.

The main emphasis of the evaluation is on the lessons learned, so that experiences from this project can be taken further to the other UNDP/GEF projects on the sector. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

4. Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be carried out by a team made up of one international evaluator and one national evaluator, assisted by the Environment Unit of the UNJO and by project staff in Praia and in the PA sites. The team is expected to combine international calibre evaluation expertise with knowledge of the environment sector in Cape Verde.

Team Qualities:

- Recent knowledge of result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Recent knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Recent knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Experience applying UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects
- Recognized expertise in the management of island biodiversity and/or arid and semi-arid ecosystems
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in Cape Verde
- Demonstrated analytical skills
- Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported conservation projects
- Both team members with excellent Portuguese communication skills (or Spanish for the international evaluator) and English (oral, aural, written and presentation).

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for a position. Joint proposals from two independent evaluators or from recognized consulting firms to field a complete team with the required expertise are welcome.

The consultants will need to be independent from project implementation and be fully acquainted with relevant M&E policies of the GEF and UNDP.

Both consultants should become fully familiar with the project through a review of relevant documents prior to beginning travel to the country / initiation of the assignment. These documents include:

- Project document
- Work plans and project budgets
- Inception Report
- Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- MTE report and its management response
- Minutes of technical committees
- Minutes of steering committees
- The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, February 2006
- The Evaluation Policy of UNDP, May 2006
- Recent project reports and publications

The above-referenced documents shall be available to the evaluators in advance of the mission and, to the extent possible, in electronic format. Any other reports produced in the realm of the project (including those of the PDF Phase), website, publications, correspondence etc. which are considered relevant to the evaluation may be availed by the project team after their arrival in Cape Verde.

5. Duration

The consultant team will be recruited for a period of 4 weeks. During the contract period, each team member is expected to provide the following working time input:

- Team Leader / International Conservation Consultant, 4 weeks
- National Conservation Consultant, 4 weeks

The consultation will include three weeks of field and office work in Cape Verde and one week of final project report elaboration. Field visits of two days for each of the sites will be undertaken.

6. Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with the UNJO in Cape Verde, being thereby the main operational point for the evaluation, responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with DGA and Government counterparts. The Office of UN Funds and Programmes in Cape Verde will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team.

7. Evaluation Products

The evaluation team is expected to produce a Final Evaluation Report (no more than 40 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes), in English and structured along the following lines:

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Executive summary2) Introduction3) The project(s) and its development context4) Findings and Conclusions<ol style="list-style-type: none">4.1 Project formulation4.2 Implementation4.3 Results5) Recommendations6) Lessons learned7) Annexes

The evaluation report should include ratings on the following two aspects:

- Sustainability
- Outcome/Achievement of objectives

The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

Evaluators are also encouraged to provide ratings for three key areas included in the final evaluation:

- Implementation strategy / approach;
- Stakeholder participation / public involvement; and
- Monitoring & Evaluation.

The report will equally assess whether the project co-financing has sufficiently realised, by completing the table in Annex.

The final report will be handed over to UNJO in English, in electronic format MS Word document. UNJO will acknowledge the receipt of the report and thereafter the Resident Representative will clear it, so final payment can be effected. The final version has to be proof-read and otherwise in a form allowing direct distribution.

The report delivery should follow the following stages:

- Debriefing with the project focal points at both UNJO and DGA. A brief Aide Memoire or Power Point Presentation may be used to present preliminary evaluation results. The UNJO will ensure translation to Portuguese.
- Submission of first draft, within 2 weeks after the mission. If payment is arranged in two tranches, the first tranche may be paid upon delivery of the draft report.
- UNJO will arrange for translation of the draft, which will be reviewed by the national evaluation consultant.
- Comments from relevant stakeholders should be received by the evaluators within 20 working days after receipt of the draft report. UNJO will ensure that all comments are duly remitted to the evaluators.
- The final report should be delivered 2 weeks after that comments have been received. Evaluators will strive to mark any changes from the draft to the final version, in order to facilitate the translation of the final report.
- If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

8. Methodology of evaluation approach:

The evaluation methodology guidelines are provided below. Any changes should be in conformity with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group 7). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The evaluation will be carried out by the team through:

Documentation review (desk study); the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in Section 5 of these TORs. These documents will be availed by DGA/Project office and/or UN.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and entities :

- UNDP: represented by the UNJO in Cape Verde Resident Representative and the members of the Environment Unit, and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Adviser for Biodiversity.
- Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources
- DGA: Director General, all relevant units and experts
- Project team: National Coordination Unit in Praia (including Project Director, National Coordinator, Chief Technical Advisor and support staff), Site Coordinators (for Serra da Malagueta and Monte Gordo Natural Parks) and respective technical and operations teams
- DGASP: Forestry Service
- Directorate General of Planning, Ministry of Finances and Public Administration
- Directorate General of International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Cooperation and Communities
- Directorate General of Tourism Development, Ministry of Economy, Growth and Competitiveness
- Municipalities surrounding the national parks
- Project Steering Committee
- Technical Committee
- Park resource users and visitors: through the use of targeted surveys or visits to adjacent farms, villages and towns.

ANNEX V: The Final Evaluation Power Point Presentation

Annexed as a separate file

ANNEX VI: Short Profiles of the Evaluators

Tamar Ron:

Ph.D. Zoology (Univ. of Natal, SA, specialized in primates behavioural ecology); M. Sc., Environmental Biology (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem), B.Sc., Biology (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem). More than 20 years experience in biodiversity conservation. During last 5 years an independent biodiversity conservation consultant. Consultancies related to project development, training and capacity building, strategic documents development and consolidation, policy proposals, coastal planning, Trans-Frontier Conservation Areas regional framework. Consultancies provided to Southern African development Community (SADC), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), UNDP, the Government of Angola, Provincial Governments of Cabinda and Kuando-Kubango, Angola, the Government of Namibia, the Government of Israel.

Previously was Biodiversity Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) to the Government of Angola, through UNDP and NORAD, during 5 years. Was responsible for the development and implementation of environmental support projects, and supported the Government in developing policies and legislation, capacity building, strategic planning, and specific community-based conservation initiatives and trans-frontier conservation initiatives. Prior to that acted as the Wildlife Ecologist of the Nature Reserves Authority and CITES Scientific Authority, of Israel, during 8 years.

Extensive experience in teaching and training in various levels and frameworks, including University graduate and post graduate courses (conservation biology and animal behaviour, at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Agostinho Neto University, Luanda, Angola). Particular experience in Projects participatory design, development and implementation.

Charles Yvon Rocha:

Certificate of Environmental Sciences (University of Dakar – Senegal, Faculty of Science - Institute of Environment Science). Master of Geography (University of Dakar – Senegal, Faculty of Human Science). More than 15 years experience working as Technical Assistant, National and International Expert in specific national and international institutions ((Executive Secretariat of the CILSS: *Inter States Committee to Combat Drought in Sahel*; Ministry of Finance and Public Administration; National Director of the European Development Fund (EDF) - Ministry of Finance, Planning and Regional Development of Cape Verde; Institute of Higher Education - Ministry of Education of Cape Verde). Also had experience relevant in UN Environmental Conventions and UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG). Extensive experience in teaching (Geography and Ecology) as Associate Professor and Projects Studies and Planning as a General Coordinator, in the Institute of Higher Education / University of Cape Verde.

Previously, was the person in charge of the national and regional Programme Management Units and had conducted all projects implementation/execution by local communities and NGO; organized and trained the Stakeholders in management projects and reporting activities; assessed the national and regional Steering Committees; monitored projects execution; implemented a network of national and *sahelian* Experts charged with assisting stakeholders; assessed and reinforced on the experiences gained from projects execution in all the Cape Verde and others States.

As independent National Consultant / Environment expert: (i) had advised the UN-Coordinator Resident and Deputy Resident Representative / Programmes Coordinator in the UN-Joint Office Cape Verde; and assumed the interim of the *Head of Unit Environment and Disaster Prevention*. (ii) had advised the FAO Resident Representative in Cape Verde, in the context of the *One UN Programme – Delivering as One Pilot Countries*. (iii) was involved in “TCP-CPLP/FAO Technical Cooperation Project: “*Formulation of a Programme to implement the UNCCD in CPLP Countries*”. CPLP – FAO – Cape Verde Environment & Rural Development Ministry. (iv) Assured the Training of the Municipalities Technicians in “*Environment Impacts in the Infrastructures Project in Cape Verde*”, managed by the Ministry of Infrastructures and Financed by the European Union.

ANNEX VII: GEF Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tools

Annexed as a separate file