



**C.A.P.E. BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND  
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT  
(BCSD)**

**TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**PHILIP TORTELL, *Consultant***

**July 2010**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous assistance I received from many individuals and organizations in carrying out this evaluation.

Firstly, I would like to thank the staff of the C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit led by the Coordinator Dr Mandy Barnett, who received me warmly, shared their experience of the project with me and provided me with all the documents and other information I requested. The Unit was also most helpful by arranging the schedule of appointments in Cape Town and throughout Cape Province and assisting with logistics for field visits. The insights provided by all those involved in the implementation of the Project were invaluable. Their warmth and hospitality were greatly appreciated.

I also wish to extend my thanks to officials from SANBI, CapeNature, Eastern Cape Parks Board, SANParks, Wilderness Foundation, Rhodes University, WWF, Table Mountain Fund, City of Cape Town and all others who met with me, described their relationship with the project and shared their views and experiences of the Project and its various activities with me in a transparent manner.

Finally, I would like to thank the Joint World Bank/UNDP Mission Team for inducting me into and updating me on the intricacies of the project, and providing me with background and extensive briefings.

To all the above, as well as to those who provided me with written comments on the draft report, I am sincerely grateful.



**Philip Tortell**

**CONSULTANT**

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT LIMITED**

**P O Box 27 433, Wellington, NEW ZEALAND**

**Tel +64-4-384 4133, Fax +64-4-384 4022, Email <[tortell@attglobal.net](mailto:tortell@attglobal.net)>**

# CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 The Project	9
1.1.1 Project setting	9
1.1.2 Problems that the project seeks to address	9
1.1.3 Development and immediate objectives of the project	10
1.1.4 Main stakeholders	10
1.1.5 Results expected	11
1.2 The Evaluation	12
1.2.1 The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Principles	12
1.2.2 Evaluation objectives and Terms of Reference	12
1.2.3 Mission activities and assignment timeline	13
1.3 Methodology and approach	14
1.3.1 Documents and websites reviewed and consulted	14
1.3.2 Consultation with key stakeholders and beneficiaries	14
1.3.3 The basis for evaluation	15
1.3.4 The rating system	15
1.4 Structure of this report	16
<b>2 FINDINGS: PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Project concept	17
2.2 Project design	17
<b>3 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 Project governance	19
3.1.1 Execution and implementation	19
3.1.2 Project steering	19
3.1.3 Project coordination	20
3.1.4 The role of Government	21
3.1.5 The role of World Bank and UNDP	21
3.2 Financial management	22
3.2.1 Budget and financial planning	22
3.2.2 Co-financing	23
3.3 Partnership strategy and stakeholder participation	24
3.3.1 Partners and partnership strategy	24
3.3.2 Participation at the project formulation phase	25
3.3.3 Participation during the implementation phase	25
3.4 Monitoring and evaluation	27
3.4.1 M&E design, planning and implementation	27
3.4.2 Project monitoring, the LogFrame Matrix, and adaptive management	29
3.4.3 The Mid-Term Evaluation	31
3.4.4 Protected area monitoring and the METT	32
3.4.5 Risks and assumptions	33
<b>4 FINDINGS: RESULTS AND IMPACTS</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1 Results achieved	35
4.1.1 Measuring progress and success	35
4.1.2 The Project Development Objective	35

4.1.3	The Immediate Objectives	37
4.1.3.1	Immediate Objective 1	37
4.1.3.2	Immediate Objective 2	42
4.2	Awareness and information management	51
4.3	Project impacts	52
4.3.1	Impact analysis	52
4.3.2	Global environmental impacts	54
4.3.3	National level impacts	54
4.4	Overall conclusion on project results and impacts	54
<b>5</b>	<b>FINDINGS: RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1	Relevance of the project results to the needs of the CFR	56
5.2	Effectiveness of project execution	56
5.3	Sustainability Plan	57
<b>6</b>	<b>RATINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>60</b>
6.1	Assessment and ratings summary	60
6.2	Conclusions	62
6.2.1	Project formulation	62
6.2.2	Project Governance, Coordination and Partnerships	62
6.2.3	Implementation approach and institutional arrangements	62
6.2.4	Project financial management	63
6.2.5	Risks management	63
6.2.6	Monitoring and Adaptive Management	63
6.2.7	Results and Impacts	63
6.2.8	Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability	64
6.3	Overall conclusion	64
<b>7</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>		
1	Evaluation Terms of Reference	
2	Credentials of the evaluator	
3	Mission schedule and project timeline	
4	Documents reviewed and/or consulted	
5	Persons met and consulted	
6	Stakeholders involvement in implementation	
7	Stakeholder events organized by the Project	
8	Management response to the MTE, with update	
9	METT score sheets	
10	Self-assessment by the PMU on results achieved	
11	Project products	

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BCSD	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development (Project)
C.A.P.E.	Cape Action for People and the Environment
CapeNature	Western Cape Nature Conservation Board
CCC	CAPE Coordination Committee
CCU	CAPE Coordination Unit
CEPF	Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund
CFR	Cape Floristic Region
CIC	CAPE Implementation Committee
CN	CapeNature
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DEADP	Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning
DEAET	Department of Economic Affairs, Environment and Tourism
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
EA	Executing Agency (for the purpose of the GEF)
EXCO	Executive Committee (of the Cape Coordinating Committee)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency (for the purpose of the GEF)
LogFrame	Logical Framework Matrix
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCM	Marine and Coastal Management
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OP	Operational Programme (of the GEF)
PA	Protected Area
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PIR	Project Implementation Review
SANBI	South Africa National Biodiversity Institute
SANParks	South African National Parks
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (of the GEF)
TE	Terminal Evaluation
THETA	Tourism, Hospitality, Sport Education and Training Authority
TMF	Table Mountain Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WF	Wilderness Foundation
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## The Project

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation of the GEF/World Bank/UNDP/ Government of South Africa Project “*Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development*” under the C.A.P.E. Programme. The World Bank and UNDP served as Implementing Agencies for the sake of the GEF and the project was executed by the South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and three sub-executing agencies (CapeNature, SANParks and the Wilderness Foundation). Project activities were coordinated by the CAPE Coordination Unit (CCU) established for the purpose by SANBI and based in Cape Town. The Project website can be found at: <http://www.capeaction.org.za/> .

The **Project Development Objective** was “*to support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful Project outcomes*”.

It also had two Immediate Objectives as follows:

- **Immediate Objective 1:** “*A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities*”
- **Immediate Objective 2:** “*Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management*”

Work towards the first Immediate Objective comprised three Components, namely, Institutional strengthening, Conservation education, and Programme and Project coordination, management and monitoring. And a further three Components were expected to contribute to the second Immediate Objective, viz., Protected areas, Biodiversity economy and conservation stewardship, and Watershed management.

The project had an initial total budget of US\$55.13 million and the GEF provided the only identifiable cash input of US\$11 million. While the original co-funding estimate was US\$44.13 million, this was exceeded by a significant amount.

## The Evaluation

Like all GEF Terminal Evaluations, this TE is being carried out:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

The approach adopted was participatory which, while safeguarding the independence of the Evaluator, included self-assessments by the CAPE Coordination Unit. A six-point rating system was applied to elements of the Project, in particular on progress towards the Objectives and Outcomes.

## Key Findings and Conclusions

### Project formulation

The project concept was sound with a reasonable timescale and an adequate budget. However, the project design was complex and the degree of relevance of some of its components to its objectives

was not always clear. Project formulation was undertaken in a participatory manner, involving a broad range of stakeholder groups using a number of different information gathering methods.

### **Project Governance, Coordination and partnerships**

Governance of the project was complex and multi-layered, but it worked satisfactorily. The fact that the project was embedded in the wider C.A.P.E. Programme worked in its favour and ensured a high level of involvement by many stakeholders especially at the provincial level, but also at national level. It was a good example of collaboration between Government organizations and between Government and non-Government partners. The CCU has played a crucial role in the coordination of the project which has been carried out effectively and efficiently. The small team has worked well together, cohesively, with good leadership and excellent team spirit. It is held in high regard by all those consulted.

### **Implementation approach and institutional arrangements**

Setting the BCSD project within the wider C.A.P.E. Programme context, which was being implemented by an existing organization, was probably instrumental in its success. The partnerships which had already been forged, the consultative and governance processes which were already in place, the technical support which was available, all stood the project in good stead and allowed it to benefit from on-going complementary initiatives. This approach was efficient and cost-effective. Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in project implementation. Information has been well-managed. It has been shared with partners and beyond and it has served as one mechanism holding the partnership together.

### **Project Financial Management**

Financial planning and management of the financial resources and reporting as a means of accountability has been as complex as other aspects of the project. However, they have been carried out diligently and effectively. The amount of co-funding pledged far exceeded the GEF requirement and the amount actually delivered was even more impressive.

### **Risk management**

A number of problems and constraints which could impact on the successful delivery of the project were identified at the project design stage. Others were raised as part of the Mid-Term Evaluation. In the event, half of the risks identified either did not eventuate or they were mitigated successfully and no new risks emerged during project implementation. Of the risks that eventuated, three were not successfully mitigated.

### **Monitoring and Adaptive Management**

The project M&E Plan comprised an impressive, comprehensive matrix which more than satisfied GEF requirements. The matrix has served as an effective basis for monitoring performance, reporting progress and informing management to take any necessary corrective action. The only weakness of this approach was that the M&E matrix was based on Indicators gleaned from the LogFrame which, even when amended by subsequent revisions, were weak and unhelpful. As a result, the project often set about achieving the Indicators rather than the Outcomes and Objectives they were meant to measure progress towards. At times the project seemed to set aside the Indicators and work effectively towards the Outcomes. With a stronger set of Indicators which satisfy the SMART criteria, this approach to monitoring and adaptive management could be considered best practice.

### **Results and Impacts**

In spite of the fact that some Indicators in the LogFrame were not completely specific or relevant to the Objective, indications are that the Development Objective has, in the main, been achieved. This conclusion is supported by the Close-out reports, PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, consultations and field visits. It is also very likely that the results achieved under Immediate Objective 1 will make a significant contribution to a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities. However, mainstreaming is a difficult result to ascertain and better Indicators were necessary. A number of piloting initiatives were carried out successfully under Immediate Objective 2, but whether these results achieved "*enhancement of CFR conservation*" is too early to tell.

However, the models are sound and if they are sustained, can be expected to lead to this ultimate result. The project targeted many foundational and intermediate products and it achieved most of these successfully. Some progress has also been made towards true results and impacts but the full impact of the project will only accrue in time, and in conjunction with other initiatives.

### **Relevance, effectiveness and sustainability**

Project activities have been very relevant to the needs of the CFR and they were carried out effectively in general. Most products have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies at both national and provincial levels. However, some institutionalization is dependent on funds becoming available and financial sustainability is not yet secure for some activities. On the other hand, there are good prospects for ecological sustainability with the stewardship scheme, management plans, the widespread use of the METT, etc, in place.

### **Overall conclusion**

This has been a successful project. Through its plans, strategies, methodologies, and pilots it has laid a good foundation for biodiversity conservation in the CFR. Its results are mainly intermediate at this stage and its impacts will accrue through the use of its products and the application of its services by the responsible institutions. Cooperation and collaboration are the most distinguishing features of the project - between the GEF IAs, between the EAs, and between various other stakeholders. It is a model which is rarely encountered, certainly not to this extent. Good progress has been made towards the Development Objective and both Immediate Objectives which have been met, in the main, and the Outputs have been achieved. Two Outcomes and two Sub-Outcomes are seen as Highly Satisfactory. Serious efforts have gone into ensuring sustainability for the project products, and it is generally very likely.

### **Recommendations**

The following is more of an exhortation than a recommendation and it is made primarily to SANBI as the coordinator of the C.A.P.E. Programme, in search of sustainability for the products and services of BCSD especially those that have been tested and merit scaling up and replication.

SANBI should ensure that the next phase of the CAPE Programme makes provision for the following elements:

- Safeguard its own coordination function to maintain collaboration, cooperation and alignment
- Broaden the range of active stakeholders to include others whose action/inaction has a bearing on biodiversity conservation, such as Agriculture
- Invest the necessary effort and resources to extend the work to Municipalities
- Invest the necessary effort and resources to ensure the meaningful involvement of grassroots communities
- Continue building capacity within government institutions as well as in the private sector and at community level
- Provide for Fine-Scale Planning to be updated regularly and managed effectively
- Instigate at national level those activities that were piloted successfully by BCSD
- Recognize that MPAs have different needs from terrestrial PAs, and provide for them
- Explore the applicability of the impressive tools developed by BCSD to other situations in South Africa, the region and further afield
- Seek institutional champions e.g. for Stewardship, Fine-Scale Planning, financial incentives and other successful products and services
- Recognize financial and budgetary constraints and seek innovative sustainable financing
- Lobby for State funding and State involvement where other avenues are not successful
- Apply a special focus on the estuarine, coastal and marine environment
- Apply a special focus on the tourism sector as a potential income earner and ally for biodiversity conservation



# 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

## 1.1 The Project

### 1.1.1 Project setting

The Cape Action for People and the Environment (C.A.P.E.) Programme is an innovative 20-year programme developed by the Government of South Africa to unlock the economic potential of conservation-friendly land use within the Cape Floristic Region (CFR), to the benefit of both the ecosystem and human population. It seeks to ensure that the natural environment of the CFR and adjacent marine ecosystems are effectively conserved and restored and deliver significant benefits to the people of the region in a way that is embraced by local communities, endorsed by government and recognized internationally.

The Programme was designed to first establish a systemic and institutional framework as well as the conservation expertise for its effective implementation. GEF support to the first five years of the C.A.P.E. has included the initial support to set up the Programme and Strategy, contributions to the establishment of a Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund investment in the CRF, capitalizing of the Table Mountain Trust Fund and the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative.

This initiative – the *C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project (BCSD)*<sup>1</sup> – is nested within the C.A.P.E. Programme. It was designed to pilot demonstration interventions in the CFR by increasing the protected area network by 4,000km<sup>2</sup> (including three additional terrestrial protected areas, two marine protected areas, two estuaries and two freshwater systems). The BCSD was also to establish a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity into economic activities in the CFR.

The BCSD was approved by GEF in May 2003 and implementation commenced in September 2004 and the planned duration was five years. This was extended by a further year and the project is in its winding down phase at the time of writing and will close in October 2010.

The total project budget is estimated at US\$55 million of which US\$11 million is provided by the GEF and the rest is co-funding in-kind and in parallel.

### 1.1.2 Problems that the project seeks to address

According to the PAD, the key threats to the CFR were identified as:

- (i) habitat loss and fragmentation brought about through urban expansion and agricultural development
- (ii) invasion by alien plant and animal species
- (iii) inappropriate fire management
- (iv) over-abstraction of surface and underground water
- (v) over-exploitation and harvesting of natural resources

The Project was expected to address these threats as well as the barriers that hinder their resolution. It was also “*charged with contributing to poverty mitigation and economic growth*”.

Section 2.2 below evaluates project design and the extent to which the project has addressed the identified problems.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <file://localhost/E:/MS-WORD%20DOCS/PROJECTS/ACTIVE%20PROJECTS/WBK-CAPE-TE/DOCS/Descriptors/GEF%20Proj%20Descriptor.mht> and <file://localhost/E:/MS-WORD%20DOCS/PROJECTS/ACTIVE%20PROJECTS/WBK-CAPE-TE/DOCS/Descriptors/UNDP-GEF%20Project%20Writeups.mht>

### 1.1.3 Development and immediate objectives of the project<sup>2</sup>

The **Project Development Objective** was “to support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful Project outcomes”.

It also had two Immediate Objectives as follows:

- **Immediate Objective 1:** “A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities”
- **Immediate Objective 2:** “Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management”

Work towards the first Immediate Objective comprised three Components, namely, Institutional strengthening, Conservation education, and Programme and Project coordination, management and monitoring. And a further three Components were planned to contribute to the second Immediate Objective, viz., Protected areas, Biodiversity economy and conservation stewardship, and Watershed management.

### 1.1.4 Main stakeholders

The PAD identified the four executing agencies as key stakeholders, viz. :

#### **National Botanical Institute now the South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI)**

SANBI is the lead executing agent for the Project. It was already executing three GEF projects and its new legal mandate, in terms of the Biodiversity Act, included support to implementing bioregional programmes such as the C.A.P.E. Programme. The SANBI is a statutory body of National Government and it assumed overall responsibility for the Project, supported by the CCU.

GEF financing: US\$4.7 million

#### **Western Cape Nature Conservation Board now known as CapeNature**

CapeNature is a statutory conservation body of the Western Cape Government. It has considerable implementation capacity in conservation management at the Provincial level. It assumed responsibility for executing the Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor as it was already managing a large protected area in the Cederberg. It also assumed responsibility for supporting Conservation Stewardship and Watershed Management (in partnership with the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF)) because it was active in the area and had the capacity.

GEF financing: US\$3.86 million

#### **South African National Parks (SANParks)**

SANParks assumed responsibility for executing the Garden Route Initiative because it already managed three smaller protected areas in the Garden Route and had the management capacity to expand these. It also supported the development of the associated Marine Protected Areas as it had a long-standing history in managing marine resources in the area. It performed these activities in partnership with DEAT, DWAF, WCNCB and NGOs.

GEF financing: US\$1.33 million

#### **Wilderness Foundation (WF)**

The Eastern Cape Province recognized its weakness in planning and implementing new conservation areas. It therefore contracted the WF, a professional and capable conservation NGO, to act on its behalf. The WF assumed responsibility for executing all activities relating to the Baviaanskloof initiative under Component 4 (Protected Areas).

GEF financing: US\$1.1 million

---

<sup>2</sup> The terminology used to refer to project elements is not entirely consistent with that used by the GEF. In this report, the GEF terminology is used, except where it might create misunderstandings.

In addition to the above main four organizations, Rhodes University and the Eastern Cape Parks Board also executed project activities.

In fact, the UNDP/GEF Project Write-Ups website<sup>3</sup> provides an impressive list of agencies, organizations and other entities that have been involved in project implementation. These are:

#### **Programme co-ordination institutions**

C.A.P.E. Co-ordinating Committee (CCC)  
C.A.P.E. Implementation Committee (CIC)  
National Botanical Institute (NBI)  
C.A.P.E. Co-ordination Unit (CCU)

#### **National institutions**

National Botanical Institute now the South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI)  
Department of Environment Affairs and Tourism (DEAT)  
Chief Directorate of Marine and Coastal Management of the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (MCM)  
Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF)  
Working for Water Programme  
Department of Land Affairs (DLA)  
Department of Agriculture (DA)  
Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG)  
South African National Parks (SANParks)  
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR)  
The Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA)  
Tourism and Hospitality Education and Training Authority (THETA)

#### **Provincial institutions**

Eastern Cape Department of Economic Affairs, Environment and Tourism (EC DEAET)  
The Eastern Cape Tourism Board (ECTB)  
The Eastern Cape Development Corporation (ECDC)  
Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs (EC DLA)  
Eastern Cape Department of Housing and Local Government (EC DHLG)  
Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (WC DEA&DP)  
Western Cape Department of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Tourism (WC DoA)  
Western Cape Nature Conservation Board (WCNCB) now known as CapeNature  
Western Cape Tourism Board (WCTB)

#### **Municipal institutions**

City of Cape Town (CoCT)  
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality (NMMM)

#### **Non-governmental organizations**

Botanical Society of South Africa  
Wilderness Foundation (WF)  
Wildlife and Environment Society of Southern Africa (WESSA)  
Table Mountain Fund (TMF)  
Mountain Club of South Africa (MCSA)  
Flower Valley Conservation Trust (FVCT)  
Fynbos Forum (FF)  
Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Company  
West Coast Biosphere Reserve Company  
South African Association of Protea Producers and Exporters (SAPPEX)  
International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA)  
National Business Initiative (NBI)

#### **International institutions**

Global Environment Facility  
World Bank  
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)  
Conservation International (CI)  
World Wide Fund for Nature – South Africa (WWF-SA)  
Fauna and Flora International (FFI)  
Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)

#### **Academic institutions**

Goldfields Environmental Education Service Centre, Rhodes University.  
Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town (GSB).  
Percy FitzPatrick Institute of African Ornithology, University of Cape Town (PFIAO).  
University of Stellenbosch (US).  
Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. (PLAAS).  
Terrestrial Ecology Research Unit, University of Port Elizabeth (TERU)  
Institute for Plant Conservation, University of Cape Town (IPC)

### **1.1.5 Results expected**

According to the PAD, this project would have been successful, if .....

- All C.A.P.E. signatory institutions directly support implementation of the Project
- The number of registered civil society stakeholders participating in the Project increases by 30%
- A CFR-wide conservation education strategy is successfully designed and implemented across the Project area
- The Baviaanskloof, Cederberg and Garden Route protected areas have been consolidated
- The number of jobs directly associated with conservation and nature-based tourism in Project intervention sites increases by 20%

<sup>3</sup> <file://localhost/E:/MS-WORD%20DOCS/PROJECTS/ACTIVE%20PROJECTS/WBK-CAPE-TE/DOCS/Descriptors/UNDP-GEF%20Project%20Writeups.mht>

- Spatial development frameworks in six representative lowland sites incorporate conservation priorities
- Five-year targets for protected area status for irreplaceable Broad Habitat Units in Lowland areas and watersheds are met as defined by the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy

## 1.2 The Evaluation

### 1.2.1 The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Principles

In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation policy of the GEF<sup>4</sup>, this evaluation is guided by, and has applied, the following principles:

**Independence** The Evaluator is independent and has not been engaged in the Project activities, nor was he responsible in the past for the design, implementation or supervision of the project.

**Impartiality** The Evaluator endeavoured to provide a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the project. The evaluation process has been impartial in all stages and taken into account all the views received from stakeholders.

**Transparency** The Evaluator conveyed in as open a manner as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of the findings. This evaluation report aims to provide transparent information on its sources, methodologies and approach.

**Disclosure** This report serves as a mechanism through which the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation are disseminated to policymakers, operational staff, beneficiaries, the general public and other stakeholders.

**Ethical** The Evaluator has respected the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and the sources of specific information and opinions in this report are not disclosed except where necessary and then only after confirmation with the consultee.

**Competencies and Capacities** The credentials of the Evaluator in terms of his expertise, seniority and experience as required by the terms of reference (Annex 1) are provided in Annex 2; and the methodology used for the assessment of results and performance is described below (section 1.3).

**Credibility** This evaluation has been based on data and observations which are considered reliable and dependable with reference to the quality of instruments and procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret information.

**Utility** The Evaluator strived to be as well-informed as possible and this ensuing report is considered as relevant, timely and as concise as possible. In an attempt to be of maximum benefit to stakeholders, the report presents in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings and issues, conclusions and recommendations.

### 1.2.2 Evaluation objectives and Terms of Reference

The ToRs require the TE to provide “a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation.”

---

<sup>4</sup> Global Environment Facility (2006) *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*.

Like all GEF Terminal Evaluations, this TE is being carried out:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

A more specific list of tasks expected of the TE is in the ToRs in Annex 1.

The Terminal Evaluation is intended to provide a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and serves as an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation sets about attempting to provide answers to the following questions:

- Did the project achieve its objectives? (= results)
- Did it do it well? (= implementation process)
- Are the results likely to be sustainable (= impacts and sustainability)

Ultimately, the Terminal Evaluation report will be assessed using the following criteria<sup>5</sup>:

- a. The report presents an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.*
- b. The report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and ratings were well substantiated.*
- c. The report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.*
- d. The lessons and recommendations are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the portfolio and future projects.*
- e. The report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity and per source) and actual cofinancing used.*
- f. The report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the M&E system used during implementation, and whether the information generated by the M&E system was used for project management.*

### **1.2.3 Mission activities and assignment timeline**

Work on this assignment commenced from homebase in mid-April with planning and documents review, and I travelled to Cape Town on 03/04 May. The first few days were taken up with initial briefings and consultations, an Inception Meeting with the EXCO and a workshop entitled Celebrating Conservation at which leaders of the various project components presented their Close-out Reports. Brief visits followed to the Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve, the Garden Route Initiative, the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor and the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve and adjacent coastline. Following further consultations and a presentation of preliminary findings to the EXCO, my in-country mission ended on 21 May.

The Draft Report was made available for comments in mid-June with a cut-off date of 12 July and this final Terminal Evaluation Report was delivered on 20 July 2010.

A full mission schedule and evaluation timeline is in Annex 3.

---

<sup>5</sup> GEF Evaluation Office, *Annual Performance Report 2008*. GEF Council Paper GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 5, May 28, 2009

## **1.3 Methodology and approach**

Two basic tools were used in the search for primary data and information – firstly documents review, secondly face-to-face consultations. Face-to-face consultations were the preferred method of consultation and were carried out with a wide catchment of stakeholders. Triangulation was used to ensure that empirical evidence collected from one source, for example documentation such as reports, was validated from at least two other sources, for example through interviews or surveys. Sometimes, the information was not available in document form and only available from consultations. In this situation, the Evaluator sought to corroborate opinions expressed and information given, by posing the same questions to more than one consultee. Anecdotal evidence was taken into account only if in the judgment of the Evaluator the information was important and the source was considered reliable. In such cases, the possible limitations of this information are noted.

### **1.3.1 Documents and websites reviewed and consulted**

The Terms of Reference provided an initial list of documents to be reviewed and additional documentation was sought by the Evaluator to provide the background to the project, insights into project implementation and management, a record of project outputs, etc. The Evaluator is grateful to the CCU for providing all necessary documents. A desk study review of all relevant documentation and well as websites was carried out and key documents/websites referred to directly in this report are noted in footnotes. The list of salient documents and websites reviewed and/or consulted by the Evaluator is in Annex 4.

### **1.3.2 Consultation with key stakeholders and beneficiaries**

As noted above, the primary stakeholders for this Project are considered to be the four Executing Agencies, namely SANBI, CapeNature, the Wilderness Foundation and SANParks together with the World Bank and UNDP (as the GEF Implementing Agencies) and the Evaluator held numerous meetings with officials at all levels of each of the four executing organizations as well as the implementing agencies. Other stakeholders which were consulted include Government agencies (both Central and local level), NGOs, community groups, and exponents of the private sector. The full list of persons consulted is in Annex 5.

The greater majority of stakeholders and beneficiaries were consulted in person and the Evaluator met with and/or consulted 79 individuals in total. Of these, the majority (about 48%) were from national and provincial institutions, about 14% were from NGOs, 8% from the private sector and 5% each from municipalities and local communities.

The draft report was distributed widely for comments and 13 persons and/or organizations provided comments. One response comprised comments from a number of stakeholders. Another set of comments arrived well after the indicated cut-off date but was still taken into account.

It is a principle applied by the Evaluator that confidentiality of individual interviewees is maintained to the extent possible. It is felt that in general, the specific sources of specific comments do not add anything to the argument. However, it is sometimes necessary to quote the organization or the institution. If this, inadvertently, indicates an individual, this is regretted and the decision to quote is not taken lightly.

### 1.3.3 The basis for evaluation<sup>6</sup>

The basis for a terminal evaluation is the ProDoc or PAD which is the signed contract for delivery of certain agreed results, products and services. Signatories bind themselves through the ProDoc and are accountable on the basis of the ProDoc. As noted by GEF, *“the results framework included in the project appraisal document submitted to the GEF for approval/endorsement by the CEO establishes project outcome expectations. At the time of project completion, these ex-ante expectations generally form a yard stick for assessment of outcome achievements.”*<sup>7</sup>

However, as the GEF guidance continues, *“in some instances during the course of project implementation the implementing agency may make changes to the results framework.”* This is justified, for example, when the time taken between the ProDoc’s design and formulation and the project’s start influences its appropriateness – hence the examination and review of the ProDoc at the Inception stages when changes are proposed, agreed and approved. In addition, it is also possible that the ProDoc could require further changes during the lifetime of the project to reflect changing circumstances and experience gained. This could take place annually, if necessary.

It would be cumbersome to change the entire ProDoc and have the new version signed afresh, each time these changes are brought about. Instead, the changes take place in the LogFrame which captures the essence of the ProDoc and the project. Such changes to the LogFrame are proposed, discussed, agreed to and approved at the PSC which comprises membership by all the original ProDoc signatories. Annual Work Plans, Quarterly Plans and Reports, are all reliant on the LogFrame, so is a project’s M&E Plan, and so is the annual accounting to the GEF through the APR/PIR or similar instrument. And, so is a terminal evaluation.

If it is found necessary or desirable to drift away from some aspect of the project’s prescription as recorded in the LogFrame, it is a responsibility of the Executing Agency and project management to ensure that such changes are recorded through agreed and approved changes to the LogFrame. If a LogFrame is weak, it is not set aside, it is strengthened. The BCSD Project LogFrame is discussed in section 3.4 below.

### 1.3.4 The rating system

GEF evaluations should ideally focus on impacts but these are invariably long term and rarely can they be seen within the lifetime of a project. However, a project can be rated on the results that it achieves that can be expected to lead to impacts, namely the Outcomes and its Immediate Objectives. In addition, evaluations are also required to rate certain aspects of a project such as:

- Project concept and design
- Stakeholder participation in project formulation
- Implementation approach
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Stakeholder participation
- Attainment of Outcomes and achievement of Objective
- Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability

These aspects, which form the framework of the core sections of this report, are augmented as considered necessary to also address issues that arose during the evaluation.

Each of the various project elements has been rated separately with brief justifications based on findings and so has the project as a whole.

---

<sup>6</sup> The use of the LogFrame as the basis for a terminal evaluation was questioned in comments on the draft report. It was therefore felt useful to assert that the ProDoc and LogFrame are the basis for a terminal evaluation, and why.

<sup>7</sup> GEF Evaluation Office, *Annual Performance Report 2008*. GEF Council Paper GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 5, May 28, 2009

According to GEF guidance<sup>8</sup>, when rating the project's outcomes, relevance and effectiveness are to be considered as critical criteria – satisfactory performance on relevance and effectiveness is essential to satisfactory performance overall. This means that the overall outcomes rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes, the project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

The standard GEF six-level rating system was applied, based on the one below which applies to the overall project rating:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Satisfactory (S):** The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Unsatisfactory (U):** The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency

Rating of various elements of the project is necessarily subjective but it is carried out according to GEF guidance and ethics, and based on the past experience of the evaluator. A score of Highly Satisfactory is not common (around 4%)<sup>9</sup>. It can only be applied in situations which are exceptional and no improvement is possible. At the other end of the scale, a score of Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) is also not common (1%) and the greater part of projects and project elements are rated in the Satisfactory (S) to Moderately Satisfactory (MU) quartile (76%).

## 1.4 Structure of this report

The Evaluator made an effort to keep this report brief, to the point and easy to understand. It is made up of four substantive parts. Following the executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report, the first part provides the introduction and the background to the assignment. It starts with a brief introduction to the project and it then explains the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used.

The next part is the main substantive part of this report and comprises four inter-related sections. It presents the findings of the evaluation exercise in terms of the basic project concept and design, its implementation, administration and management, its achievements and limitations, and the relevance of what it achieved, its degree of effectiveness and the potential for sustainability of the products and services that it produced. The findings are based on factual evidence obtained by the Evaluator through document reviews and consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The third part is the conclusions section which gathers together a summary of the ratings given and conclusions that had been reached throughout the report and augments them to create a cohesive ending arising from the investigation. This section in turn leads to the final section comprising the recommendations.

A number of annexes provide supplementary information.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*. Global Environment Facility, Evaluation Office. Evaluation Document No.3. 2008

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*



## 2 FINDINGS: PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN

### 2.1 Project concept

The BCSD project has its origin in the C.A.P.E. Strategy and its goal is consistent with that of the Strategy. According to the GEF Project Brief<sup>10</sup>, the BCSD project is one of three GEF-supported initiatives under the CAPE Strategy with the other two being the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) and the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative.

The project represents the first 5-6 year phase out of three which will span 20 years. It is consistent with GEF Operational Strategies for Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems (OP 1), Coastal and Marine Freshwater Systems (OP 2), Forest Ecosystems (OP 3) and Mountain Ecosystems (OP 4) which were current at the time.

The role of the Project is to catalyse and drive the implementation of the C.A.P.E. Programme in Phase 1 by enhancing the policy and institutional framework for conservation in the CFR and by undertaking carefully targeted conservation demonstrations in selected biophysical, socio-economic and institutional contexts. The scope of planned activities is broad, however, the extensive preparation of the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy and the unprecedented alignment and support of key executing partners renders the Project feasible.

The project concept is basically sound – a multi-faceted approach to create a foundation for the conservation of the Cape floristic resources. The timescale is reasonable (especially with the one year extension) and the budget seems adequate.

### 2.2 Project design

The Project lies within the broader scope of the CAPE Programme. It was designed to address specific threats to biodiversity in the CFR while recognizing the work being carried out through other initiatives. The following table assesses the response in the project design and scope to the threats and root causes identified in the PAD.

**Table 1. Project design response to identified threats and root causes**

THREATS, ROOT CAUSES (as in the PAD)	PROJECT RESPONSE (as identified by the Evaluator)
<b>Key Threats</b>	
habitat loss and fragmentation, primarily through urban expansion and agricultural development	The project addresses this threat directly through its "biodiversity corridor" model which it will pilot and through its planned initiatives to mainstream biodiversity into land use planning and decision making
invasion by alien plant and animal species	IAS strategy addressed directly by the project. Project design also recognizes the work being carried out on invasive species through other initiatives and aims to collaborate with them
fire, including inappropriate fire management	Fire management is not a strong emphasis of the project design; but addressed in GEF fire adaptation project
over-abstraction of surface and underground water	Project design addresses this through component 4.4, and the Sandveld work which seeks to model water use and make associated recommendations for water pricing, and of the Ecological Reserve work

<sup>10</sup> GEF Project Brief : C.A.P.E. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Project. World Bank, Washington, 2003

	(component 6)
over-exploitation and harvesting of marine resources and certain plant and flower species	Project design does not address the over-exploitation of natural resources directly, however, it collaborates with other initiatives that do
<b>Root Causes</b>	
whilst the CFR is characterized by relatively well developed conservation institutions, further capacity is required to implement a long term conservation agenda to conserve the CFR	The project design makes institutional strengthening one of its main focal areas
historically, there has been a lack of coordination between conservation agencies which has diluted the ability to implement a long term program to conserve it	Coordination is well-catered for by project design
A coherent education agenda, aimed at encouraging inhabitants and business to conserve the CFR, has been lacking	The project outputs include conservation education and awareness
historically, there has been too little emphasis placed on developing new models to increase the area of the CFR under conservation management, especially involving private land and the conservation of marine resources. This has resulted in an ineffective system of conservation areas to conserve a representative sample of the CFR including the region's 1,200 threatened plant species and marine resources	New models, such as the stewardship process for achieving protection on private land, are piloted as part of the project activities
historically, there has been too little emphasis on incorporating biodiversity considerations into land use planning in order to prevent habitat loss. Further, in threatened areas, fiscal and other instruments required to encourage landowners to not develop in priority conservation areas have been lacking	The fine scale planning maps and associated capacity development work targeted by the project together with the financial incentives that the project will develop, are an excellent base for incorporating biodiversity considerations into the land use planning process
policy and legal frameworks for addressing biodiversity threats in watersheds have been lacking	The project aims to develop both policy and legal frameworks to address threats to biodiversity

From the above analysis, it is evident that the project design has a primary focus on the root causes of the identified threats, addressing them more directly than the threats themselves. This is seen as an appropriate emphasis.

The purpose of the Project is illustrated by the **Project Development Objective** which is “to support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful Project outcomes”.

The scope of the project is set by two Immediate Objectives each of which comprises three components. GEF projects are normally restricted to a single immediate objective.

**Immediate Objective 1** sought to establish a “foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities”, and it proposed to do this through the **Institutional strengthening** of various organizations to enable them to implement the Project. It also was to carry out **Conservation education** with inhabitants of the CFR so as to raise their awareness. Finally, the Project aimed to achieve this objective by increasing the capacity for **Programme and Project coordination, management and monitoring**.

The linkages between Immediate Objective 1 and its constituent components are not entirely clear. Furthermore, it is not usual to consider Project Management as a component within the project design linked to a single particular objective since its benefits accrue to the whole project.

**Immediate Objective 2** sought to enhance the “conservation of the CFR through piloting and adapting<sup>11</sup> models for sustainable, effective management”. This was to be achieved through a flagship component on **Protected areas** including the support, consolidation and establishment of effective management in the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, the Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve, the Garden Route Initiative and the Kogelberg Biosphere and Marine Reserve. In addition, the Project was to extend its activities to **Biodiversity economy and conservation stewardship**

<sup>11</sup> There is a possibility that “adapting” is an editorial mistake since “adopting” would seem to be a more accurate description of what the project set out to do. This TE uses the PAD wording except where it explicitly takes a different view.

for six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society. And finally, this objective was to benefit from **Watershed management** activities whereby biodiversity concerns would be integrated into watershed management.

The project design is complex with two Immediate Objectives and six Outcomes/Outputs and the linkages between them are not readily obvious. In effect, the project scope comprises some six to eight discrete projects and the complexity that this entailed was going to be a significant challenge for those entrusted with coordinating and holding the project together.

Project design is considered **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** because while there are linkages between components, it has moderate shortcomings in its scope and structure and the degree of relevance of its components to its objectives.

The weaknesses in project design became apparent during project implementation and led to a *de facto* restructuring of the project framework which was not formally recorded. For example, project targets such as public awareness and biodiversity mainstreaming “migrated” from their respective Outputs/Outcomes and activities were carried out under and through other components; sub-components of Outcome 4 grew beyond the dimensions indicated by the Outcome wording.

### **3 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT**

#### **3.1 Project governance**

##### **3.1.1 Execution and implementation**

The project has benefited from its context within the C.A.P.E. Programme structure. C.A.P.E. gave it direction and purpose. It also gave it a recognizable place within a bigger vision. However, the execution and implementation arrangements for the project were complex. They involved two GEF Implementing Agencies, and a main Executing Agency with three sub-Executing Agencies. The Project was also supported by a range of other key partners, including central, provincial, local government and NGOs, all very actively involved. This created the potential for difficulties, but these did not eventuate. The difficulties were avoided through the cooperative spirit firstly among the two GEF Implementing Agencies, and secondly among the four national Executing Agencies which were among the high level partners to the C.A.P.E. Programme who signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to give effect to their commitment to cooperate in implementing the C.A.P.E. Programme.

The high level of cooperation and partnerships was a noticeable feature of this project.

However, one other very important ingredient in this auspicious situation was the CCU. The leadership, cohesion and professional skills displayed by the Coordination Unit were instrumental in the successful implementation of the project.

##### **3.1.2 Project steering**

The MoU referred to above created two key structures: the C.A.P.E. Coordinating Committee (CCC), with the overall function to coordinate the long-term implementation of the C.A.P.E. Programme and which operates at a political level between National and Provincial Government; and the C.A.P.E.

Implementation Committee (CIC) which represents government departments, municipalities, statutory bodies and accredited NGOs actively involved at the operational level.

In operating at the technical level across the projects portfolio of the C.A.P.E. Programme, the CIC was to receive direction from the CCC but this arrangement did not turn out to be as effective as expected mainly due to the demanding schedules of the CCC members. As a solution, SANBI, as the agency identified in the MoU with the responsibility of leading the implementation of the Programme, established a sub-committee of the CCC which became known as the EXCO (Executive Committee) to address monthly work programme issues. In effect, it was the EXCO that provided the BSCD project with its central level guidance, direction and steering.

However, the project also benefited from the setting up (or strengthening) of 14 Task Teams which, according to *Fynbos Fynmense*<sup>12</sup> were to facilitate networking between CFR institutions and individuals and served as a powerful force behind the coordinated implementation of the Programme. Coordination at the local level was also provided by the Project Management Units which operated in the larger geographical initiatives of the project including the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, the Baviaanskloof Mega-Reserve and the Garden Route Initiative.

Local Project Management Units benefited in turn from Steering Committees (eight in all) which provided overall guidance, advice and support to the PMU, coordinated activities and facilitated communication among partner organizations, and supported the Executing Agency in its responsibility for project delivery.

Over the duration of the project, the CIC met quarterly, with the BSCD (and ABI) projects as standing items on its agenda. The CIC was supported by the Task Teams Roundtable, a gathering of all task team and steering committee representatives, which took place every 6 months to maximize alignment between the different areas of work.

### **3.1.3 Project coordination**

In the same way as all other aspects of this project, coordination is embedded within the broader C.A.P.E. Programme and entrusted to the CAPE Coordination Unit (CCU) which serves as the project's management unit. The CCU was set up by SANBI through its commitment under the MoU to implement the C.A.P.E. Programme and while the BSCD project has not been its sole function, it has certainly been its major one.

The CCU is housed in premises provided by SANBI as part of the Government in-kind contribution. The premises, located within the SANBI Centre for Biodiversity Conservation at Kirstenbosch National Botanical Gardens, provide a generous amount of space and excellent on-site facilities.

The CCU team is small and close-knit, comprising a Coordinator, a Programme Developer and Procurement Manager, a Finance/Business Manager, an Administrator, and an Administrative Assistant. Other staff such as the Learning Network Manager, the Capacity Development Coordinator, the Learning Network & Communications Officer and others are formally on SANBI's staff complement but in effect they have functioned as part of the CCU. They are a good example of the effective manner in which the CCU has functioned within SANBI which provides all other supervisory, administrative, financial and human resource management services.

The CCU operation was partly financed through the GEF grant and partly through SANBI (project coordinator salary paid by SANBI, as well as in kind contributions for office space, etc). In addition to carrying out the project management functions, the CCU implemented cross-cutting activities related to Component 1: Institutional Strengthening and Component 3: Programme Coordination, Management and Monitoring. It also executed some of the Conservation Education, Biodiversity

---

<sup>12</sup> Ashwell, Ally, Trevor Sandwith, Mandy Barnett, Azisa Parker and Fumanskile Wisani (2006) *Fynbos Fynmense: people making biodiversity work*. SANBI Biodiversity Series 4. SANBI, Pretoria

Economy and Watershed Management activities. This “hands-on” involvement in implementation is lauded even if at times it risked stretching the resources of the CCU.

The CCU is very much a team, working together cohesively with good leadership and excellent team spirit. Staff are motivated and show a high level of professionalism. They are clear about their role and they feel they have the support and guidance to carry it out. Stakeholders see them as effective, helpful and supportive. Over the six years, there have been a few changes and episodes of maternity leave, but the transitions have invariably been smooth and seamless.

The Evaluator wishes to acknowledge the full and thorough responses from the CCU to requests for data, information and analysis and finds that Project coordination has been effective and efficient and **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

### **3.1.4 The role of Government**

The Government, in partnership with civil society, set up C.A.P.E., the Cape Action for People and the Environment Programme which, according to the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism Mr Marthinus van Schalkwyk in his introductory message for *Fynbos Fynmense*, was “*in response not only to its obligations to secure globally significant biodiversity for the international community, but driven by the opportunity that the rich resources of the region offer for social and economic development of our people*”.

This appreciation of the value of biological resources, was reiterated recently at the highest levels. Speaking at the Green Economy Summit in Sandton, on 18 May 2010, President Jacob Zuma stated that functioning ecosystems underpinned all economic and social activity and that “Ecosystem failure will seriously compromise our ability to address our social and economic priorities”.

The Government has provided both the foundation and the context within which the BCSD project was planned and has been implemented. Through the direct involvement in project implementation by a number of Central Government and Provincial Government organizations, the Government has demonstrated full ownership of the BCSD project.

### **3.1.5 The role of World Bank and UNDP**

The GEF Council endorsed the UNDP as implementing agent for components 1 and 2 and it endorsed the World Bank as implementing agent for components 3 to 6. Each agency has, as per separate Grant Agreements, assumed responsibility for all aspects of the implementation of their respective components. This included project supervision and monitoring, all fiduciary issues and responding to the needs for technical assistance.

The World Bank and UNDP had an obligation to ensure accountability as the agencies with the legal responsibility for the GEF funds. They were responsible to the GEF for the timely and cost-effective delivery of the agreed project outputs. They achieved this through their understandings with the Government of South Africa and their agreements with SANBI, CapeNature, SANParks and the Wilderness Foundation as executing agencies.

They have provided guidance and oversight of the project through their joint supervision and monitoring of implementation, field visits to project areas, helping to resolve problems, reviewing and revising project reports and providing feedback. They facilitated the mid-term review and this terminal evaluation. All Project reporting has as far as possible been standardized between the two agencies and all technical project documents have been shared between the two agencies.

Each agency has been responsible for covering its own costs in this regard.

As far as can be ascertained, management and control over financial operations has been carried out successfully by the World Bank and UNDP, the independent financial audits were commissioned and recruitment and contracting has been carried out in accordance with World Bank/UNDP/GEF procedures and rules. Progress reports, evaluation reports and annual financial reports have been posted on the project website and have been available publicly in the interest of transparency.

The governance of the project was certainly complex and multi-layered, but from all accounts, it worked satisfactorily. It is rated overall as **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

## 3.2 Financial management

### 3.2.1 Budget and financial planning

According to the PAD, the project had an initial total budget of US\$55.13 million and the GEF provided the only identifiable cash input of US\$11 million. While the original co-funding estimate was US\$44.13 million, this was exceeded by a significant amount.

The following table shows the comparative amounts allocated from the GEF budget to each Output.

**Table 2. GEF budget allocation per component as in the original PAD and as amended**

PROJECT COMPONENTS/OUTPUTS	ORIGINAL	%	AMENDED	%
1 Enhanced strategic alignment of conservation activities and increased capacity of relevant institutions for integrated bioregional conservation management in the CFR supported by comprehensive performance management and information management	1.4	12.72	1.4	12.72
2 Increased environmental awareness and committed action of people in the CFR contributes to biodiversity conservation	0.6	5.45	0.6	5.45
3 Enhanced management capacity, effective communication and efficient adaptive management result in the integrated development and implementation of the C.A.P.E. programme	1.1	10.0	1.27	11.54
4 Protected areas contributing to priority targets for conservation of the biodiversity of the CFR are consolidated or established; cost-effective management is sustained; tourism development plans are implemented; and stakeholders derive direct and indirect benefits	4.12	37.45	4.11	37.36
5 Enhanced understanding of economic incentives to induce changes in land user behaviour in favour of conservation stewardship	2.45	22.27	2.33	21.18
6 Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watershed management	1.32	12.0	1.29	11.72
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>100</b>

The budget amendment was signed in April 2009 to take into account the one year extension, reflect the re-allocation of grant proceeds across disbursement categories, and recognize CapeNature as a tax exempt entity and increase its expenditure finance percentage to 100%. However, the changes were not of major significance.

Outputs 4 and 5 between them account for more than half of the budget and this is seen as justified. The allocation to Output 2 may have been on the low side. At 12%, Output 3 is slightly on the high

side for project management, however, the activities include more than simply management and for a complex project such as this the proportion allocated is seen as reasonable.

Management of the financial resources and reporting as a means of accountability has been as complex as other aspects of the project. The IAs provided training to the first financial manager in the CCU but her replacement when she left the project was only provided with a hand over. On the other hand, the CCU Financial Manager has met with each of her counterparts in the Executing Agencies (each of whom has a separate contract with the IA) and helped clarify responsibilities, requirements and commitments.

The MTE raised the issue of low delivery, however, this was addressed effectively and has remained satisfactory according to the PIRs. Financial reporting has also been satisfactory.

The project accounts were audited annually by the South African Auditor-General who found that the project financial statements had been prepared according to accepted practice and standard. In 2006, the financial audit carried out by Ernst & Young, found that as a result of a change in accounting policy from a cash basis to an accrual basis, some irregularities may have inadvertently occurred but these did not affect the financial management conduct of the project. In 2009, Ernst & Young identified some matters requiring management attention in the short term. These were noted by project management and explained or addressed accordingly.

Financial planning and management have been **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 3.2.2 Co-financing

The GEF requires co-funding on a proportion of 1:1 or better. The amount pledged was some four times this amount even though no letters of pledges or commitment were obtained. However, the amount pledged pales in comparison to the actual amount which is claimed to have been contributed, in kind and in parallel, to the project. As can be seen from the table below, provided by the CCU, the amount delivered is estimated to have been a massive US\$84.37 million and while the exact amount of co-funding in kind and in parallel may be somewhat difficult to determine with any precision, there is no denying that it was a substantial amount.

**Table 3. Co-financing pledged and acquired**

PARTNER OR CONTRIBUTOR	NATURE OF CONTRIBUTOR	NATURE OF CONTRIBUTION	AMOUNT (in millions US Dollars)	
			PLEGGED (according to PAD)	ACQUIRED TO MARCH 2010
SANBI	Government Executing Agency	In-kind and Parallel	2.51	1.92
SANParks	Government Executing Agency	In-kind and Parallel	3.02	1.62
CapeNature	Government Executing Agency	In-kind and Parallel	4.44	9.67
Universities: Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Western Cape and Rhodes	Academic institutions (Government)	Parallel		0.92
Ford Foundation	NGO		0.12	0.0
Extended Public Works Programme – DEAET	Government	Parallel		2.60
City of Cape Town, Nelson Mandela Bay, Overberg Municipality	Local Government	Parallel		0.88
Lotteries Board	Government	Parallel		0.09
DWAF, DEAT, MCM, DWAF	Government	In-kind and Parallel	14.27	13.24

BotSoc, CSIR, Fynbos Forum, Nature's Valley Trust, TMF, SEED, WWF, WESSA, Edu Africa	NGOs	In-kind and Parallel	0.08	11.61
DEA & DP, DoA, DEAT, Land care, PDoA, EC DEAET	Provincial Government	In-kind and Parallel		8.55
Individuals, Afriplex, Rand Merchant Bank, Development Bank	Other	Parallel	18.02	0.75
THETA	Government		3.50	0.0
Working for Water	Government	In-kind and Parallel		25.02
CEPF	Multi-lateral	Parallel		7.5
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>45.96</b>	<b>84.37</b>

As can be expected, especially without written confirmation of pledges, a number did not materialize or turned out to be smaller than expected. However, this was more than balanced by the support provided by the universities, municipalities and Provincial Government organizations which had not been identified as potential supporters. However, the most significant additional co-funding provided was from the Working for Water Programme which amounted to over US\$25 million.

The amount of co-funding pledged was excellent; the amount of co-funding delivered was even more impressive – **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

### 3.3 Partnership strategy and stakeholder participation

#### 3.3.1 Partners and partnership strategy

The OECD<sup>13</sup> considers Stakeholders as “Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation”. This definition is all-embracing and includes Beneficiaries and Partners which are defined in turn as: “Beneficiaries - The individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention”; and “Partners - The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives”. In the case of Partners, the OECD adds that “the concept of partnership connotes shared goals, common responsibility for outcomes, distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations”.

From this definition, the World Bank and UNDP are partners for the purpose of GEF while SANBI and the other executing agencies also fall within the definition of true partners in that they do have shared goals, a common and shared responsibility for outcomes and distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations.

However, the concept of partnership for this project goes well beyond this inner core and includes a range of central and local government entities, a number of NGOs, and others. The Project Brief has extensive treatment of the involvement of stakeholders in the project and its Annex 6 records the involvement of stakeholders in the project formulation and its context, it reports on the stakeholder analysis and it provides a participation plan including participatory mechanisms and activities by project component. The STAP expert lauds the project methodology which “appears to be centrally dedicated to the involvement and engagement of local rural communities, business and industry, and political jurisdictions”, even if the expert questions whether “consultation” is adequate engagement.

The Evaluator has seen a lot of evidence of consultation, and indeed engagement, by the project of the institutional stakeholders from Government and NGOs. A lower, but still substantial level of

<sup>13</sup> DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris.



engagement was also seen with the private sector, farmers and land owners. However, engagement with the rural communities, the poor and the disadvantaged was less evident even though it is known to have taken place particularly through CEPF and TMF interventions both of which are recognized by the project as “partners”<sup>14</sup>.

### 3.3.2 Participation at the project formulation phase

The formulation of the BCSD project goes back to the formulation of the C.A.P.E. Programme and many stakeholders do not make a distinction between the two. According to the Project Brief, the formulation process of the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy comprised an extensive process of stakeholder consultation and participation, involving a systematic identification of all stakeholders in the CFR who could influence biodiversity conservation or be affected by it. Stakeholders were involved in developing the analysis, strategy and action plan. Participation in the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy process was structured to allow different degrees and levels of involvement by different groups, depending on their preference and on the roles that they would play in implementation. Executing agencies that would be responsible for the implementation of C.A.P.E. were involved closely throughout the process in order to develop a sense of ownership and to guarantee long-term sustainability of the initiative. A media campaign was undertaken to inform the broader public of the CAPE 2000 Strategy process and outputs with information being made available through a website, brochures and public presentations.

In the period since September 2000, the commitment and involvement of government agencies and other key stakeholders has been sustained and enhanced. Key stakeholder partnerships, supported by MoUs between government agencies and other stakeholders, have guided preparation activities.

A rapid assessment of stakeholder and social issues was undertaken as part of project preparation in an effort to:

- identify key stakeholders with respect to biodiversity conservation in the CFR;
- review stakeholder interests and associated impacts on resource use and the project;
- identify and mitigate against possible negative socio-economic impacts on local stakeholders resulting from the project; and
- develop a mitigation strategy.

The Evaluator is satisfied that project preparation was undertaken in a participatory manner, involving a broad range of stakeholder groups using a number of different information gathering methods, including formal and semi-formal interviews, group discussions and workshops, and literature review. In addition, local consultants participating in project preparation provided information and contributed to the identification of risks, impacts and mitigation strategies.

Participation during the project formulation stages is considered to have been **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 3.3.3 Participation during the implementation phase

As noted elsewhere in this report, the PAD had developed a comprehensive Stakeholders Participation Plan and the CCU has provided the Evaluator with a detailed account of the extent that this plan was implemented and this update is in Annex 6. Furthermore, the CCU also provided the Evaluator with an impressive list of Stakeholder events which have been organized by the project or

---

<sup>14</sup> The CCU advised that the Outcomes of CEPF and TMF interventions cannot be separated from the BCSD: The CCU and various PMUs were intricately involved in the identification, development and implementation of a suite of projects where rural communities were implementers and or beneficiaries. Although funded through CEPF and TMF (and therefore not accountable under the BCSD), they were deliberately designed to complement the BCSD – and BCSD resources were fundamental to providing project development and review capacity. In addition, Kogelberg and Cederberg landscape initiatives had dedicated small grant facilities for this.

to which the project has contributed significantly, and this is in Annex 7. Both tables are organized according to project Outputs/ Outcomes.

The updated Stakeholders Participation Plan shows that stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in project implementation activities. Many stakeholders have benefited from capacity building exercises before becoming involved in project activities. Others have participated in governance groups such as steering committees, forums, etc.

The list of Stakeholder Events provides even more detail of the involvement of a wide constituency in project implementation. The following table is a summary of the number of person that were involved in project activities.

**Table 4. Events organized by the project and numbers of participants**

PROJECT ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF EVENTS	NUMBER OF PERSONS	COMMENTS
1.4.1 Biodiversity Information Management	10	659	The events took place between 2008 and 2010 and the majority were workshops and training
1.4.2 Learning Network	20	1,370 approx	Throughout project life, from 2004 to 2010. Wide range of conferences, forums, some workshops and 3 Community Learning Exchanges
1.2 Capacity Development Programme	26	406+	Mainly training courses such as for Mentors and Stewardship, but also including Careers Fairs and Biodiversity Expos
2 Conservation Education	35	not available	Throughout the project life – Steering Committee meetings, workshops, training and conferences
4.1 Baviaanskloof Mega-Reserve	20	3,518+	From 2004 to 2009. Public functions, launches, training (including professional development, not necessarily biodiversity related), tourism development
4.2 Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor	64	11,869	From 2004 right up to 2010 and including workshops, launches, training, festivals and exhibits, expos
4.5 Kogelberg Project	18	385	Between 2005 and 2010 mainly workshops and training
4.6 Marine Programme	2	43	Two launches of patrol boats in 2008 and 2009
5.1 Fine-Scale Planning	34	595	Starting in 2006 mainly workshops, training and field trips but also including stewardship meetings and reviews, up to 2008
5.2 Land Use Planning and Decision Making	21	702	Training and workshops between 2007 and 2010
5.3 Stewardship	6	144+	Workshops, farmers' day, field day and including a Stewardship Summit
5.4 Resource Economics	12	665	Training, workshops, stakeholders' forum and lectures between 2007 and 2010
6.1.1 Ecological Reserve Implementation (ERI) and Catchment Management	12	41+	Workshops, training and capacity building; technical meetings and partners' discussions between 2006 and 2010
6.1.2 Fire Management	No events	None	Usual meetings of stakeholders but no special events
6.2 Invasive Alien Species	2	90	One symposium, and one workshop both in 2009
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>20,487+</b>	

Some of the participants in the above events are repeat beneficiaries, however, even after taking this into consideration, the number of those participating in projects events is very remarkable.

It is also heartening to note that many of the stakeholder groups (e.g. the national Green Economy Thinktank, the national Stewardship Technical Working Group, etc) that were formed under the project will be continuing after the project closes.

The level of stakeholders' participation in project implementation has been **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**.

### 3.4 Monitoring and evaluation

#### 3.4.1 M&E design, planning and implementation

*“GEF projects are required to develop M&E plans by the time of work program inclusion, to appropriately budget M&E plans, and to fully carry out the M&E plan during implementation. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project to changing situations.”<sup>15</sup>*

The M&E Plan required by GEF should comprise a number of minimum requirements<sup>16</sup> as in the following table. The table also contains the response of the CCU to the requirements and the Evaluator's summary observations on the way that this project satisfies these elements. These are then discussed further in the following sections.

**Table 5. GEF minimum requirements for M&E planning**

GEF M&E REQUIREMENTS	CCU COMMENTS	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
SMART <sup>17</sup> indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management	<p>These are set out in the project's M&amp;E matrix.</p> <p>The process of developing the matrix was a complex one because firstly, the indicators that are set out in the project document and the PAD are different and, secondly, in many cases they could not be measured.</p> <p>A set of revised indicators, based on agreed project activities, was developed and agreed to by the World Bank and UNDP, and it is against these revised indicators that the project has reported each year since inception.</p>	<p>As noted by the CCU, the original Indicators were weak and few satisfied the SMART criteria. The revised Indicators are not much better – just over half of Indicators for the Dev Obj are SMART, only 2 out of 14 are for Imm Obj 1 and none for Imm Obj 2.</p> <p>The project has an impressive, comprehensive M&amp;E matrix which has served as the yardstick for measuring progress with implementation and these process indicators have been monitored satisfactorily. However, the matrix is based on weak indicators which do not always coincide with those in the PIRs.</p>
SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators	As above	<p>The focus of this requirement is results, which is different from above which assesses progress with implementation. Monitoring of outputs has been carried out by the CCU as part of the above process and is subject to the same influences.</p> <p>The project was not expected to achieve clear impacts and no indicators were set for this.</p>
A project baseline or, if major	Baselines were calculated at inception and	Baselines were identified for each

<sup>15</sup> GEF Evaluation Office, *Annual Performance Report 2008*. GEF Council Paper GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 5, May 28, 2009

<sup>16</sup> See - <http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html> and the *GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, Evaluation Document, 2006, No.1

<sup>17</sup> SMART = **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic and **T**imely - according to *Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations*. GEF, 2007

baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation	are included in the above matrix.	output targeted.
An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities	An M&E plan was developed before project inception. This was elaborated on in the CAPE Project M&E matrix, in which indicators were refined, baselines established and responsibilities clarified. This matrix was completed annually.  M&E information that was required for the PIR and World Bank reporting was extracted from this matrix.  The MTE was viewed as a separate independent activity and was not included in the plan.	The M&E Matrix has taken the place of an M&E Plan and it has done this effectively. Although the Matrix does not have a specific timeline for reviews and evaluations, these are known to have been carried out and planning for M&E by the project has been satisfactory.
An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation	The CCU was responsible for overall project M&E. This included setting up processes for data collection, establishing project baselines and collection and collation of the relevant information over the duration of the project. This collection and collation process was based on the information concerning data collection strategy/ instruments; frequency and reports and responsibility for collection that is part of the M&E matrix.  When the project was designed, it was imagined that a dedicated M&E officer would be employed. The strengthening of the rand, and resultant reduced project budget, resulted in a revision of this intention and other project staff picking up this responsibility.	As noted by the CCU, there was no discrete setup for M&E, no dedicated personnel (although originally planned) and no assigned budget. However, and in spite of this, the resources (both human resources as well as financial ones) allocated by the CCU to the M&E process have been adequate and the function has been well carried out.

An even more specific indication of a project's compliance with the GEF M&E expectations is provided by the instrument of assessment used by the GEF itself which states that – *a project needs to be in compliance with all the critical parameters and needs to perform sufficiently well on all the parameters together. To be classified as compliant, projects are required to score at least a 2 (on a scale of 1 to 3, with 3 being the highest) on each of the critical parameters and to have an aggregate score of 26 out of a maximum of 39.*<sup>18</sup>

**Table 6. Instrument for Assessment of M&E Plans**

PARAMETERS	RAW RESPONSE AND POSSIBLE	PROJECT SCORE
1 Is there at least one specific indicator in the log frame for each of the project objectives and outcomes?	Yes.....3 No.....1	2 (not for Immed Objectives)
2 Are the indicators in the log frame relevant to the chosen objectives and outcomes?	Yes.....3 Yes, but only some are relevant.....2 No.....1	2
3 Are the indicators in the log frame sufficient to assess achievement of the objectives and outcomes?	Sufficient.....3 Largely Sufficient.....2 Some important indicators are missing.....1	2 (no direct Indicators for Imm Obj)
4 Are the indicators for project objectives and Outcomes quantifiable?	Yes.....3 Some of them are.....2 No, or else it has not been shown how the indicators could be quantified.....1	2

<sup>18</sup> GEF Evaluation Office, *Annual Performance Report 2008*. GEF Council Paper GEF/ME/C.35/Inf. 5, May 28, 2009

5 Has the complete and relevant baseline information been provided?	Yes, complete baseline info provided.....3 Partial info but baseline survey in 1st year.2.5 No info but baseline survey in 1st year.....2 Only partial baseline information.....1.5 No info provided.....1	2.5 (in incremental cost matrix and PAD Annex 11)
6 Has the methodology for determining the Baseline been explained?	Yes.....3 No.....1	2
7 Has a separate budget been allocated to M&E activities?	Yes.....3 No.....1	2 (under Comp 3 but not separate)
8 Have the responsibilities been clearly specified for the M&E activities?	Yes, and clearly specified.....3 Yes, broadly specified.....2 No.....1	3
9 Have the time frames been specified for the M&E activities?	Yes, for all the activities.....3 Yes, but only for major activities .....2 No.....1	2.5
10 Have the performance standards (targets) been specified in the log frame for the project outputs?	Yes, for all the outputs.....3 Yes, but only for major outputs.....2 No.....1	1 (some Indicators serve as Targets)
11 Have the targets been specified for the indicators for project objectives and outcomes in the log frame?	Yes, for most.....3 Yes, but only for some indicators .....2 No .....1	2.5
12 Are the specified targets for indicators of project objective and outcomes based on initial conditions?	Yes, for most.....3 Yes, but only for some of the indicators.....2 No.....1	3
13 Do the project documents mention having made a Provision for mid term and terminal evaluation?	Yes, both mid term and terminal evaluation...3 Only terminal evaluation.....2.5 Only mid term evaluation.....1.5 No information provided.....1	1.5 (not explicitly)
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>28</b>

As can be seen from the table above, the project is compliant on most parameters and has scored 28 out of a possible 39. M&E Design and Planning are considered **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 3.4.2 Project monitoring, the LogFrame Matrix and adaptive management

The implementation of the M&E Plan is an even more important element than the Plan itself. According to GEF guidance, implementation is “*considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system and the overall rating for the M&E systems cannot be higher than the rating on M&E plan implementation*”<sup>19</sup> and the best basis for monitoring project progress is the LogFrame Matrix.

A good LogFrame Matrix provides a summary of what the project aims to achieve with departure points (baseline), targets, indicators and risks along the way. As such, it is a useful tool for those implementing the project and a good measure of progress towards targets. The LogFrame is not fixed but it evolves during the life of the project with changes precipitated by two possible factors – firstly, corrections to a faulty project design; secondly, judicious refinements to reflect changing circumstances (adaptive management).

The LogFrame in the PAD is aptly named Project Design Summary and it basically contains all essential elements except for baselines. It is well endowed with both Impact Indicators and Process Indicators but they are not always SMART (see footnote 10 above) which is a GEF requirement<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>20</sup> Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office (2007) *Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations*. GEF, Washington

While it does show Assumptions, Risks are not given explicitly and these are discussed below in Section 3.4.5.

The elements of the LogFrame are used in the PIRs to measure progress. There are minor differences between the Indicators in the 2006 PIR and those in the PAD LogFrame, but no explanation is given. On the other hand, the 2007 PIR shows the changed Indicators and notes the originals; likewise the 2008 PIR.

Changes in the LogFrame elements have also been made to the scope and focus of some Components/Outputs and the following table is a summary of the salient changes as reported by Project Coordinators/Managers in their close-out reports.

**Table 7. Changes to project components and main sub-components**

ORIGINAL COMPONENT	CHANGES <sup>21</sup>
1.1 Enhance inter-agency cooperation and strategic planning for conservation management in the CFR 1.3 Appraise and develop strategies for financial stability	No substantive changes were made to the wording or the overall design
1.2 Build capacity for effective conservation management in the CFR	Changed to a systems approach with a focus on professional development within communities of practice towards strengthening conservation practices and ultimately institutions, to better achieve their conservation mandates
1.4.1 Establish a comprehensive information management system	There were no substantive changes
1.4.2 Develop a mechanism for skills and knowledge transfer 3.1.4 Undertake a communications programme	Mid-way through the project, these areas of work were consolidated into a single Learning Network Programme, reported under Component 1 on information management but incorporating the lessons learned and communications elements of Component 3
2.1 Conservation Education	No change
3. Project and Programme coordination, management and Monitoring	No changes
4a Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve Project, <i>under</i> 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas	Changes to the work plan to accommodate the Coleske settlement issue and allow for extensive consultation with the community, the development of a Coleske Area Socio-economic, Rights and Entitlements and Natural Resource Use study as well as a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP)
4b Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor (GCBC), <i>under</i> 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas	No changes
4c Garden Route Initiative, <i>under</i> 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas	The marine component was refocused to be more on effective management and not to proclaim new areas (Nov 2006). It was then assigned to the WWF Marine programme (Nov 2007). (reported under 4e)
4d Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve (KBR) Project, <i>under</i> 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas	Marine component refocused to be more on effective management instead of proclaiming new areas; and assigned to the WWF Marine Programme (now 4e) Remaining activities focus on institutional strengthening, assessment of community development opportunities, Small Grants Fund for tourism, and conservation stewardship
4e Marine Programme, <i>under</i> 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas	The Marine subcomponent was reoriented to focus on capacity-building for management effectiveness, as well as raising public awareness of the threats to marine life. These activities were not to involve the imposition of new restrictions on access to marine resources. It was also agreed that the preparation of a Marine Area Management Plan was no longer necessary (Aide Memoir November 2007)
5.1 Fine-scale Biodiversity Planning Project	Initial five priority lowland areas (NW Sandveld, Saldanha Bay, Nieuwoudtville, Upper Breede River Valley and Riversdale Coastal Plain) extended to include the Overberg District Municipality. In addition, the main CBA Maps were finalized in middle 2008, and the FSP project was able to dedicate time and resources to assist Component 5.2 with its implementation
5.2 Integrating Biodiversity into Land-	No changes

<sup>21</sup> Taken from the collated Close-Out Reports as presented at the CloseOut Workshop – Celebrating Conservation, May 2010, SANBI, Kirstenbosch, Cape Town

use decision-making	
5.3 Increasing Land Owner commitment to conservation (Stewardship)	No changes
5.4. Resource Economics	No changes were made to the overall objective but the focus was narrowed
6.1.1 Increase the effectiveness of the “Ecological Reserve” measure in water resource management	The Catchment Management Agency sub-component which was initially planned to be a separate set of activities was added to this one
6.1.2 Incorporate Biodiversity concerns into the new fire management regime	No changes
6.2 Improve management of invasive alien species	No changes
6.3 CAPE Estuarine Programme (CEP)	An additional five co-funded estuary management plans for the Berg, Verlorenvlei, Diep, Bot and Gouritz Estuaries were developed

In the main, the changes to Indicators were made as an improvement to the original LogFrame, whereas the changes to component scope and focus were made as an adaptation to changing circumstances or in the light of new experience gained. As such, they are good examples of adaptive management.<sup>22</sup> Most changes took place following the MTE and all were agreed to in EXCO meetings and during supervision missions. The decisions are all captured in the minutes of the meetings or mission Aide-Mémoires but no comprehensive, updated LogFrame was produced.

The APR/PIR often serves as the key mechanism for reporting on progress and its section on *Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective*, which is written by the Project Manager, the Implementing Agency and the IA/GEF Regional Technical Advisor<sup>23</sup>, is analytical and considers the trend in results observed from different perspectives over a period of time, identifies shortcomings and possible reasons and explores corrective action leading to adaptive management. The project is rated consistently as Satisfactory (S) by all actors and in all its components.

Another reporting mechanism for this project is the Aide-Mémoire (AM) produced after each joint supervision mission by the World Bank and UNDP. Monitoring by the AM is carried out at a much more detailed and technical level than the PIR; it is also more frequent. The AMs did not often rate project progress and when they did, the ratings ranged from Highly Satisfactory (HS) to Moderately Satisfactory (MS). Whereas, the World Bank rated the project consistently as Satisfactory (S) in its six-monthly Implementation Status Reports.

Finally, at a much more micro level, the Quarterly Reports and Workplans provide component managers with a detailed plan of action and a tool for measuring achievement against their forecasts. They also provide helpful feedback from the CCU.

The monitoring processes applied by the project and the use of the results of monitoring to inform management and take corrective action, have been **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 3.4.3 The Mid-Term Evaluation

A Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was carried out in August 2007 when the project was approximately at its half-way stage. The MTE mixed accolades with critical comments. It was “*deeply impressed with the overall progress made by the BCSD Project, which is clearly making a major contribution to the implementation of the C.A.P.E. Strategy ... a hugely successful and energetic mobilization with excellent engagement of partners*”. But it also found that “*the Project is stumbling because of*

<sup>22</sup> Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the outcomes of management actions, accommodating change and improving management. It involves an analysis of the situation (the result of monitoring), exploring alternative actions and making explicit adjustments to the implementation strategy and the LogFrame.

<sup>23</sup> The same analysis by the Government and the Executing Agency is optional, but it is rarely done.

*institutional constraints, mainly relating to the capacity and budgetary resources of some key partners”.*

The MTE made 12 recommendations and the management response to these was in general positive with none being rejected. Annex 8 shows the full MTE recommendations, the full management response and an update on the actions arising from the MTE as reported by the CCU.

As can be seen from the update, some of the institutional difficulties identified by the MTE still persist. Governance and direction from the CCC is still elusive, but the CIC has continued to ‘step into the breach’ and especially after the *Pathfinder*<sup>24</sup> exercise is providing inter-agency cooperation through regular information sharing. The CIC also signs off on the mandates of the Task Teams and reviews their progress.

The MTE identified CapeNature as a crucial player in biodiversity conservation within the CFR but found its contribution to be weaker than it should be. In response, through the BCSD, the CCU has provided support for component development, ToRs drafting, and financial and procurement matters as well as operating costs for stewardship and extension staff in Kogelberg and Gouritz planning activities. In recognition of limited CN capacity, changes were made to LogFrame components including the restructuring of the Kogelberg and Marine components and the deferment of the establishment of two new estuarine and freshwater PAs.

With the help of the project, a Business Plan was developed and the position of Technical Advisor was created in CN. In addition, many of the posts created through the project have been absorbed into the CN staff complement and there is also a stated intention to absorb the balance, dependent on funding. Unfortunately, in spite of the preparation of the Business Case for increased MTEF funds for CN, these are still a barrier to CN’s performance.

#### **3.4.4 Protected area monitoring and the METT**

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT<sup>25</sup>) has become a standard approach for GEF Biodiversity projects dealing with protected areas. It assigns a score, on a four-point scale for Context, Planning, Inputs, Processes, Outputs, and Outcomes, and it is meant to show progress in the management regime for a specific Protected Area. However, as the original authors noted, “*The whole concept of ‘scoring’ progress is fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion*” and its limitations should therefore be acknowledged. It is not considered as an appropriate target or indicator of project progress; neither is it very reliable in comparing scores across different PAs.

The METT exercise was carried out diligently by the project across the protected areas within its scope and the project was also instrumental in introducing the METT concept to protected areas management nationwide. A modest improvement was achieved in the METT average score during the life of the project, however, the scores are not considered reliable. The following table which provides a summary of the records, could not use the scores for Baviaanskloof for 2007 because they followed a different format and could not be taken into account. Furthermore, for each of Baviaanskloof, Cederberg and Knysna, there was no consistency of assessors – viz. in Baviaanskloof, of the five assessors in 2007, only one served as an assessor in 2010 (although one of the original assessors served as a reviewer in 2010); in Knysna, the Park Manager carried out the 2005 assessment and a team of three completely different persons repeated it in 2010; in Cederberg, a different individual did the assessment in 2005 and 2010.

---

<sup>24</sup> Steyn, Lala (2008) *C.A.P.E. Pathfinder 2008 – Sustaining Achievements*. (Draft, November 2008).

<sup>25</sup> Stolton, Sue, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon and Tony Whitten (2003) *Reporting Progress in Protected Areas - A Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool*. World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use. Washington.



**Table 8. Summary of METT scores, by categories, for three selected Protected Areas**

PROTECTED AREA PARAMETERS	BAVIAANSKLOOF		CEDERBERG (Groot Winterhoek Wilderness Area)		KNYSNA LAKE	
	2007	2010	2005	2010	2005	2010
Context	-	7	8	8	7	11
Planning	-	7	4	5	4	6
Planning (additional)	-	2	1	1	1	3
Planning/Outputs	-	2	1	1	2	3
Inputs	-	5	5	6	6	10
Process	-	18	7	15	16	19
Inputs/Process	-	1	2	2	1	2
Outputs (additional)	-	2	1	1	2	3
Outputs	-	5	2	2	1	3
Outcomes	-	5	5	5	5	7
Planning process	-	3	1	1	1	3
TOTALS	-	57	37	47	46	70

Annex 9 contains the full score-sheets for the three selected localities with a full comparison of the initial and most recent scores.

Protected areas monitoring is considered to have been **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 3.4.5 Risks and assumptions

An assumption is an expectation that an ingredient external to the project but essential for project implementation will be present. A risk is the possibility that the ingredient will not be present.

The PAD identified 12 potential risks, determined their level of seriousness and proposed mitigation measures. One or two “risks” could arguably be considered as barriers to be addressed by the project rather than risks, and the mitigation measures proposed are indeed project activities.

According to the CCU, of the 12 risks identified, six either did not eventuate or they were mitigated successfully; three were dealt with adequately but more work was required on mitigation measures; and, three risks did eventuate and mitigation attempts had not been successful. The three risks which did eventuate had been under-rated as modest risks (M).

The table below shows the original risks and planned mitigation measures, together with observations from the CCU.

**Table 9. Risks identified, proposed mitigation measures**

RISK	LEVEL	RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTS ACCORDING TO CCU
<b>From Outputs to Objectives</b>			
Output 1: Inadequate alignment of strategies of key conservation agencies	N	Alignment to the program to be an annual requirement for executing agencies to access GEF resources	All agencies aligned with CAPE in principle – budget alignment and reflection of CAPE priorities in annual business plans is a current objective
Output 2: Stakeholders are not committed to support the conservation education components of the program	N	Upfront consultations with stakeholders will mitigate risks	Risk was mitigated and conservation education stakeholder supported the project and its future sustainability
Output 3: Stakeholders perceive the Project to be a low priority and	N	Base strengthening needs on capacity audits	Most implementing agencies fully supported the project. The only

RISK	LEVEL	RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTS ACCORDING TO CCU
therefore do not partake in management strengthening			exception would be SANParks where penetration into senior management proved to be difficult
Output 4: Implementing agencies are not adequately resourced to maintain protected areas or the concessioning programs do not elicit anticipated returns	M	The Project will support agencies to develop various income earning opportunities and agencies themselves will ensure that they do not over-extend their operations	This mitigation measure was not adequate: Concessioning programmes did not elicit anticipated returns and protected area management remains inadequately resourced in all conservation agencies
Output 5: Development planning resources cannot support conservation in fragmented landscapes or GoSA does not support the roll-out of extended economic incentives to conserve threatened lowland areas	M	Develop cost-effective, easy to use, planning systems and ensure that key government agencies are part of design working groups for development of new financial instruments	This risk was mitigated well and impacts of this output were excellent
Output 6: Fire Protection Associations are under-funded to perform mandates	M	The Project is supporting the development of an overall plan to eradicate alien invasive species from the CFR which is expected to support agencies to access government funding for their removal. This should assist to meet a substantial financial portion of their mandate	This process is taking longer than anticipated. An overall plan for alien eradication and associated principles has been developed, and governance structures have been agreed. Fundraising and alignment of activities that are based on these products and driven by these structures will form part of Phase 2. FPAs remain underfunded.
<b>From Components to Outputs</b>			
Component 1: Lack of commitment by key agencies to the Project	N	Provided that the CCC and the CIC remain in place and the Project continues to respond to the needs of Executing Agencies, this risk will be mitigated	This risk was mitigated for the most part, in spite of the CCC not being effective. SANParks commitment may have benefited from an effective CCC.
Component 2: Consensus is not reached on an education strategy	N	Bring all key players into the process of designing the strategy upfront	This risk was mitigated and as a result of the consultation, a different approach that resulted in a conservation education strategy development process, rather than a strategy per se, was agreed to. This has resulted in 67 associated strategies to date.
Component 3: Agencies fail to support the Project.	N	As for Component 1 above	As for Component 1 above
Component 4: Resettlement issues retard establishment of protected areas	M	The RPF has been well designed and the types of models proposed for expanding protected areas are based on a rights based approach ie using the rights of inhabitants to leverage further opportunities	Resettlement issues did not affect project implementation. The Coleske issue did, however, absorb a large amount of staff time, and it is frustrating that the issue is still not resolved.
Component 5: Communities unwilling to support conservation in fragmented landscapes	N	Ensure proper consultation with affected parties, provide knowledge support and ensure that proposals are advantageous to communities	This risk was mitigated and because their beneficiation was a focus of project activities, communities and private landowners across the CFR supported the project.
Component 6: New CMAs not resourced to perform mandates	M	This is expected to be a low risk as the CMAs do have a capacity to levy water users to pay for their operations though these still need to be decided	Only one of the CMAs has been formed, with another in formation, and this resulted in this component of the project being changed. The risk of CMAs not being formed was not factored into the original project design.

Risk Rating – H (High Risk), S (Substantial Risk), M (Modest Risk), N (Negligible or Low Risk)

Risk planning and risk management are seen as **Satisfactory (S)** because the majority of risks were identified and, with minor exceptions, mitigation measures were effective.

## 4 FINDINGS: RESULTS AND IMPACTS

### 4.1 Results achieved

#### 4.1.1 Measuring progress and success

As noted elsewhere in this report, the departure point for this assessment of the results achieved is the LogFrame in the PAD, especially its Outputs/Outcomes and Indicators. Also as noted, the quality of the original Indicators was not high and their replacements were not much better as indicators of progress towards the Objectives and Outcomes. This was mainly because they did not always have a good “fit” with the Outcomes or the Objectives, *i.e.* they did not relate well to the Outcome or Objective they were supposedly indicating.

The Indicators were often treated as targets and the project gave the impression that it set out to “achieve” the Indicators which is not intended. It is the Outcomes and the Objectives which should have been the Targets. Unfortunately, even when the Indicators were “achieved”, because they were not always Specific or Relevant to the Outcome or the Immediate Objective, this did not indicate achievement of the Outcomes or the Objectives.

The Indicators were therefore not very helpful in assessing progress towards the Outcomes and Objectives and the information below was gleaned mainly from the PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, the Close-out Reports, and the self assessment by the CCU (see Annex 10) which was based on an impressive monitoring system. Unfortunately, these sources of information on progress are formatted differently and have not been easy to reconcile. PIR2009 and the 2009 Aide-Mémoire provided the most recent set of Indicators and these were used in the tables below. However, the new format for PIRs is not user-friendly and the information it provides on progress and achievements is very scant. Aide-Mémoires are better but do not go down to Outcome level. The Close-out Reports and the CCU self-assessment were the most informative but were not entirely in harmony either with each other or with the PIR2009. The information gleaned from a mixture of these sources was supplemented and corroborated through consultations, field visits and the review of other documentation.

#### 4.1.2 Project Development Objective

The Project Development Objective according to the PAD was:

*To support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful project outcomes*

and there have been no changes to this wording.

According to this Objective, the project was expected to *support by laying a foundation* and this Evaluation needs to answer the following two key questions regarding this Objective –

- Has the Project laid a foundation for scaling up and replicating project outcomes?
- Has this led to the support of conservation in the CFR?

In an attempt to monitor progress towards the Development Objective, the PAD selected eight Indicators. However, there are some differences between the Indicators in the PAD and those in the PIRs and Aide Memoires – *e.g.* PIR2006 does not list Indicators 3 and 8 from the PAD and provides more detail for Indicators 4 and 6; PIR2007 and PIR2008 replace Indicator 3 (with reasons), reduce the detail in Indicator 4, and list Indicator 5 twice. PIR2009 shows the most significant differences, particularly by omitting three Indicators. Aide-Mémoires start in harmony with the PAD, then show similar changes as the PIRs. These changes could be claimed to be examples of adaptive management, however, there was a feeling that Indicators may have been changed to fit results, not the other way round but this has been disputed by the CCU.

The table below lists the latest Indicators (from the PIR2009 and the 2009 Aide-Mémoire), comments on their usefulness and assesses progress towards the Development Objective.

**Table 10. Indicators of achievement of the Development Objective**

<b>Project Development Objective: To support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful project outcomes</b>		
<b>Key questions to answer:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Project laid a foundation for scaling up and replicating project outcomes?</li> <li>• Has this led to the support of conservation in the CFR?</li> </ul>		
<b>INDICATORS AS AMENDED IN THE PIRs AND AIDE MEMOIRES FOR THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>COMMENT ON THE INDICATORS ACCORDING TO THE SMART<sup>26</sup> CRITERIA</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</b>
1. Increased number of conservation organisations with education strategies (revised from: A CFR-wide conservation education strategy is successfully designed and implemented across the Project area)	Not very <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> but difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	The Indicator target has been achieved but whether it has contributed to the foundation for scaling up and replicating is debateable; neither can it be certain that it has led to support of conservation
2. All C.A.P.E. signatory institutions directly support implementation of the Project (of TOTAL NUMBER, measured based on the number of C.A.P.E. partners that regularly attend CIC meetings)	Quite <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and can be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b> – a SMART Indicator	Indicator is relevant to a foundation for scaling up and replicating and can be expected to lead to the support of conservation. The target is reported as having been achieved
3. Five-year targets for protected area status for irreplaceable broad habitat units in lowlands and watersheds are met as defined by the C.A.P.E. 2000 strategy. (in ha of critically endangered and endangered veg under formal conservation management )	Reasonably <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and possible to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b> and a SMART Indicator	This is more of an Indicator of a result rather than a foundation for scaling up and replicating, however, it is certain to have led to the support of conservation
4. Spatial development frameworks in six representative lowland local municipalities sites incorporate conservation priorities (in number of SDFs)	Very <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and can be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b> . This is a SMART Indicator	The target was changed to 10 SDFs and at end of project, 9 had been obtained – a good result contributing to a foundation for scaling up and replicating which has already contributed to the support of conservation
5. The Baviaanskloof, Cederberg and Garden Route protected areas have been consolidated and expanded through critical lowland habitats (in ha under formal management agreements; as alternative to: the extent of protected areas in the CFR increases 400,000ha)	This is another SMART Indicator. It is very <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and can be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b> .	Once again the target was a result – the actual scaling up itself rather than a foundation for it. The target has been achieved and exceeded and has contributed to the support of conservation
6. The number of jobs directly associated with conservation and nature-based tourism, and related to the project objectives in Project intervention sites (in number of people employed)	Not very <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for scaling up and replicating; easily <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> but difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> to the Objective but <b>Trackable</b>	The target has been met and exceeded, and as the jobs are claimed to be directly related to conservation, it makes a contribution to a foundation for scaling up and replicating
7. The number of jobs directly associated with conservation and nature-based tourism, and related to the project objectives in Project intervention sites (in person days)	Same as above	The logic of this re-interpretation of the numerical values was that many of the 'jobs' are short term opportunities, better measured as person days than as jobs. The target was met and exceeded and its contribution to a foundation for scaling up and replicating and its support of conservation, are based on the type of jobs as above.

<sup>26</sup> SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Attributable, Relevant, Trackable

Of the seven Indicators considered above, four satisfy the SMART criteria. Of these, two were Indicators of result whereas two contribute to the *foundation* required by the Objective. The targets set by the Indicators have been met and some have been exceeded. More precisely, and as advised by the CCU, the BCSD has produced a suite of replicable 'pilots' that are already being applied across the CFR and even nationally, and the project is seen as a forerunner to mainstreaming internationally. These include approaches to learning networks, the B-GIS, approaches to corridor conservation, the stewardship approach, standards for fine-scale planning, models and approaches to PES, approaches to estuary management, approaches to integrated alien species management, mechanisms to influence land use planning and decision making, etc.

In spite of the fact that some Indicators are not completely specific or relevant to the Objective, indications are that the answers to the two key questions are generally positive – the Project has laid a foundation for scaling up and replicating project outcomes; and this has contributed to the support of conservation in the CFR. The Objective has, in the main, been achieved and this conclusion is supported by the Close-out reports, the PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, consultations and field visits.

Attainment of the Project Development Objective is assessed as **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 4.1.3 The Immediate Objectives

The PAD LogFrame does not provide any Indicators at the Immediate Objectives level. Instead it clusters three Outcomes (called Outputs) under each and provides Indicators for each Outcome. This evaluation has adopted the same approach, namely, assessing progress and achievement of the Immediate Objectives through the achievement of their relevant Outcomes/Outputs, as guided by the respective Indicators.

#### 4.1.3.1 Immediate Objective 1

The Immediate Objective 1 according to the PAD was:

*A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities*

and there have been no changes to this wording.

According to this Objective, the project was expected to establish a foundation, so that CFR biodiversity can be mainstreamed into economic activities and this Evaluation needs to answer the following key question regarding this Objective –

- Has the Project established a foundation for mainstreaming?

It is not easy to determine if and when a foundation for mainstreaming has been laid and the PAD helped by noting that *laying a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities will entail:*

- (i) *institutional strengthening;*
- (ii) *supporting conservation education; and*
- (iii) *implementing a programme coordination, management and monitoring framework.*

The PAD then converted each of these three elements into an Outcome/Output as follows:

**Output 1:** *Capacitated institutions to implement the Project*

**Output 2:** *Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education*

**Output 3:** *CCU capacitated to perform Project coordination function*

Through these three Outcomes/Outputs, the project was expected to strengthen institutions, support conservation education, and implement a framework for programme coordination, management and monitoring.

The PAD adopted Indicators for each Outcome/Output to help determine whether *a foundation has been laid for mainstreaming biodiversity*, but these were changed significantly during the life of the project as evidenced by the PIRs and the Aide Memoires.

Project implementation also showed drifting between Outcomes/Outputs. For example, mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities, was supported by a range of cross-cutting activities across the whole project, and not just by the Outcomes where it was planned in the project LogFrame. The work of Outcomes 5 and 6 below was largely focused on the establishment of this foundation.

Likewise, awareness raising was handled in a cross cutting manner by all executing agencies, and notably, through the CCU (Outcome 3) and learning network (Outcome 1) work programmes.

Another example is provided by the land use planning and stewardship components which had very significant and successful capacity development results that influenced the mainstreaming of biodiversity into land use planning and agriculture and are therefore relevant to the delivery of Outcome 1 and Immediate Objective 1, even though the activities were carried out under other Outcomes.

The following table provides a comprehensive summary of the Evaluator's assessment of progress towards the three Outcomes and the Immediate Objective 1. It uses the LogFrame as the departure point, but it then lists the Indicators for each Outcome/Output as found in the PIR2009 (the latest set available). It then carries comments on their qualities as Indicators and their usefulness in assessing progress. Next follows an indication of progress as reported in the Close-out Report Highlights and the CCU Self-assessment. This is followed by the Evaluator's comments on the progress achieved towards the specific Outcome/Output together with ratings. Finally, there are comments on the Immediate Objective and an overall rating.

**Table 11. Analysis of the Indicators for Outcomes under Immediate Objective 1 and progress achieved**

Immediate Objective 1: <i>A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities</i>					
OUTCOME/OUTPUT AND INDICATORS AS IN PIR2009		COMMENT ON THE INDICATORS ACCORDING TO THE SMART CRITERIA	RELEVANCE TO IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 1	RESULTS ACCORDING TO CLOSE-OUT REPORTS HIGHLIGHTS AND CCU SELF-ASSESSMENT <sup>27</sup>	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
Outcome 1: Capacitated institutions implement the project	1. Increase in the number of users of the information management products. Based on the number of user registrations for information management products produced and used in biodiversity management.	Not very <b>Specific</b> for a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; but not <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	The project aimed to capacitate institutions to implement the project as part of a "foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity". Unfortunately, this Indicator does not indicate whether institutions are capacitated as a result of the project	<p><b>From Close-out Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAPE partnership expanded from to 23 signatory partner organisations.</li> <li>• 3,510 stakeholders registered on the CAPE database</li> <li>• 176 participants in capacity building programmes on mentorship, stewardship and environmental education</li> <li>• new mentorship course, Enviro Eds course, and new stewardship course piloted</li> <li>• 9 Project Developers' Forum and Protected Areas Forum / Landscape Initiatives Knowledge Exchange events, and as 5 annual Partners' Conferences</li> <li>• 26 systematic biodiversity planning products published on BGIS website</li> <li>• 2,934 registered users of BGIS website</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b> A new streamlined model for</p>	<p>Outcome 1 was assigned eight Indicators and only one satisfies the SMART criteria. Only two are Specific and Relevant to the Outcome but seven are easily attributable to the project. As a general conclusion it can be said that out of the Indicators selected for Outcome 1, the majority do address project implementation as a whole, but only three indicate whether progress has been made towards Immediate Objective 1 which sought a <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i>.</p> <p>The Outcome sought implementation of the project by institutions capacitated (presumably by the project). The project delivered a range of products most of which are either an illustration of the implementation of the project by institutions, or an indication of capacity. The connection of some other of the products under this Outcome with the capacitation of institutions or their implementation of the project is not always obvious.</p> <p>The Evaluator was advised that this Outcome had a huge capacity development programme whereby</p>
	2. Increase in number of biodiversity conservation planning products published on the BGIS website (in number of products published on the website)	Not very <b>Specific</b> for strengthened institutions or a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; but only partly <b>Relevant</b> ; it is <b>Trackable</b>	The project aimed to capacitate institutions to implement the project as part of a "foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity". Unfortunately, this Indicator does not indicate whether institutions are capacitated as a result of the project		
	3. Increase in number of conservation information management products produced (part replaces: 50% increase in number of conservation information management products produced and used in biodiversity management)	Same as above	Same as above		
	4. Use of Project supported management systems in the various agencies	Partly <b>Specific</b> for strengthened institutions towards a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity; it is not <b>Measurable</b> , but <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; it is partly <b>Relevant</b> , and <b>Trackable</b>	This is an Indicator of the applicability of project products and although it does not say much about strengthened institutions, it can be claimed to contribute to the "foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity" as targeted by the Objective		
	5. Institutions are able to meet demand to incorporate private land into protected areas	<b>Specific</b> but not easily <b>Measurable</b> ; probably <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b>	This is an Indicator of strengthened institutions and as such it provides an indication of whether a "foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity" has been laid.		

<sup>27</sup> The CCU Self-assessment was based on the monitoring system set up to reflect the Indicators from both the World Bank PAD and the UNDP ProDoc. As the PAD became the signed implementation document, it was adopted as the focus of this evaluation in order to avoid confusion. For the purpose of this assessment of progress only the results linked to the PAD were considered.

		and <b>Trackable</b> This is a SMART Indicator	The work to achieve this was done largely through Outcome 5 – i.e. stewardship.	biodiversity stewardship was agreed upon and implemented nationally, with a total of 58 contracts signed between landowners and CapeNature – establishing 39 nature reserves and 19 biodiversity agreements.	large numbers of municipal, provincial and private individuals were provided with training to use the B-GIS information and system. From consultations carried out with active stakeholders and from visits to field situations a picture has emerged of stakeholder institutions whose capacity has been strengthened, effectively implementing the project or its follow-up activities.
	6. Legal mandates and roles of institutions clarified	<b>Specific</b> to more efficient institutions; not easily <b>Measurable</b> , and difficult to know when <b>Achieved</b> ; could be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> , but not easy to <b>Track</b>	This Process Indicator targets stronger and more efficient institutions and can be said to be relevant to the Objective target of laying a “ <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ”	8 landscape initiative steering committees and 14 cross-cutting task teams were established, with 4 landscape initiatives and 14 task teams receiving direct support from the project.	The achievement of Outcome 1 is considered to be <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> .
	7. Number of learning programmes that respond to identified C.A.P.E. capacity building needs (new)	Not <b>Specific</b> to stronger institutions or a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; but not very <b>Relevant</b> ; it is <b>Trackable</b>	This Indicator seems irrelevant to capacitated institutions as targeted by the Outcome, although it could be seen to make a distant contribution to the Objective target of a “ <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ”	7 of the 14 cross-cutting task teams have expanded to a national scope of work. Others will continue to have a CFR focus, coordinated by partner institutions.	
	8. Number of people within participating institutions who directly benefit from C.A.P.E. capacity building activities, through participation in training courses or mentorship programmes	Not <b>Specific</b> for stronger institutions or a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; not <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	The Indicator measures a process and not a result. As such, its contribution to the Outcome target of capacitated institutions and that of the Objective which is “ <i>foundation has been laid for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ” is unquantifiable		
Outcome 2: Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education	9. Civil society and private sector initiatives support conservation of the CFR (measured by the number of projects registered on C.A.P.E. databases)	<b>Specific</b> for contributions but nothing about awareness and education; <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> but difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b>	This is an Indicator of the target sought by the Outcome, namely, “ <i>inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation</i> ”. It is relevant to the Objective target of a “ <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ”	<b>From Close-out Report</b>	Outcome 2 was assigned three Indicators of which, one (Indicator 11) satisfies the SMART criteria fully while the other two satisfy most. Two are good Indicators for progress towards both the Outcome and the Immediate Objective, whereas the third (Indicator 10) is not Specific to the Outcome but is still relevant to the Immediate Objective.  The Outcome sought the contribution to biodiversity conservation of CFR inhabitants who had benefited through awareness raising and environmental education.  In its delivery under this Outcome, the project focused almost exclusively on conservation education and relied substantially on the CEPF and TMF partner projects to raise awareness and provide an avenue to CFR inhabitants to contribute to biodiversity conservation. It also carried out awareness raising activities under various other components. While it is commendable that the project did not
	10. Increased number of conservation education professionals offering programmes (measured as the number of participants registering and completing relevant courses)	Not <b>Specific</b> to the Outcome; <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> but cannot be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	This is a preparatory type of Indicator which does not target the contributions of CFR inhabitants to biodiversity conservation. However, it could be claimed to contribute to the “ <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ” targeted by the Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 109 participated in courses on conservation education</li> <li>• 141 learning support materials developed by partner organisations</li> <li>• 3 sub-regional networks for conservation education established with plans for sustainability post-BCSD</li> </ul>	
	11. Learning support materials (LSM) in use and supporting CE (measured by the number of materials produced and disseminated, per partner, per year)	<b>Specific</b> to “ <i>awareness raising</i> ”; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> but cannot be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> to the Outcome and <b>Trackable</b> . This is a SMART Indicator	A good Indicator of the awareness raising effort through which “ <i>inhabitants of the CFR contribute to biodiversity conservation</i> ”. Relevant to the Outcome and contributes to laying the “ <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> ” as targeted by the Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76 organisations involved in the networks and 67 have explicit conservation education strategies</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b> The number of civil society and private sector conservation projects supported by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund and the Table Mountain Fund grew from 98 to 210, significantly exceeding the target of 136.</p> <p>Two community outreaches have been held per quarter as well as</p>	



				interventions on 3 environmental days were completed over the last period.	attempt to repeat the work of partner projects, a revision of the Outcome wording to reflect the project focus would have been justifiable.  If the simple wording of Outcome 2 is taken into account, progress towards the Outcome is seen as having been Marginally Satisfactory (MS). However, the achievements in conservation education and the knowledge of awareness raising activities elsewhere, can be considered <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> .
Outcome 3: CCU capacitated to perform project coordination function	12. Increase in number of communication programme materials produced and disseminated ( including brochures, campaigns, exhibitions, media releases, popular articles and publications)	Not very <b>Specific</b> to the coordination function sought by the Outcome; can be <b>Measured</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; it is only partly <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	This Process Indicator does not indicate coordination as sought by the Outcome and it does not address programme coordination, management and monitoring.	<p><b>From Close-out Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 landscape initiative steering committees and 14 cross-cutting task teams established (7 teams expanded to national scope)</li> <li>210 civil society and private sector conservation projects supported by CEPF and TMF</li> <li>101 communications products produced and disseminated</li> <li>28 case studies produced, recording lessons learnt and achievements of the partnership</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b> Project partners have indicated satisfaction with the CCU, and have supported the proposal that SANBI continue to house the Coordination Unit within its Fynbos Programme.</p> <p>SANBI has committed to continue supporting CAPE's coordination function. To this end, both the programme developer and the coordinator are now permanent positions.</p>	<p>Outcome 3 was assigned three Indicators and none satisfies the SMART criteria completely. Only one (Indicator 13) can help with one aspect of the Outcome targets and this Indicator is also relevant to the Immediate Objective. Indicator 14 is impossible to measure since it indicates something beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>The Outcome sought a functional CCU, implementing the project effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>The results reported in the Close-out Report do not relate well to the Outcome. However, the results listed in the CCU Self-Assessment indicate peer satisfaction and this was confirmed by the Evaluator's consultations. The CCU has performed its tasks well and it is highly regarded.</p> <p>The achievement of Outcome 3 is considered to be <b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b> regardless of the Indicators.</p>
	13. Lessons learned through monitoring and evaluation are recorded, disseminated and periodically incorporated into C.A.P.E. strategy and M&E system	This is <b>Specific</b> to the monitoring function of the CCU; it is not <b>Measurable</b> , but <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> , and <b>Trackable</b>	This is an Indicator of the application of the results of monitoring, as such it is an illustration of the capacity of the CCU as sought by the Outcome. It could also be said to be a contribution to the " <i>foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity</i> " as sought by the Objective		
	14. Project partners support the CCU in Phase 2 of the C.A.P.E. program	Not <b>Specific</b> ; not <b>Measurable</b> , and not <b>Achievable</b> (within the life of the project); cannot be <b>Attributed</b> to the project; not <b>Relevant</b> or <b>Trackable</b>	This is an impossible Indicator since it goes beyond the life of the project.		

**Overall comments on the achievement of Immediate Objective 1:**

The Objective sought a *foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities* and it is very likely that the results achieved through the three Outcomes targeted under this Objective, will make a significant contribution to such a foundation. Although mainstreaming is an elusive target and better Indicators are necessary before it can be ascertained, the progress made towards it by the project is considered as **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 4.1.3.2 Immediate Objective 2

The Immediate Objective 2 according to the PAD was:

*Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management*

and there have been no changes to this wording.

According to this Objective, the project was expected to pilot and adapt (adopt?) models to enhance CFR conservation and this Evaluation needs to answer the following two key questions regarding this Objective –

- Has the Project piloted and adapted (or adopted) models for sustainable, effective management?
- Has this resulted in CFR conservation being enhanced?

There is no difficulty in determining whether the project has piloted (and adapted/adopted) models for sustainable, effective management. However, it is not easy to determine if CFR conservation has been enhanced.

The PAD envisaged that this Objective would be achieved through:

- (i) *protected area management;*
- (ii) *establishing the foundations of the biodiversity economy; and*
- (iii) *integrating biodiversity concerns into watershed management*

These three activities were then fashioned into Outcomes/Outputs targeting protected area management, foundations for the biodiversity economy, and the integration of biodiversity concerns into watershed management. In order to assess how successful the project has been, there is a need for Indicators and the PAD adopted eight Indicators for the three Outcomes/Outputs to help determine whether *conservation of the CFR has been enhanced through piloting and adapting (or adopting) models for sustainable, effective management*. The Indicators were changed during the life of the project, but in spite of this, the majority are not very helpful with determining progress towards the Outcomes and ultimately to the Objective. The project is to be commended for setting aside some Indicators and carrying out activities which achieved results relevant to the Outcomes and the Objective.

Table 12 below provides a comprehensive summary of the Evaluator's assessment of progress towards the three Outcomes and the Immediate Objective. It lists the Indicators for each Outcome/Output as found in the PIR2009 (the latest set available). It then carries comments on their qualities as Indicators and their usefulness in assessing progress. Next follows an indication of progress as reported in the Close-out Report Highlights and the CCU Self-assessment. This is followed by the Evaluator's comments on the progress achieved towards the specific Outcome/Output and ultimately the Immediate Objective as well as a rating for each Outcome/Output and an overall rating for the Immediate Objective.

In spite of the apparent focus on hectares of the Indicator, the CCU update and the PIRs/AMs, Outcome 4 merits special attention because of the extent of the work known to have been carried out, the innovative approach applied and the dimensions of the activities and inputs required, relative to other parts of the project. Table 13 in the following pages, "dissects" the Outcome into its five sizeable sub-outcomes, records the progress achieved (as in the Close-out Reports), and adds comments from the Evaluator. Baselines, targets and indicators are not available.

Table 12. Analysis of the Indicators for Outcomes under Immediate Objective 2 and progress achieved

Immediate Objective 2: Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management					
OUTCOME/OUTPUT AND INDICATORS AS IN PIR2009	COMMENT ON THE INDICATORS ACCORDING TO THE SMART CRITERIA	RELEVANCE TO IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 2	RESULTS ACCORDING TO CLOSE-OUT REPORTS HIGHLIGHTS AND CCU SELF-ASSESSMENT	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS	
<p><b>Outcome 4: Additional 4,000km<sup>s</sup> of viable protected area established and properly managed</b></p>	<p>15. 400 000ha of additional protected area established (in ha)</p>	<p>This Indicator is too <b>Specific</b> since it merely repeats the wording of the Outcome itself; it is <b>Measurable</b>, and <b>Achievable</b> and it may be <b>Attributable</b> to the project; but it is not very <b>Relevant</b> to “<i>piloting and adapting (or adopting) models</i>”. It is <b>Trackable</b></p>	<p>Merely adding hectares does not enhance protection and conservation. The most useful Indicators for this Outcome would have been those that address “viable” and “properly managed”. The hectares have been added, so the Outcome is achieved, but it has not necessarily contributed to the Objective which has a focus on “<i>sustainable, effective management</i>”.</p>	<p><b>From Close-out Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase of 99,213 ha under formal management agreements in Kogelberg, Cederberg, Baviaanskloof, Gouritz, Garden Route and South West Lowlands</li> <li>• Increase of 45,488 ha of endangered and critically endangered biodiversity under conservation</li> <li>• 181,276 person days per year over the project period of work associated with conservation</li> <li>• METT scores improved slightly from an average of 55.7 to an average of 57.3</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b></p> <p>The total number of hectares under formal management agreements in the Kogelberg, Cederberg, Baviaanskloof, Gouritz, Garden Route and South West Lowlands areas grew from 1,054,033 hectares to 1,764,117 hectares – exceeding the target of 1,454,033 hectares</p> <p><b>Update from the CCU</b></p> <p>The landscape initiatives all focused on creating an enabling environment for biodiversity conservation by creating awareness and involving people, including production sectors and other actors in biodiversity conservation, and by implementing a range of pilots to mainstream biodiversity into decision-making and local economic development (through design and implementation of small projects)</p> <p>They also provided a platform through which innovations such as stewardship, mainstreaming into land use planning and estuary management could be tested.</p>	<p>The Outcome sought 400,000ha of <u>viable</u> additional protected areas, <u>properly managed</u> and, as already noted, this single Indicator focused on the hectares and misguided the CCU Self-Assessment into the wrong focus.</p> <p>The Indicator has no reference to the manner in which these additional areas are being managed. The bland statements of results would merit a rating of Unsatisfactory (U), were it not for the additional information gleaned from field visits which indicated that management was taking place effectively with the METTs, the stewardship approach, management plans, etc. <b>Satisfactory (S)</b>.</p> <p>In recognition of the additional investment that is known to have been put into this Outcome, and the results attained, Table 13 below takes the assessment to the sub-Outcome level. Unfortunately, no Indicators are available at the sub-Outcome level and the approach adopted could not be as thorough.</p>

Outcome 5: Biodiversity in six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society	16. Increase in number of officials who received capacity building in conservation planning (this indicator will only measure direct project results as other data has not been recorded)	Not <b>Specific</b> for “ <i>areas identified and secured</i> ”; actual “ <i>capacity building</i> ” is not <b>Measurable</b> through this Indicator. It is <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; but it is not <b>Relevant</b> ; although <b>Trackable</b> . There is no Indicator for “ <i>in conjunction with civil society</i> ”	Capacity building for conservation planning enhances the chances for effective management, however, this is not what the Outcome targeted. The Indicator has set up a target of its own.  More relevant Indicators would have focussed on identification of biodiversity and making them secure. It would have also been helpful to have an Indicator of the extent of civil society involvement	<p><b>From Close-out Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical biodiversity area maps with associated land-use guidelines have been produced for 31 of the 34 CFR municipalities</li> <li>• A Conservation Action Priorities map developed for CapeNature to guide biodiversity stewardship work</li> <li>• Biodiversity has been adopted by the provincial planning authority as part of their mandate</li> <li>• Strengthening the biodiversity component of the Spatial Development Frameworks of 15 out of 18 CFR municipalities</li> <li>• 564 officials, planners, environmental assessment professionals and students participated in comprehensive full-day training course on using critical biodiversity maps and guidelines</li> <li>• New biodiversity stewardship model agreed and implemented nationally, with 58 contracts signed establishing 39 nature reserves and 19 biodiversity agreements</li> <li>• Municipal rates rebate and a national tax deduction created as new incentive mechanisms for biodiversity stewardship</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b></p> <p>As a result of the BCSD project, critical biodiversity area maps with associated land-use guidelines have been produced for 31 of the 34 local municipalities of the Cape Floristic Region, including and going far beyond the targeted lowland priority areas.</p> <p>A Conservation Action Priorities map was developed as an internal tool for CapeNature to guide biodiversity stewardship work throughout the Western Cape.</p> <p>A new streamlined model for biodiversity stewardship was agreed upon and implemented nationally, with a total of 58 contracts signed between landowners and CapeNature – establishing 39 nature reserves and 19 biodiversity agreements.</p>	<p>The two Indicators selected by the project design for this Outcome are neither specific nor relevant.</p> <p>The Outcome targeted six priority areas for biodiversity identification and securing with civil society participation.</p> <p>In spite of the irrelevant Indicators, the project has delivered a valuable tool in the form of biodiversity maps and provided training for their use; an effective stewardship model and an economic incentive tool to secure biodiversity. The only element which is not completely satisfied is the involvement of civil society although it could be claimed that this is achieved through the stewardship efforts as well as through the TMF and CEPF interventions that were designed to complement this work, and were supported by staff who were hired through the BCSD and through the governance and stakeholder engagement processes of the landscape initiatives</p> <p>This is a very good result which satisfies the Outcome and contributes significantly to the Immediate Objective 2. Achievement is considered to have been <b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>.</p>
	17. Increase in number of landowners who receive input or support regarding biodiversity conservation from extension teams in priority areas	Not <b>Specific</b> to the Outcome and only marginally so for the Objective; it is <b>Measurable</b> , and <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	Receiving input and support is not the result sought by the Outcome, which aimed for biodiversity to be identified and secured. As with the above, the Indicator has set up targets of its own		

Outcome 6: Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watershed management	18. Extent to which the implementation of the ecological Reserve integrates biodiversity concerns in target areas (Replaces: Extent to which biodiversity concerns are integrated into ecological reserve determinations in target areas)	Not <b>Specific</b> , not <b>Measurable</b> (too vague), and difficult to determine when <b>Achieved</b> ; difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> , and only maybe, <b>Trackable</b>	This Indicator requires Indicators! It repeats the Outcome in different words. It does not help determine whether " <i>piloting and adapting (adopting) models for sustainable, effective management</i> " as required by the Objective, has taken place	<p><b>From Close-out Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protocol for estuary management plans developed, and 11 estuary management plans developed</li> <li>A comprehensive strategy for managing alien plant and animal species developed</li> <li>Biodiversity considerations were strengthened in water resource management procedures, techniques and protocols of 3 of 5 CFR catchments</li> <li>National audit and review of the methodologies, techniques and status of Ecological Reserve implementation in South Africa</li> </ul> <p><b>From CCU Self-Assessment</b></p> <p>Biodiversity considerations were strengthened in water resource management procedures, techniques and protocols of 3 of the 5 CFR catchments (Olifants-Doring, Baviaanskloof and Breede-Overberg), with a view to informing catchment management in the emerging catchment management agencies and integrating environmental water requirements into decision-making processes.</p> <p>The BCSD project catalysed a national audit and review of the methodologies, techniques and status of Ecological Reserve implementation in South Africa that will guide national strategies for integrating environmental water requirements into water resource management.</p> <p>The CapeNature fire management policy is based on information derived through the Fire Management Data Project. The project included an assessment of the impact of fires on fynbos ecosystems, and proposed changes to CapeNature's fire management policy and guidelines.</p> <p>A comprehensive strategy for managing alien plant and animal species in the Cape Floristic Region was developed, and a new cooperative approach to this work has been achieved, with implementation structures in place</p> <p>A protocol for estuary management plans was developed, and with co-funding, 11 estuary management plans developed through</p>	<p>None of the five Indicators selected for this Outcome is helpful.</p> <p>The project sought the integration of biodiversity concerns into watershed (= catchment) management. Good Indicators would have focussed on what "<i>concerns</i>", and what "<i>management</i>" and whether one has been "<i>integrated</i>" into the other.</p> <p>In spite of the unhelpful Indicators, the project has delivered a package of results relevant to the Outcome. They focus on some "<i>biodiversity concerns</i>" and they illustrate "<i>integration</i>" into "<i>management</i>". As such, they also contribute to the Immediate Objective 2 in its target of "<i>piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management</i>".</p> <p>The achievement of this Outcome is considered as <b>Satisfactory(S)</b>.</p>
	19. A pilot IAS control project is implemented in priority ecosystems (Revised from: Two pilot IAS control projects implemented in priority ecosystems)	Quite <b>Specific</b> and <b>Measurable</b> (it has either taken place or it hasn't). It is <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> and <b>Trackable</b>	This is not an Indicator but an Activity. However, it is about the integration of biodiversity concerns and it is also about piloting models for effective management as targeted by the Objective		
	20. Adoption and implementation of biodiversity conservation measures in fire management systems in target watersheds	This is <b>Specific</b> to " <i>integration of biodiversity concerns</i> "; but difficult to <b>Measure</b> ; it is <b>Achievable</b> but difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> , but not easy to <b>Track</b>	This is another Activity rather than an Indicator – the Indicator would have helped determine whether <i>adoption and implementation</i> had taken place. However, as an Activity it is relevant to the Outcome and to the Objective		
	21. Plans developed and implemented to remove threats to biodiversity in watersheds (alien invasives, fire, ecological reserve, estuarine management) 1. Fire management strategy 2. IAS strategy	This is <b>Specific</b> for " <i>integration of biodiversity concerns</i> "; development is <b>Measurable</b> , but implementation is not; it is <b>Achievable</b> but difficult to <b>Attribute</b> to the project; it is <b>Relevant</b> . Plan development is <b>Trackable</b> but implementation is probably not.	This Indicator would have been more useful if it had focussed on an indication of implementation. However, it is relevant to the Outcome as well as to the Objective		
	22. Protocol developed for CFR estuarine management	Not very <b>Specific</b> to the Outcome or the Objective; it is <b>Measurable</b> (the protocol is either developed or it isn't); it is <b>Achievable</b> and <b>Attributable</b> to the project; only partly <b>Relevant</b> , but <b>Trackable</b>	This is not an Indicator of whether biodiversity concerns have been integrated into watershed management or not. Neither does it indicate whether " <i>piloting and adopting models for sustainable, effective management</i> ", as required by the Objective, has taken place.		

				consultative processes.	
<p><b>Overall comments on the achievement of Immediate Objective 2:</b>  The Objective sought the “<i>piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management</i>” so as to achieve “<i>enhancement of CFR conservation</i>” and a number of piloting initiatives were indeed carried out successfully by the project. Whether these results achieved “<i>enhancement of CFR conservation</i>” is too early to tell, but they are sound models which, if they are sustained, can be expected to lead to this ultimate result. The progress made towards Immediate Objective 2 by the project is considered as <b>Satisfactory (S)</b>.</p>					

**Table 13. Consideration of Outcome 4 at Sub-Outcome level**

ACTIVITIES	KEY SUCCESSES ACHIEVED (as in Close-out Reports)	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<b>4a Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve Project</b>		
<p><b>4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas</b>  4.1.1 Consolidate and expand the Baviaanskloof protected area</p> <p><b>4.2 Development of sustainable management effectiveness</b>  4.2.1 Design and test a Strategic Performance Management System in three target PAS  4.2.2 Adapt the EIS model developed in Cape Peninsula National Park for other priority PAS  4.2.3 Develop plans for responsible tourism in target PAS  4.2.4 Facilitate development of tourism infrastructure and facilities in target PAS  4.2.5 Develop PAS business plans and mechanism for financial sustainability for target PAS  4.2.6 Implement priority</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably the most successful aspect of the project was establishing a creative partnership between an NGO (Wilderness Foundation) with the ability to operate outside of restrictive bureaucratic systems and a fledgling government agency. This allowed for a far more rapid establishment of a flagship protected area and established a sound basis for the sustainable future of the protected area.</li> <li>The above and the subsequent well planned and executed handover from the Wilderness Foundation to ECParks will improve the long term sustainability of activities initiated as part of the project.</li> <li>The EIS system and other GIS data gathered by the Project (e.g. property audit) are actively used by EC Parks management staff and scientific services.</li> <li>The PMU raised funds to appoint experts to carry out a cultural heritage audit and develop appropriate management plans for selected sites. The Baviaanskloof has considerable cultural heritage features and the study went a long way to document these and raise awareness with the management authority. In addition the information produced was used to develop an informative guide book that increased awareness amongst local inhabitants and visitors alike.</li> <li>There is improved awareness about the role of ECParks and communication channels have been opened between them and stakeholders. This awareness was also enhanced by taking local leaders and decision makers out on wilderness trails within the Baviaanskloof (funded by CEPF small grants). This contributed to a greater appreciation for the area as a World Heritage Site and also built local awareness of ECParks responsibilities and functions.</li> <li>The Biodiversity and Citrus Initiative has brought in a whole new group of stakeholders that are committed to making a contribution to the mega-reserve and conservation in general.</li> <li>Conservation has been established as a legitimate land use with many more landowners now open to the idea of stewardship and the concept of setting aside land for conservation.</li> <li>The important link between tourism and conservation has been established with recognition that the Baviaanskloof is a unique natural area demanding special attention and management. This was further strengthened through tourism training and SMME development support provided to local community members along the Baviaanskloof Routes made possible through a small grant raised from CEPF. As part of the intervention more than 50 community members from across the planning domain were trained and linkages made between local tourism offices, product owners, the routes and the community members. To further strengthen the tourism/conservation link 6 community members were trained as Natural and Cultural Field Guides and they were used as part of the decision-maker trail programme were possible (exposed to the basics of wilderness guiding) and many are employed in the province as guides. The number of product owners that are currently involved in the route (<a href="http://www.openafrica.org/route/baviaanskloof-route">www.openafrica.org/route/baviaanskloof-route</a>) is significant.</li> </ul>	<p>Project design targeted the consolidation and expansion of the Baviaanskloof PA and the development of a suite of management tools.</p> <p>Project activities implementation has resulted in the expansion and consolidation of the PA as targeted. In addition a number of tools and strategic approaches have been used to good effect.</p> <p>Excellent foundational work was carried out by the Wilderness Foundation and the handing over (exit strategy) to the East Cape Parks Board was exemplary. On its part, East Cape Parks has assumed the responsibilities for the PA and its effective management in a self-assured and competent manner. The rapport between the Board's staff and the local stakeholders, especially ecotourism operators, is impressive.</p> <p>Although the Evaluator is not competent to comment on it, one could not help noticing that black South Africans did not seem to be as involved</p>

management programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies initiated and coordinated by the project have added significantly to the general body of knowledge available for the broader Baviaanskloof.</li> <li>• The management effectiveness of the statutory reserve has been improved and there is improved awareness of natural resource management on private land within the planning domain.</li> <li>• Deliberate and effective communication and stakeholder engagement approach could provide lessons for other landscape level conservation interventions.</li> <li>• While efforts were made to demonstrate links between conservation and tourism similar attention was paid to the link to job creation and improved livelihood opportunities. An example of this is the beekeeping training project which has created new skills and employment for local community members. 9 community members were trained at a basic and advanced level</li> </ul>	<p>in project activities. And, as the Coleski contention illustrates, this is an issue which needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The Baviaanskloof sub-Outcome is rated as <b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>.</p>
---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 4b Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor (GCBC)

<p><b>4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas</b></p> <p>4.1.1 Consolidate and expand the Cederberg protected areas</p> <p><b>4.2 Development of sustainable management effectiveness</b></p> <p>4.2.1 Design and test a Strategic Performance Management System in three target PAS</p> <p>4.2.2 Adapt the EIS model developed in Cape Peninsula National Park for other priority PAS</p> <p>4.2.3 Develop plans for responsible tourism in target PAS</p> <p>4.2.4 Facilitate development of tourism infrastructure and facilities in target PAS</p> <p>4.2.5 Develop PAS business plans and mechanism for financial sustainability for target PAS</p> <p>4.2.6 Implement priority management programs</p>	<p><b>1. Expansion of protected areas within Corridor</b> The corridor has made great strides in terms of its establishment and the next phase will see the expansion of the efforts of the first phase (see Table 1 in Section 7). Key partners such as the Cederberg Conservancy have also played the role of an implementer and acted as a consultant to secure stewardship sites to consolidate the Cederberg core corridor. Stakeholders have also highlighted the positive relationships that have emerged with the local communities within the Corridor, linking it directly to employment creation and tourism development. This has been noted as one of the areas that will require more attention, support and investment and resources in future.</p> <p><b>2. Partnerships</b> One of the strongest influences behind the successes within the corridor has been partnerships. The Multi-stakeholder governance structure of the GCBC in the form of the Steering Committee has formed an important base for governance, coordination and support for activities within the corridor. The partnerships that have been formed have been goal orientated and localized priorities reflected. It was also highlighted that these partnerships have been build on trust. During 2008/2009 the steering committee has been revived and is going through a process of revision. This has been welcomed by attending members as the needs and partnerships have also evolved over the last few years. The Sandveld task team was born out of necessity to address overutilization of natural resource in the Sandveld. This task team has managed to formalize a ministerial action plan to help coordinate and direct efforts towards addressing overutilization of natural resources. The task team has taken the form of an information forum to further promote this coordinated approach.</p> <p><b>3. Business and Biodiversity</b> In 2007 Best Practice Guidelines for Potato Production in the Sandveld were produced through funding from the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) and the combined resources of Cape Action for People and the Environment (CAPE), Potatoes SA, Woolworths, Conservation International, CapeNature and the GCBC. The development of Rooibos Best Practice Guidelines was initiated by the SA Rooibos Council and CapeNature and funded by these partners together with the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund. This project collated, developed and proposed a set of practical guidelines aimed at steering farming operations towards conservation of biodiversity and sustainable agricultural practices, including the protection of sensitive vegetation types, adherence to national legislation governing the management of natural resources, the establishment of core corridors and the sustainable utilization of groundwater. Three years on, laudable progress has been made in implementing Best Practice methods in Rooibos and Potato farming, with 20 farmers within each industry taking part in the initiatives and contributing more than 100 000ha as part of the voluntary agreements set under the expansion of protected areas. A key success from this process has been that the two industries have both taken up the best practice initiatives and have gone on to engage another 30 farmers. This part of the project went way beyond the greatest expectations and has contributed considerably to the conservation of Sandveld ecosystem which was under severe threats of becoming a totally degraded landscape. The formalization of these projects spearheaded the formation of the Green Choice Alliance which serves to coordinate and strengthen all Biodiversity and Business initiatives. This has led to the introduction of sustainable farming practices in other areas and industries.</p> <p><b>4. Catalytic effect</b> The GCBC also acted as a catalyst for funding for specific projects. Here the successful completion of the Small Grants funded projects needs to be mentioned. The overall aim of actively engaging with civil society was made possible by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund through the small grants projects which served as stepping-stones to create new partnerships between the Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor and other organizations and to ensure that these partnerships will be long-term partnerships. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund encourages projects that demonstrate clear plans for continuation or replication after initial CEPF Seed funding. The aim is that complementary funding will be forthcoming as other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked to one of the CEPF projects. The Corridor has been able to clearly demonstrate the tangible results of engagement with communities and landowners and the additional funding leveraged as a direct result of successes with the initial CEPF-funded projects</p> <p><b>5. Awareness</b> Raising awareness has been an ongoing activity within the corridor and various media have been employed to do</p>	<p>Project design targeted the consolidation and expansion of the Greater Cederberg by applying the Biodiversity Corridor concept, and the development of a suite of management tools.</p> <p>Project activities implementation has resulted in the expansion and consolidation of the Corridor as targeted and it has tested and applied a number of tools and strategic approaches.</p> <p>The project has an impressive list of achievements, two of which stand out - Firstly, its inspiring work with the business community in the Sandveld which has created partnerships where opposition was to be expected – much has been achieved and a foundation laid for what appears to be a still daunting task ahead. Secondly, at the other end of the scale, its collaboration on work at the community level, as illustrated to the Evaluator at the Algeria Community. The feeling of proud ownership augurs well for the success of CapeNature in its future endeavours in the GCBC.</p> <p>The GCBC activities are considered as <b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>this. The Krokkitor II (a booklet developed for the corridor that explains the concept of corridor building) has been developed and was launched with the local schools. There is discussion with the Department of Education to have the Krokkitor I and II booklets taken up as part of the curriculum. The outreach programme has created awareness at various levels but targeted the general labourers and community members involved in the corridor. The GCBC will also be implementing an outreach programme for the Wupperthal Community which will be rolled out wider at a later stage.</p> <p><b>6. Local economic development.</b> The project has supported initiatives that contribute to local economic development such as the Donkey cart Route and the Rooibos Heritage Route. The Working for Wetlands project was initiated to address resource conservation and local economic development through job creation.</p> <p><b>7. Learning</b> The planning and implementation phases of the GCBC have provided fertile ground for learning through doing. The sharing of the lessons from these phases has been promoted through peer learning and knowledge exchanges. Knowledge exchanges provide a platform to share lessons but also to learn. The GCBC PMU members have had the opportunity to share their experiences and learn from their peers, both locally and internationally. This has also resulted in the development of various lessons learned documents and reports from each of the exchanges that feed into further project support and building communication networks. These exchanges also provided opportunities to further build capacity within the project management unit and the organization.</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>4c Garden Route Initiative</b>		
<p><b>4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas</b>  4.1.1 Consolidate and expand the Garden Route protected areas  4.1.3 Establish a marine protected area</p> <p><b>4.2 Development of sustainable management effectiveness</b>  4.2.1 Design and test a Strategic Performance Management System in three target PAS  4.2.2 Adapt the EIS model developed in Cape Peninsula National Park for other priority PAS  4.2.3 Develop plans for responsible tourism in target PAS  4.2.4 Facilitate development of tourism infrastructure and facilities in target PAS  4.2.5 Develop PAS business plans and mechanism for financial sustainability for target PAS  4.2.6 Implement priority management programs</p>	<p>The establishment of the Garden Route National Park and the support to the improvement of the management effectiveness of the protected area through the various management planning initiatives undertaken is a very note worthy success.</p> <p>The fine scale systematic biodiversity plan, and the programme of work engaging authorities and other role-players in the land use regulation sector, was a notable success. This resulted in four of the five municipal Spatial Development Frameworks that were updated during the project period, reflecting the identified biodiversity priority areas. The information is also being used regularly to inform development proposals, particularly when this can be integrated into the development planning process early on, before detailed proposals are already in place.</p> <p>The invasive alien vegetation map produced for the Garden Route as part of the biodiversity planning project, was the first of that scale and level of detail to be produced in South Africa. The information is a very useful tool in the strategic prioritization and planning of invasive alien plant management in the area.</p> <p>The integrated fire management plan for the Garden Route. The Southern Cape Fire Protection Association (FPA) has endorsed the plan as their blueprint for the next five years, and this work has provided a platform for significantly improving integrated fire management in the Garden Route.</p> <p>Piloting the stewardship approach to protected area expansion within SANParks. Although the dedicated extension effort by SANParks has not continued, the stewardship initiative has resulted in many key role-players within SANParks being better informed about stewardship approaches to protected area expansion and their potential value. These lessons learnt during this project will be of value to the organization should they decide to follow a similar course in future.</p> <p>The Garden Route integrated marine management plan has provided the basis for inter-institutional collaboration and alignment in the management of the Garden Routes coastline and near shore environment. The boat supplied to the Robberg MPA has dramatically assisted with managing that MPA and the surrounding marine area more effectively.</p> <p>The Management planning process and particularly the development of the costing component of actions was a major step forward, with this approach being implemented in the rest of SANParks.</p> <p>The marine component was refocused to be more on effective management and not to proclaim new areas (Nov 2006). It was then assigned to the WWF Marine programme (Nov 2007).</p>	<p>Project design targeted the consolidation and expansion of the Garden Route PAs and the establishment of a marine PA, and the development of a suite of management tools.</p> <p>Project activities have led to the expansion and consolidation of the PAs into the Garden Route National Park and considering the demand for holiday accommodation and related development this cannot have been easy.</p> <p>In addition, the project has used the fine-scale planning tool to good effect; collaborated on the control of invasive plants and fire management; and was successful in its piloting of the stewardship approach. On the negative side, the MPA was not pursued.</p> <p>Unfortunately, due to budgetary constraints, SANParks will not be continuing with the stewardship programme and its sustainability is in question<sup>28</sup>.</p> <p>The Garden Route Initiative has been <b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>.</p>

<sup>28</sup> SANParks is unable to take on additional responsibilities without the necessary additional financial resources and while this may place sustainability in jeopardy, it might be better than taking the stewardship programme on and then finding it has to be abandoned for lack of funds. National and Provincial Governments have assumed responsibility for a number of project products and services and this 'inheritance process' merits extending.



## 4d Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve (KBR) Project

### 4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas:

4.1.3 Establish a marine protected area including fisheries co-management arrangements

### 4.2 Developing sustainable management effectiveness

4.2.2 Adapt the Environmental Information Management system (EIS) model developed in the Cape Peninsula National Park

4.2.3 Develop plans for responsible tourism

4.2.4 Facilitate development of tourism infrastructure and facilities

4.2.5 Develop protected area business plans and mechanisms for sustainability

4.2.6 Implement priority management programmes

### 5.1. Kogelberg Coordination Unit

A Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve coordination unit which provides support to the Management Committee and Board of Directors of the KBR Company has been successfully established. A coordinator was appointed in April 2008 and an assistant in January 2008. Management of the KBR is guided by a Strategic Management Framework.

A fully equipped office for the KBRC has been established in Kleinmond.

The KBRC has undertaken a successful membership drive which has resulted in approximately 100 new members being recruited. The KBRC has set up a new website (<http://www.kogelbergbiospherereserve.co.za>) that is now used extensively to involve stakeholders through newsletters, news flashes and other relevant information.

A Tourism Plan for the KBR was completed in 2006 and regular meetings are held with Kleinmond Tourism Board to investigate opportunities for the creation of Tourism Projects.

### 5.2. Networking

Staff representing the Kogelberg project regularly took part in networking opportunities such as the Landscape Initiatives Knowledge Exchange workshops in 2008 and 2009; C.A.P.E. task team meetings; the National Biosphere Reserve Workshop in 2008 where a national position paper on biosphere reserves was compiled; and research projects relating to biosphere reserve issues.

The KBRC completed the UNESCO 10 year review in 2009 and has been asked to be available for potentially assisting other biosphere reserves in the African region.

### 5.3. Small grants fund

CapeNature and the KBRC successfully facilitated the implementation of four small grants projects, funded through the Kogelberg Small Grants Facility:

- Awareness materials for the promotion of the KBR. This project was executed by KOBIO.
- Training of municipal employees within the boundaries of the KBR, This project was executed by KOBIO. 150 workers were involved and many signed up as members of the KBRC.
- Training of tour guides for a hiking trail in the Groenland Mountains. This project was executed by the Green Mountain Eco Route. Ten tour guides were trained during this project by the Elgin Learning Foundation. This training provided the learners with the competence to practice as a tourist guide as envisaged in the Tourism Amendment Act. Of these ten students, eight are currently employed in the tourism industry and the other two are employed in other sectors and waiting for the opportunity to join the tourism sector.
- Fynbos Friendly Christmas trees. This project was executed by the Kleinmond Nature Conservation Society and involved school children cutting down invasive pine trees and selling them during the holidays.

### 5.4 Stewardship Extension officer

A Kogelberg extension officer was appointed in July 2008 on contract with CapeNature and facilitated the identification of protected area expansion options in the KBR.

The compilation of a comprehensive multi-million rand funding proposal for the expansion of Rooisand Nature Reserve was facilitated. The extension officer was successful in attracting international funding for purchasing priority land in order to secure the biodiversity corridor. Negotiations with landowners are still underway.

A professional extension service was provided to the landowners, NGOs, and partners in the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve. This included introducing priority landowners to the various Stewardship options for private land.

### Stewardship consultant

A Kogelberg stewardship consultant was appointed from October to December 2008. A workshop was held where the priority stewardship sites within the Kogelberg domain were selected. The consultant undertook site assessments of each of these 11 sites and drafted individual reports on the biodiversity importance of each site with the recommended stewardship option.

Project design aimed for the establishment of an MPA with fisheries co-management together with a suite of management tools.

After a very shaky start, KBR had to cut its tasks down to size with no mention of the MPA or any reference to fisheries and a new focus on preparatory and foundational tasks. Even so, and considering that the changes took place over 2 years ago, the results achieved are not too impressive.

The KBR Project as been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

## 4e Marine Programme

4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas  
 4.1.2 Establish two priority marine protected areas (Garden Route and Kogelberg).  
 4.1.3 Pilot fisheries co-management arrangements in the Kogelberg Marine Protected Area

- Strong stakeholder and partnership development and support
- Raising the profile of Marine Protected Areas (MPA's) through consolidated awareness raising
- Improved capacity of management staff
- Improved commitment towards MPAs from management authorities
- Small scale fisher support for the broader planning process
- District Municipality buy in for improved Integrated Coastal Management
- The development of a longer term Marine Parks Programme through WWF and Honda Marine that will support MPAs within South Africa and the sub-region.
- The development of new processes and concepts for ensuring the protection of biodiversity while also ensuring social benefits that result in overall transforming of sector thinking.
- The development of Integrated Coastal Management Plans
- The provision of the two patrol boats has greatly improved compliance effectiveness and had aided monitoring and research within the study areas. This has helped take the current MPAs away from being just "paper parks"
- Lessons learnt from this component are being used within the rest of the South African coastline and is guiding the way that MPAs are integrated into South African society, particularly from a social and co-management perspective.

The Marine subcomponent was reoriented to focus on capacity-building for management effectiveness, as well as raising public awareness of the threats to marine life. These activities were not to involve the imposition of new restrictions on access to marine resources. It was also agreed that the preparation of a Marine Area Management Plan was no longer necessary (Aide-Mémoire November 2007). This function was outsourced to the WWF C.A.P.E. Marine Programme

Project design targeted the establishment of 2 MPAs at GRI and KBR, and the piloting of fisheries co-management in Kogelberg MPA.

According to reports, the Marine Programme was "re-oriented" but in effect it was completely redesigned, with problems created for (or because of) GRI and KBR. The 2 new MPAs and fisheries co-management may have been too ambitious and their setting aside can be considered a good example of adaptive management. The new focus on planning, capacity building and awareness does not constitute results but lays down a good foundation for future work (if the funding support can be secured). The 'stepping into the breach' by the WWF Honda Marine Parks Programme is commendable.

The original Marine Programme has been Unsatisfactory, however, the Marine Programme as rescued by WWF, has been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

## 4.2 Awareness and information management

**Awareness raising** was planned by project design as a series of activities under Outcome 2. In the event, Outcome 2 was refocused almost exclusively on Conservation Education and awareness activities were “mainstreamed” into the entire project.

According to the CCU, awareness raising activities were a big focus of the BCSD and were handled in a cross cutting manner by all executing agencies, and, notably, through the CCU (Outcome 3) and the learning network (Outcome 1) work programmes. In support of this, a range of materials were produced and a number of events and campaigns that focused specifically on awareness raising were convened. The following list provides examples of the awareness raising products produced by the project.

### Brochures

Innovating Conservation  
ABI  
CFN  
B-GIS  
Business and biodiversity  
Conservation Planning Unit  
Baviaanskloof  
Conservation Education  
Fynbos Footprint  
Sustaining life in the Fynbos  
Conservation Incentives  
Fynbos Fynmense  
Conservation education: Enabling sustainable livelihoods practices  
Table Mountain Fund  
Critical lowlands

### Promotional goods

Branded Caps  
Branded Pens  
Footprint stickers – over 10 000 printed and distributed  
Bumper stickers and license disks – over 10 000 printed and distributed

### Partners conferences (Big focus on civil society participation)

C.A.P.E Partners Conference 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009  
Regional conferences in Cederberg 2010  
Regional conference in Baviaanskloof 2010

### Campaigns

Innovating Conservation  
Fynbos Fynmense  
Biodiversity Business  
Fynbos Footprint  
Conservation Marketplace

### Exhibitions/ stands

World Biodiversity Day  
World Biodiversity day  
Fynbos Forum 2005 - 2009  
C.A.P.E. / SKEP Conservation Marketplace  
Western Cape Sustainable Dev Conference  
Fynbos Fynmense book launch  
World Environment Day  
Interfaces (FF + AZEF)  
Cape Town Festival  
False Bay Ecology Park  
Biodiversity Expo  
NMBM Signatory ceremony  
WC Climate Change Conference  
Careers Fair

### News, Media releases/popular articles

eNews to approx 3000 stakeholders every 2 weeks  
Newspaper articles and Africa Geographic  
50/50 slot on SABCTV on Fynbos Awards

### Publications , including book chapters

Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes (Chapter in book)  
Linking mountains to lowlands for biodiversity conservation in the Cape Floristic Region (Chap in book)  
Fynbos Fynmense  
Monitoring & Evaluation Handbook  
Linking the landscape (Chapter in Global Protected Area Management book)  
Project Planning Handbook  
Conservation Education Strategy Planning Toolkit  
Stewardship Operations Manual  
DVD: Careers in Conservation  
Conservation Education Teachers' Workbook  
The Krokitor handbook - Cederberg

The list excludes awareness raising activities that underpinned the corridor initiatives and the stewardship components. All of these were fundamentally about educating members of civil society about biodiversity, with a view to them mainstreaming conservation into their farming and other activities.

The above are all good examples of awareness raising activities but there are no Indicators of where it has been raised to – in other words, the result.

**Information management** is closely related to Outcome/Output 1, however, like awareness raising, it has permeated the entire project. Information is closely allied to awareness raising and it has

been shared with partners and beyond; it served as one mechanism holding the partnership together and created outreach to the wider Cape Floristic Region community.

The CCU provided the Evaluator with a comprehensive list of project products which was collated from inputs received from the various project Task Teams. The list, which is in Annex 11, comprises tangible results achieved by the project including extensive publications and other documents both in hard copy and electronic.

The Evaluator has examined a wide range of project products, from reports to posters, leaflets, stickers, videos, DVDs, etc. All are of a very high quality and serve as a lasting legacy of the project. Similarly, the C.A.P.E. website<sup>29</sup> and SANBI's Biodiversity Advisor website<sup>30</sup> are attractive and informative and reach out with project products such as the finescale plans and the Biodiversity GIS.

Information management is considered as **Satisfactory (S)**.

## 4.3 Project impacts

### 4.3.1 Impact analysis

**Outputs** are the **immediate products** of the project's activities usually within the direct control of the project to deliver; **Outcomes** are the **short to medium term effects** of a project's outputs and are expected to outlive the project; whereas **Impacts**, are the **long-term effects** resulting from a project.

The achievements of Outputs which lead to Outcomes is assessed by LogFrame analysis which is mainly carried out by the Project M&E System, and confirmed by the TE with reliance on good Indicators. The conversion of Outcomes to Impacts often requires an Intermediate stage and this is assessed mainly by TE methodology. It is predicated by Assumptions, and is dependent on Impact Drivers which include Relevance, Sustainability and Catalytic effects.

The BCSD project has, in the main, achieved its Outputs and Outcomes and these have led to Intermediate Impacts as planned – strategies, pilots, frameworks, methods. These foundational products of the project will, in turn, contribute to Impacts, in time and through the contributions of other interventions. These Impacts are expected to be both global and national.

The figure on the next page is an illustration of impact analysis of the project using the Theory of Change approach. It reflects the progress made by the project from Outputs to Outcomes which have all been rated as Satisfactory or Highly Satisfactory and the progress from Outcomes to the Immediate Objectives and the Development Objectives (all three are Intermediate Impacts) which have also been rated as Satisfactory. The final step to achieve Global and National Impacts is bigger than BCSD and will depend on a number of external assumptions being realized and impact drivers operating.

---

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.capeaction.org.za/>

<sup>30</sup> <http://biodiversityadvisor.sanbi.org/>

# Impact Analysis of the BCSD using the Theory of Change approach

## Outputs to Outcomes (Logframe)

- Key Outputs:**
- CAPE Partnership – 23 partners
  - Business Case for Eastern Cape Parks Board
  - Systems approach to capacity development
  - Biodiversity-GIS and website
  - Learning network
  - Enhanced awareness at all levels
  - Biodiversity Conservation Education Framework
  - Conservation Marketplace Event
  - Various collaborative partnerships
  - Stewardship Scheme
  - Strengthened Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve
  - Biodiversity + Tourism partnership
  - More extensive and cohesive Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor
  - Mainstreaming biodiversity into business practice
  - Improved Garden Route management
  - Fine-scale systematic biodiversity planning and training
  - Collaboration on invasive alien vegetation
  - Integrated Coastal Management Plans
  - Biodiversity integrated into land-use planning at municipal level
  - Fiscal Incentives for Biodiversity conservation
  - Ecological Reserve as a tool for protection of ecological values

- Outcome 1:**  
*Capacitated institutions to implement the project*
- Outcome 2:**  
*Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education*
- Outcome 3:**  
*CCU capacitated to perform Project coordination function*
- Outcome 4:**  
*Additional 4,000km<sup>2</sup> of viable protected area established and properly managed*
- Outcome 5:**  
*Biodiversity in six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society*
- Outcome 6:**  
*Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watershed management*

## Outcome to Intermediate Impacts

- Intermediate:**  
*A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities*
- Intermediate:**  
*Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management*

## Eventual Impacts

**Main Assumptions:**  
 Availability of financial resources  
 Continuation of political commitment  
 Easing of poverty barrier  
 Other complementary interventions

**Intermediate:**  
 To support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful project outcomes

**Impact Drivers:**

- Relevance
- Sustainability
- Catalysis

**IMPACTS:**

**Global Environmental Benefits**  
*The natural environment and biodiversity of the Cape Floristic Region and adjacent marine environment will be effectively conserved, restored wherever appropriate, and will deliver significant benefits to the people in a way that is embraced by local communities, endorsed by government, and recognized internationally*

---

**National Benefits**  
*Poverty mitigation and economic growth*

### 4.3.2 Global environmental impact

South Africa is one of the 12 biological "mega-diversity" countries, due in large measure to the Cape Floral Kingdom which is a global biodiversity asset. It is the smallest (only 90,000 km<sup>2</sup>) of the six floral kingdoms in the world and the only one to be found entirely within one country. It is also the richest in terms of its unique ecological diversity – some 70% of the 9,600 plant species of the Cape Floral Kingdom are found nowhere else on earth – if they are not protected here, they will not be protected. As a result, any conservation or protection measures carried out within the CFR have a global dimension and contribute to global biodiversity impacts.

It is in reflection of this global dimension that GEF has invested significantly in the CFR. The first GEF assistance was in 1997, at a cost of US\$12.3 million, which produced the CAPE Action Plan for the Environment. Other GEF investments have followed since then, either directly such as through the Table Mountain Fund (TMF) project and this BCSD project, or indirectly such as through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) project.

The project has made a significant contribution to the Global Environmental Benefit espoused by the C.A.P.E. Programme, namely, *The natural environment and biodiversity of the Cape Floristic Region and adjacent marine environment will be effectively conserved, restored wherever appropriate, and will deliver significant benefits to the people in a way that is embraced by local communities, endorsed by government, and recognized internationally.* The GEF investment has been used effectively.

### 4.3.3 National level impacts

Intertwined with its targeted global environmental impact, the project has also contributed to the two national impacts targeted, namely, *Poverty mitigation and Economic growth.*

Its contribution to these two national-level impacts arises from a basket of Outputs achieved by the project. Results have included enhanced capacity and effectiveness of key institutions with responsibilities for biodiversity conservation; a portfolio of tools for conservation and protection management; an effective mechanism for collaboration among key institutions; increased awareness and a foundation for conservation education; heightened appreciation of the values and vulnerabilities of ecosystems and biological diversity; contributions to various national policy formulation.

These are all important, foundational-type achievements and although the project has also had some impacts such as in the socio-economic sphere through its furthering of tourism potential, its contribution to new employment opportunities, its tools for sustainable land-use, and its piloting of small scale projects that deliver social benefits through sustainable biodiversity based activities, most impacts will take time to materialize – after all, C.A.P.E. was designed as a 20-year programme.

## 4.4 Overall conclusion on project results and impacts

According to the PAD, the targets of the project were habitat loss and fragmentation, alien species, fire management, over-abstraction of water, over-harvesting of natural resources, poverty and economic growth. In response, the project has produced a wide range of varied and mainly foundational results important both at the global and national levels.

It has satisfied its Development Objective and its two Immediate Objectives by laying a good foundation for scaling up and replicating models for sustainable, effective management as well as for mainstreaming biodiversity into planning, land-use and development. It has raised awareness of the values and vulnerabilities of biodiversity in the CFR, and it has contributed to economic growth and the creation of employment opportunities.

Its impacts will accrue in time through the further implementation and operationalization of its products and the contributions of other interventions.

Biodiversity conservation in the CFR has been well-served by the project and the results are **Satisfactory (S)**.

## 5 FINDINGS: RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS<sup>31</sup> AND SUSTAINABILITY

### 5.1 Relevance of the project results to the needs of the CFR

Relevance, according to the OECD<sup>32</sup> is a measure of the extent to which the objective and outcomes of a project are consistent with “*beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.*”

UNDP<sup>33</sup> sees Relevance as the extent to which a project and its outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. In the case of GEF projects, the scope of Relevance must also include global environmental benefits. UNDP continues ... “*relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries.*”

In other words, does the project design address the identified threats and their root causes? And, did project implementation stay true to the project design?

The threats to the CFR and their root causes were identified in the ProDoc and the project was designed to address them. Section 1.1.2 above found that both threats and root causes have indeed been addressed in the project design. Furthermore, Section 4 above found that while there was some “drift” in project activities during implementation, the Outcomes and Objectives were all attained satisfactorily.

The results are very relevant to the needs of the CFR and Relevance is **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 5.2 Effectiveness of project execution

The OECD (*op.cit.*) defines effectiveness as “*the extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, taking into account their relative importance*” and UNDP (*op. cit.*) sees Effectiveness as a measure of the extent to which the project’s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved.

Section 4 above records the comprehensive achievement of targeted Outputs and Outcomes as well as the Objectives, with results often exceeding the original targets. As a further measure of effectiveness, reference is made to the PAD end-of-project situation which synthesizes the project’s aims and targets. The following table lists the elements of the end-of-project situation and the Evaluator’s observations on the extent to which these targets have been met.

---

<sup>31</sup> According to GEF guidance, reflected in the ToRs for this assignment, “*Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall outcome rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.*”

<sup>32</sup> DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris.

<sup>33</sup> *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. United Nations Development Programme, New York. 2009.



**Table 14. Effectiveness of project execution as measured against end-of-project expectations**

END-OF-PROJECT INDICATORS	COMMENTS
All C.A.P.E. signatory institutions directly support implementation of the Project	Target achieved – high level of commitment
The number of registered civil society stakeholders participating in the Project increases by 30%	Target met and exceeded
A CFR-wide conservation education strategy is successfully designed and implemented across the Project area	Conservation education strategy designed and implemented
The Baviaanskloof, Cederberg and Garden Route protected areas have been consolidated	Consolidation has taken place
The number of jobs directly associated with conservation and nature-based tourism in Project intervention sites increases by 20%	Target met and exceeded
Spatial development frameworks in six representative lowland sites incorporate conservation priorities	Target met and exceeded
Five-year targets for protected area status for irreplaceable Broad Habitat Units in Lowland areas and watersheds are met as defined by the C.A.P.E. 2000 Strategy	Target met and exceeded

Taking the analyses in Section 4 into account and the above summary of achievements, the level of effectiveness of project execution is considered **Satisfactory (S)**.

### 5.3 Sustainability Plan

In 2008 the C.A.P.E. partnership programme within which the BCSD project is nested, carried out a pathfinder study<sup>34</sup> so as to ascertain how it intends to sustain the conservation gains made in the C.A.P.E. programme using donor (GEF, CEPF, TMF) and other investments since 2001. Partners, landscape initiatives and task teams were asked to reflect on their achievements and questionnaires were set to identify any mechanisms in place to ensure sustainability.

The study found that in the case of CapeNature a detailed business case and MTEF submission had been developed seeking substantive additional human and financial resources to fulfill their mandate into the future. The ECPB had started a similar process, while SANBI had already included many aspects of C.A.P.E. into its MTEF cycle. The ABI project with SANParks leadership was spearheading a process to develop a district level collaborative governance system. The City of Cape Town and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality, both had taken steps to mainstream C.A.P.E. work within their municipalities. Civil society organizations had taken steps to diversify funding sources and thereby secure their ability to continue work into the future. The role of TMF in this regard was seen as key.

According to the study, there were still many areas of weakness where, if funding were to end then, project activities would cease within a few months. The study then analyzed the status of sustainability and found where weaknesses lay, and made recommendations to the C.A.P.E. partnership to develop strategies to address them.

This far-sighted initiative was in 2008. The following table, which updates the situation to mid-2010, comprises the CCU response to a similar request by the Evaluator seeking the project's plans for ensuring that its products and services will be sustainable beyond the end of the project. In effect, this is less of an "Exit Strategy" and more of a "Sustainability Plan" because while the BCSD project is formally ending, the CCU, the partnership and most of the work started by the project will continue. The table is based on key project Activities carried out under one or other of the six Outcomes/Outputs.

<sup>34</sup> Steyn, Lala (2008) *C.A.P.E. Pathfinder 2008 – Sustaining Achievements*. (Draft, November 2008).

**Table 15. Project plans for sustainability**

OUTCOMES/OUTPUTS AND KEY ACTIVITIES	EXIT STRATEGY/SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (as in May 2010)
<b>Output 1: Capacitated institutions implement the project</b>	
1.1 Enhance inter-agency cooperation and strategic planning for conservation management in the CFR	<p>Governance and coordination to be sustained through SANBI's fynbos programme. Two permanent positions are on the SANBI organogram to facilitate this.</p> <p>The programmes of work of many task teams have been taken up as national processes. These include information management, stewardship, land use planning and resource economics. The estuaries and invasive aliens work is also expanding beyond the CFR.</p> <p>Investments in rationalization of protected areas are being sustained through a national study that is currently underway, after long delays.</p>
1.2 Build capacity for effective conservation management in the CFR	<p>SANBI is leading a national Human Capital Development process and the learning from this component will be included.</p> <p>SANBI entered into a partnership with WESSA to expand its offering of the Environmental Education course, and the new Stewardship course was taken up by Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University and is being offered nationally on an ongoing basis.</p>
1.3 Develop financial sustainability plan	<p>CapeNature and ECPB will continue to use their business cases to lobby for additional resources. This is complicated for ECPB as a merger with Eastern Cape Tourism is imminent.</p> <p>The 'Making the Case' study, which is currently being procured, aims to further this process.</p>
1.4 Establish a comprehensive information management system	<p>Biodiversity GIS and the Biodiversity Advisor are embedded in SANBI and permanent staff positions will sustain the BCSD investment and build on it.</p> <p>The learning network function is embedded in SANBI's fynbos programme and funds to sustain the position for another two years have been secured. It is SANBI's intention to grow this programme of work.</p> <p>The monitoring and evaluation activities will also be sustained through SANBI's monitoring activities. The M&amp;E framework development process has already informed similar processes in the succulent karoo and grasslands biomes,</p>
<b>Output 2: Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education</b>	
2.1 Raise awareness and understanding of biodiversity issues and benefits in CFR	<p>This work will be continued through three sub-regional networks, with SANBI Education supporting national coordination activities.</p>
<b>Output 3: CCU capacitated to perform project coordination function</b>	
3.1 Undertake Project and program coordination, management and monitoring	<p>As discussed in Outcome/Output 1, SANBI has committed to continue supporting CAPE's coordination function. To this end, both the Programme Developer and the Coordinator are now permanent positions.</p> <p>Pathfinder discussions have resulted in signatory partners committing to the next phase of C.A.P.E., with an emphasis on local rather than international funding. Strategy elucidation and fundraising efforts were initiated in early 2010.</p> <p>There is no 'GEF Phase 2' as was envisaged when the project was designed.</p>
<b>Output 4: Protected areas established as per project document; Additional 4000kms of viable protected area established and properly managed</b>	
<p>4.1 Establish and consolidate key protected areas</p> <p>4.2 Development of sustainable management effectiveness</p>	<p>Baviaanskloof: Functions to be sustained through ECPB, who have created a Baviaanskloof Megareserve Coordinator position.</p> <p>Cederberg: To be sustained by CapeNature and supported by CapeNature's Corridor Coordinator, a new permanent position in CapeNature.</p> <p>Garden Route: Sustainability in discussion. Current thinking is the investigation of a Biosphere Reserve that is located within the District Municipality.</p> <p>Kogelberg: To be sustained through the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve – although future funding not yet secured.</p> <p>Marine: To be sustained through WWF marine programme</p>
<b>Output 5: Biodiversity in six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society</b>	
5.1 Undertake fine-scale conservation planning	<p>CapeNature has expressed an intention to update maps, but has not yet secured the funding for this function. The WC provincial planning department (DEA&amp;DP) has also been investing in the production of critical biodiversity maps and, although unexpected, many also play a role here. SANBI, through its municipal programme, will continue to facilitate discussions about this issue as updated maps are a critical element of mainstreaming activities.</p>
5.2 Integrate biodiversity in land-use decision-making	<p>Located within SANBI's Municipal Programme. Former Land Use Advisor is now a permanent position on SANBI's organogram.</p>

OUTCOMES/OUTPUTS AND KEY ACTIVITIES	EXIT STRATEGY/SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (as in May 2010)
5.3 Increase landowners commitment to conservation	Stewardship programme is embedded in CapeNature, new Stewardship Coordinator position is now permanent in CapeNature and model is being expanded nationally by the Department of Environmental Affairs.
5.4 Investigate economic incentives for enhancing conservation stewardship of priority lowland	The Resource Economics component is embedded in SANBI's new policy unit with SANBI's Policy Advisor coordinating the Green Economy Think Tank, and leading the national discussion on biodiversity in resource economics.
<b>Output 6: Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watershed management</b>	
6.1 Improve watershed management and water resource management	<p>Projects to be included in appropriate catchment management strategies.</p> <p>Government Agencies at National, Provincial and Local levels have been briefed as to their responsibilities with regards to the calculation and management of the reserve.</p> <p>Effective integration of DEA and DWA in this process has been planned.</p> <p>Insights gained through the BCSD investment in fire management have been absorbed in CapeNature's fire management policy and guidelines documentation. Record keeping procedures to collect Fire Management data has been upgraded and the databank itself has been expanded to include informally protected areas.</p> <p>Analysis of the databank will take place every five years to ascertain what shifts there may have been in the fire regimes and their potential impacts. This is particularly important with regards to global warming impacts.</p>
6.2 Improve management of Invasive Alien Species	High level task teams to support the implementation of the strategy are in the process of being set up. This process has high level support from key agencies including CapeNature, Working for Water and DWA.
6.3 Improve estuarine management	<p>A permanent MPAs, Islands and Estuaries position has been created in CapeNature to continue this programme of work.</p> <p>Continued co-funding from DEA, DWA and Local Government has been assured.</p> <p>The concept of co-funded and co-managed estuary management plans has been developed with the aim of capacitating all participating Government Departments with regards to the development of additional estuary management plans (21 to date).</p>

As the above table illustrates, many project activities have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies, and institutional sustainability appears **Likely (L)** in the main.

However, some institutions are dependent on funds becoming available and financial sustainability is not yet secure for some activities and can only be rated as **Moderately Likely (ML)**.

On the other hand, there are good prospects for ecological sustainability with the stewardship scheme, management plans, the widespread use of the METT, etc, in place and it appears **Highly Likely (HL)**. However, this rating could drop if institutional capacity were to drop as a result of inadequate funding.

## 6 RATINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 6.1 Assessment and ratings summary

CRITERION	SUMMARY COMMENTS	RATING
<b>PROJECT FORMULATION</b>		
Concept and design	The project concept is sound; the timescale is reasonable; the budget seems adequate. The project design is complex and the degree of relevance of its components to its objectives is not always clear.	<b>MS</b>
Stakeholder participation in project formulation	Project preparation was undertaken in a participatory manner, involving a broad range of stakeholder groups using a number of different information gathering methods.	<b>S</b>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
Project Governance	Governance of the project was complex and multi-layered, but it worked satisfactorily.	<b>HS</b>
Project Coordination	CCU is very much a team working together cohesively with good leadership and excellent team spirit; project coordination has been effective and efficient.	<b>HS</b>
<b>Implementation Approach</b>		
The LogFrame and Adaptive management	Many Indicators were weak and unhelpful; changes could be attributed to adaptive management, but there was a feeling that they were being changed to fit results, not the other way round. Monitoring processes and the use of the results of monitoring helped to inform management and take corrective action.	<b>S</b>
Stakeholder participation in implementation	Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in implementation; many benefited from capacity building exercises; others participated in governance groups e.g. steering committees, forums, etc.	<b>HS</b>
Information management	Information has been well-managed. It has been shared with partners and beyond; it served as one mechanism holding the partnership together and creating outreach to the wider Cape Floristic Region community.	<b>S</b>
Risk management	Risk planning and risk management identified the majority of risks and, with minor exceptions, mitigation measures were effective.	<b>S</b>
<b>Project finances</b>		
Financial planning and management	Management of the financial resources and reporting as a means of accountability has been as complex as other aspects of the project, however, they have been carried out diligently and effectively.	<b>S</b>
Co-financing	The amount of co-funding pledged was excellent; the amount of co-funding delivered was even more impressive.	<b>HS</b>
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>		
M&E Design, Plan and Budget	M&E Plan comprises an impressive, comprehensive matrix and it more than satisfies GEF requirements.	<b>S</b>
Protected Area monitoring	METT carried out diligently and the concept introduced to protected areas management nationwide. A modest improvement was achieved in average score, but the scores are not considered reliable.	<b>S</b>
<b>PROJECT RESULTS : Achievement of Objectives and attainment of Outcomes/Outputs, with reference to the Indicators</b>		
<b>Development Objective:</b> <i>To support the conservation of the Cape Floristic Region (CFR) and adjacent marine environment by laying a sound foundation for scaling up and replicating successful project outcomes</i>	In spite of the fact that some Indicators are not completely specific or relevant to the Objective, indications are that the Development Objective has, in the main, been achieved. This conclusion is supported by the Close-out reports, the PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, consultations and field visits.	<b>S</b>
<b>Immediate Objective 1:</b> <i>A foundation is established for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities</i>	It is very likely that the results achieved under this Objective will make a significant contribution to such a foundation. Mainstreaming is an elusive target and better Indicators were necessary.	<b>S</b>
<b>Immediate Objective 2:</b> <i>Conservation of the CFR enhanced through piloting and adapting models for sustainable, effective management</i>	A number of piloting initiatives were carried out successfully. Whether these results achieved "enhancement of CFR conservation" is too early to tell, but they are sound models which, if they are sustained, can be expected to lead to this ultimate result.	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> <i>Capacitated institutions implement the project</i>	The project delivered a range of products most of which are either an illustration of the implementation of the project by institutions, or an indication of capacity.	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 2:</b> <i>Inhabitants of the CFR contributing to biodiversity conservation through improved awareness raising and environmental education</i>	Under this Output, the project focused almost exclusively on conservation education and relied on CEPF and TMF to raise awareness and allow CFR inhabitants to contribute to biodiversity conservation. This is commendable, but a revision of the Outcome wording to reflect the project focus would have been justified. Progress towards the Outcome as written is less satisfactory than the achievements in conservation education.	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> <i>CCU capacitated to perform project coordination function</i>	Close-out Report does not relate well to the Outcome. However, the results listed in the CCU Self-Assessment indicate peer satisfaction and this was confirmed by consultations. The CCU has performed its	<b>HS</b>

CRITERION	SUMMARY COMMENTS	RATING
	tasks well and it is highly regarded.	
<b>Outcome 4 (overall):</b> <i>Additional 4000km<sup>2</sup> of viable protected area established and properly managed</i>	The Outcome wording focussed on the hectares and so did the Indicators and there is no reference to the manner in which these additional areas are being managed. Additional information gleaned from field visits indicated that management was taking place effectively with the METTs, the stewardship approach, management plans, etc.	<b>S</b>
<b>Sub-Outcome 4a:</b> <i>Baviaanskloof Mega Reserve Project</i>	Excellent foundational work by Wilderness Foundation and handing over to the East Cape Parks Board was exemplary. East Cape Parks has assumed the responsibilities, is managing effectively in self-assured and competent manner. Rapport between staff and the local stakeholders, especially ecotourism operators, is impressive.	<b>HS</b>
<b>Sub-Outcome 4b:</b> <i>Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor (GCBC)</i>	Impressive list of achievements, including inspiring work with the business community in the Sandveld and collaboration on work at the community level, as illustrated by the Algeria Community.	<b>HS</b>
<b>Sub-Outcome 4c:</b> <i>Garden Route Initiative</i>	Expansion and consolidation of the PAs into the Garden Route NP carried out and tools used to good effect. On the negative side, the MPA was not pursued and due to budgetary constraints, SANParks will not be continuing with the stewardship programme	<b>MS</b>
<b>Sub-Outcome 4d:</b> <i>Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve (KBR) Project</i>	After a very shaky start, KBR had to cut its tasks down to size with no mention of the MPA or any reference to fisheries and a new focus on preparatory and foundational tasks.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Sub-Outcome 4e:</b> <i>Marine Programme</i>	The original Marine Programme was in effect, abandoned. The new Programme faltered and was then rescued by WWF.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Outcome 5:</b> <i>Biodiversity in six priority lowland landscapes identified and secured in conjunction with civil society</i>	Indicators irrelevant, but the project delivered a set of valuable tools. Civil society element not completely satisfied but could be claimed that this is achieved through the stewardship efforts. A very good result which satisfies the Outcome and contributes significantly to the Immediate Objective 2.	<b>HS</b>
<b>Outcome 6:</b> <i>Biodiversity concerns are integrated into watershed management</i>	Unhelpful Indicators. Project delivered a package of results relevant to the Outcome with a focus on some biodiversity concerns; they illustrate integration into management and contribute to the Immediate Objective 2.	<b>S</b>
<b>Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability</b>		
Relevance	Project results address identified threats and root causes and are very relevant to the needs of the CFR	<b>S</b>
Effectiveness	Project execution when measured against predicted end-of-project situation was effective	<b>S</b>
Institutional sustainability	Many project activities have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies.	<b>L</b>
Financial sustainability	Some institutionalization is dependent on funds becoming available and financial sustainability is not yet secure for some activities.	<b>ML</b>
Ecological sustainability	There are good prospects for ecological sustainability with the stewardship scheme, management plans, the widespread use of the METT, etc. in place.	<b>HL</b>
<b>OVERALL PROJECT RATING</b>	This has been a foundational-type project with plans, strategies, methodologies, and pilots. Its results are mainly intermediate at this stage and its impacts will accrue through the use of its products and the application of its services by the responsible institutions. It has made good progress towards its Objectives and they are expected to lead to impacts, in time.	<b>S</b>

## **6.2 Conclusions**

Conclusions have been reached and recorded throughout this report. They are gathered here and augmented as necessary to serve as a synopsis.

### **6.2.1 Project formulation**

The project concept was sound with a reasonable timescale and an adequate budget. However, the project design was complex and the degree of relevance of some of its components to its objectives was not always clear.

Project preparation was undertaken in a participatory manner, involving a broad range of stakeholder groups using a number of different information gathering methods.

### **6.2.2 Project Governance, Coordination and partnerships**

Governance of the project was complex and multi-layered, but it worked satisfactorily. The fact that the project was embedded in the wider C.A.P.E. Programme worked in its favour and ensured a high level of involvement by many stakeholders especially at the provincial level, but also at national level. It was a good example of collaboration between Government organizations and between Government and non-Government partners. More specifically, partnerships and collaboration have been a feature of the project – between the World Bank and UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agencies, between SANBI as Executing Agency and the sub-Executing Agencies, between Central and Local Government, and between the many stakeholders involved, especially at local level.

The CCU has played a crucial role in the coordination of the project which has been carried out effectively and efficiently. The small team has worked well together, cohesively, with good leadership and excellent team spirit. It is held in high regard by all those consulted.

### **6.2.3 Implementation approach and institutional arrangements**

Setting the BCSD project within the wider C.A.P.E. Programme context, which was being implemented by an existing organization, was probably instrumental in its success. The partnerships which had already been forged, the consultative and governance processes which were already in place, the technical support which was available, all stood the project in good stead and allowed it to benefit from on-going complementary initiatives. This approach was efficient and cost-effective.

As evidenced by the regular reports from the project and from the supervision missions by the Implementing Agencies, project implementation proceeded comparatively smoothly especially for a complex, multi-faceted project such as this one.

Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in project implementation; many have benefited from capacity building exercises while others participated in various governance groups such as steering committees, forums, etc.

Information has been well-managed. It has been shared with partners and beyond and it has served as one mechanism holding the partnership together. Information was the basis for the project's outreach to the wider Cape Floristic Region and beyond. It was instrumental in raising awareness and bringing biodiversity values and vulnerabilities to the attention of a wide constituency.

## **6.2.4 Project Financial Management**

Financial planning and management of the financial resources and reporting as a means of accountability has been as complex as other aspects of the project. However, they have been carried out diligently and effectively.

The amount of co-funding pledged far exceeded the GEF requirement and the amount actually delivered was even more impressive.

## **6.2.5 Risk management**

A number of problems and constraints which could impact on the successful delivery of the project were identified at the project design stage. Others were raised as part of the Mid-Term Evaluation. In the event, half of the risks identified either did not eventuate or they were mitigated successfully and no new risks emerged during project implementation. Of the risks that eventuated, three were not successfully mitigated.

## **6.2.6 Monitoring and Adaptive Management**

The project M&E Plan comprised an impressive, comprehensive matrix which more than satisfied GEF requirements. The matrix has served as an effective basis for monitoring performance, reporting progress and informing management to take any necessary corrective action.

The only weakness of this approach was that the M&E matrix was based on Indicators gleaned from the LogFrame as amended by subsequent revisions. Unfortunately, many Indicators were weak and unhelpful, did not relate well to the Outcome or Objective and set up targets of their own. As a result, the project often set about achieving the Indicators rather than the Outcomes and Objectives they were meant to measure progress towards. Conversely, the project at times seemed to set aside the Indicators and work effectively towards the Outcome, in spite of the Indicators.

Many Indicators were changed during the course of the project and this could be claimed to be a sign of adaptive management. However, there was a feeling that Indicators may have been changed to fit results, not the other way round but this has been disputed by the CCU.

With a stronger set of Indicators which satisfy the SMART criteria, this approach to monitoring and adaptive management could be considered best practice.

## **6.2.7 Results and Impacts**

In spite of the fact that some Indicators in the LogFrame were not completely specific or relevant to the Objective, indications are that the Development Objective has, in the main, been achieved. This conclusion is supported by the Close-out reports, PIRs, the Aide-Mémoires, consultations and field visits.

It is also very likely that the results achieved under Immediate Objective 1 will make a significant contribution to a foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CFR into economic activities. However, mainstreaming is a difficult result to ascertain and better Indicators were necessary.

A number of piloting initiatives were carried out successfully under Immediate Objective 2, but whether these results achieved "*enhancement of CFR conservation*" is too early to tell. However, the models are sound and if they are sustained, can be expected to lead to this ultimate result.

Under each of the two Immediate Objectives, the project delivered a range of products and services. Often, this was in spite of Indicators which were not at all helpful. At times, the component or sub-component focussed strongly on particular aspects of the Outcome/Output, virtually ignoring other important aspects, e.g. the exclusive focus on conservation education under Outcome 2 and lack of attention to raising awareness and allowing CFR inhabitants to contribute to biodiversity conservation. This does not mean that the activities were not carried out – they were made a widespread feature across a number of Outcomes. However, while awareness raising activities were undeniably carried out, there has been no measurement of awareness as a result.

The focus of project design and Indicators on hectares under Outcome 4 masked an extensive portfolio of activities which required assessment at sub-Outcome level. The results achieved were mixed, however, some were in the superlative range.

The project targeted many foundational and intermediate products and it achieved most of these successfully. Some progress has also been made towards true results and impacts but the full impact of the project will only accrue in time, and in conjunction with other initiatives.

### **6.2.8 Relevance, effectiveness and sustainability**

Project activities have been very relevant to the needs of the CFR and they were carried out effectively in general. Most products have been internalized, institutionalized and mainstreamed as core activities of key agencies at both national and provincial levels. However, some institutionalization is dependent on funds becoming available and financial sustainability is not yet secure for some activities. On the other hand, there are good prospects for ecological sustainability with the stewardship scheme, management plans, the widespread use of the METT, etc, in place. Furthermore, in continuing C.A.P.E., consideration should be given to broadening the active stakeholders to include others whose action/inaction has a bearing on biodiversity conservation, such as Agriculture.

## **6.3 Overall conclusion**

This has been a successful project. Through its plans, strategies, methodologies, and pilots it has laid a good foundation for biodiversity conservation in the CFR. Its results are mainly intermediate at this stage and its impacts will accrue through the use of its products and the application of its services by the responsible institutions.

Cooperation and collaboration are the most distinguishing features of the project - between the GEF IAs, between the EAs, and between various other stakeholders. It is a model which is rarely encountered, certainly not to this extent.

Good progress has been made towards the Development Objective and both Immediate Objectives which have been met, in the main, and the Outputs have been achieved. Two Outcomes and two Sub-Outcomes are seen as Highly Satisfactory.

Serious efforts have gone into ensuring sustainability for the project products, and it is generally very likely.



## 7 RECOMMENDATIONS

Terminal evaluations do not normally make many recommendations, especially for a successful project such as this one. Any recommendations made usually focus on sustainability of project benefits and this project has made ample plans for the sustainability of its benefits.

The following is more of an exhortation than a recommendation and it is made primarily to SANBI as the coordinator of the C.A.P.E. Programme, in search of sustainability for the products and services of BCSD especially those that have been tested and merit scaling up and replication.

SANBI should ensure that the next phase of the CAPE Programme makes provision for the following elements:

- Safeguard its own coordination function to maintain collaboration, cooperation and alignment
- Broaden the range of active stakeholders to include others whose action/inaction has a bearing on biodiversity conservation, such as Agriculture
- Invest the necessary effort and resources to extend the work to Municipalities
- Invest the necessary effort and resources to ensure the meaningful involvement of grassroots communities
- Continue building capacity within government institutions as well as in the private sector and at community level
- Provide for Fine-Scale Planning to be updated regularly and managed effectively
- Instigate at national level those activities that were piloted successfully by BCSD
- Recognize that MPAs have different needs from terrestrial PAs, and provide for them
- Explore the applicability of the impressive tools developed by BCSD to other situations in South Africa, the region and further afield
- Seek institutional champions e.g. for Stewardship, Fine-Scale Planning, financial incentives and other successful products and services
- Recognize financial and budgetary constraints and seek innovative sustainable financing
- Lobby for State funding and State involvement where other avenues are not successful
- Apply a special focus on the estuarine, coastal and marine environment
- Apply a special focus on the tourism sector as a potential income earner and ally for biodiversity conservation