



TERMINAL EVALUATION

GEF/UNDP/Government of Cape Verde

Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System

GEF PIMS: 4176

Executed by
General Directorate for the Environment,
Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning
Cape Verde



Juliane Zeidler and Margarida Santos
DRAFT 14 December 2015

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	9
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	11
3. FINDINGS	18
3.1 Project Design / Formulation	18
3.2 Project Implementation	18
3.3 Project Results	24
4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS	30
5. ANNEXES	33
ANNEX 1: TOR	34
ANNEX 2: ITINERARY	35
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	37
ANNEX 4: SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS	40
ANNEX 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	41
ANNEX 6: EVALUATION – SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES	43
ANNEX 6 A: STAFF AND BENEFICIARIES (ENGLISH)	44
ANNEX 6 B: STAFF AND BENEFICIARIES (PORTUGUESE)	47
ANNEX 6 C: INSTITUTIONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES (ENGLISH)	50
ANNEX 6 D: INSTITUTIONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES (PORTUGUESE)	54
ANNEX 7: QUESTIONNAIRES USED	59
ANNEX 10: TRACKING TOOLS AND SCORECARDS	88
ANNEX 11: EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM	89

List of Tables

Table 1: Ratings And Their Scales Defined For Different Evaluation Criteria	10
Table 2: Outcomes And Outputs Of The Project	12
Table 3: Excerpts From The Management Response To Recommendations From The MTR On Project Design Recommendations, Affecting Monitoring And Evaluation	13
Table 4: Main Stakeholders With Their Roles And Interests In The Project	14
Table 5: Summary Of The Key Mtr Recommendations (Sept.2013)	16
Table 6: Management Response To Mtr As Set Out In Pir 2014	17
Table 7: Partnerships Update In Pir 2014	21
Table 8: Ratings Of Project Results At Te	24

Acronyms

ADR	Assessment of Developmental Results	NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ATMAR		D/NRM	Department of/ National Resource Management
CO		PA	Protected Area
COSPE		PAAA	PA Autonomous Authority
DGA	General Directorate for the Environment	PIR	Project Implementation Review
DGDT	General Directorate of Tourism Development	PPP	
EIA		PTA	
GEF	Global Environmental Facility	RTA	
IAS	Invasive Alien Species	SIGOF	
INDP	National Institute for Fisheries Development	SMART	
INIDP	Institute for Agriculture Development and Research	SRF	Strategic Results Framework
IR	Inception Report	TAC	
IWO	Island Wide Office	TE	Terminal Evaluation
M&E	Management and Evaluation	TOR	Terms of Reference
MPA	Managed Protected Area	TT	Tracking Tool
MTR	Mid Term Report	UNDP	United Nations Development Program
		WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Acknowledgements

The consultants would like to thank all interviewees for their dedication to the project and Protected Areas (PA) management in Cape Verde. The warmth and hospitality extended by the numerous project beneficiaries is greatly appreciated, particularly as the project interventions per se ended over a year ago.

The team of the General Directorate for the Environment (DGA), in the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning is thanked for their dedication to and interest in the Evaluation exercise, and the willingness to jointly learn from the project experience. Mr Manuel Leao Carvalho, the former project coordinator and now National Coordinator for PAs in the DGA, and the island-based PA management teams, is thanked for their personal efforts to ensure that the evaluation team could get a comprehensive overview of the projects' impacts a year after project closure.

UNDP, notably Antonio Querido, is thanked for their organisational support to the assignment, and their great flexibility in ensuring that the site visits were possible.

Executive Summary

1. Project Summary Table

UNDP/GEF Project Title	Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System
Parent Program	Strategic Program in West Africa: Sub-component on Biodiversity. Objective 3: 'Consolidating Protected Area Networks'
GEF Project ID No	3752
UNDP Project ID No	PIMS 4176
Terminal Evaluation Time Frame	16 November to 23 December 2015
Date of Evaluation Report	23 December 2015
Region	West Africa
Country	Cape Verde
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity
GEF-4 Strategic Objective and Programs	SO1 "To catalyze sustainability of protected area systems" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP2 : Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Area Networks in Protected Area Systems • SP3: "Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks"
Implementing Agency	UNDP
Executing Agency	Directorate General of Environment, Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning
Project Partners (as in project document; revised at MTR)	Government of Cape Verde, Spanish Cooperation, Austrian Cooperation, US Peace Corps, WWF Cape Verde, UN Joint Office in Cape Verde
GEF project financing	US\$3,100,000
UN Joint Office in Cape Verde cash co-financing	US\$ 300,000
Government of Cape Verde cash co-financing	US\$ 783,000
In kind co-financing	US\$15,697,738
Total co-financing	US\$16,780,738
Total Project Cost	US\$19,880,738
ProDoc Signature (date project began)	4 August 2010
Date of Inception Report	14 April 2011 (finalized September 2011)
Date of MTR Report	23 September 2013
Original operational closing date	30 May 2014
Revised operational closing date	December 2014 (project extension of 7 months approved in March 2013)

2. Project Description (as prescribed in August 2010)

The proposed project will strengthen and expand Cape Verde's national system of Protected Areas (PAs) for both terrestrial and marine units. Cape Verde's biodiversity is globally significant. It is threatened, however, by a variety of anthropogenic pressures. In coastal and marine ecosystems, localised pollution driven by rapid tourism and real estate developments, exacerbated by unsustainable fishing, lead to a continuous loss of coastal habitat. In terrestrial ecosystems, overgrazing and land degradation aggravated by invasive plant species, are pervasive threats to ecological equilibrium. Ultimately, climate change looms in the horizon as another consequential threat for Cape Verdean ecosystems. The management of Protected Areas is a vital instrument: (1) to safeguard Cape Verde's unique biodiversity; and (2) to engage communities surrounding PAs in the

sustainable use of natural resources supported by environmental conservation. However, several barriers hinder the effectiveness of the nascent national system of PAs. These are linked to: (1) evolving PA management and governance frameworks, i.e. legal, institutional and policy issues; (2) emerging operationalization of PAs, and (3) persistent capacity gaps in the national management of PAs, despite recent interventions. In this context, this project aims to (1) strengthen and consolidate Cape Verde's PAs system through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units, and (2) promote participatory approaches to management and conservation to ensure the overall sustainability of PA systems. In terms of coverage and expansion, the project is expected to add 41,214 ha to the total protected estate as gazetted by law (i.e. a 38% expansion over the baseline) and bring the level of PAs operational from only 6% of the existing estate to 77% of the expanded one. The expansion will be achieved through the consolidation of several MPAs into larger parks extending into the sea for fisheries' protection purposes. The project will equally support the establishment and strengthening of an autonomous PA management authority and two island-wide PA offices on Sal and Boa Vista islands. Community mobilization and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within and surrounding PAs will be instituted based on the successful practices and lessons learned from a previous UNDP/GEF PA project. In brief, this project will enhance Cape Verde's national capacity in the sustainable use and conservation of its unique biodiversity endowment while improving the livelihoods of communities within and surrounding PAs.

3. Evaluation Rating Table

Table 8 Assessment of overall project results, sustainability and impact

Component	Rating	Notes
Project Results (using 6-point satisfaction scale – see Table 1)		
Achievement of Objective	S	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 1	MU	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 2	MS	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 3	S	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Overall Project Results	MS	Based on Table 7, Annexes 8, 9
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes (using 6-point satisfaction scale – see Table 1)		
<i>Relevance</i>	HS	See Section 3.3.1.
<i>Effectiveness</i>	MS	See Section 3.3.2.
<i>Efficiency</i>	MS	See Section 3.3.2.
Sustainability (using 4-point likelihood scale – see Table 1)		
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability ¹	S	See Section 3.3.5.
Impact (using 3-point impact scale – see Table 1)		
<i>Environmental status improvement</i>	S	Likely significant improvement in effective management and sustainable financing of PAs, resulting in improved conservation status of globally significant biodiversity in the long term

4. Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

¹ All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability should not be higher than the lowest rated dimension (2012 UNDP Guidance for Terminal Evaluation of GEF-funded and UNDP-implemented Projects).

Most **recommendations relating to the project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation** were already made during the MTR, and should be considered. The MTR is of high quality and offers useful lessons.

With regards to corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project the following four key areas are highlighted:

- *Importance of timely MTRs*
- *The need to value M&E activities*
- *Critical for success: Adaptive management know-how*
- *Oversight responsibility of UNDP.*

Specific actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project are organised into delivery areas as follows:

Delivery area 1: Refining the long-term vision: PA management sub-service at DGA versus PAAA

Proposed actions:

1. Clearly articulate strategy for PA management arrangements as currently practiced, especially the budget allocations and financing
2. Options paper for long-term perspective on effective PA management, based on project outputs
3. Policy influencing strategy and next steps for realisation

Delivery area 2: For now focus on effectively operationalizing the PA management sub-service at DGA

Proposed actions:

1. Review structure, TORs and staff profiles; define lines of reporting, responsibilities, budgeting etc. For example, it was mentioned that one strong focal person at national level is needed to head up all PA work
2. Improve on current arrangements, as all interviewees identified serious short comings; UNDP to ensure improvements are in place before GEF 5 project is initiated
3. Procedure for payments (SIGOF)² to be operationalized better to suit PA management context, where people work in remote areas (MTR 2013, Section 3.2.1.)
4. Clear budget allocations for 2016 agreed to and allocated, as part of 2016 budgeting exercise
5. DGA to improve performance management system and secure appropriate staffing in key positions, including for the new GEF 5
6. UNDP with Director of DGA seek high-level (Minister) appointment for a relevant briefing on this key recommendation from the TE

Delivery area 3: Strategy to finish the work that has been started

Proposed actions:

1. Articulate a plan on how to best bring to fruition the unfinished work of the project, based in part on this TE. There are a number of policy documents and plans that have been prepared

² Integrated system for management, budgeting and finance, centralised at the General Directorate of Planning, Budget and Management (DGPOG)

during the project, but only haphazard and ad hoc follow-up on them is currently taking place, e.g. the Law on enabling the collection and use of Entrance Fees.

2. Creative mobilization of resources for on-the-ground actions, including the responsibility for resource mobilization, must be embedded within the TORs of identified staff members. This could take different forms, but would be a key asset for sustainability.

Delivery area 4: Cutting edge community of practice: document, analyse and share PA management experiences from within Cape Verde

Proposed actions:

1. Develop knowledge management and capacity support strategy, which allows for the systematic documentation and analysis of knowledge and learning from Cape Verdean conservation experiences. Firstly this would make project documents available through an online platform. This is of particular value because of the difficulties and costly nature of “physically” travelling between Islands.
2. Support research and generation of experimental management knowledge; identify creative support mechanisms e.g. through international and University partnerships. On Santo Antao in particular excellent examples of such partnerships can be found.
3. Apply more modern technologies for communication and information sharing. Inspire younger staff members to use Google+ etc. for meetings, and communications, etc.

1. Introduction

1. Purpose of the evaluation

The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2010)³ states that: *"Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Projects can be evaluated during the time of implementation, at the end of implementation (terminal evaluation), or after a period of time after the project has ended (ex-post evaluation). Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers, COs, PTAs, etc. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and Assessment of Development Results (ADRs), and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility."*

The policy serves two overarching objectives at the project level: (1) to promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance; and (2) to improve performance by the promotion of learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned.

The specific objectives of the TE are to:

1. Assess extent to which project has addressed set objectives and improved livelihoods;
2. Identify the changes caused by the project in terms of impact to target beneficiaries.

2. Scope & Methodology

The TE is strategic in its approach; generating learning for all project partners and the UNDP for future interventions whilst focusing on building sustainability. The TE is participatory in nature and includes representatives of all key stakeholder groups in the project.

The TE follows the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy¹⁷, the Terms of Reference of the consultants (national and international) (Annex 1) and the UNDP (2012) Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects⁴.

The evaluation was conducted independently by national and international consultants, without influence from GEF, UNDP, the Government of Cape Verde, project staff and project partners. The consultants adhered to the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form (Annex 11).

The TE was conducted between 16 November and 23 December 2015, as an ex-post TE, about one year after project closure. The late timing of the TE was proposed at project closure and during the 2014 PIR, to allow for sufficient time between MTR and TE and to better evaluate the project results integration beyond the project lifetime.

The review entailed a preparation time of five days, 10 days in-country consultations at the national and sub-national (island) levels. Stakeholders, beneficiaries and project sites were visited on the islands of Sal, Boa Vista, St Vincente and Sao Antao, and consultations with relevant project partners

³ <http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010>

⁴ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

took place in Praia (Santiago Island)⁵. The initial findings of the TE were presented to stakeholders at a workshop on 4 December 2015 in Praia. Details of the in-country itinerary, including field visits, and stakeholders met are provided in Annexes 2 and 3.

A detailed review of available project materials (documents) was undertaken to contextualise the project scope and to cross-validate the MTR's findings. Official reports such as the project terminal report, response to the MTR and the 2014 PIR were used as a foundation for this report, including the 2014 completed scorecards. A formal list of documents consulted/reviewed is included in Annex 5.

The consultations were conducted in group meetings or one-to-one semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires were facilitated for different target groups. Specific meetings for clarification were scheduled with former project staff or Ministry representatives, as appropriate. A full list of individuals consulted is presented in Annex 3. The sample questionnaires are included in Annex 7, and a transcript of responses is found in Annex 6.

Site visits were undertaken on all islands to visualise the project impacts amongst beneficiaries and within the target Protected Areas (PAs) one year since project completion (See Annex 4 for a summary of field visits).

As part of the standard methodology for TEs for GEF projects, a rating system for a suite of agreed to evaluation criteria to be applied is being used (see Table 1). The systematic continuation and comparison of project performance following-up on the 2013 MTR can thus be provided. It is noted that the MTR was conducted towards the end of the project implementation time and limited resources were available for continued implementation.

Table 1: Ratings and their scales defined for different evaluation criteria

Design, Results, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Monitoring, Implementation and Execution	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings
Satisfactory (S)	Only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings
Levels of risk to sustainability of project outcomes	
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks , but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.
Level of Impact (Expected)	
Significant (S)	Substantial positive impacts of the project on conservation of global biodiversity expected
Minimal (M)	Some positive impacts expected
Negligible (N)	Little or no impact expected

⁵ It is noted that not all project sites could be visited and important stakeholders from e.g. Fogo and Maio were unfortunately not included in the consultations. This was only due to a need to focus the TE visit and had no implications in terms of importance of sites.

3. Structure of the evaluation report

The structure of the report follows the UNDP Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects, Annex 2, TOR Annex F.

As such the report begins with this introductory section, describing the TE and project context. Section 2 describes the project and its expected results in more detail within the development context of the project sites and Cape Verde. The findings of the TE are presented in Section 3, dealing in turn with formulation, implementation and results of the project and rating. Section 4 summarizes the conclusions, recommendations of the TE and lessons learned in terms of relevance, performance and success of the project.

2. Project description and development context

1. Project start and duration

The project agreement was signed on 04 August 2010, and the project inception workshop took place in April 2011. The project was closed in December 2014. Hence the project was implemented over a 4 year time period.

2. Problems that the project sought to address

The project sought to address the threats to Cape Verde's terrestrial and marine biodiversity and to engage communities in sustainable use of natural resources, through strengthening of the protected area (PA) system. It is a young PA system, existing more on paper and in computer files than on the ground, and it was given a boost under the "Phase 1" GEF project⁶.

The specific protected area problems that this project seeks to address are linked to:

1. The (slowly) developing protected area system – little science based strategy, poor supporting legislation (e.g. wildlife protection laws), poor consideration of biodiversity in governance, inadequate finance and weak institutional framework
2. Site level demarcation and management of protected areas in the face of increased threats from economic development and potential impacts of climate change
3. Protected areas in the landscape – community involvement and local development planning

Three barriers to an effective national system of protected areas in Cape Verde were identified in the project document (2010) as follows:

Barrier 1: The legal, policy and institutional frameworks require strengthening to enable effective PA management

⁶ The GEF Phase 1 project, was an initial GEF investment implemented between 2003-2008 (see https://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=1124). Notably no "Phase 2" project was funded by the GEF, instead this GEF 4 project was formulated and implemented.

Barrier 2: Only a fraction of the PA estate is currently operational; capacities and financial resources remain scarce to face the up-scaling and consolidation challenges

Barrier 3: Participatory approaches to conservation in Cape Verde are still limited

3. Immediate and development objectives of the project

Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System is a four year UNDP/GEF full-size project that aims to get the country's nascent protected area system firmly established within an effective institutional setting, integrated into government policy, and staffed and equipped with the management tools that it requires both centrally and at the site level.

The **Project Objective** read *"To consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas (PA) System through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation"*.

The project intended to contribute to the broader **Development Goal**, which was and still is *"To conserve globally significant terrestrial and marine biodiversity in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde through a protected area system's approach"*.

The following strategic project design was developed to address the development goal (Table 2).

Table 2: Outcomes and outputs of the project

OUTCOME 1: Governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system is strengthened
Output 1.1 The PA Autonomous Authority (PAAA) is established, operational and appropriately staffed with trained personnel and with a strengthened capacity to manage both terrestrial PAs and MPAs Output 1.2 PA planning and management tools have been developed and are under implementation, including (i) a National PA Zoning Plan; (ii) a National PA Strategy; and (iii) a National PA Business Plan Output 1.3 The new PAAA is cooperating effectively with relevant institutions for sustainable resource management Output 1.4 Quantitative data on climate change and carbon sequestration is effectively informing the design and implementation of the National PA strategy
OUTCOME 2: Management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs is enhanced
Output 2.1 Management and business plans have been prepared and implemented in a participatory fashion in 4 terrestrial PAs and in 3 MPAs involving communities, private land owners and tourism operators, among others Output 2.2 Island-Wide Conservation Strategy Plans have been implemented and are supporting the establishment of all of the MPAs on Sal and Boa Vista Islands Output 2.3 Ecological monitoring systems are in place for the seven target PAs/MPAs, yielding relevant data on the health of ecosystems Output 2.4 Exotic species are under management and IAS under sustained control in target terrestrial PAs Output 2.5 A Fisheries Management Plan is under implementation, as a result of cooperation agreements between the Directorate of Fisheries and the Island-Wide Office, at all MPA sites
OUTCOME 3 The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas
Output 3.1 Organized communities, farmers associations, and associations of artisanal fishermen have the capacity to engage in biodiversity friendly income-generating activities as an alternative to resource degrading ones Output 3.2 Local governments, resource institutions, private operators, NGOs and others participate actively and collaboratively in biodiversity conservation in PAs and MPAs through the established Advisory Councils for the project's target PAs and MPAs Output 3.3 The integration of PA/MPA planning and strategizing into local development frameworks ensure that sectoral development at the local level is more harmonious with the conservation objectives and activities of PAs and MPAs

Output 3.4 Natural resource and soil use (e.g. agriculture, tourism, fisheries, development construction) for the 4 PAs and the 3 MPAs respect restrictions of ecological carrying capacities ⁷

4. Baseline Indicators established

The project document set out the SRF, which was subsequently commented on during the MTR. Annex 9 specifies all indicators and provides an updated assessment of their achievement. The commentary from the MTR is fully supported by the TE.

Annex 9 includes a performance assessment of the project against the established Strategic Results Framework (SRF) set out in the project document. The MTR had recommended some adjustments to the SRF, which were accepted as part of the management response (see Table 3).

Table 3: Excerpts from the Management Response to recommendations from the MTR on Project design recommendations, affecting monitoring and evaluation

Key issues and Recommendations	Management Response*	
	Response	Key Actions
Project design recommendations, affecting monitoring and evaluation		
Recommendation 1: Revise the SRF Indicators for Objective and Outcomes using the suggestions given	<p>UNDP recognizes that some of the indicators retained on the SRF are not sufficiently attributable to project activities. Additionally, it is agreed that cost-effectiveness of verification means should have been better appraised at the project <u>design</u> phase. In the absence of clear biodiversity monitoring mechanisms and information systems (especially in terms of marine and coastal biodiversity) baseline definition and data collection required time and resources investments for project indicators' measurement. UNDP acknowledges the importance of indicators for appropriate project monitoring systems and therefore considers the revision suggestion made.</p> <p>From the reformulation proposed on Annex 8 of MTR report are adopted the recommendations for Objective Indicator 1 and 3 (clarifications and ambiguity reduction); Outcome 1 indicators 1 and 2 (consistency improvements and clarity); Outcome 2 indicator 2; Outcome 3 Indicator 1. The recommendations on Objective 1 Indicator 2 are considered but not adopted for the on -going project for several reasons. Namely, adopting new indicators at this stage will bring back the issue of having appropriate data needed to determine a baseline. Additionally, in case the generation of primary source data is necessary for monitoring, records will be missing since no systems will have been designed from inception.</p> <p>We agree with the comments on the redundancy of using scorecard and tracking tool values for SRF purposes. However, since no better indicators where designed from inception, those ones will be kept. Considerations made on the "fragility" masked behind some accurate data provided in response to TT and scorecards questions are also noted and considered as essential remarks to be highlighted on the scorecard results analysis and reflections.</p> <p>We will consider all the suggestions and comments as lessons learned. For next projects, costs of verification systems will be better appraised and a SMART test will be applied to each indicator proposed. We consider that reflections are needed on the approach to project M&E system to make sure is better integrated on national systems and/or contribute to reinforce sector statistics tools whenever they do not exist.</p>	<p>Lessons learned will be capitalized on for the project SRF design for future GEF biodiversity projects.</p> <p>Recommendations on how to better design indicators for ecological monitoring will be incorporated on the formulation of ecological monitoring plans and on the design of M& E tools for the management and ecotourism plans. Additionally, guidance will be requested to RTA to ensure impact or process indicators are formulated as required for each level of monitoring. The guidance note to be prepared should make clear the difference between these two different types of indicators, the minimum standards and the utility and value of each one of them.</p> <p>Technical consultations with research institutions intervening on natural resources management will be organized in order to agree on improved monitoring systems and how to better design ecological and environmental indicators</p> <p>A reflection on how GEF/UNDP projects contribute to improve national environmental sector statistics will be launched with national partners</p> <p>Capacity development actions to improve national biodiversity conservation monitoring systems and environmental sector statistics will be considered for future interventions.</p>

⁷ Output 3.4 was added as a result of a revision of the Strategic Results Framework at the Inception Phase

<p>Recommendation 2:</p> <p>Delete Output 3.4</p> <p>“Natural resource and soil use (eg. agriculture, tourism, fisheries, development construction) for the 4 PAs and the 3 MPAs respect restrictions of ecological carrying capacities” from the SRF</p>	<p>This recommendation is considered but not adopted as such. It is agreed that the respect of ecological carrying capacities thresholds is implicit on the sustainable use concept. However, those values were unknown and no baseline data was available to measure progress through the different indicators. The consultancy was planned because national technical capacities to apply analysis methodologies and calculate ecological carrying capacities and resources sustainable use thresholds were judged limited. At this point, deleting the output from the SRF will not result in any improvement or change on project results and will make no difference on the implementation progress; neither will support better planning for the remaining project duration.</p> <p>However, additional guidance on how to better approach in the future capacity reinforcement on this area would be appreciated. We recognize that the way the consultancy was planned would have benefit from a better planning and a more specific definition of what was expected from this work. As a lesson learned, we note that capacity building from this type of short international consultancy was limited. In the future, the focus should be more clearly put in achieving national technicians’ command of concepts, methodologies and analysis tools rather than on producing a report with values that could be used for monitoring purpose.</p> <p>Despite the limitations acknowledged above, it should be noted that the results of the consultancy has been largely discussed by national institutions participating on the project committees and values have been used not only for project monitoring but also considered on the design of management and ecotourism plans.</p>	<p>During the analysis and discussion of the consultancy report on Ecological carrying capacities study, the committee members decided to create a task force to improve data used.</p> <p>As a key action, it has been agreed to foster this task force and to use it as a platform of learning. From the identification of the analysis gaps, recommendations will be derived on how to improve sector data collection system in order to improve ecological carrying capacity analysis. Additionally, capacity reinforcement needs at each department level will be identified and recommendations will be derived for research institutes on which resources and ecosystem characteristic and which process impacts need to be better understood in order to refine the carrying capacity analysis.</p>
--	---	---

5. Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders and their roles, as identified in the Project Document, are listed in Table 4. There is no indication in the Inception Report that this list was reviewed during the Project’s Inception Phase.

Table 4: Main stakeholders with their roles and interests in the project

Stakeholder	Roles/Interests in the project (as in Project Document)	Comments at TE stage
General Directorate of the Environment (DGA)	<p>Executing agency until the Protected Area Autonomous Authority (PAAA) created (see Output 1.1), so primarily responsible for project delivery.</p> <p>(Responsible for coordination with other agencies with respect to all matters pertaining to the environment, and for managing EIA)</p>	<p>Confirmed at MTR stage. Since project closure, a PA management team has been formally established under the DGA’s Service for Natural Resources Management (DNRM) with a majority of project positions now formally integrated into Government services.</p> <p>DGA staff for PA management includes: Sal – 4 people; Boavista – 4, Santo Antao – 4; S. Vicente/Santa Luzia – 1; Maio – 1; Fogo – 5; S. Nicolau – 6; Santiago – 6. These teams are implementing the activities proposed in the plans for planning and management, developed in the project framework.</p>
Ministry of Environment, Rural Development and Marine Resources and its general directorates and linked institutions	Parent ministry of DGA	At MTR stage it was confirmed that the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning took over as the parent ministry for the DGA, but the project maintained collaboration with the new Ministry of Rural Development

Stakeholder	Roles/Interests in the project (as in Project Document)	Comments at TE stage
Local governments on Santo Antao, Boa Vista, Sao Vicente, Sal and Fogo	Advisory Councils and participation in protected area planning and consideration of protected areas in development planning	At MTR stage it was found that Advisory Councils were formed and were key stakeholders. Local government agencies outside the Advisory Councils also interested stakeholders participating in protected area planning.
Bilateral and Multilateral Development Agencies	Austrian Development Agency and Spanish Development Cooperation with parallel programmes that qualify as project co-finance. Expected to sit on the Project Steering Committee EU and French Development Agency with relevant programmes regarding operationalization of marine protected areas (Sal and Santa Lucia) and watershed management projects (Fogo) (EU) and investments in the Water Sector (French Development Agency)	At MTR stage it was found that the Austrian and Spanish agencies withdrew from Cape Verde, and the project has no links with the EU and the French Development Agency.
US Peace Corps	Six volunteers expected to be deployed at site level. US Peace Corps to have a seat on the Project Steering Committee	At MTR stage it was found that three volunteers were deployed - on Boa Vista, Sal and Santo Antao - and they performed useful work. One was accompanied by his spouse, and she also worked on the project. No further engagement was reported beyond MTR.
WWF Cape Verde	Contributed to project development from conception, especially with regard to Marine Protected Areas Expected to be involved on Sal in particular Expected to contribute through its technical experts nationally, regionally and globally	At MTR stage it was confirmed that WWF withdrew from Cape Verde before the project began
Regional, Coastal and Marine Conservation Programme for West Africa	Expected to contribute through stakeholder involvement and capacity building through a subsidiary project and WWF Cape Verde	No links at MTR stage; confirmed at TE.
Cape Verde Environmental NGOs	For example, Amigos da Natureza, Natura 2000, ATMAR, SOS Tartaruga, Turtle Foundation. All interested and latter two will support measurement of turtle hatching indicator.	At MTR stage it was found that strong links with at least three of these NGOs existed, particularly with respect to protection of turtles and nesting beaches on Sal and Boa Vista. The TE confirmed these partnerships, which are now continuing under the DG NRM.
Other local NGOs	For example, Fishing Community of Palmeira (Sal), COSPE (Fogo), Land Owners and Grogue Producers Association (Santo Antao) and others, are interested in the project	Links through protected area planning and the local Advisory Councils The TE confirmed these partnerships, which are now continuing under the DG NRM.
Private Sector tourism operators (Sal and Boa Vista)	Several members of the tourism industry, including the parastatal Cape Verde Investment Society expressed interest when consulted during the PPG phase	Some links continuing. The TE confirmed some strong and innovative partnerships, which are now continuing under the DG NRM. An example would be work with the Cape Verde Investment Society on Boavista.

It is noted that even beyond project closure these partners and interest groups remain engaged, furthering the long-term project impacts.

At MTR stage it was noted that the signature page of the Project Document lists the following as partners: General Directorate of Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry (*sic*), General Directorate of Tourism Development (DGGT), National Institute for Fisheries Development (INDP), National Institute for Agriculture Development and Research (INIDA), Spanish Cooperation, Austrian Cooperation, US Peace Corps, WWF Cape Verde and the Municipal Councils at the project sites (three on Santo Antao, two on Fogo, and one each on Sal, Boa Vista and Sao Vicente). It was found at that point that several of these partners were not active in Cape Verde anymore; WWF Cape Verde closed their country office and the Austrian Cooperation reduced their support to the environment sector in Cape Verde. Therefore the formal partnership arrangements were changed at that time. No further changes were noted between the MTR and project closure.

6. Expected Results

The MTR formulated the expected results as follows:

The most important result expected in the Project Document is that the protected area system of Cape Verde will be firmly established, sustainably funded and ably and scientifically managed by well trained staff and that there is a smooth transition when the project ends and government teams take over responsibility at both system and site level and in particular at the four project field offices. The project is expected to establish active management according to approved management plans in its focal protected areas and to have an influence on others through its Island Wide Offices (IWO) on Boa Vista and Sal.

*The most important global benefit resulting from the project is expected to be enhanced conservation of globally significant biodiversity throughout the archipelago, but in particular at the four field sites. Improved protection of Loggerhead Turtles (*Caretta caretta*) and the control of invasive plants where they threaten endemic plants and animals, have been singled out as indicators of project impact in the Strategic Results Framework (SRF).*

It is expected that capacity of communities and local governments to understand and work together with protected areas will have been raised at the project sites and that this will facilitate decentralization of protected area management responsibilities at those sites and provide models for replication elsewhere. Local and national benefits expected are improved livelihoods for people living in and around the project's focal protected areas (local) and viable models developed in these areas that will be replicated (after necessary adaptations) at other sites throughout the islands after the end of the project (national).

At time of the TE the expected results remain the same. The specific results (outputs) and progress against achieving them are included in Annex 8 and described in more detail in Section 3, below.

7. Recommendations from MTR

The MTR conducted in September 2013 made seven key recommendations (Table 5). In January 2014, a formal management response was formulated, and progress on implementation was reported in the PIR of July 2014 (Table 6), which is the last official progress report. The project closed most operations at that time, while some project staff remained in place until project closure in December 2014.

Table 5: Summary of the key MTR recommendations (Sept.2013)

Recommendation 1	Revise the SRF Indicators for Objective and Outcomes using suggestions given
Recommendation 2	Delete Output 3.4 (on carrying capacities) from the SRF
Recommendation 3	Arrange joint reaffirmation by all stakeholders of determination to go forward with establishment and funding PA system administration before the end of the project
Recommendation 4	Establish a task force to get the protected area administration financed and institutionalized either as PAAA or within the DGA and agree to a timetable of steps and milestones
Recommendation 5	Design and implement a programme to deepen understanding of the economic values of protected areas across all sectors of government and among the general public
Recommendation 6	Reduce project duration by 4 months to end of August 2014
Recommendation 7	<p>Quickly prepare a programme of work to cover the period October 2013 to August 2014, reconsidering the priorities of activities scheduled for 2013, and focusing on activities necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Achieve institutional sustainability for the PA system administration before the end of the project (links with Recommendations 3, 4 and 5) b) Consolidate project outputs at the site level, and c) Establish practical spatial database for the whole PA system using the GIS capabilities developed by the project

Table 6: Management response to MTR as set out in PIR 2014

Recommendation 1	<p>Revise the SRF Indicators for Objective and Outcomes using the suggestions given.</p> <p>MR1: We recognize that some of the indicators retained on the SRF are not sufficiently attributable to project activities. In fact, cost-effectiveness of verification means should have been better appraised at the project design phase.</p>
Recommendation 2	<p>Delete Output 3.4 “Natural resource and soil use (eg. agriculture, tourism, fisheries, development construction) for the 4 PAs and the 3 MPAs respect restrictions of ecological carrying capacities” from the SRF</p> <p>MR2: This recommendation is considered but not adopted as such. It is agreed that the respect of ecological carrying capacities thresholds is implicit on the sustainable use concept. However, those values were unknown and no baseline data was available to measure progress through the different indicators. Furthermore, when this MTR took place this activity had already been done.</p>
Recommendation 5	Design and implement a program to deepen understanding of the economic values of protected areas across all sectors of government and among the general public and to put forward the economic case (and the non-economic case) for adequate government financing of protected areas.

	<p><u>MR5:</u> This recommendation is accepted. It is agreed that decision-makers awareness is needed and will be beneficial. However, the second element of specific actions proposed is not adopted due to financial restrictions</p> <p>In general, the mid-term review of the project was very positive. This was due to the methodology used and the expertise of the evaluators which allowed for in-depth project analysis both in terms of the design of the indicators of the objectives and results as well as the logic of its applicability. Unfortunately, this exercise, normally undertaken ex-ante evaluation or during the inception workshop of the project, took place only near the end of the project, ie, six months before. This means that some recommendations made are not applicable, since most of the project results have been achieved. A change of indicators at this late stage would be inadvisable. Despite this, some recommendations will serve as guidelines for further projects of the Directorate General of Environment.</p>
--	--

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

The TE fully aligns with the assessment provided on project design and formulation set out in the MTR. Only three specific points are specifically raised at time of the TE:

1. It should be noted that the MTR identified that *“There is a certain risk that at the terminal evaluation of this project, the comments on lack of an exit strategy could be repeated. It is important that there is soon clarity on government commitments.” (MTR, Section 3.1.6).* This point will be addressed under Section 3.3. Project Results, below.
2. It is noted in the MTR that a large staff complement was foreseen in the project design from project planning stage. At TE stage it was repeatedly mentioned that excessively high staff costs impaired project implementation, as budgetary limits are being cited as a key reason for lack of performance on certain deliverables. The design of the budget, in hindsight, is seen to have been a hindrance in achieving visible project results on the ground.
3. The risks associated with the establishment of the PAAA were probably underrated at project design stage, and not sufficiently addressed in subsequent risk monitoring. However, it is not exactly clear if the risk only changed during the project life span, or whether it was underrated at design stage.

From the questionnaires and interviews it is apparent that a strongly appreciated point has been that the project formulation was undertaken in a participatory manner. Most respondents found that the project design addressed key priorities to biodiversity conservation, and that the establishment of a functional PA management framework was needed.

3.2 Project Implementation

1. **Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)**

During the final 15 months of project duration following the MTR (including a 7 months extension), the most significant adjustments revolved around the management response to the MTR. However, as limited financial resources were available for on the ground activities, the project staff mostly focused on the finalisation of outputs not yet completed.

An update on the type of activities implemented on the national level and island specific offices is included in Annex 8 in the form of a progress report on the continued work related to the project outputs. Notably there are activities that took place up to December 2014, while other activities are still on-going at this point. The Government of Cape Verde decided to integrate a great deal of project staff into their own ranks, and as such a PA management “sub-service” with island offices has been established in the Natural Resource Management (NRM) Service. The staff continue to implement the activities started by the project.

2. Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

A detailed update on partnerships and activities undertaken during the 2013 to 2014 reporting period (PIR, July 2014) indicate a rich engagement with partners in all project intervention areas. An overview is provided in Table 7, below.

Certain partnerships which were foreseen at project design did not materialise, including on co-financing (MTR, 2013, Section 3.1.4. On Cost-effectiveness).

Table 5: Excerpts from MTR, 2013, Section 3.1.4. on co-financing partnership arrangements

Synergies and co-financing at the ratio of 1:5.6 in leveraged funds	This sounded very good at the start. However, much of the cofinance was not realized.
---	---

Project integration with the DGA was already observed to be strong by the MTR, which observed: *“The MTR team were surprised to find that many local residents view the project field staff as official government-appointed protected area staff and they have corresponding expectations of the project teams. This on the one hand demonstrates the close working arrangements between DGA and the project but on the other hand is building up to a potential sudden loss of trust in the system (MTR, 2013, Section 3.3.1).”*

At time of the TE, it can be assessed that this close integration with the government services and investment into this partnership has been a success factor for continuity and sustainability of project investments beyond the project lifetime. Section 3.3.5. on sustainability will elaborate on the integration of project staff into the government service.

Partnerships with local communities and institutions on all islands have been regarded as particularly powerful and important. Although the TE team only consulted with a sub-set of partners, those interviewed and visited all cited extremely positive working relationships which have lasted well beyond the project lifetime. As most institutions, including local government and private sector, are implicated as partners in the various development PA management plans and the PA specific eco-tourism plans, they do continue with implementation of the various signed up for activities. The Municipality of xxx on Santo Antao, for example, cited a great deal of conservation investments as part of their annual plan and budget, in response to their roles in the PA management plans for xxx. It is noted though that the TE did not allow for a comprehensive assessment of on-going activities and

their impacts on biodiversity in the specific PA areas, with the exception of spot checks during the site visits.

Project beneficiaries, who were directly involved in the project implementation and received support for alternative livelihoods from PA related activities, were extremely positive about the project implementation and their personal engagement. The project concept, to provide opportunities to benefit from eco-tourism activities as well as provide incentives to reduce e.g. grazing pressure in selected PAs seemed to generate good partnership arrangements and deliver visible socio-economic benefits. A more detailed assessment is included in Annex 4, as well as under section 3.3.

Table 7: Partnerships update in PIR 2014

Partners	Innovation and Work with Partners
Civil Society Organisations/NGOs	<p>The following partners have worked with the project in the areas of education, environmental awareness and education, among others:</p> <p>The innovative aspect of these partners has to do with: participation in training activities, as forming and project partner; receiver and transmitter of information of interest to the conservation of natural resources, participation in the implementation of project activities related to conservation resources, socializations and public consultations of proposed managements tools at local level; boundaries protected areas demarcations on Boavista, Sal, Santo Antão and S. Nicolau Islands, thereby contributing to sustainability of the national PA System: Fogo Island: ACD Chã das Caldeiras; ACD Montinho; ACD Cabeça Fundão; ACD Achada Furna; ACD Monte Largo; ACD Monte Grande; ACD Miguel Gonçalves; ACD Cutelo Capado; ACD Inhuco; ACD Ribeira Filipe; ACD Campanas de Cima; ACD Atalaia; ACD Ribeira Ilhéu; ACD Feijoal; ACD Pai António; ACD Cutelo Alto; ACD Estância Roque; OMCV; SOLDIFOGO; CRUZ VERMELHA; Associação de Guias de Chã.</p> <p>SAL Island: Associação RAMAO; Escuteiros; Paradise Beach; IEPF, Liceu Olavo Moniz, Associação de pais e encarregados de educação; Operadores de Moto 4; Associação Chã de Matias, Centro comunitário África 70; Projecto Nós Kaza; SOS Tartarugas; Centro de desenvolvimento Social do Sal.</p> <p>BOA VISTA Island: Associação Comunitária Amigos de Fundo das Figueiras; Associação Curral Velho Nos Cultura; Associação Desenvolvimento Agrícola e Pecuário do Norte da Boa Vista; Associação Pescadores da Ilha da Boa Vista; Bios.CV; Cabo Verde Natura 2000; Centro de Juventude da Boa Vista; Centro de Juventude de Sal Rei; Clube Ambiental da Boa Vista; Radio Comunitária Voz de Bubista; Grupo de Mulheres de João Galego; Liga dos Condutores da Boa Vista; Fundação Tartaruga; Associação MARE de João Galego.</p> <p>SANTO ANTÃO Island: Unidos pelo Desenvolvimento do Planalto leste; Associação das Mulheres do Planalto Leste; Montanha Viva - Associação de Desenvolvimento Comunitário de Corda; Associação Amigos da Montanha; Associação Comunitária para o Desenvolvimento Rural de Pico da Cruz; Associação Dragoeiro; Liga dos Amigos de Paul; Associação para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável de Igreja do Paul; Associação Irmão Unidos; Associação Recreativa Mãos Unidas de Compainha; Associação Luz Viva de Lagoa e Compainha; Associação para a Protecção Ambiental e Desenvolvimento de R^a Grande – Garça de Cima; Associação Voz Comunitária para o Desenvolvimento do 2º Povoado de Alto Mira.</p> <p>S. VICENTE Island: BIOSFERA 1; MORABI; Amigos da Natureza; Amigos de Monte Verde.</p>
Indigenous Peoples	
Private Sector	<p>The following partners have been worked with the project in the areas of training, awareness and environmental education, collecting subsidies for management tools namely management and ecotourism plans, protected areas boundaries demarcations, among other activities: the consensus arrived on various aspects under participatory approach, is indeed an innovation, because the management of natural resources will be made in a less confrontational, thus ensuring its sustainability. Sal Island: Rio Hotel and Turist: cleaning campaigns in Sal (city and beaches); Paradise Beach: provides space for meeting on turtle conservation campaigns ; Neptunos: provides ships and enviromental monitors for guide visites; Fogo Island: Operador Turístico: CASA MARIZA, Qualitur, Vista Verde, CITS, ZebraTravel, Revolution Climbing Europe, blocSyndicate Ltd., Empresa de alpinismo e segurança em montanhas; Universidade de Barcelona (Departamento de Biologia Animal); Centro de Recuperação de Fauna Silvestre de Tarifa, Gran Canárias.</p> <p>Santo Antão Island: SANTTUR; PROTUR; Câmara do Comercio, Agremiação empresarial; S. Vicente Island: Câmara do Comercio, Agremiação empresarial; TELECOM; Agências de Viagens e Guis Turísticos; Boa Vista Island: Ultramaratona de Boa Vista; Baobab Tour Lda; Barracuda Tours; Boa Vista Ma Bô; Clamtour; Hotel Royal Decameron; Hotéis RIU; Lacação Golf & Beach Resort; Marine Club; Morabitur; Naturalia Lda; Quad Land; Quad Zone; Sabura Center; Scuba Caribe.</p>
GEF Small Grants Programme	<p>During this reporting period, In Boa Vista Island, an integrated project was elaborated by GEF-Small Grant Programs and PCSAPCV (USD76.094,78). The main objectives of this project are: (i) Promote strengthening the capacities to adapt to climate change, while ensuring improvements in the livelihoods of the communities of northern Boa Vista; (ii) strengthen organizational capacities / internal communities of the north of Boa Vista, Acquired greenhouse for agriculture activities, Community Center rehabilitation, of soil and water conservations activities. This project is co-financed by SGP and PCSAOCV (PCSACV: USD21.146,62).</p> <p>There are 16 projects, being 15 in Santo Antão and 1 in S. Vicente Islands, financed under micro grans of the PCSAPCV to local communities for income generating and conservations activities (USD27.494). All the activities related to project selecting were conducted by local Adviser Council of the project.</p>

	Also under the SGP were undertaken the training on project preparation, monitoring & evaluation for small grants, nurseries for plants.
Other Partners	<p>Other Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schools-guided visits to protected areas, celebration dates related to the environment and lectures to students about protected areas -Universities: UNICV, Piaget, support for students and teachers in carrying out work on graduation, etc.. - INE-National Institute of Statistics-Data: to obtain data from Census and other thematic surveys train community surveyors for the socio-economic assessments. - National Police; Youth local center; - Delegations of Ministry of Education on the islands of Fogo, Boa Vista, S. Vicente and Santo Antão; - Delegations of MDR (Rural Development Ministry) on the islands of Fogo, Boa Vista, S. Vicente and Santo Antão in various domains such as logistics support, participation on technical committees, forest co-management , yielding space for project offices. - General Directorate of Tourism as Steering Committee Member; - General Directorate of Marine Ressources: exchange of information and experiences, joint work of socio-economic surveys; marine resources management police and poverty reduction in West Africa"; Signature of Memorandum of Understanding between project of consolidation protected area system and PRAO-CV, related to traditional fisheries managements in Sal Island; - Cape Verde Investment (CVI): advice and information on the guidelines for the work of international consultants; - Local councils on the Municipalities of intervention: proposals to articulate the Municipal Development Plans (PDM) with protected areas; seashore cleaning campaigns. - Ministry of Rural Development- General Directorate of Planning and Budget Services (Office of Statistics and Information Management) : support to formulate baselines for socio-economic survey, training on database management; participation on project's technical staff hiring process. - General Directorate of Agriculture and Rural development: Providing data to the consultants for the determination of carrying capacity and the preparation of management plans. - Youth Centres: support on beach cleaning campaigns - Steering and Technical Committees Members : MIREX, ICIEG, SDTIBM, DGPOG MAHOT, DGRM, DGOTDU, DGT, DGADR, AMP, INIDA, INDP, POWPA, Municipalities of Fogo, S. Vicente, Boa Vista, Sal, Municipality Association of Santo Antão Island, National Municipality Association, Platform of NGOs.Partnerships: Univ. Gran Canary on technical assistances in fauna (Pterodroma feae). Meeting with teachers 3 Univ. Germany for the development of a Biodiversity Information System (BIS) in Fogo Island.

3. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Overall, the lack of adaptive management was mentioned as one of the critical failures of the project. The re-programming of funds for on-the-ground activities has been a particular point of resentment. Various PIRs as well as indication in the Inception Report pointed to the fact that the staff costs of the project were extremely high, leaving limited resources for implementation actions. Further, the perceived need to finalise outputs related to planning instruments before implementing tangible conservation actions in the field was criticised from the onset of project implementation. Limited corrective measures were taken. It can be asserted that the in-country project management and oversight leadership did too little to steer the project to more practical delivery.

4. Project Finance

The MTR (September 2014) provided a detailed assessment of the financial situation of the project and concluded that *with expected available funds of US\$683,000 for 2014 and with recurrent costs having accounted for over US\$630,000 in previous annual project budgets there appears to be a shortage of funds for other than salaries, office expenses, local vehicle use and standard monitoring meetings in 2014. A further US\$40,000 is budgeted for the Terminal Evaluation, so unless changes are made to affect recurrent costs, only US\$13,000 would be available for other expenditures (MTR Section 3.2.1.).*

The TE found that relevant management decisions had been implemented and staff were taken off the project bills as of mid-2014, with only key staff (i.e. the project coordinator) staying to wrap up project closure. At PIR stage (July 2014) the estimated total GEF grant disbursement as of June 2014 stood at \$ 2,682,543 (87% of \$3.1m), which indicates that project closure is imminent and is in line with the relatively short extension granted in early 2013 (project closure postponed by 7 months to December 2014).

At project end all relevant financial reports and closure had taken place.

5. Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)

The MTR rated monitoring and evaluation as Satisfactory overall with respect to project implementation, but commented that *more should have been done to deal with some of the problems with the SRF that were acknowledged by project staff (MTR, Section 3.2.2.).*

The MTR recommended an amendment of the SRF in its Recommendations 1 & 2 (see Table 5 above).

6. UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

Between the MTR and the project closure no significant changes in implementation/execution coordination and management arrangements were made, with the exception that staff were phased out as from July 2014.

The MTR made specific reference to one issue concerning the management arrangements as follows (MTR 2013, Section 3.1.7. Management Arrangements): *The Prodoc provided for a large field-based staff on four different islands – two Project Site Units (PSU) on Santo Antao (responsible for two PAs*

on Santo Antao and one PA on neighbouring Sao Vicente) and Fogo (one PA), and two Island-Wide Offices (IWO) on Boavista and Sal, responsible for the three proposed Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). Although there was a chance for field based staff to interact with the TAC when they met on their island there was never a chance for all project staff to meet together. This, in hindsight, may have been a mistake. Certainly the field based staff would have appreciated the opportunity and it would have provided a mechanism for site staff to learn from each other, and to standardize methodology where appropriate. This could still be done over the next year, possibly at the expense of one of the TAC meetings.

The issue of capacity and knowledge transfer, or the limitations thereof, were raised during the TE and are of particular relevance now that many of the technical staff have been absorbed by the DGA. First of all, the suggestion from the MTR to still invest into such matters was not explicitly taken up. Secondly, currently there are no clear staff development plans in place, and the performance expectation of staff in the PA sub-service is unclear. To ensure that a top notch and well performing PA sub-service (if not PAAA) are in place, a relevant performance and capacity support system should be in place. Furthermore a formal knowledge-sharing platform should be established, to allow for the growth of a community of practice learning from national PA management experiences. Relevant recommendations to this effect are included in Section 4.

3.3 Project Results

At TE stage, the Project is evaluated as **Moderately Satisfactory** with respect to the achievement of its objective based on the assessments in Annex 8 and summarised in Table 7. This is in line with the assessment undertaken at MTR stage. The project's overall performance assessment is given in Table 8 and the analysis of project performance indicators in Annex 9. A qualitative, evidence-based assessment of the extent to which the outcomes have been addressed, is provided in Annex 8 for each project output. This assessment is against what was originally planned in the Project Document, plus the few modifications made during the inception phase, and is based on the final PIR for the project compiled in 2014. At time of the TE in December 2015, current PA sub-service DGA staff, mostly composed of former project staff, were interviewed. Although this 2015 self-assessment is noted in Annex 8, it is not considered in the rating. The rating is purely derived from the official reportings (PIR, TTs/scorecards). Annotations contextualise the longer-term delivery on the outcomes and outputs.

Table 8: Ratings of project results at TE

Based on evidence given in Annex 8, measured by PIR 2014. Notably additional activities have been carried out between then and time of the TE (July 2014-December 2015), which demonstrate some good sustainability and absorption by DGA, but these are not considered in the performance rating per se. Annotations are provided to contextualise the longer-term sustainability beyond project closure

Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs	Rating (See Table 1 for codes)					
	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Project's Development Goal: To conserve globally significant terrestrial and marine biodiversity in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde through a protected area system's approach. Note that this is not expected to be achieved by the project alone – it is the long term goal	Normally not rated; At MTR stage it was however considered that progress towards the Goal is Satisfactory . This assessment can be confirmed at TE stage.					
Project Objective: To consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas (PA) System through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation.		V				

Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs	Rating (See Table 1 for codes)					
	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
OUTCOME 1 Governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system is strengthened				√		
OUTPUT 1.1 The PA Autonomous Authority (PAAA) is established, operational and appropriately staffed with trained personnel and with a strengthened capacity to manage both terrestrial PAs and MPAs					√	
OUTPUT 1.2 PA planning and management tools have been developed and are under implementation, including (i) a National PA Zoning Plan; (ii) a National PA Strategy; and (iii) a National PA Business Plan			√			
OUTPUT 1.3 The new PAAA is cooperating effectively with relevant institutions for sustainable resource management				√		
OUTPUT 1.4 Quantitative data on climate change and carbon sequestration is effectively informing the design and implementation of the National PA strategy			√			
OUTCOME 2 Management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs is enhanced			√			
OUTPUT 2.1 Management and business plans have been prepared and implemented in a participatory fashion in 4 terrestrial PAs and in 3 MPAs involving communities, private land owners and tourism operators, among others		√				
OUTPUT 2.2 Island-Wide Conservation Strategy Plans have been implemented and are supporting the establishment of all of the MPAs on Sal and Boavista Islands		√				
OUTPUT 2.3 Ecological monitoring systems are in place for the seven target PAs/MPAs, yielding relevant data on the health of ecosystems			√			
OUTPUT 2.4 Exotic species are under management and IAS are under sustained control in target terrestrial PAs			√			
OUTPUT 2.5 A Fisheries Management Plan is under implementation, as a result of cooperation agreements between the Directorate of Fisheries and the Island-Wide Office, at all MPA sites					√	
OUTCOME 3 The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas		√				
OUTPUT 3.1 Organized communities, farmers associations, and associations of artisanal fishermen have the capacity to engage in biodiversity friendly income-generating activities as an alternative to resource degrading ones		√				
OUTPUT 3.2 Local governments, resource institutions, private operators, NGOs and others participate actively and collaboratively in biodiversity conservation in PAs and MPAs through the established Advisory Councils for the project's target PAs and MPAs		√				
OUTPUT 3.3 The integration of PA/MPA planning and strategizing into local development frameworks ensure that sectoral development at the local level is more harmonious with the conservation objectives and activities of PAs and MPAs		√				
OUTPUT 3.4 Natural resource and soil use (eg agriculture, tourism, fisheries, development construction) for the 4 PAs and the 3 MPAs respect restrictions of ecological carrying capacities			√			

Outcome 1 is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, a rating that is lower than the rating received during the MTR. At MTR stage this outcome was rated at Moderately Satisfactory. The rating has been downgraded as two major outputs foreseen for the project were not achieved. The envisaged and, during project preparation, clearly agreed to visions for a functional PAAA were not achieved. Although it is fully recognised that the Government has absorbed the project staff into their services and has established an in-house sub-service on PA management, at time of the TE no compelling plan was available that would demonstrate what the new vision for a functional PA management team would be. It is recognised that the establishment of PAAA type entities might not be the preferred solutions for all countries, and the currently pursued alternative may develop into a preferred solution, but a lot more strategic planning is required and investments into successful PA management operationalization are needed to achieve success. Although some progress has been made in advancing critical policy documents stemming from the project intervention, and even getting some

passed at the highest political level, there are some reservations on the quality of these and the envisaged implementation. More detailed reflections are provided in Section 3.3.6 Sustainability and under Section 4, including conclusions and recommendations.

Outcome 2 is rated as **Moderately Satisfactory**: although there had been some further accomplishments under all outputs of this outcome between the MTR and project closure (e.g. foreseen business plans have been developed, IAS strategy has been advanced), most plans developed are still not under significant implementation and most have not yet been approved at national level. Notably, by December 2015, several local level partners have indicated that they are delivering on their responsibilities set out in the plans, and there are indications that integration into local level planning and budgeting is taking place. Work under Output 2.5 remains rudimentary and limited ownership and integration with the work and responsibilities of the Directorate of Fisheries with regards to the MPAs and linkages to the national Fisheries Management Plan was reported.

As during the MTR stage, **Outcome 3** is scored as **Satisfactory**. Building partnerships clearly has been the biggest success of the project during its implementation period. All outputs have been addressed to some extent and even one year after project closure these partnerships seem to continue and ownership is clearly discernible. This investment seems to have contributed to a good sustainability of project outcomes. Interviews with project partners and beneficiaries have provided very positive feedback on the project intervention – and there is hope for a continuation of started initiatives.

Progress towards the **Objective**, *“To consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde’s protected areas (PA) System through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation”* was rated as Moderately Satisfactory. At TE stage, this overall rating has been upgraded to **Satisfactory** – based on the interesting sustainability observations. Although a lot remains to be done, it is clear that not only new PAs have been formally established through the project, but visible and functional PA management units exist on island level as well as on national level through a folding of project structures into the formal DGA services. Against the predictions made and fears voiced at MTR stage that project interventions would *likely to come to a sudden end when the project finishes*, this did not come true, and a more positive result and impact was achieved by the project.

At MTR stage, the performance towards the project goals was unofficially rated as Satisfactory. The motivation read as follows: *The unofficial Satisfactory rating given to progress towards the overall development goal reflects the determination and interest shown to the MTR team from the partners, stakeholders and project staff alike. The details of how protected areas are institutionalized may not yet be clear but there is in the view of the MTR a commitment to achieving that.* This assessment is confirmed at TE stage.

Progress towards meeting end of Project targets, established for the indicators in the SRF, has also been assessed and rated (Annex9). The limitations of the SRF were outlined in the MTR (2013) and apply.

1. Relevance(*)

The high relevance of the project was confirmed by all interviewees and consultations. A special focus on including local stakeholders in PA management as well as incentivising pro-conservation actions through benefits from conservation was detected. Creating opportunities from eco-tourism activities, for example, were rated very highly.

2. Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)

Effectiveness and efficiency are both rated as Moderately Satisfactory (Table 8), with no observed changes from MTR stage. Effectiveness affects the extent to which the objective and outcomes are achieved or likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Efficiency concerns how economically resources or inputs (funds, expertise, time, equipment, websites etc.) are being converted into results.

Effectiveness

At MTR stage it was observed that effectiveness has been constrained by the lack of integration between outcomes and outputs - and the absence of any sequencing of outcomes in the project design. It was anticipated that many of these shortcomings would be addressed before project closure, which, in the view of the TE team, only has materialised to a limited extent. Once again outputs were often produced, however, not brought to full fruition as a strategy to align them to a national strategy for effective PA management. Pragmatism was lacking – and more importantly plans were not updated or formulated with the newly emerging reality that the PAAA would likely not materialize. Notably, the MTR did not pick up that this was a likely development, and consequently no alternative was identified, scoping new ways of integrating the PA management units into the government services.

It is noted by the TE that project cost efficiency in relation to project impacts was questionable. Value for money was not always realised in the implementation of the project, and it seems that by virtue of employment an attitude of entitlement was fostered. Huge amounts of project funding had been dedicated to staff costs, with, according to the interviews, very limited funding for implementation. Despite having a large staff complement on the national team, a large number of international consultants were hired to produce project outputs. Therefore certain weaknesses in management effectiveness, partially already recorded under adaptive management, are recorded by the TE.

Efficiency

The findings from the MTR were confirmed during the TE. Furthermore the TE concludes that efficiency should also include a measure of quality. It seems that although a number of contracts and consultancies may have been managed efficiently, outputs lack quality. For example, the PAAA concepts, including financial sustainability assessment, could have been of much better quality – which would possibly have led to a higher acceptance of the idea on a political level.

3. Country ownership

Country ownership of the project is highly related, especially considering that ownership was not only created on national but also on sub-national levels. Considering the outlook on sustainability below, country ownership seems to have been a strong point of this project.

4. Mainstreaming

A great many of project outputs have been mainstreamed through various sectors and by a multitude of partners. The PA management plans and eco-tourism plans in particular seem to have generated a good level of multi-institutional partnerships with partners keen to implement biodiversity and PA management related activities. Examples from all Islands can be cited, where local government and local NGO partners are continuing their engagement with the implementation of these plans and even

dedicating funds from their budgets. Although the TE relies mostly on interviews conducted, and no hard evidence of anecdotal information could be gathered (such as the review of actual budget allocations for 2016), the interviews were largely enthusiastic and well informed.

A gap still remains in terms of mainstreaming PA management in the fisheries sector, which was one major intended output from this project.

5. Sustainability (*)

The fact that the TE was conducted as ex post evaluation, provided a special opportunity to assess sustainability of the project results and impacts. Sustainability is assessed at various levels and includes considerations at national, sub-national (island-wide) as well as PA specific ones.

PA management sub-service at DGA versus PAAA

It is noted that the PAAA, which was a key result foreseen under outcome 1, has not been established. Instead the DGA has absorbed a majority of project staff into its own services, and a PA management sub-service operates under the NRM Service. DGA hired technical staff who are working in the Island PA offices: Sal – 4 people; Boavista – 4, Santo Antao – 4; S. Vicente/Santa Luzia – 1; Maio – 1; Fogo – 5; S. Nicolau – 6; Santiago – 6. These teams are implementing the activities proposed in the plans for planning and management, developed as part of the project framework. Although all staff members reported some difficulties in terms of how they are integrated into the services and the limitations to state-of-the-art management and a lack of finances for implementation activities, all identified the current arrangement as a pragmatic alternative to the establishment of an autonomous agency, even if as a medium-term solution.

The TE recognises this development as an opportunity. It is recognised that the introduction of PAAAs may not work in every country context, particularly in a country such as Cape Verde, where the financial independence of such an agency may not be easily achieved. Therefore integration into the existing government service may be a suitable alternative. The TE finds that some of the PAAA planning documentation including the financing plan are not of convincing technical quality, and that assumptions have been made, which may not hold. For example, during the final presentation of the Project Steering Committee, the delegate of the Ministry of Finance expressed scepticism that revenue collected from the tourism tax would be allocated to the management of PAs. This corroborated to some extent the worry already expressed during MTR and PIR stages that project outputs were developed without a larger strategy to work towards the outcomes.

The interviews with PA management staff at both national and sub-national level indicates that there are a number of issues that need urgent attention, especially with the view that a new GEF 5 project will soon start in Cape Verde. The GEF 5 project builds on the advancements made in terms of national and sub-national PA management especially on Sal and Boavista islands. It is therefore critical that certain measures be implemented to ensure that a GEF 5 project can start on a solid footing.

There was no access to a clearly written strategy which would outline the vision for installing a *PA management sub-service at DGA versus establishing a PAAA*. It seems that it should be a minimum requirement before starting a new GEF 5 project to develop and commit to such a strategy, which would clearly demonstrate sufficient government commitment, also translating into relevant budgetary allocations for substantial PA management actions on the ground.

Sustainability of PA management interventions – a mixed bag

During the site visits conducted as part of the TE, several PAs and a great many local level project beneficiaries were visited. The newly established PAs are established to varying degrees. While some are quite clearly discernible, others completely lack signage and demarcation. Very limited PA infrastructure is visible on site. Limited site-specific staff holds back the conservation mandate. It is clear that a first step in the right direction has been taken, but long-term investments are required to ensure that the PAs can serve their specific management objectives.

All PAs have been identified to become important eco-tourism hubs, however, to appeal to visitors and attract entry fees, a lot more is needed. The sustainability of the established PAs is still not guaranteed unless a concerted effort is made to invest more into the development of the sites. It is noted that in terms of sustainability of conservation gains the evaluators received a mixed report of success. For example, on Boavista, during 2015 the loss of turtle nests, eggs and hatchlings and mortality of adults was reported to have soared – just a year after project closure. According to local NGOs this was mostly attributed to the fact that previous military presence on the beaches was pulled out, but with or without military presence, this indicates that the challenges are far from addressed. A continued effort and commitment by government is required to ensure that a major conservation priority is met and tourist attraction created.

Similarly it was observed that investments made into Invasive Alien Species (IAS) control on Santo Antao had major impacts on vegetation structure and the rehabilitation of endangered species such as the Dragon Tree. However, it was also noted that IAS control is not a once off measure, but an on-going effort, requiring on-going commitment and support.

Interestingly, those community investments that promoted small business enterprises i.e. in support of eco-tourism (among others) were often quite sustainable and continued operating beyond project end. Enterprises such as small home restaurants catering for hikers, juice and marmalade production from introduced fruit trees in areas adjacent to PAs, home herbal gardens for tea and other products, were working quite well and beneficiaries commented on their socio-economic value.

A large number of interviewees indicated that they valued the investment the project had made into raising biodiversity and conservation knowledge, understanding and passion amongst local communities, including school children and adults. A focus on local people seemed to have generated a lot of enthusiasm and buy-in into the national conservation agenda, which is arguably a good foundation for sustainability.

Section 4 elaborates a set of relevant recommendations on these points.

6. Impact

The impact of the project – especially with hindsight and assessing it one year after project closure – seems to be manifold, and more positive than perceived at MTR and possibly project closure stage. As pointed out in Section 3.3.5 on Sustainability – some interesting and longer-lasting impacts could be attributed to the project interventions. These include specifically:

- Establishment of new PAs, and partial clear demarcation (visible/known boundaries)
- A functional PA management sub-service as integral part of DGA, with operational island offices
- Increased awareness and buy-in for biodiversity conservation and PA management amongst a diverse set of local stakeholders

- A first generation of Pa management, eco-tourism and other plans, which pave a way for future actions
- Initial thinking of the value of a Cape Verdean PAS, which can add value to the national economy especially, but not only, through enhancing the countries value as a sustainable tourism destination

Leading to:

- Initial thinking on ecosystem services that need to be protected to keep Cape Verde's economy and development pathways sustainable and healthy
- Initial gains in the protection of biodiversity of value (endemic species, some species of international protection status)

Table 8 Assessment of overall project results, sustainability and impact

Component	Rating	Notes
Project Results (using 6-point satisfaction scale – see Table 1)		
Achievement of Objective	S	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 1	MU	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 2	MS	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Attainment of Outcome 3	S	Based on Table 7, Annex 8
Overall Project Results	MS	Based on Table 7, Annexes 8, 9
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes (using 6-point satisfaction scale – see Table 1)		
<i>Relevance</i>	HS	See Section 3.3.1.
<i>Effectiveness</i>	MS	See Section 3.3.2.
<i>Efficiency</i>	MS	See Section 3.3.2.
Sustainability (using 4-point likelihood scale – see Table 1)		
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability ⁸	S	See Section 3.3.5.
Impact (using 3-point impact scale – see Table 1)		
<i>Environmental status improvement</i>	S	Likely significant improvement in effective management and sustainable financing of PAs, resulting in improved conservation status of globally significant biodiversity in the long term

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

Mostly recommendations relating to the project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation were already made during the MTR, and should be considered. The MTR is of high quality and offers useful lessons.

Timely MTRs: At TE stage, one observation is that often MTRs are being delayed due to late project start. Project teams feel that they did not have sufficient time to achieve what the project document had sent out, and consequently MTRs are scheduled more closely to project closure. In the experience

⁸ All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability should not be higher than the lowest rated dimension (2012 UNDP *Guidance for Terminal Evaluation of GEF-funded and UNDP-implemented Projects*).

of the evaluator, this is often a missed opportunity. A well-conducted MTR like the one for this specific project can add value to project delivery and recommend management adjustments rather at an earlier stage. Often such adjustments are clear relatively quickly after project commencement.

Valuing M&E activities: Instead of seeing M&E activities as a threat and unwelcome distraction from day-to-day project implementation, it would be desirable if M&E would be understood and valued as an adaptive management tool. In the case of this project critical recommendations made as part of PIRs were disregarded, both by UNDP Country Office as well as the project team. Valuable opportunities for reprogramming especially financial resources and staffing decisions were missed at critical stages of the project.

Adaptive management know-how: In the case of this specific project it is observed that the project leadership team seemed resistant to the idea of adaptive management, and viewed the project document to be cast in stone. Instead of using it as a management guidance and instilling common sense and vision to the realisation of the overall project objective, the USD 3.1 Mio investment could not reach its full potential. A corrective measure for future projects could be to introduce relevant orientation training to the project team at the onset of their appointments.

Oversight responsibility of UNDP: Overall it is the view of the consultants that UNDP CO and the regional team must be more candid in following through on recommended project adjustments to ensure that projects are delivered successfully. This is a valuable lesson for the implementation of the following GEF investments in Cape Verde.

2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Delivery area 1: Refining the long-term vision: PA management sub-service at DGA versus PAAA

Proposed actions:

4. Clearly articulate strategy for PA management arrangements as currently practiced, especially the budget allocations and financing
5. Options paper for long-term perspective on effective PA management, based on project outputs
6. Policy influencing strategy and next steps for realisation

Delivery area 2: For now focus on effectively operationalizing the PA management sub-service at DGA

Proposed actions:

7. Review structure, TORs and staff profiles; define lines of reporting, responsibilities, budgeting etc. For example, it was mentioned that one strong focal person at national level is needed to head up all PA work
8. Improve on current arrangements, as all interviewees identified serious short comings; UNDP to ensure improvements are in place before GEF 5 project is initiated
9. Procedure for payments (SIGOF)⁹ to be operationalized better to suit PA management context, where people work in remote areas (MTR 2013, Section 3.2.1.)
10. Clear budget allocations for 2016 agreed to and allocated, as part of 2016 budgeting exercise

⁹ Integrated system for management, budgeting and finance, centralised at the General Directorate of Planning, Budget and Management (DGPOG)

11. DGA to improve performance management system and secure appropriate staffing in key positions, including for the new GEF 5
12. UNDP with Director of DGA seek high-level (Minister) appointment for a relevant briefing on this key recommendation from the TE

Delivery area 3: Strategy to finish the work that has been started

Proposed actions:

3. Articulate a plan on how to best bring to fruition the unfinished work of the project, based in part on this TE. There are a number of policy documents and plans that have been prepared during the project, but only haphazard and ad hoc follow-up on them is currently taking place, e.g. the Law on enabling the collection and use of Entrance Fees.
4. Creative mobilization of resources for on-the-ground actions, including the responsibility for resource mobilization, must be embedded within the TORs of identified staff members. This could take different forms, but would be a key asset for sustainability.

Delivery area 4: Cutting edge community of practice: document, analyse and share PA management experiences from within Cape Verde

Proposed actions:

4. Develop knowledge management and capacity support strategy, which allows for the systematic documentation and analysis of knowledge and learning from Cape Verdean conservation experiences. Firstly this would make project documents available through an online platform. This is of particular value because of the difficulties and costly nature of “physically” travelling between Islands.
5. Support research and generation of experimental management knowledge; identify creative support mechanisms e.g. through international and University partnerships. On Santo Antao in particular excellent examples of such partnerships can be found.
6. Apply more modern technologies for communication and information sharing. Inspire younger staff members to use Google+ etc. for meetings, and communications, etc.

3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

At this point it seems that the most sensible priority is a dedicated effort to operationalize the PAs which have been already demarcated and agreed to. While for strategic reasons there may be a need to also invest into the further expansion of the PAS to “out compete” other claims on land- and seascapes and areas.

The in the GEF 5 identified tourism linkage is of high relevance especially for those islands with high tourism development pressure. Further investments, e.g. by a GEF 6 intervention could further improve and upscale community-based and innovative eco-businesses. More specific scoping of PPPs with tourism investors could be specifically scoped.

5. Annexes

1. ToR
2. Itinerary
3. List of persons interviewed
4. Summary of field visits
5. List of documents reviewed
6. Evaluation Question Matrix
 - a. Staff and beneficiaries (English)
 - b. Staff and beneficiaries (Portuguese)
 - c. Institutions and local communities (English)
 - d. Institutions and local communities (Portuguese)
7. Questionnaire used and summary of results
8. Progress on delivery of project outputs
9. Evaluation of projects performance indicators
10. Tracking tools and Score cards
11. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex 1: ToR

Annex 2: Itinerary

Data	Hora	Actividades
25/11/2015 Praia-Santiago	03:00	Int. Consultor arrives Praia
	08:00	Encontro com o PNUD/Apresentação Consultor Nacional
	10:00	(António Querido)
	10:15- 11:00	Encontro com ex-Coordenador Nacional do Projeto
	11:00 – 12:00	DNA + GEF Political Focal Point
26/11/2015 Ilha do Sal	08.00	Encontro com a equipa do projeto (Ponto de situação das atividades realizadas)
	10.00	Visitas aos sítios do projeto
	15:00	Encontro com as Instituições parceiras (Delegações do Turismo, MED, Representantes de Associações).
27/11/2016 Ilha do Sal	8:00	Encontro com os Centros de Juventude e Segurança Social
	10:00	Encontro com os Serviços Fitossanitários da ilha (MDR, Pescas)
27/11/2015 Ilha da Boa Vista	15:00	Encontro co Técnicos do Escritório do PCSAP-CV
	16:00	Visita à RN Tartaruga, PP Curral Velho.
28/11/2015 Ilha da Boa Vista	9:00	Encontro com os representantes das instituições locais em Boavista (MDRAP, SDTBM, IMP, Camara Municipal, ONGs, Associações)
	16.00	Visita ao PN do Norte e contactos com as comunidades locais em Cabeça dos Tarrafes e Fundo das Figueiras
29/11/2015	12:25	Partida para S. Vicente (chegada 19.20)
30/11/2015 Santo Antão	8:00	Partida para Santo Antão (Barco)
	10:00	Partida para a Sede do Projeto – Planalto Leste
	10:30	-Visita ao PNCPR - Visitas aos Parceiros beneficiários de actividades geradoras de rendimento
	15:00	Encontro com a equipa do projeto (Ponto de situação das atividades realizadas)
	16:30	Encontro com líderes Associativos do Planalto leste e elementos das comunidades de Cova, Água das caldeiras, Lombo de figueira, Corda, Spongeiros, Chã de Mato, Rba de Poi, Lim Corvo.
01/12/2015 Santo Antão	8:00	Visita ao PN de Moroços e Pico da Cruz
	13:00	Almoço em Água das Caldeiras
	14:00	Encontro com as Instituições parceiras (Delegações do MDRAP, MED, Câmaras Municipais, CCB-AE).
	17:00	Partida para S. Vicente

Data	Hora	Atividades
02.12.2015 S.Vicente		
	8:30	Visita Parque Natural de Monte Verde
	11:00	- Encontro com a equipa da DDRAP (Delegada, Silvada e Carla) - Encontro com Presidente de associação de Proprietários de Monte Verde.
	20:00	Partida para Praia
03/12/2015 Praia-Santiago	8:30	Skype, telephone calls or email exchanges with Lucas Black (UNDP/GEF RTF), Eduardo Carqueijeiro (former protected area planner on project), ...
	10:00	Encontro com serviços centrais parceiros do projecto, na sala de reuniões das Nações Unidas, na Cidade da Praia.
	14:00 -18:00	Sessão de trabalho (Consultores)
03/12/2015	24:00	Regresso da Consultora Internacional

Annex 3: List of persons interviewed

Name/Island	Institution	Role	Date of interview	Contact
Regional				
Lucas Black	UNDP	RTA (current)	04.12.2015	lucas.black@undp.org
Yves de Soie	UNDP	RTA (previous)	04.12.2015	yves.desoye@undp.org
Praia/ Santiago				
António Querido	Programa Comum do PNUD, UNICEF e UNFPA – Programa das NU – Cabo Verde	Head of Environmental Energy & Natural Disaster Prevention Unit	25.11.2015	antonio.querido@cv.jo.un.org Tel: 9780655
Manuel Leão Carvalho	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Ex-Coordenador Nacional	25.11.2015	leacarvalho21@yahoo.com.br Tel: 9933026
José Ortet Fernandes	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Ex-Assistente Administrativo e Financeiro	25.11.2015	jjortet@hotmail.com
Iderlindo dos Santos	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente (DNA)	Director Nacional do Ambiente Substituto	25.11.2015	iderlindo.santos@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9552009
Nuno Ribeiro	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Director de Serv. de Gestão dos Recursos Natura.	25.11.2015	Nuno.ribeiro@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9994011
Ana Madalena Veiga	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Ponto Focal GEF	25.11.2015	Ana.m.veiga@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9514012
Sónia Araújo	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Téc. Direcção de Serviço R. Naturais	03.12.2015	Sonia.araujo@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9998797
Liza Lima	Direcção Nacional do Ambiente	Téc. Direcção de Serviço R. Naturais	03.12.2015	Liza.lima@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9783653
Geisa Tavares	Instituto da Gestão do Território	Administradora	03.12.2015	Geisa.tavares@igt.gov.cv
Ivone Lopes	MIEM - Direcção Geral das Pescas	Delegada	03.12.2015	lvone.lopes@miem.gov.cv
Nádia de Pina	MAHOT – DGPOG	Representante	03.12.2015	Nadia.pina@mahot.gov.cv Tel: 9764749
Sal				
Élia Santos			26.11.2015	
Lourdes Rocha Godinho	Escola Secundária Olavo Moniz	Professora	26.11.2015	Lutchinharocha81@gmail.com Tel: 9831403
Lúcia Maria Baptista	Escola Secundária Olavo Moniz	Professora	26.11.2015	Lucimarbaptista2013@gmail.com Tel: 9936875
Oteniel Jorge Monteiro	Kate Surf	Campeão Mundial	26.11.2015	mitucaboverde@gmail.com
Aldair Duarte	Centro nós Kaza/ICA	Responsável/monitor	26.11.2015	Aldim.icca@gmail.com 5937071
Isaurinda Oliveira	Centro Desenv. Social (CDS)	Coordenadora	26.11.2015	Isaurinda.oliveira@mjedrh.gov.cv Tel: 5161871

Cheila Pinto	Centro de Juventude	Coordenadora	26.11.2015	Cheila.pinto@mjedrh.gov.cv Tel: 5161910
Hlda Carvalho	ACOPECA	Responsável	27.11.2015	2411463/9976167
José Aureliano Almeida	MDR	Responsável	27.11.2015	2411463-5160097
Ravi dos Santos Pereira	MDR	Inspector fitossanitário	27.11.2015	5159442
Domingos Gomes	Associação de Pescadores de Palmeira	Presidente	27.11.2015	Casados.pescadores@hotmail.com 2412185/9923866
Yuri Ramos	INDP	Técnico e membro da Associação	27.11.2015	Yuri.ramos78@hotmail.com 9761649
Adalzira Fernandes	Escritores insulares	Coordenadora	03.12.2015	
Boavista				
Lázaro Sá	DNA/AP	Ex-Coordenador local do Projecto		
Marina Pereira Silva	DNA/AP			
João Lopes da Silva	Delegação DRAP	Delegado	28.11.2015	Joao.g.s.@mdr.gov.cv
Avelino Bonifácio Lopes	SDTIBM Sociedade D. Turístico das ilhas Boavista e Maio	Presidente	28.11.2015	a.lopes@sdtibm.cv
Xisto Baptista	Câmara Municipal da Boavista	Vereador (Substituto Presidente)	28.11.2015	xistobaptista@hotmail.com 9946085
Fernando da Cruz Silva	Associação de Agricultores de Zona Norte	Presidente	28.11.2015	9935954
Samir Martins	Associação BIOSCV	Presidente	28.11.2015	
Euclides Revende	Fundação Tartarugas/Turtle Foundation	Presidente	28.11.2015	
Santo Antão				
Emitério Ramos	DNA-AP-Sto Antão	(Ex-Coordenador Regional AP)	30.11.2015	Emiterio.ramos@gmail.com Tel: 9914659
Gilda Maria Monteiro	DNA-AP-Sto Antão	Ex-Staff Projecto	30.11.2015	Gilda.monteiro84@gmail.com Tel: 9853913
Alexandre Monteiro	Associação de Agricultores	Presidente	30.11.2015	
José Carlos Rodrigues	Agricultor	Beneficiário	30.11.2015	
Maria Conceição Fortes	Associação de Mulheres de Planalto Leste	Presidente	30.11.2015	
Joaquim Lopes	Associação Ami Montanha	Beneficiário	30.11.2015	Tel: 9973092
Etaulindo D Fortes	Associação Ami Montanha	Presidente	30.11.2015	amimontanha@sapo.cv Tel: 9986451
Amilcar da Luz	Associação de agricultores	Beneficiário	30.11.2015	Tel: 9858132
Arlindo Lopes	Associação de agricultores	Presidente	30.11.2015	Tel: 9924581
Eatio	Biosfera Amor		30.11.2015	amordobiosfera@hotmail.com
João Baptista Boaventura	Associação de agricultores	Beneficiário	30.11.2015	
Antão Estevão Santos	INE	Coordenador Local	01.12.2015	antaoestevao@sapo.cv

				9937489
António Jorge Morais	Representante da CM R ^a Grande		01.12.2015	aimmonteiro@hotmail.com 9922569
Osvaldo Pedro Maurício	Delegação DRAP de Santo Antão	Delegado	01.12.2015	Osvaldo.mauricio@mdr.gov.cv 5159590
Ademilson da Graça Ramos	CMPaúl	Representante da CMPaúl	01.12.2015	ademilsongraca@gmail.com 9968683
José Manuel Leite Fonseca	Delegação Educação Paúl	Coordenador dos Serviços de Educação e Formação de Adultos	01.12.2015	jleitef@gmail.com 9941221
António Carlos Fortes	Delegação DRAP	Responsável do Perímetro Florestal Planalto Leste	01.12.2015	Tokayfortes16@hotmail.com 9940740
S. Vicente				
Janaina Almeida	Delegação DRAP	Delegada	02.12.2015	Janaina.almeida@mdr.gov.cv 9934002
Silvana Roque	Delegação DRAP	Coordenadora das AP S. Vic e Sta Luzia	02.12.2015	Silvanamonteiro27@gmail.com 9846994
Carla Margarida Monteiro	Delegação DRAP	Ex-Técnica do projecto	02.12.2015	Carlam.monteiro@mdr.gov.cv 9934142
Gabriel Évora	Associação dos Proprietários, Agricultores e Amigos de Monte Verde	Presidente	02.12.2015	gabs@sapo.cv 9915960

Annex 4: Summary of field visits -

To be finalised

Annex 5: List of documents reviewed

M&E

4176 Biodiversity PIR of PIMS Consolidation of CVs PAS FINAL 31Dec14 .docx
4176 Cape Verde_PR PIR Consolidation of CVs PAS 2013.doc
4176 Cape Verde_PIR 2011-2012_Final 07oct12.Doc
4176 Cape Verde_GEF BD Tracking Tool - SHEET 1_v3 (2) aq2
2013 PIR Annex_EBD-specific sheet with guidance_pnud17072013
4176 Cape Verde-GEF BD Tracking Tool - 16 May 13final
2014 Tracking tools

MTR

Management Response MTR Consolidation Final vs1401.doc
MTR Consolidation of Cape Verde PA system English final2.pdf
RMP_PCSNAPCV_versao Port Final.pdf
TE of "phase 1"PA project, assessed in 2008 by Tamar Ron

Project documents and implementation Reports

4176 UNDP Project Document PAs_FINAL.pdf
4176 Biodiversity inception report PIR of Consolidation of CVs PAS 14April11.pdf
4176 PIF Consolidation of CV PAs Final Approved 10Sept08.doc
Relatório das actividades referente ao ano de 2011. Projecto Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde, NºPIMS PNUD GEF 4176.Janeiro de 2012
Relatório de Actividades Referente ao Ano de 2012. Projecto Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde, Nº PIMS PNUD GEF 4176. Janeiro de 2013
Quarterly Progress Report 9 (January - March 2013).Project: Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Area System (Biodiversity)
Ponto de Situação das Actividades Desenvolvidas pelo Projecto "Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde" Dezembro de 2010 a Outubro 2011. Nº PIMS PNUD GEF 4176 Novembro de 2011.
End of project report Leao Carvalho
Documento de Projecto do PNUD. Governo de Cabo Verde. Agência de Execução: Direcção Geral do Ambiente, Ministério do Ambiente, Desenvolvimento Rural e Recursos Marinhos (MADRRM). Escritório Conjunto das Nações Unidas para Cabo Verde Através do Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento. Nº PIMS PNUD GEF 4176. Programa Estratégico do GEF para a África Ocidental – SPWA. Sub-Componente Biodiversidade : Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde
Project inception report of the project "consolidation of cape verde's protected areas system (pims 4176). City of praia, april 14th, 2011. Ministry of the Environment, Habitat and Territorial planning. General Directorate of Environment PRAIA, June2011
UNDP, 2009. Final Evaluation. Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas
DRAFT Ceo Endorsment new project

Consultancies and technical documents

Estratégia e Plano de Conservação Ilha da Boa Vista. Cabo Verde Natura 2000 Outubro de 2011
Estratégia e Plano de Conservação Ilha do Sal. Cabo Verde Natura 2000. Draft Outubro de 2011
Avaliação de Limites de Uso Sustentável dos Recursos Naturais feb2012.pdf
Proposta De Modelo De Gestão E Estudos Económicos E Financeiros Da Autoridade Autónoma Das Áreas Protegidas De Cabo Verde final Mar2013-1.doc AAAP.pdf
Cesarini D., 2012.Analise espacial e zonamento final DA Rede de Áreas Protegidas. Relatório final de consultoria. Projecto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas protegidas de Cabo Verde (PCSAPCV). MAHOT/PNUD/GEF.253 pp.
Mauremootoo J., 2012. Invasive Plant Management Strategy For Terrestrial Protected Areas in: Fogo, Santo Antão, São Vicente. PCSAPCV. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF July 2012

Ehrlich M.,2012. Estratégia e Plano de Negócio das Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF
Ehrlich M.,2012. Cape Verde's Protected Areas Financial Sustainability Strategy and Plan. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF 50pp.
MHOT-DGA e PCSAPCV, 2012. Estratégia nacional de Áreas Protegidas 2013-2022. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF.247 pp.
Carqueijeiro E. 2013.Plano De Ecoturismo. Plano de Execução ou de Ação Complexo de Áreas Protegidas do Leste da Boa Vista.Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF Ilha da Boa Vista. Abril de 2013. 46 pp.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013.Plano De Gestão.Complexo De Áreas Protegidas Do Leste Da Boa Vista. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF Ilha da Boa Vista. Abril de 2013
Carqueijeiro E., 2013.Plano De Ecoturismo. Documento Plano de Execução ou de Ação. Parque Natural do Fogo. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GEF. Ilha do Fogo 50 pp.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013. Plano De Ecoturismo. Programa de Execução ou de Ação- Parque Natural Monte Verde. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE. S Vicente.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013. Plano De Ecoturismo. Programa de Execução ou de Ação- Complexo de APs: Reserva Natural da Costa da Fragata, Reserva Natural da Serra Negra, Paisagem Protegida das Salinas de Santa Maria. Ilha do Sal, 19 pp.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013. Plano De Ecoturismo. Programa de Execução ou de Ação- Reserva Natural Da Ponta Do Sinó. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE Ilha do Sal, 12 pp.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013. Plano De Ecoturismo. Programa de Execução ou de Ação- Parque Natural de Cova, Paul E Ribeira Da Torre. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE Ilha de Santo Antão, 20 pp.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013. Plano De Ecoturismo. Programa de Execução ou de Ação- Documento Programa de Execução ou de Ação. Parque Natural de Moroços. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE Ilha de Santo Antão.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013.Plano De Gestão. Documento Programa De Execução E Avaliação Parque Natural de Cova, Paul e Ribeira da Torre. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE Ilha de Santo Antão.
Carqueijeiro E., 2013.Plano De Gestão. Documento Programa De Execução E Avaliação Parque Natural De Cova, Paul E Ribeira Da Torre. Projeto de Consolidação do Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Cabo Verde. MAHOT/PNUD/GE Ilha de Santo Antão.

Annex 6: Evaluation – Question Matrix

Annex 6 a: Staff and Beneficiaries (English)

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES: STAFF AND SOME BENEFICIARIES OF THE PROJECT

	Importance of Project to the Island	Involvement in Planning Preparation	Knowledge of Plans and your Opinion	Effect on life of the park	Benefit that a PA brings	Comment on Improvements	Relationship to management unit	How to aid PA
ILHA DO SAL								
1	It was and remains important. There was no change in behaviours regarding the protection of species (plants, birds or turtles) despite implementation among the population from early childhood to adult ages.	Yes, he participated in the field with tec. SIG. Also on the preparation of the document that served to support the preparation of these tools	Yes have knowledge. They are valuable tools for implementation and will make work more directed to the PA	Positive effect. These communities have been included in the project activities, for example, the population living in the Salinas de S. Maria.	Maintain local biodiversity (flora and fauna). Maintain natural landscapes. Opportunity safely tour a friendly environment. Educational places, recreation and research	Technical training in the database (GIS) and bird and plant identification techniques. Creating a service only for PA.	I was working as a technical support on the ecological project	Continue with our work on information and awareness among the community, particularly children
2	It was a good result but should continue	The most important result is that people are now aware			Very good. I am the beneficiary of the project	I would like the project to continue because we still need more awareness	Good relations with the project. No problems.	
3	The project should continue	The fishermen have understood the project				Awareness. The PA must be marked		
ILHA DA BOAVISTA								
4	It is very important to the Island in that it allowed us to make the division of PA, prepare and approve the management tools, establish relations, work with different organizations and associations, demonstrate the importance of the island's			In Phase 1 people were reticent, but with the work to raise awareness and integration of the communities they now have an awareness. The PA is important to the capital gains of those living in a natural	It allows management and knowledge of resources, by integrating all stakeholders in order to achieve participatory resource management. The consolidation of the	Greater autonomy of the management team, which in turn needs to be strengthened in terms of human and financial resources		

	resources for communities and operators.			environment especially because they will have an opportunity to develop income generating activities while protecting resources	PA leads to the development of communities.			
ILHA DE SANTO ANTÃO								
5	Great importance with regard to the conservation of natural resources and local development and tourism	Yes, coordination of field work for the preparation of the proposal, meetings with communities, civil society and institutions of the island	Yes, they are critical planning tools. It contains current and vital information beyond the important steps for the future of PA	In creating spaces that represent sites of rare beauty and healthy environment, can also represent interesting opportunities for development, economic and wealth creation.	Health (hiking tours, outdoor sports) in the economy and increase people's income. Research opportunities and several studies, local culture.	Efficient implementation and urgent signalling, Central Community Improvement and local definition rates and effecting control of visitors	Direct collaborator in Management / Management team	Supporting the implementation of the project, assisiting in the mobilization of resources developed and research, direct intervention in and awareness campaigns
6	This project saw the start of the PA implementation process on the island of SAL and made the division of the island 's other PAs	Yes, it was one of the technical unit sites. The entire process of drawing up plans included the development of local technicians and communities	Yes, but despite reflecting local realities and priorities in terms of conservation and community development, its implementation has been deficient due to scarce resources.	The people who live in protected areas are privileged. They can develop in the conservation sector and in activities related to tourism	PAs provide benefits in terms of conservation.			
7	It was reasonable			Healthier life	Social development, Valuing local products and culture	Promote more awareness	Good	Offer less to individuals and more to communities
8	Enhancement of existing species. Training and information of some projects	Yes, through meetings		Yes	Protection and enhancement of our species		Good	Transmitting such knowledge as was gained during this phase, helping in the conservation of species for future generations

ILHA DE S. VICENTE								
9	Important project for the island, considering the tourism and ecotourism potential in Green Hill Park.	Yes, from the beginning of the project	Yes, well designed, but the implementation needs very large financial backing	Impact on health, knowledge, environment if the coexistence have as icon THE PROTECTION	Boosting PNMV Environmental protection and preservation, growth of an economic branch. Research income families, Poverty Reduction	Specific financial need for the PA	Good	Driving for funding for the implementation of protection projects/ environmental preservation integrated concisely with eco tourism, poverty reduction and yield improvement for the families involved and creation of business
10	Great impact in the sense of training opportunities for communities, awareness, and in some activities that contributed to the generation of income community members who use the park.	Yes, part of the PA team	Participated in the preparation of the project and in ecotourism management plans as a focal point. In my opinion they are well-structured documents that give a good basis for the work to be done.	In the case of PN Monte Verde, people do not live inside the park and are not dependent on agriculture for survival; It is used for pleasure and well being.	An area for tourism, generating income for people, possibilities for jobs, a place for leisure and awareness and environmental education activities	Project activities should be continued in the following years in order to value the investments made during the project	Normal working relationship, it was part of the team and performed all work well as a team	Working on the implementation of the management plan and ecotourism, continuing the work process initiated during the term of the project
11	Was of great importance, SV Island is the only sub-humid area, where we found the highest concentration of species	Yes, the ground work with consultants and project team on lifting subsidies and contributions	Yes. I am of the opinion that the plans meet the identified needs. With these tools better management of this area is possible	Very positive effects given that that they can produce their food as well as create a sustainable income	Development of local, conservation of existing biodiversity; promotion of tourism; promotion of income generating activities	Building some infrastructure to support tourism, as parking, toilet, viewpoints, etc.	It was very good. We work in close harmony	With technical assistance, environmental awareness to farmers and park goers regarding the preservation of endemic species etc

Annex 6 b: Staff and Beneficiaries (Portuguese)

ANALISE DOS RESULTADOS DOS QUESTIONÁRIOS: STAFF E ALGUNS BENEFICIÁRIOS DO PROJECTO

	Importância do projeto para a ilha	Envolvimento na fase de elaboração dos planos	Conhecimento dos Planos e sua opinião	Efeito de viver dentro do Parque	Benefícios que as AP pode trazer	Comentário para a melhoria	Relacionamento com a Unidade de Gestão	Como ajudar na proteção AP
ILHA DO SAL								
1.	Foi e continua sendo importante. Com a sua implementação houve mudança de comportam. por parte da população desde a camada infantil a adultos na protecção das espécies (plantas aves e tartarugas)	Sim, participou saindo para o terreno com o tec da SIG. e na elaboração dos docum. que serviram de apoio na elaboração desses instrumentos	Sim, são instrumentos muito valiosos que com a sua implementação os trabalhos serão mais direcionados para as AP	Efeito positivo. Essas comunidades foram incluídas nas actividades do projecto, por exemplo a população residente nas Salinas de S.Maria, foram contemplados no Plano	Manter a biodiversidade local (fauna e flora).. Manter as paisagens naturais. Oportunidade de um turismo seguro e amigo do ambiente. Locais de educação, recreação e investigação	Formação dos técnicos em base de dados (SIG) e em técnicas de identificação de aves e plantas. Criação de um serviço somente para as AP	Fui Técnica de seguimento ecológico do projecto	Continuando com os trabalhos de informação e sensibilização junto das comunidades, principalmente as infantil
2.	Foi bom o resultado, mas devem continuar	Os resultados mais importantes são que as pessoas já estão a consciencializar			Muito boas. Sou beneficiário do projecto	Gostaria que o projecto continuasse, porque precisa ainda de alguma sensibilização.	Boas relações com o projecto. Não houve problemas	
3.	O Projecto deve continuar	Os pescadores já entenderam o projecto				Sensibilização. As AP precisam ser sinalizadas		
ILHA DA BOAVISTA								
4.	Foi muito importante para a ilha na medida em que permitiu fazer a delimitação das AP, elaborar e aprovar os instrumentos de gestão, estabelecer relações de trabalhos com diferentes entidades e associações, demonstrar a importância dos			Numa 1ª fase as pessoas ficam reticentes, mas com o trabalho de sensibiliz., e de integração das comunidades elas passaram a ter consciê. da importância das AP	Permitem uma gestão e conhecimento dos recursos, integrando todos os actores de modo a se conseguir uma gestão participativa na gestão dos recursos. A	Maior autonomia da equipa de gestão, que, por sua vez necessita de ser reforçada em termos de recursos humanos e financeiros.		

	recursos da ilha para as comunidades e operadores.			e das mais valias que é morar num espaço natural sobretudo porque terão oportunidade de desenvolver actividades geradoras de rendimento ao mesmo tempo que proteger os recursos.	consolidação das AP leva ao desenvolvimento sobretudo das comunidades.			
ILHA DE SANTO ANTÃO								
5.	Importância relevante no que diz respeito à conservação dos recursos naturais e do desenvolvimento local e turístico	Sim, na coordenação dos trabalhos de campo para a elaboração da proposta, nas reuniões de discussão com as comunidades, sociedade civil e instituições da ilha	Sim, são instrumentos fundamentais de planificação. Contém informações actuais e vitais para além das medidas importantes para o futuro das AP	Nos espaços para além de representar sítios de beleza rara e de ambiente saudável, podem também representar oportunidades interessantes de desenvolvimento económico e criação de riquezas	Na saúde (caminhadas passeios, desporto ao ar livre) na economia e aumento da renda das pessoas Oportunidades de pesquisa e estudos diversos, Cultura local	Implementação Rápida e urgente de sinalização, Melhoria da Comunidade Central e local, Definição de taxas e efectivar o controlo de visitantes	Colaborador Directo na equipa de Gestão/Direcção	Apoiando na implementação do projecto, ajudando na mobilização dos recursos, Desenvolvimento e pesquisas, Intervendo directamente nas Campanhas e sensibilização.
6.	Através desse projecto iniciou o processo de implementação das AP na ilha de SA e foi feita a delimitação das outras AP s da ilha	Sim, era uma das técnicas da Unidade de sítios. Todo o processo de elaboração dos planos contou com a elaboração dos técnicos e comunidades locais	Sim, mas apesar de retratarem a realidade local e suas prioridades tanto a nível de conservação e do desenvolvimento comunitário, a sua implementação têm sido deficitária por causa dos poucos recursos.	As pessoas que vivem dentro dos espaços protegidos são privilegiados. Podem desenvolver a partir de iniciativas de conservação, actividades relacionadas com o turismo, etc.	As APs trazem benefícios a nível da conservação			
7.	Foi razoável			Vida mais saudável	Desenvolvimento sociais. Valorizar produtos típicos e cultura	Promover mais sensibilização	bom	Oferecer disponibilidade individual e por as colectividades
8.	Valorização de espécies existentes. Formações e informações de alguns projectos	Sim através de reuniões		Sim	Proteção e valorização das nossas espécies		bom	Transmitindo esses conhecimentos ganho durante esses tempo, ajudando na

								conservação das espécies identificadas para geração do futuro
ILHA DE S. VICENTE								
9.	Projecto importante para a ilha, considerando o potencial de turismo que a ilha e considerando o grande potencial para o ecoturismo que o Parque de Monte Verde têm para SV	Sim, desde o início do projecto	Sim. Bem elaborados, contudo a implementação carece de recursos financeiros muito avultados	Impacto na saúde, no conhecimento, no ambiente se a convivência tiver como ícono a protecção	Dinamização do PNMV Protecção e preservação ambiental, Crescimento de um ramo económico Investigação, Rendimento das famílias, Redução da pobreza	Necessidade de financiamento específico para as AP	Bom	Impulsionando e procurando financiamentos para a implementação de projetos de protecção/preservação ambiental integrados de forma concisa com o ecoturismo, a redução da pobreza e a melhoria de rendimento às famílias envolvidas e criações de empresas.
10	Muito grande no sentido de oportunidades de formação para as comunidades, sensibilização, e em algumas actividades que colaboraram para a geração de renda de membros das comunidades que fazem parte de utilizadores do Parque	Sim, fazia parte da equipa das AP	Participei da elaboração dos Planos de Gestão e Ecoturismo como ponto focal. Na minha opinião são documentos bem estruturados que dão uma boa base para o trabalho a ser realizado	No caso de PN Monte Verde, as pessoas não vivem dentro do Parque e não dependem da agricultura para sobrevivência, mas para lazer e bem estar dos utilizadores do Parque.	Uma área para o turismo, geração de rendimento para as pessoas, possibilidades para postos de trabalho, um lugar para lazer e actividades de sensibilização e educação ambiental	As actividades do projecto devem ter continuidade nos anos seguintes, no sentido de valorizar os investimentos realizados durante o projecto	Normal relacionamento de trabalho, fazia parte da equipa e realizamos todas os trabalhos em equipa	Trabalhar na implementação do Plano de Gestão e de Ecoturismo, dando continuidade ao processo de trabalho iniciado durante a vigência do projecto
11	Teve grande importância, tendo em conta que a única área sub-húmida da ilha de SV, onde podemos encontrar a maior concentração de espécies em via de desaparecer	Sim, no trabalho de terreno com os consultores e equipa do projecto no levantamento de subsídios e contribuições	Sim. Sou da opinião que os Planos vão ao encontro das necessidades inventariadas. Com esses instrumentos é possível uma melhor gestão desta área.	Tem efeito muito positivo tendo em conta que consegue produzir seu alimento e também e também actividades geradoras de rendimento sustentáveis	Valorização do local, conservação da biodiversidade existente; Promoção do turismo; Promoção de actividades geradoras de rendimento.	Edificação de algumas infraestruturas de apoio ao turismo, Como parque de estacionamento, Wc, miradouros, etc.	Foi muito boa. Trabalhamos em estreita sintonia	Com a assistência técnica, sensibilização ambiental aos agricultores e frequentadores do parque no tocante a preservação das espécies endêmicas, etc.

Annex 6 c: Institutions and local communities (English)

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES: INSTITUTIONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

	Importance of Project to the Island	Involvement in Planning Preparation	Knowledge of Plans and your Opinion	How does nature effect the lives of people	Benefits that a PA brings	Comment on Improvements	Relationship to the management unit	How to aid PA
IHLA DO SAL								
1	Very important to implement the PA on the Island because it brings benefits and respect	Yes-participation in the validation of management plans	Yes, have knowledge		Respect for the environment		Collaboration, meetings	Exchange of ideas and information
2	Brings more information to the Island and shows the benefits of preservation	Yes, in terms of information, awareness and training	Yes	Wild Life of natural areas has a great effect in terms of showing the tourist world what we have.	Preserve, added value for the Island and the whole country	Continue with the project to strengthen awareness	We are the MDR, so part of the project	Awareness, information
3	Very important to the Island because of the approach of raising public awareness in the field of species conservation etc. Form sustainable awareness for the management of PA	We visit and know all the PAs of the Island and in presenting the plans of PA	I think the plans are good. They may have a lack of some things but its nothing that the team cannot solve. The younger generation should be more involved.	People are influenced by their local environment as the natural spaces dictate the way people live so that both can benefit in a sustainable way.	Building awareness of sustainable management, conservation of resources of endemic species	Yes the project could organize more training sessions and more awareness campaigns	Friendly and cooperative relationship. We have always responded positively	Mainly by raising awareness and participation in the project. Activities accomplished
4	The project is very important to the Island in that it serves to convey information and knowledge, which are an asset to education	Yes, participating in meetings and training meetings	Plans well designed, clear information on the Island of Sal, ecotourism plan is of utmost importance being an Island holiday destination.	Because it helps people to have an awareness of the importance of the environment and raise awareness for its protection	Contribution to the preservation and conservation of biodiversity	The project should be continued so that students continue to have important information about the PA and environmental conservation	Excellent relationship	Transmitting information and knowledge to the students, with the help of the project. Play an important role in training and information for students
5	Of great value because we now have more and better knowledge	Yes I gave suggestions and mutual aid	Yes, they engaged with great commitment	The impact is improved behaviour	Improving the environment, knowledge and other	More training and information	Highly relevant and of association	Assisting in the mobilization and training, advising on protection

6	Very important to the Island because through this project we get to know the PA and contribute to their protection	Yes, we are involved. We participate in some activities	Yes, some. I think are very relevant to society and to the conservation of our environment	Life in protected areas has a positive effect on people because they live in healthy spaces with no pollution.	Brings benefit to tourism, for nature and society in general are aware they they must preserve nature.	Work more on raising awareness in schools since the EBI	Very good	Working together to raise awareness among youth groups
ILHA DA BOAVISTA								
7	Great importance to the demarcation of environmental areas that should be preserved and controlled to prevent mismanagement (spatial planning)	Yes, mainly in farming communities to raise awareness	Yes, the plans must exist in order to assist with planning and greater control limits for PA	The inhabitants of these areas should contribute to the preservation of this natural environment. There should be a link between agricultural and environmental areas	Protection of these areas, tourist interest, production in agricultural areas and environmental	Creation of adequate infrastructure for the control f PA and tourism	Collaborate when prompted	Continue to work with the office created by the project and MAHOT whenever necessary
8	Very important, especially for the sustainability of key economic activity of the Island – Tourism.	Yes, we always had a representative/ focal point, who worked in close collaboration with the direction of the project	Yes, they are very good. I believe that, once deployed, will be important for the future of Island tourism.	People's quality of life greatly improved compared to those in urban areas. But the PA should be able to generate revenue for people who live within them.	Allow people living nearby to participate in its management, get involved with protection and conservation create income.	There is a need to implement the autonomous authority of PA Management.	Quite close partnership	Continuation of the partnership, willingness to develop and together implement a multi-year project.
9	Was and is important to the Island as it allows a more sustainable management of fragile resources.	Yes, the city Council has been involved from the outset in all phases of the project. We believe we have had a good partnership over each year of the project.	Yes. The plans are ambitious and if implemented will enable better management of Island resources	Always has a positive effect on people's lives since habitat influences the way the people live.	The benefits are many. Allow local people to take ownership of their resources and take economic and social profits, but also improve the management of resources.	Management of the project should be local, not dependent on any central structures so that decision making is quicker	Optimal so far	The Town Hall as the highest authority of the Island can help protect the PA in different ways. Granting institutional support, as before, but also technical. Good relationships transmit more credibility to the project.
10	Good	Participated in meetings	I collaborated in the drafting of plans	I feel very good to live in this area	Improved living conditions of population	Involve other partners	Has been very good	Do everything we can to improve our area.
11	Yes, as of the last 3 yrs. I believe the results were good for the Island in terms the protection awareness	Protection awareness				For guards to receive salaries. I believe the project should continue –	The Turtle Foundation has always had good relations with the	

						it's a great form of education for the people of Boavista	project and it would be a great help if it remains in Boavista	
12	Yes, the project brought some difficulties and conflicts with local people. Do not feel integrated into tourism development. This has led to people killing more turtles	Creation of a technical team for the Island of Boavista, guard for protection of sea turtles, PA creation on the island				The project has the capacity to be sustainable. A priority should be the regulation of tourist activities on the Island. Creating a body of environmental guards.	Good	Communities within the PA do not feel integrated into the development of the Island. Lack of dialogue with local communities
ILHA DE SANTO ANTÃO								
13	It is an extremely important project for the Island. It helps to preserve the environment especially the PA and the appreciation of the endemic species that are already endangered	Education has always been called delimitation of PA, in the management of the tools. Just about training. Information		Publicize local products, have more business opportunities, adding value to local products, improve the quality of life	Respect for the environment, enhancement of endemic plants	Extension of the project on the Island beyond the perimeters of the PA	There is a close relationship with the project	Through dissemination and awareness of the PA
14	The project is an opportunity for reflection on environmental issues with very positive impact on the appreciation and preservation of the endemic species	Yes. We have been involved. We participated in meetings and gave our opinions and suggestions to deal with the matters under review.	Yes. We are confident that it is a plus for this region and for the Island as a whole.	Life in natural areas contributes significantly to the output and quality of life. Besides air purity there is produce for a healthy diet.	The PA can offer beautiful landscape with gains for tourism.	The conditions are created for continuity and sustainability of the project. For example through the creation of a body to take care exclusively of the PA	The relationship is good	By spreading awareness in schools and communities
15	Yes several. All levels benefit from this project	Yes, information, awareness campaigns, training and more	Yes, but in my opinion work must be done to improve it every day by continually adapting to current situations.	Yes, safety and welfare	Respect for natural resources knowledge of the areas by residents etc.	Very good – we are always available to help and do what we can.	Continuation of the project, building security for viewpoints especially at Pico da Cruz	Community information and awareness
16	Sustainable management of natural resources especially in terrestrial biodiversity; management and regulation of water	Yes, through participation in discussion and approval	I believe: Are essential tools in the sustainability of resources and improvement of socio-	You can create an awareness that man is a part of nature and therefore be mindful of the next generation	In preserving the environment, biodiversity, sustainable	Strengthen communication in general to discuss the need for implementation of	Great relationship	Participation in information/training and communication activities.

	resources, participation in decision making of the interested parties themselves		economic conditions of residents.		management of resources	management plans and ecotourism		Lectures on specific subject on PA
17	The project has a major environmental impact – protecting the environment	Personal awareness, lectures, diverse backgrounds, management of parks, gender equality etc.	Development projects. The plans were well designed	Live a healthy life. Breathing fresh air.	Protection of the environment. More income for families	Continue the projects	Relationship has been good	Mobilization of resources. Disclosure of information to people via lectures
18	The project is important to the Island in benefiting more families with more PAs	Yes. We need more communities to be involved in the preparation of work plans.	I do not know and do not know about them	I do not know whether living in natural areas has an impact on people's lives.	Knowledge	Treatment and improvement	Improving relationship	Help protect this area and improving the union of associations.
ILHA DE S. VICENTE								
19	He knows the project and participated in various stages of their formulation. The results achieved fell very short of expectations					Torrent control with recovery of paths and direct support to farmers. Ensure access control throughout the year. Urgently resume the activities in the different components already inventoried.	Quite reasonable relationship. The most important result of the project was cleaning weeds along the access road and TELECOM perimeter with recovery of endemic nursery. Lately there has been weak financing and bureaucracies in communications.	

Annex 6 d: Institutions and local communities (Portuguese)

ANALISE DOS RESULTADOS DOS QUESTIONÁRIOS: INSTITUIÇÕES E COMUNIDADES LOCAIS

	Importância do projeto para a ilha	Envolvimento na fase de elaboração dos planos	Conhecimento dos Planos e sua opinião	Efeito de viver dentro do Parque	Benefícios que as AP pode trazer	Comentário para a melhoria	Relacionamento com a Unidade de Gestão	Como ajudar na proteção AP
ILHA DO SAL								
1.	Muito importante a implementação das AP na ilha porque traz benefícios e respeito	Sim, participação na validação dos planos de gestão	Sim	Ter conhecimento	Respeito para o ambiente		Colaboração, encontros	Troca de ideias e informações e
2.	Trouxeram mais informações para a ilha, mostrar o bom que tem em termos ambientais para preservar	Sim em termos de informações, sensibilização e formação	Sim	Viver em espaços naturais tem um grande efeito em termos de também mostrar ao mundo turístico o que temos de bom	Preservar, mais valia para o turismo, para a ilha e para o país inteiro	Continuar com o projecto e reforçar mais sensibilização	Somos do MDR, portanto do projecto	Sensibilizando, informando
3.	Muito importante para a ilha, por causa da abordagem, da sensibilização da população no domínio da conservação de espécies, do meio natural, etc. Formar consciência sustentável para a gestão das AP	Fomos chamados para visitar e conhecer todas as AP da ilha e quando da apresentação dos planos das AP	Penso que os planos são bons. Podem carecer de algumas coisas de nada que a própria equipa não pode resolver. A camada infantil deve ser mais envolvida.	As pessoas também são influenciadas pelo meio onde vivem e os espaços naturais ditam a forma que as pessoas devem viver para que ambos tirem proveitos de forma sustentável	Construção de uma consciência de exploração sustentável, preservação dos recursos disponíveis e preservação de espécies endémicas	Sim, o projecto pode organizar mais sessões de formação e mais campanhas de sensibilização	Relacionamento de amizade e de cooperação. Temos respondido sempre positivamente.	Principalmente através da sensibilização e participação nas actividades que o projecto realizar.
4.	O projecto é muito importante para a ilha na medida em que serviu para transmitir informações, conhecimentos, que são uma mais valia para educação	Sim, participando nas reuniões e encontros de formação	Planos bem elaborados, com clareza de informação para a ilha do Sal, o plano de ecoturismo é de extrema importância sendo uma ilha turística	Porque ajuda as pessoas a terem a consciência da importância do meio ambiente e sensibilizar para a sua protecção	Contribuir para a sua preservação, e conservação da biodiversidade	O projec. deve ter continuidade para que os alunos continuem a ter informações importantes sobre as AP e conservação ambiental	Relacionamento excelente	Transmitindo as informações e conhecimentos para os alunos, com ajuda do projecto que tem um papel importante na formação e informação dos alunos
5.	De grande valia porque passou-se a ter mais e melhor conhecimento	Sim, dei sugestões e de interajuda	Sim, engajaram com grande empenho	O impacto é de melhoria de comportamento	Melhoria do ambiente, no	Mais formações e informações	De grande relevância e de associativismo	Ajudando na mobilização e formação,

					conhecimento e demais			aconselhando na proteção
6.	Muito importante para a ilha porque através deste projecto que ficamos a conhecer as AP e colaborar para a sua protecção	Sim, fomos envolvidos. Participamos em algumas formações	Sim, alguns. Acho que são muito pertinentes para a sociedade e para a conservação do nosso ambiente	Viver em espaços protegidos tem efeito positivo para as pessoas porque vivem em espaços saudáveis e sem poluição.	Trazem benefício para o turismo, para a natureza e para a sociedade no geral que ficam conscientes que devem preservar a natureza	Trabalhar mais na sensibilização nas escolas desde o EBI	Muito boa	Trabalhando nas sensibilizações junto da camada juvenile
ILHA DA BOAVISTA								
7.	Grande importância para a delimitação de áreas ambientais que devem ser preservados e controlados para que mã gestão. (Ordenamento do território)	Sim, principalmente na zona onde se pratica agricultura para sensibilizações das populações	Sim, os planos devem existir por forma a existir uma forma de planificação e um maior controle de limites das AP	Os habitantes desses espaços deverão colaborar para a preservação desse ambiente natural. Deverá existir uma interligação entre as áreas agrícolas e ambientais	Prevenção dessas áreas, interesse turísticos, produção nas zonas agrícolas e ambientais	Criação de infraestruturas adequadas para o controlo das AP e do turismo	Colaborativa quando solicitado	Continuar a trabalhar com o gabinete criado pelo projecto e MAHOT, sempre que necessário
8.	Muito importante, sobretudo para a sustentabilidade da actividade económica fundamental da ilha – Turismo.	Sim, tivemos sempre um representante/ponto focal, que trabalhou em estreita colaboração com a direcção do projecto	Sim, são muito bons. Penso que, uma vez implementados, terão importância para o turismo futuramente na ilha	É o nível da qualidade de vida das pessoas muito melhora que nos meios urbanos. Mas, as AP deviam poder gerar receitas para as pessoas que vivem nelas.	Permitir as pessoas que vivem nas proximidades participar na sua gestão, envolverem-se com a sua prtotecção e conservação e tirar rendimento	Ha necessidade de implementar a Autoridade Autónoma de Gestão das AP	De parceria bastante próxima	Continuação da parceria, disponibilidade para desenvolver e implementar conjuntamente, um projecto plurianual
9.	Foi e é importante para a ilha visto que permite uma gestão mais sustentáveis dos recursos que são frágeis	Sim, a Câmara Municipal foi envolvida desde a primeira hora em todas as fases do projecto. Entendemos ter tido uma boa parceria ao longo de todos os anos do projecto.	Sim. Os planos são ambiciosos e caso sejam implementados permitirão uma melhor gestão dos recursos da ilha	Tem sempre visto que o espaço influencia, quer se queira quer não, o modo com as pessoas apropriam o espaço	Os benefícios são vários. Permitem as populações locais apropriar-se dos recursos e deles tirar proveitos económicos e sociais, mas também melhorar a gestão dos recursos	AGestão do projecto ser localmente feito, não dependendo de nenhuma estrutura central por forma que os processos de decisão sejam mais céleres.	Foi até então a melhor possível	A Câmara Municipal como autoridade máxima da ilha, pode ajudar a protecção das AP de diversas formas. Concedendo o apoio institucional, como vem sendo feito, mas também técnica. Por outro lado a boa relação existente transmite maior credibilidade ao projecto.

10.	Boa	Participei nos encontros	Dei a minha colaboração na elaboração dos planos	Sinto muito bem a viver nessa área	Melhoria das condições de vida das populações	Envolver outros parceiros	Foi muito boa	Fazer tudo o que for possível para melhorar a nossa zona
11.	Yes, as of the last 3 yrs. I believe the results was good for the Island in terms the protection awareness	Protection awareness				I would say to have a better term f guards receiving the salaries. I believe the project should continue its a great form f education for the people of Boavista	Fundação Tartaruga has always had good relations with theme projecto and it would be a great help if it remains in Boavista	
12.	Sim. O projecto trouxe algumas dificuldades e conflitos com a população local. Não sentem integrados no desenvolvimento turístico. Tem levado as pessoas a matar mais tartarugas	Criação de uma equipa técnica para a ilha da Boavista, guarda para a protecção das tartarugas marinhas, criação de AP na ilha				O projecto tem capacidade de ser sustentável. Como prioridade devia ser regulação das actividades turísticas na ilha. Criação de um corpo de guardas ambientais.	Boa	As comunidades dentro das AP não sentem integrados no desenvolvimento da ilha. Falta de diálogo com as comunidades locais
ILHA DE SANTO ANTÃO								
13.	É de extrema importância o projeto para a ilha visto preservar o meio ambiente em especial as AP e a valorização das espécies endémicas que ja se encontram em vias de extinção	A educação sempre foi chamada delimitação das AP, nos instrumentos de gestão. Praticamente em formação. Informação		Divulgar os produtos locais, ter mais oportunidades de negócio, valorização dos produtos locais, melhorar a qualidade de vida	Respeito pelo ambiente, valorização das plantas endémicas.	Alargamento ao projecto a nível da ilha e não ser somente nos perímetros e arredores das AP	Há um estreito relativamente com o projecto	Através de acções de divulgação e sensibilizações das AP
14.	O projecto é uma oportunidade para reflexão sobre a questão ambiental com repercussão muito positiva na valorização e preservação particularmente das espécies endémicas.	Sim. Fomos envolvidas. Participamos nas reuniões e demos as nossas opiniões e sugestões face as matérias em análise	Sim. Estamos convictos de que são mais valia para esta região e para território nacional no seu todo.	Viver em espaços naturais contribui significamente para a saída e qualidade de vida das pessoas. Além do ar puroficado pode	As AP podem oferecer: beleza paisagísticas com ganhos para actividade turística	Que sejam criadas as condições para continuidade e sustentabilidade do projecto, através por	O relacionamento é bom	Através da divulgaçãoe sensibilização junto das escolas, comunidades, etc.

				se tirar produtos para uma dieta saudável		exemplo de criação de um organismo que cuide exclusivamente do mesmo		
15.	Sim vários. Todos os níveis sectoriais ganham benefícios com este projecto	Sim campanhas de sensibilização informações, formações e muito mais.	Sim na minha opinião é trabalhar para melhorar-lo cada dia adaptando-o as nossas realidades	Sim segurança e bem estar	Respeito pelos recursos naturais conhecimento das áreas pelos moradores etc.	Muito boa estão sempre disponível em ajudar naquilo que é possível fazer	Continuação do projecto, construção de segurança para os miradores, principalmente Pico da Cruz	Informando e sensibilizando a comunidade
16.	Gestão sustentável dos recursos naturais em especial na biodiversidade terrestre; na gestão e regulação dos recursos hídricos, na participação na tomada de decisões dos próprios interessados	Sim através de participação das discussão e aprovação	Conheço. São instrumentos essenciais na sustentabilidade de recursos e melhorias das condições sócio económicas dos residentes	Pode criar uma consciência de que o Homem é parte de natureza daí ter que conservar tendo em conta a geração vindoura	Na preservação do ambiente, da biodiversidade, gestão sustentável dos recursos	Reforçar a comunicação em geral sobre a necessidade de implementação dos planos de gestão e ecoturismo	Relacionamento e ótimo	Na participação em actividades de informações/formações e comunicação Palestras sobre assuntos específicos sobre AP
17.	O projecto tem um grande impacto ambiental, proteção do meio ambiente.	Sensibilização de pessoal, palestras, formações diversas. Gestão dos parques, igualdade de género. etc	Elaboração de projectos. Os planos foram bem elaborados	Viver uma vida saudável. Respirar um ar puro	Proteção do meio ambiente. Mais rendimentos para as famílias	Dar continuidade aos projectos	Relacionamento foi muito bom	Mobilização dos recursos. Divulgar informações nas pessoas com palestras
18.	A importância destes projecto para a ilha e ter mais continuação e mais projecto para beneficiar mais famílias e mais AP	Sim mais algumas comunidades, frentes de trabalho	Não conhece e não sei sobre elas	Não sei se o facto de viver em espaços naturais tem impacto sobre a vida das pessoas	Conhecimentos	O tratamento e da melhoria	Relacionamento da melhoria	Ajudar na proteção dessa área e na melhoria da união das associações.
ILHA DE S. VICENTE								
19.	Conhece bem o projecto, e participou em várias fases da sua formulação. Os resultados atingidos ficaram muito aquém das expectativas					Correcção torrencial com recuperação dos caminhos, recuperação de banquetas e apoio directo aos agricultores. Assegurar o controle de	Relacionamento bastante razoável. O resultado mais importante do projecto foi Limpeza de invasoras ao longo da estrada	

						<p>acesso ao longo do ano.</p> <p>Retoma urgentemente as actividades nas diferentes componentes já inventariadas.</p>	<p>de acesso e no perímetro de TELECOM com recuperação do viveiro de endémicas.</p> <p>Ultimamente tem havido fraco financiamento e burocracias nas comunicações</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Annex 7: Questionnaires used

A. Questões Apresentadas Nos Encontros com Associações e Comunidades locais

1. Conhece bem o projecto? O que pensa dos Resultados atingidos no projecto até finais de projeto? e até Novembro 2015?
2. Quais foram os Resultados mais importantes atingidos pelo Projeto até agora?
3. Considera que existiram problemas ou Barreiras que impediram o Projeto de atingir os objetivos planificados? Se sim quais são esses problemas?
4. O que é que gostaria que fosse considerado com prioridade para essa zona?
5. Tem algum comentário ou Sugestões que gostaria de fazer para a gestão dessa área protegida?
6. Algumas Recomendações

A. Questionnaire for Local Associations and Communities

1. Do you know the project well? What do you think of the results achieved by the project end? And up to November 2015?
2. What are the most important results achieved by the project so far?
3. Were there any problems or barriers that prevented the project from achieving the planned goals? If so what were they?
4. What would you like to be considered as a priority for this area?
5. Do you have comments or suggestions for the management of this protected area?
6. Some recommendations

B. Questões Apresentadas Nos Encontros Com Representantes Das Instituições locais

1. Qual a importância deste projeto para a ilha?
2. Foram envolvidos durante as fases de delimitação, elaboração dos planos de gestão das Áreas Protegidas/ Plano de Ecoturismo? Se sim de que forma?
3. Conhece os Planos de Gestão das áreas protegidas elaboradas e os Planos de Ecoturismo? Qual a sua opinião sobre eles?
4. Como é que o facto de viver em espaços Naturais pode ter algum efeito sobre a vida das pessoas?
5. Que benefícios as Áreas protegidas podem trazer?
6. Tem mais algum comentário ou sugestão de melhoria
7. Qual é o seu relacionamento com a unidade do projecto?
8. Como pretende ajudar na proteção dessa área*

B. Questionnaire for Representatives of Local Institutions

1. What is the importance of this project to the Island?
2. Were you involved in the planning process, development of management plans of protected areas or Ecotourism plan? If so, how?
3. What do you think of the Management plans drawn up for PAs and the ecotourism plans?
4. How does the life of Natural Spaces affect the lives of people?
5. What benefits can protected areas bring?
6. Do you have any other comments of suggestions for improving the project?
7. What is your relationship with the project?
8. How will it help to protect this area *

Annex 8: Progress in delivery of project outputs – To be finalised

*Satisfaction rating scale (see Table 1): Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory, Highly Unsatisfactory

Project Outputs	Mid-Term Status (reported by PMO)	PMO Rating	Mid-Term Review comments	MTR Rating	Terminal Evaluation (based on PIR and End of Project reports for 2014, and interviews and end of year report of DGA for 2015)	TE Rating
Outcome 1 Governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system is strengthened						
OUTPUT 1.1 The PA Autonomous Authority (PAAA) is established, operational and appropriately staffed with trained personnel and with a strengthened capacity to manage both terrestrial PAs and MPAs	The proposal AAAP was developed by the project, appreciate by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee. This document has been submitted to the Government for approval. Now the government has been discussed the category of institution	S	The process is under way for government approval of the PAAA route to protected area system. However, other options are also being discussed at high level and there is no certainty that the PAAA option will be approved. Other options for administration and management of the country's protected areas would also be acceptable. Funding from government is the main requirement now for any of the options. Even if the PAAA is established immediately, there are further steps to be taken in recruitment and training to complete the output.	MS	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 1.1 - The proposal of the Protected Areas Autonomous Authority was appreciated by the Technical Committee and endorsed by the Steering Committee of the project, with representatives of local authorities. The proposal was sent to government authorities for consideration and approval.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: The AAAP has not been established. The project team has been integrated into the DGA under the Service for NRM, booth national and sub-national staff and offices. There is no clear commitment to establish the AAAP any time soon, although the establishment of a DGA internal PA “unit” is can be considered a nationally preferred (interim) solution.</p> <p>See above. The PA “Unit” is managed under the Service of NRM. The “PA Coordinator” reports to the Head of Service, while the sub-national office to also report to the head of the Service.</p> <p>Created Office of Insular Conservation Island of Sal. Formed by a team from Green tracking technique, conductor, helper of services, general and Coordinator</p>	

				<p>In our view, a holding entity with exclusive functions and responsibilities for protected areas would bring greater efficiency in the management of Pas</p> <p>The document is being considered by the government for approval. Based on the document, they hired technical staff who are working in the Island PA offices: Sal – 4 people; Boavista – 4, Santo Antao – 4; S. Vicente/Santa Luzia – 1; Maio – 1; Fogo – 5; S. Nicolau – 6; Santiago – 6. These teams are implementing the activities proposed in the plans for planning and management, developed in the project framework.</p>	
<p>OUTPUT 1.2</p> <p>PA planning and management tools have been developed and are under implementation, including</p> <p>(i) a National PA Zoning Plan;</p> <p>(ii) a National PA Strategy; and</p> <p>(iii) a National PA Business Plan</p>	<p>National PA Zoning Plan and National Strategy Protected Areas were prepared, appreciate by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee</p> <p>The proposal of the National Business Plan was prepared by a international consultant and delivered to the project. This document is being examined. the technical staff of the project, after which it will be submitted to the technical and steering committees for appreciation and approval</p>	<p>S</p> <p>MS</p>	<p>There are valuable analyses in these plans and strategies and they include useful recommendations, including identification of 35 additional sites for consideration as protected areas. The National PA Business Plan demonstrates clear thinking on the problems of PA financing, but the calculations of financial needs are suspect because they are based on current expenditure in just two protected areas (Serra Malagueta and Monte Gordo). There are close synergies between the topics of the three documents and in hindsight it is regrettable that they were not combined into a single comprehensive strategy paper.</p> <p>The long review periods that these reports are subjected to reduces momentum towards the project objective. The consultative process to produce such strategies should involve the wider project team and stakeholders from the beginning, in order to facilitate consensus on the final strategies.</p>	<p>MS</p> <p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 1.2 - Zoning Plan, National Strategy for Protected Areas, and Business Plan were finalized, appreciated by the Technical Committee and validated by the Steering Committee. The proposed document on the Business Plan was sent to government authorities for consideration and approval. A new decree law on national protected area network was finalized, appreciated by the Technical Committee and validated by the Steering Committee. In terms of innovation, the Decree Law introduces private protected areas, gives greater importance of PAs regarding the ZDTIs, better characterization of PAs typologies, supervision and enforcement of penalties, marine and terrestrial PAs definition.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>The document on the National Strategy for Protected Areas; Territorial analysis and zoning of Protected Areas; The National Plano f AP Business approved by RAR</p>	

				<p>In the case of Santo Antão the proposal foresees the expansion of the territory of protected areas, many are in favour of its expansion in various parts of the Pas</p> <p>A National Strategy for Protected Areas has been approved at the Meeting of High Representatives (RAR) and submitted to Cabinet for approval.</p> <p>The National Plan PA Business has already been approved at the Meeting of High Representatives and submitted to the Cabinet for approval.</p> <p>Plans for local businesses (complex of eastern PAs of the Island of Sal in the Southeastern tip) elaborated on.</p> <p>The Document of the Proposal for a New Legal Regime for Protected Areas, Nature conservation and Biodiversity is in the process of approval by the Government.</p>	
<p>OUTPUT 1.3</p> <p>The new PAAA is cooperating effectively with relevant institutions for sustainable resource management</p>	<p>- Training on guidelines for ecotourism and environmental protection at the site of the project intervention;</p> <p>- Training on planning (territorial analysis and zoning); database CSPRO</p> <p>Not being the AAAP operating to date, it was understood well by starting to create conditions so that this will happen through training, awareness, etc.</p>	S	<p>In the absence of the PAAA, the emphasis here should have been on preparation for cooperation of the PAAA with relevant institutions. The PMO response addresses this in part. There has been work to promote cooperation with local non-governmental and governmental institutions (under Outcome 3). There should be more work at central level to engage the tourism and development sectors in a dialogue on protected areas and sustainable resource management.</p>	<p>MU</p> <p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 1.3 - In order to prepare local communities to cooperate with the AAAP to be created, the strategy adopted is based on capacity development actions. Additionally, as last year, technical assistance is being provided to community groups to organize themselves, identify capacity gaps and development needs and sustainable income generating activities. In terms of capacity building, training actions targeting communities and institutions representatives were conducted with civil society, public, private institutions and NGOs on the development projects relating to income generating activities.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>See above. The PA “Unit” is managed under the Service of NRM. The “PA Coordinator” reports to the Head of Service, while the sub-national office to also report to the head of the Service. This is important in</p>	

				<p>terms of sorting out responsibilities and mandates for collaborating with other entities.</p> <p>Local partners involved in environmental awareness activities conducted by the Insular Sal Office and collaborate actively with the Office.</p> <p><u>The team that works in the protected areas of Santo Antao continue to follow-up with the beneficiaries of projects for income generating activities</u></p> <p>Finalized the draft income generating activity, with monitoring and evaluation conducted by the local team of Insular Office of Protected Areas</p> <p>Close partnership between Island offices of the PA and local institutions, tour operators and local communities.</p> <p>The activities have been carried within the close relationship between the Island offices of the PA and the different local institutions, including NGOs, State institutions, tour operators and local communities.</p>	
<p>OUTPUT 1.4</p> <p>Quantitative data on climate change and carbon sequestration is effectively informing the design and implementation of the National PA strategy</p>	<p>The carbon sequestration systems have been identified and the amount of atmospheric carbon sequestered (Santo Antão and Fogo). The survey on weather stations, udometros, in the site of the project intervention has been identified, as well.</p>	MS	<p>The project is not expected to collect information, just to use existing information in order to include climate change considerations into design (and implementation) of the National PA Strategy. There are indeed references to climate change in the National PA Strategy but these are mainly generic (and largely in quotations from CBD COP Decisions and Aichi Targets) and do not deal with specific data. There is a need for more analysis of the potential impacts of climate change, in collaboration with the GEF project on Climate Change running in parallel with this project</p>	<p>MS</p> <p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 1.4 - Systems of carbon sequestration identified in PA, based on forestry inventory data carbon sequestration potential was quantified. A document with systems and meteorological equipment was elaborated.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>Waiting for provision of financial resources to purchase equipment (rain gauges and weather stations etc)</p>	

Outcome 2 : Management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs is enhanced					
<p>OUTPUT 2.1 Management and business plans have been prepared and implemented in a participatory fashion in 4 terrestrial PAs and in 3 MPAs involving communities, private land owners and tourism operators, among others</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boundaries demarcations of the 14 PA by the project, in the site of the project intervention, socialized, approved by the Steering Committee, approved by the Government and gazetted (BO (Bulletin No 18 Series I, of 05.04.2013, Bulletin No 23 Series I, from 05.09.2013;) - 6 Management Plans and 7 Ecotourism Plans were developed in a participatory approach, socialized and approved at workshops in local / regional sites in the project intervention; - Preliminary reports on biodiversity. and socio-economy were prepared as well as their socialization, and approved by local partners; - Os planos de negócios estão programados para 2014; - The Technical and Steering Committees were created in 2011 and they are in the 4th and 3rd meeting, respectively; - The project has been assured the surveillance of beaches and biodiversity monitoring beaches (national campaign for the protection of sea turtles), in Sal and Boa Vista Islands; - The project has selected a consulting firm for the preparation of legal normative for management and ecotourism plans; the work should begin next August. <p>The management and ecotourism plans will be appreciate by the</p>	S	<p>A massive amount of work has been put into the preparation of management plans and ecotourism plans and business plans are scheduled for 2014. Most of the work appears to have been done by one consultant, with the support of project staff, through a process that involved the consultant making five or six visits to each of the project sites over a period of eight months or more. This is a challenging undertaking for anyone, and by the very volume of work expected, it sets limits on how much grass-roots participatory planning can be undertaken by the consultant.</p> <p>Very important progress has made in that boundary delineation and official gazetting of the focal PAs has been completed and is now underway for a large number of additional PAs. Ecological and socio-economic assessments of terrestrial habitats was stronger than that for marine habitats and this is reflected in the treatment of the marine environment in the MPA management plans.</p> <p>Budgets in the PA management plans are not developed with reference to actual costs: they are estimates for general programmes and they appear to be generous estimates. More detail will be required.</p> <p>Implicit in the budgets is an assumption that partners will provide a large part of the funding, but no agreements has been reached. It is hard to see how these management plans can be approved without these agreements.</p> <p>The Ecotourism plans include unnecessary detail and, with their</p>	S	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 2.1. Six management plans and the 7 ecotourism plans and their respective regulations, Preliminary studies on forest, fauna and flora on coastal areas, sustainable agriculture practices and soil and water conservation studies, proposed boundary on-the-ground demarcation and national protected areas network signage system were validated and approved by Technical and Steering Committees. Furthermore, 17 new protected areas boundary delimitations were finalized and gazetted with 30.545.5 ha, being 23.522,5 terrestrial area and 7.023 marine area. The preparation of locals business plans is ongoing.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: Two plans, planning and management respective regulations approved by the Government. Two Ecotourism plans and respective regulations approved by the Government. Changed the definition of <u>Protected Natural Area Reserve Ponta do Sino by Decree 5/2015 to June 4</u></p> <p>Implementation activities contained in the Management Plan. Socialization of management plans and ecotourism.</p> <p>Six Management plans and seven Ecotourism Plans and related regulations were approved by the Government and are in the implementation phase.</p>

	<p>Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee. At the moment the project has been supported DG Environment in the boundaries demarcations, socialization, in order to be gazetted, 7 remained PAs in Boa Vista, 7 on Sal, 3 Santo Antão, 1 Santiago, 1 S. Nicolau, which will be objects of a specific project for the preparation of their management tools.</p>		<p>additional budgets, make it more complicated to assess overall management actions and costs. In hindsight it may have been better to incorporate them as sections of the main Management Plans, and this could still be done.</p> <p>Although the Management Plans have not been approved, some aspects of them are being implemented by the project teams, notably in turtle conservation, invasive plant control and conflict resolution among local communities and groups.</p>			
<p>OUTPUT 2.2 Island-Wide Conservation Strategy Plans have been implemented and are supporting the establishment of all of the MPAs on Sal and Boavista Islands</p>	<p>Strategy and Conservation Plan was elaborated for the Boa Vista and Sal island. Both were appreciated by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee.</p> <p>The information served as the basis for the preparation of management and ecotourism plans</p>	S	<p>The Island Wide Conservation Strategies are a vital part of development of a viable protected area system. They should actually be prepared for all islands, not only for Boa Vista and Sal. Spatial plans for each island are a necessary prerequisite for the detailed site planning for protected areas themselves.</p>	S	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 2.2. Island-wide strategy and conservation plans for Boa Vista and Sal were validated and approved by Technical and Steering Committees.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>Sal Conservation Strategy and Boa Vista approved by RAR</p> <p>Finalised activities relating to turtle observations campaign in 2014, including the preparation of the report that was sent to all those involved in the campaign and delivery of the contributions.</p> <p>We had several meetings with NGOs and tour operators to coordinate the monitoring campaign and observation of sea turtles in 2015. We had a visit from PNCTM coordinator (23-25/07) and found that there was lack of guards, lack of trained guides, and problems with the coordination of tours with tour operators and NGOs. We have the support of 15 guards from 15/07 to 15/10 and 22 military guards during the month of September. As in previous years we have issued authorizations for observation</p>	

				<p>excursions during spawning season. I made only one visit to each of the monitoring camps for sea turtles.</p> <p>Acompanhamos, ainda que não diretamente, os trabalhos das ONG na monitorização de aves, cetáceos e tubarões.</p> <p>Strategy and Conservation Plan for Boa Vista Island and strategy and Salt Conservation Plan were approved at RAR and submitted to Cabinet for approval. The measures proposed in these strategies are being implemented at the level of respective islands.</p>	
<p>OUTPUT 2.3</p> <p>Ecological monitoring systems are in place for the seven target PAs/MPAs, yielding relevant data on the health of ecosystems</p>	<p>Is scheduled to draw up plans for ecological monitoring in 2014. However, there has been some work on ecological monitoring in the Natural Park of Fogo (birds – <i>Pterodroma feae feae</i> (Gon-gon and alien species) and in the beaches of Sal and Boa Vista islands (sea turtle – <i>Caretta caretta</i>).</p> <p>In 2014 will be prepared 6 monitoring plans.</p>	MS	<p>It is important when these are done, that there is a standard monitoring protocol adopted nationally. The project can contribute by establishing this standard. Some proposals are available in the biodiversity reports produced by the project. These reports have been painstakingly prepared but a high level of duplication exists for protected areas that are close together, and it might be better to combine such reports to the extent possible.</p>	<p>S</p> <p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 2.3. Preparation of ecological monitoring plans in all project sites is ongoing; Marine turtle monitoring and conservation campaigns took place on the Sal and Boa Vista islands. The project organized a meeting on Boa Vista Island, in June 2014 with representatives from ONGs working in turtle conservations at national level and others partners (25 participants, specifically 10 man and 15 women), in order to identify the best indicators for assessing the impact of projects on turtle conservation, in the short and long terms. Meeting with all partners working with marine turtle conservation (98 participants, being 43 man and 55 women). Numbers of rangers recruited: 12 on Boa Vista Island and 2 in Sal Island.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>Coordination of the monitoring campaign and observation of sea turtles; Effectiveness indicators of conservation management defined sea turtles; Monitoring Birds done by technical teams and NGOs on the ground. Inventory of existing plant species.</p>	

				<p>Follow, although not directly, the work of NGOs in monitoring birds, cetaceans and sharks. We did several meetings and a tour by tour-operators to introduce the group to good practice in outdoor activities and the map with tracks.</p> <p>We sent a letter to the Ministers of Tourism Environment and the parliamentary and municipal representatives to request the regulation of outdoor activities, including tours in all-terrain vehicles.</p> <p>We have been working on various issues with NGOs, SDTIBM and CMBV, namely: training of tourist guides; definition and signalling paths.</p> <p>In 2014 the environmental committee of the Island of Boa Vista was created. In 2015 various activities were carried out within the Committee, particularly education and environmental awareness activities. <u>At this point the committee is on official phase with the development and subsequent approval</u> of statutes.</p> <p>Finalized the identification of photographed species of flora and cataloguing of herbarium specimens with possible field trips to collect more specimens for the herbarium.</p> <p>The ecological monitoring technicians continue to track plant and animal species, especially those threatened with extinction. The herbarium work is on-going.</p> <p>There has been some volunteer activity with the removal of invasive plants and cleaning. Military to ensure the security of the area and involvement of owners throughout the system.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					In implementing the six enhanced Ecological Monitoring Plans. Monitoring and Poultry monitoring, cetaceans, sea turtles and flora.	
OUTPUT 2.4 Exotic species are under management and IAS are under sustained control in target terrestrial Pas	A document entitled "Invasive Plant Management Strategy" was elaborated under the project" The project has been prepared to starting the invasive plants control, according to the technical recommendations. Contracts with local associations to control of invasive species are in approval	S	The Strategy appears to be sound. Application of the strategy requires careful planning. There is a risk that in the enthusiasm to get started, some of the basic tenets of the strategy may be overlooked. It is important to have a long term plan with sustained (not intermittent or short term) control activities, to take into account possible side effects such as secondary invasions and soil erosion, and to be modest in aims and build up gradually to more ambitious targets. Measures recommended include the use of herbicides, but as permission to use these herbicides has not been granted, the methodology being used is likely to require a particularly high level of sustained effort. Activities have begun and there is a real risk to success should there be no funding after the end of the project in 2014.	MS	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 2.4. Under the project the local communities were engaged in aliens species control on the islands of Santo Antão (13,0 ha), São Vicente (3,0) and Fogo (26 ha).</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: It was done in partnership with MDR combat weeds in a 50 ha area during the year 2015.</p> <p>Preparation of production plants. Removal work 1.5ha of invasive species and planting 2,000 seedlings of endemic species, awaiting funding.</p> <p>Mechanical control activities of alien species (S. Antao, S. Vicente and Fogo)</p>	
OUTPUT 2.5 The Fisheries Management Plan is under implementation, as a result of cooperation agreements between the Directorate of	Demarches are being given towards developing a partnership agreement with DGPescas.	MU	Little work has been done on the fisheries aspects of the MPA management. This is important work and requires attention. The Marine Biologist at the PMU is in a good position	MU	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 2.5 – In order to align the interests between the CSAP-CV project and Regional fisheries project for West Africa - Cape Verde (PRAO-CV), a memorandum of understanding for joint activities on marine resources conservation was established for Sal island.</p>	

Fisheries and the Island-Wide Office, at all MPA sites			to negotiate the scope of such agreements.		<p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>Collaboration with the PRAO-CV project in the fisheries co-management awareness and implementation work on Sal Island</p> <p>800 endemic plants were produced and fixed of which at least five were different species.</p> <p>Poio partners, the Biosphere as the main partner in awareness and training activities and the preparation of projects for mobilizing financing.</p> <p>Awareness and information sessions with partners linked to the management of fisheries and marine resources in the islands of Sal and Boavista. In implementing the Moemorandum of Understanding signed between PCSAPCV/DGA e DGRM/PRAOCV</p>	
<p>Outcome 3: The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas</p>						
<p>OUTPUT 3.1</p> <p>Organized communities, farmers associations, and associations of artisanal fishermen have the capacity to engage in biodiversity friendly income-generating activities as an alternative to resource degrading ones</p>	<p>- Training on associations, conflict management, negotiation, protected areas management, biodiversity Conservation, natural resources management and mainstreaming gender and equality</p> <p>- Community projects were developed, generating income (Sal, Boa Vista, Santo Antão), in order to improve the living conditions of the populations.</p> <p>- Dissemination of the project through meetings, lectures, exhibitions, radio, television, video.- Page WEB</p>	S	<p>A wide range of useful activities have taken place. The MTR team was concerned, however, at the lack of attention to prior assessment of the possible impacts of what are loosely termed biodiversity friendly income-generating activities.</p> <p>Training courses were organized but the MTR team was unable to confirm that there was a training needs assessment that guided the training.</p> <p>Some of what is termed training under the project is really education and provision of information</p> <p>There is a communication strategy plan and a web-site. The web-site could be improved by adding more reports and information,</p>	MS	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 3.1.Training sessio were conducted at the community level on preparing projects of income generating activities. By Island the number of participants were: Fogo 23, being 14 M and 9 W; Boa Vista: 17 participants , being 4 M and 13 W; Sal: 29, being 12 M and 17 W; Santo Antão: 32 participants , being 11 M and 21 W, and S. Vicente: 18 participants , being 11 M and 7 W. In Santo Antão Island took place others training as capacity building under SGP/GEF, namely nursery plants preparation, with total participants 54, being 31 M and 23 W. Communication, Information and education and awareness actions conducted with local communities on environmental issues. (Fogo island: 923 participants; Boa Vista: 978; Sal: 1487; Santo Antão:</p>	

	<p>(www.areasprotegidas.gov.cv), Environmental education program, Strategy and Communication Plan, Brochure, Comics, Newsletter, etc.. Trainings are scheduled for development and management of income-generating projects</p>		<p>including maps and spatial hot-links to databases on other sites. PMO has reported the communication work here under Outcome 3 but it is just as important under Outcome 1 in building a constituency of support for protected areas at the central level.</p>	<p>1514, S. Vincent: 745) Awareness materials prepared and disseminated.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: Created Association of Fishermen of Santa Maria; 1 Draft of co-management fishing plan drawn up and <u>socialized (initiated/ implemented?)</u> on Sal Island</p> <p>Celebration of important environmental dates in partnership with the student community</p> <p>Held six guided tours of Protected Areas</p> <p>Formed six guards/ environmental guards for collaboration in turtle campaign</p> <p>We participate in various activities / events/ meetings that highlight educational activities and environmental awareness especially the Wetlands Day, Environmental Fair, the Environmental Day, Oceans and Beaches clean-up Campaign, planning the basin of Calhau; requalification of the forested area of the Boa Esperanca Nature Reserve; TAOLA; National Steering Committee of the GEF SGP; 8th Forum of the PRCM.</p> <p>Community associations continue to receive PA team assistance in the preparation of projects for funding applications</p> <p>The PA team continues to do the follow-up of beneficiaries</p> <p>176 students and teachers from Coculi and Suzete Delgado secondary schools, informed about protected areas and biodiversity conservation;</p> <p>56 students from the EBI de Lombo de Figueira informed of the importance of forests and trees;</p> <p>39 students and teachers made aware of the importance of world environment day;</p> <p>238 students from Joao Varela Secondary School in</p>	
--	---	--	---	--	--

				<p>Porto Novo made aware of the importance of biodiversity protection;</p> <p>70 students from Januário Leite–Paul Secondary School made aware of the importance biodiversity protection</p> <p>42 Students from EBI Faja Domenica Benta-Riberia da Torre, informed about biodiversity conservation</p> <p>50 students from EBI Tea Manuel dos Santon – Paul, informed of biodiversity conservation;</p> <p>25 individuals from the Aguas das Caldeiras community made aware of the importance of biodiversity protection</p> <p>Activity project generating income: “Cabana de Cha” finances and implemented in PNMV, in partnership with the Association APAAM</p> <p>Involvement of APAAM in environmental education activities</p> <p>Four talks held with schools and universities</p> <p>Four study visits with schools and universities</p> <p>Project prepared for construction of a <u>Wall for torrential rain correction</u>, in partnership with APAAM Association (pending funding)</p> <p>Two volunteer activities in the nursery and areas of invasive PNMV</p> <p>Partnership since the preparation of projects for Monte Verde, <u>to execution work under the supervision of the technical support team</u></p> <p>A good partnership established with a technical school for adult education. They have given great support by volunteering in the rehabilitation of the nursery and removal of invasive plants.</p> <p>Effective collaboration between the insular offices of the PA and all civil society associations formed, in generating income activities, ecosystem conservation,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					soil and water conservation, control of invasive species, among others.	
<p>OUTPUT 3.2</p> <p>Local governments, resource institutions, private operators, NGOs and others participate actively and collaboratively in biodiversity conservation in PAs and MPAs through the established Advisory Councils for the project's target PAs and MPAs</p>	<p>At each project site, the project created an Advisory Council of Protected Areas that has been meeting regularly. The internal regulations of this council was prepared and approved by the technical and steering committees, lacking only the formal establishment of advisory councils by the Government.</p>	S	<p>The Advisory Councils (AC) have been formed and are meeting regularly, and the MTR met members of some. Although AC regulations and formal establishment under the law are still being pursued, this seems to be a successful contribution to PA management and it is important that momentum is not lost when the project ends in 2014.</p>	S	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 3.2. Three meetings of technical committees took place on the following dates: October 21 and 22, 2013 (30 participants numbers being M (17) W (13); December 16: 20 participants being M (13) W (7); May 20, 2014 (25 participants numbers being M (18) W (7); Three meetings of Steering Committees took place on the following dates: October 25 2013 (23 participants numbers being M (10) W (13); December 20: 15 participants being M (9) W (6); May 23, 2014 (21 participants numbers being M (14) W (7). Local PA Advisor Council took place in Santo Antão: 15 participants; São Vicente: 14 participants; Boa Vista: 28 participants; Fogo: 11 participants; Sal: 8 participants,</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015:</p> <p>Meetings with members of the committee and local consultants.</p> <p>There was a meeting for tourism partners and the association of farmers and homeowners.</p> <p>Continuous sharing of information between partners; application of knowledge acquired in training.</p> <p>Regular meetings of the PA Board of Advisors <u>already created</u></p>	
<p>OUTPUT 3.3</p> <p>The integration of PA/MPA planning and strategizing into local development frameworks ensure that sectoral development</p>	<p>Throughout the preparation of management plans and ecotourism, we adopted a participatory approach, with the active participation of local</p>	S	<p>There is reference to a wide range of development actions in the management plans, and there is a wide range of partners listed. The key to success on</p>	S	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Output 3.3 - The final drafts for six management and seven ecotourism plans were approved by Technical and Steering Committees. In these meetings there were the recommendations that were incorporated in</p>	

at the local level is more harmonious with the conservation objectives and activities of PAs and MPAs	authorities, NGOs, Civil Society Organization, private sector; it was possible to harmonize the plans, programs and projects, bearing in mind the principles of strategic assessment of impacts.		this output will be formal approval by government and the partners listed.		<p>the documents. These proposals management tools will be sent for government approval in Council of Ministers.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: Prepared the proposed signage for Reserva Natural Ponta do Sinó, Reserva Natural Serra Negra, Reserva Natural Costa da Fragata and Paisagem Protegida Salinas de Santa Maria</p> <p>New agreement signed in May with the Rheinland Nature Park A local advisory council meeting of Santo Antao held.</p> <p>Well integrated implementation of the plans taking place with schools, NGOs, community associations, universities at all levels, logistics (cars, telecoms) via exhibition activities with endemic plants, the Biosphere.</p> <p>Implementation of the plans in an integrated way (provided) between the partners and Island offices of PA</p>	
OUTPUT 3.4 Natural resource and soil use (eg agriculture, tourism, fisheries, development construction) for the 4 PAs and the 3 MPAs respect restrictions of ecological carrying capacities	A document entitled "Assessment of Limits Uses Sustainable Natural Resources" was elaborated. The document was appreciated by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee.	S	This is an output phrased as an outcome. It is of course vital that ecological damage is avoided by proper management of impacts. The commissioned paper referred to by the PMO is a full treatment of the assessment of limits but its main relevance to Cape Verde PA management today is in the author's sound general comments about the concept of ecological carrying capacities and where it can be applied effectively. Some of the mathematical analyses and the detailed attention to specific trail systems for example, are surplus to requirements at this stage, particularly as data are hard to come by and difficult to verify. If the report has resulted in recognition of the importance of limiting impacts then that is good, but it was	MS	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Output 3.4 - The final proposed carrying capacity document approved by Technical and Steering Committees incorporated the recommendations made by this board and will be sent for government approval.</p> <p>TE – at Nov/Dec 2015: A meeting was conducted to present the studies of those in the tourist industry. Participation was high and there were good contributions, which fortunately already contained the plan. An emergency plan was proposed that has not yet been prepared; moreover other requests were already part of the plan, including security (being done through the military).</p>	

			an expensive and inefficient way of doing this.		Verification of indicators (realistic or not) carrying capacity in terms of project sites	
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

Annex 9: Evaluation of project performance indicators - To be finalised

Objective and outcome indicators used in the strategic results framework

Objective To consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas (PA) System through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation.			
		MTR	TE
OBJECTIVE INDICATOR 1. Increase in the surface area percentage of operational PA as part of the national PA/MPA network (an operational PA is one that counts at least on minimum staff and a management plan under implementation)		Rating: S	Rating:
Baselines and Targets	2012 and Mid-term Levels (as in 2012 PIR and 2013 Draft PIR)	MTR Comments on Design and Use	TE (as in PIR 2014) and modified in response to MTR recommendations
<p>Baseline Level Only 10,195 ha or 14% of the gazetted PA/MPA estate is currently operational (Monte Gordo 952ha, Serra Malagueta 774ha, Fogo 8,469ha)</p> <p>Target Level at end of project As a cumulative GEF investment in Cape Verde 57.617 ha or 80% of the PA/MPA expanded estate are operational, as independently verified by project evaluators</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2012 The delimitation of the Protected Areas covered in this project, has been concluded using GIS (Geographic Information System) tools. Limits, for a total new area of 52,239 ha of PA/MPA (cumulative area equals 62434 ha) were publicly presented, discussed and agreed at the local level. The proposal was sent for official approval and publication in the official Gazette. Delimitation proposals are being used for management plan formulation, which are currently in their final stage of preparation. Local communities, public institutions and private sector are actively involved in all the phases of delimitation and management plan formulation. The approval of PA/MPA limits and adoption of management tools are essential for the operationalization of the protected areas. To</p>	<p>Comments on indicator design Ambiguity throughout – eg in use of “operational” , “gazetted” , “expanded” (and also the use of “new” in the Objective). Data on areas are not consistent and there is no reference to differences in treatment of land and sea areas.</p> <p>Comments on indicator application Too much text written. Good to recognize the problems with this indicator (2012) but inadequate response just to point it out. Should have acted to change the indicator to something measurable – eg number of hectares added - and stop referring to percentages. Land and sea areas are combined in single totals to calculate percentages and this is leading to confusion.</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2014: An additional 17 protected areas had their boundaries defined and gazetted. The total size of these new protected areas is 30.545.5 ha (23.522,5 terrestrial protected area and 7.023 marine protected area). Although not initially part of the output of this project, the addition of these new protected areas has raised the cumulative size of the protected areas of Cabo Verde to 94.569,24 ha. The project has contributed to the legal definition of the boundaries of 31 Protected Areas. As previously reported these processes of demarcation of the Protected Areas boundaries continues to be fully participatory with continued engagement of the communities living in and around the protected areas, civil society and private institutions. The legal boundaries represents a significant step towards the operationalization of these 17 protected areas. Furthermore, the draft management tools (management plans and PA ecotourism plans) of 14 protected areas</p>

	<p>this purpose management plans are under preparation. The formulation of baseline and target levels (in percentages) was based on an estimate of the total surface areas of the gazetted PA/MPA. As the project proceeds on precisely mapping the limits of the PA/MPA, some discrepancies on surface area have appeared and are expected to continue as the delimitation process of all the gazetted PA/MPA progress. This implies that the total surface area of PA/MPA foreseen at the project start, do not match the actual values determined by precise delimitation. For example, in the case of the Natural Park of Cova/Paul/R^a da Torre, according to the PRODOC, the foreseen land surface at project start was 3,217 ha. However, after precise delimitation, the actual surface proved to be significantly smaller than the estimate, the real value being 2,092 ha.</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013</p> <p>The boundaries demarcations of the protected areas were completed (14 protected areas corresponding to 53828.74 ha), presented to the Technical Committee for consideration and approved by the Steering Committee, representing 74% compared to baseline (73.072 ha in PRODOC) . These boundaries demarcations were approved by the Council of Ministers and gazetted, on April 5th and May 9th this year, by decree regulations. There has been a cumulative value 64,023,74 ha GEF's investment in Cape Verde. Communities and public and private institutions participated actively in the whole process. The approval by the Council of Ministers of the limits of aps is very important</p>	<p>Comments on project progress</p> <p>Excellent progress has been made in official description and gazetting of protected areas that were legally established (without precise delineation) in 2003.</p> <p>There has been progress too in promotion of participatory processes in conservation (as in the Objective) but none of the indicators measure this specifically.</p> <p>A better, more straightforward indicator would be "Increase in area of gazette protected areas by 50,000 ha by the end of the project"</p>	<p>gazetted in 2013 (during PIR/2012/2013) were finalized, reviewed by Technical Committee and approved by the project Steering Committee.</p> <p>Final project report:</p>
--	---	--	--

	because the management tools being finalized will allow an increase in the percentage of operationalization of protected areas in Cape Verde, with a positive impact in terms of conservation of biological resources, geological and historical-cultural and subsequent satisfaction of the socio-economic needs of local communities.		
OBJECTIVE INDICATOR 2. Average sea turtle emergences in terms of nests by island within the target MPA sites for the project, namely Boa Vista and Sal island (best approximation as some turtles come twice a year and there is high fluctuation)		N/A	N/A
Baseline Level Number of nests per year per island Boa Vista: 13.925 Sal: 515 Target Level at end of project Increase by 20%	Level at 30 June 2012 Despite the conservation efforts of the sea turtle in Boa Vista and Sal, the number of nests shows a decreasing trend according to data collected in 2009, 2010 and 2011. Although the causes of this decrease are not fully understood, there is some shared sense that this could be linked with reproduction and migratory cycles of the species. If on one hand, the defined baseline was based on a very limited time series; on the other hand, there is not a scientific consensus on the existence of a direct cause-effect relationship between conservation and protection measures (habitat conservation, nesting site protection and hunting prevention) and the increase of the number of nests. For ecological monitoring purposes, the project is working to improve data collection methodology on sea turtle nesting. In this sense, the project team is working on a standardized methodology for data collection, treatment and analysis that will be used by all partners to produce more accurate measurements. Moreover, technical discussions are ongoing to propose a "SMARTer"	Comments on indicator design Fundamental problem with this indicator is that there are many factors affecting the numbers of successful nests that are independent of protected areas and participatory conservation. Natural fluctuations in numbers of females coming ashore make this kind of indicator usable only over scales of a decade or more. It should be kept for such a time scale. A better indicator to assess the impact of the project on turtle conservation (ie in the short term) might be Numbers of cases of turtle killing, egg thieving, or nest destruction by people per year per site. The indicator might have been designed to measure protected area management effectiveness and community participation, but is not precisely enough focused to do that. Comments on indicator application	PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: As in previous years, the project has installed, in partnership with local NGO's and members of the communities, the logistics and system to monitor the number of sea turtle nests: In 2013 nesting season (July – October) 11,476 nests were counted on Boa Vista island, representing a slight increase compared to the baseline (13,925); 2,031 nests were counted on Sal island, representing an increase of 394% compared to the baseline (515). The Mid Term review mission which took place in July 2013 provided technical advice on indicator reformulation, such as numbers of cases of turtle killing, egg thieving or nest destructions by people per year per site. Taking into account that the project will finish in December 2014, this recommendation could be adopted in the next years by OAAP/DGA. Furthermore, the project organized a meeting on Boa Vista Island, in June 2014 with representatives from NGOs working on turtle conservations at national level and others partners (25 participants), in order to identify better indicators to assess the impact of turtle conservation efforts, in the short and long term. Short term indicators identified were: numbers of cases of turtle killing, number of nesting turtles, beaches monitored, number of local volunteers recruited; long term indicators: number of

	<p>indicator to gauge the project's conservation impact. One of the alternative indicators under analysis is "successful egg hatching and turtle offsprings successfully arriving to the sea".</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013</p> <p>The number of nests sea turtle, both on the island of Boa Vista and Sal accused a significant increase compared to baseline (13,925 and 515 respectively). In fact, in Boa Vista was 22,366 nests, which represents a percentage increase of 60.62%, in Sal was 2,585 nests, representing an increase of 401.94%. The increased number of nests and subsequent amount of turtles contribute to the preservation of the species considered important around the world.</p>	<p>The flaws in the indicator were recognized (2012) when there was a fall (data not given) in numbers of successful nests. It was suggested that a better indicator be designed, but nothing was done about this, and when the numbers of successful nests increased sharply (2013) the indicator was treated as sound and the project congratulated itself.</p>	<p>nests versus number of tracks, emerging hatchlings, numbers of cases of turtle killing, number of nesting turtles. The meeting advised the construction of a statistical multiple linear regression model integrating the explanatory or predictor and the response variables, in order to identify, through multi-factor studies, the explanatory variables that can predict with confidence the response variable.</p> <p>AT TE Nov/Dec. 2015: Additional reports from Natura 2000 and Tartaruga</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE INDICATOR 3. Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover in specific areas of target terrestrial PA sites for the project Sites are: Fogo NP; Monte Verde NP; Moroços NP; and Cova/Paúl/R da Torre NP</p>		N/A	N/A
<p>Baseline Level</p> <p>FOGO : Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover : 328 ha versus IAS 105 Ha. Ratio 3:1</p> <p>SANTO ANTÃO (Moroços NP and Cova/Paul e Ribeira da Torre NP): Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover : 919,5 ha versus IAS 170.8 Ha. Ratio 5,4:1</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2012</p> <p>Work to delimitate surface occupied by IAS (invasive alien species) were conducted in 2011 by local teams. During the 2012 first quarter, a study to elaborate a IAS management strategy was conducted. The strategy pointed to specific measures to control IAS on the targeted terrestrial protected areas. This study served as well to establish baseline and targets for this indicator. Measures proposed consist on manual, chemical and biological control measures. The strategy action plan covers also awareness raising campaigns to avoid that local communities plant IAS. Some of the chemical measures identified by this consultancy conflict with national legislation on herbicides use. The project is working with DGA to analyze ways to</p>	<p>Comments on indicator design</p> <p>Too much ambiguity.</p> <p>The ratios are spurious without reference to how the specific areas were chosen? A better indicator would use percentages of an independently defined area such as the whole protected area.</p> <p>How is it that the native/endemic species areas remain the same from Baseline to Target but the IAS areas decrease – to leave what? It is invalid to use a ratio in such a calculation.</p> <p>In effect what this indicator is doing is simply measuring numbers of ha of Lantana, Furcraea and Leucaena infestation brought under sustained control.</p>	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>Fogo Island: PN Fogo: 26 ha of IAS controlled. This represents 24% of IAS controlled compared to the target (78.5 ha IAS). Ratio 6.27:1;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Santo Antao Island: Moroços/Cova PN / Paul / R.Torre: 13 ha of IAS controlled representing 7% IAS controled compared to the target (126,9 ha IAS). Ratio: 8.06:1 <p>S. Vicente: Monte Verde: 3 ha of IAS controlled representing 12% IAS controled compared to the target (19 ha IAS). Ratio :10.39:1.</p> <p>In term of target, in all protected areas there was an increase of ratio, i.e, Fogo: Ratio 6.27:1 ; Santo Antao: Ratio: 8.06:1; and S. Vicente : Ratio :10.39:1The control of these invasive alien species contribute to elimination of competition between native and invasive species, in</p>

<p>S. VICENTE (Monte Verde NP):Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover : 166,2 ha versus IAS 24,7 Ha. Ratio 6,7:1</p> <p>Target Level at end of project</p> <p>FOGO: Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover : 328 ha versus IAS 78.75 Ha. Ratio 4:1;</p> <p>SANTO ANTÃO (Moroços NP and Cova/Paul e Ribeira da Torre NP): Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover: 919,5 ha versus IAS126.98 Ha. Ratio 7.24:1.</p> <p>S. VICENTE (Monte Verde NP):Rate of native/endemic species vegetative cover versus IAS cover : 166,2 ha versus IAS 19 Ha. Ratio 8.75:1</p>	<p>overcome this legal limitations. Measures covered on the strategy action plan will be considered on project site work plans in the next term and are also considered on the ongoing process to prepare management plans for the PA.</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013</p> <p>The local teams identified, based on the document Strategy and Management of alien Invasive Plants, the priority areas of intervention and control techniques of invasive species. The projects sheets have already been prepared and made contacts with the Local Associations for drafting contracts, in order to implementing the planned activities. PN Monte Verde: 6,839 m2 for Lantana camara; 4,231 m2 for Furcraea foetida; 13,632 m2 for Leucaena leucocephala. PN Fogo: 700,000 m2 for Lantana camara; 170,000 m2 to Furcraea foetida and 180,000 m2 for coverage mixta; Cova PN / Paul / R.Torre: 50,000 m2 of Lantana camara. The control of these species contribute to elimination of competition between native and invasive species, in terms of plant nutrients, light, water, soil, allowing the conservation of natural ecosystems and native and / or endemic species.</p>	<p>Comments on indicator application</p> <p>Too much text and explanation. No clear presentation of results achieved to date. Plans are there, but the plans (for specific areas of control) confirm that the indicator is in effect a process indicator for numbers of ha brought under control.</p>	<p>terms of plant nutrients, light, water, soil, allowing the conservation of natural ecosystems and native and / or endemic species.</p>
<p>Outcome 1 Governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system is strengthened</p>			
<p>OUTCOME 1 INDICATOR 1. Increased scores on the UNDP's Financial Sustainability Scorecard for National Systems of Protected Areas over the baseline</p>		<p>Rating: MS</p>	<p>Rating:</p>

<p>Baseline Level Total Score for PA System = 33 out of a total possible score of 197 (i.e. 17%) Refer to [PIR] Annex 4 and 6 respectively for summarized and detailed scores</p> <p>Target Level at end of project Scores, expressed in absolute terms, increase by at least 30%</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2012 UNDP's Financial Sustainability Scorecard was applied during PRODOC formulation. Since management tools and strategies (business plans, management plans, ecotourism plans) for PA are still under preparation, if the Scorecard was applied at this time, there will not be major changes on the results. For this reason, scorecard will be applied again only at mid-term, but methodology and orientations are currently under analysis by project teams with support of UNDP Country Office.</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013 Total Score for PA System = 40 out of a total possible score of 220(i.e. 18%) Refer to Tracking tool/2013 for summarized and detailed scores</p>	<p>Comments on indicator design Straightforward design but the details need care in drafting (see comments below on absolute scores vs percentages). Depends on accurate data being available and used consistently. The baseline wisely refers to a percentage of the total possible score (because total possible score varies between years), but the target level reverts to an increase in absolute terms which rather negates the point of using a % figure. The target is a score of 43 and has already been reached according to the recent application of the tracking tool. It is however only a 1% increase in percentage of maximum score. So the target has already been achieved and yet the Outcome is very far off completion – so the target is too low. A better target would be something like 55% of maximum possible score, which would be a score of 121 on the 2013 form. This is part of standard monitoring for GEF projects and so applying it here (admittedly with targets) seems redundant.</p> <p>Comments on indicator application MTR team find that data in Part 1.2 – Financial Analysis of the National Protected Area System are unconvincing, it is difficult to justify some of the scores if they depend on project run protected areas (because of lack of guaranteed sustainability). Otherwise the form has been completed pretty accurately.</p>	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Financial Sustainability scorecards were applied directly by the project team through working sessions. The final draft was reviewed with support from UNDP country office. Draft quality and completeness is to be appraised by terminal evaluation. The total score obtained for PA system = 64 out of a total possible score of 220 (i.e. 29%) Refer to Tracking tool/2014 for summarized and detailed scores. During the process of gathering information there were many difficulties, as the organization of financial data from the government, NGOs and the private sector at national level are not easily integrated into the organizational structure of the tracking tool.</p>
---	--	---	---

		<p>It would be better to aim for a specific % of the total possible score, rather than a % increase on the baseline, or alternatively to use exactly the same scorecard to avoid complications of new versions of the scorecard.</p> <p>Comments on project progress A lot of reports, proposals and analyses on paper but so far no policy, no decision on institutional setting, and no guaranteed government financial support.</p> <p>The reported drop in “Total annual central government budget allocated to PA management (excluding donor funds and revenues generated for the PA system)” from US\$1,712,527 to US\$577,336 in 2013 is concerning.</p>	
OUTCOME 1 INDICATOR 2. Increased scores on the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard of Protected Areas Management over the baseline		Rating: MS	Rating:
<p>Baseline Level Systemic 9 / 30 (30%) Institutional 18 / 45 (41%) Individual 10 / 21 (46%) (General avg. 37%)(Refer to [PIR] Annex 3 for summarized and detailed scores) Target Level at end of project Scores, expressed in absolute terms, increase by at least 20%</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2012 The UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard for Protected Areas Management was applied during the PRODOC formulation process. Currently a capacity development plan is being delineated and ToRs for specific training are being developed. The different aspects (systemic, institutional and individual) considered on the Capacity Development Scorecard are helping to structure the competencies profile in preparation, for PA management in Cape Verde. Level at 30 June 2013 Systemic 7/ 59 (12%) - Componente 2 Institutional 25/ 90 (28%) - Componente 1 Individual 8/ 71(11%) - Componente 3 (General avg. 17%)(Refer</p>	<p>Comments on indicator design Straightforward as long as the data are accurate and are applied consistently This is part of standard monitoring for GEF projects and so applying it here (admittedly with targets) seems redundant. Comments on indicator application MTR team have been advised that the Capacity Development Scorecard has not yet been completed, so these figures to be ignored. Comments on project progress N/A</p>	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Systemic 20 / 30 (67%) Institutional 30/ 45 (73%) Individual 16 / 21 (83%)</p>

	to Tracking Tool/2013 for summarized and detailed scores)		
Outcome 2 Management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and coastal/marine Pas is enhanced			
OUTCOME 2 INDICATOR 1. Increased scores on the GEF4's PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool "METT" for all seven target sites		Rating: S	Rating:
Baseline Level Scores for target PAs / MPAs [1] MPA S. Negra/C. da Fragata 15 [2] MPA P do Sinó 15 [3] (Complexo das áreas protegidas do Leste da Boa Vista 18) [4] Chã das Caldeiras NP 61 [5] Monte Verde NP 13 [6] Morroços NP 15 [7] Cova/Paúl/R da Torre NP 15 (Refer to [PIR] Annex 6 for complete METT) Target Level at end of project Scores, expressed in absolute terms, increase by at least 30%)	Level at 30 June 2012 GEF IV PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools were applied during PRODOC formulation. Next application is scheduled in the context of the Mid-Term Review, planned for 2013. Level at 30 June 2013 Scores for target PAs / MPAs [1] MPA S. Negra/C. da Fragata/ P.P Santa Maria 51 [2] MPA P do Sinó 51 [3] (Complexo das áreas protegidas do Leste da Boa Vista 51) [4] Chã das Caldeiras NP 62 [5] Monte Verde NP 48 [6] Morroços NP 49 [7] Cova/Paúl/R da Torre NP 50(Refer to Tracking Tool/2013 for complete METT)	Comments on indicator design Straightforward and appropriate as long as the data are accurate and are applied consistently However, this is part of standard monitoring for GEF projects and so applying it here (admittedly with targets) seems redundant. Comments on indicator application Significant increases but many of the increased scores are dependent on established staff and continuity of management presence beyond the end of the project – some explicitly (eg 13 and 14 Staff numbers and Staff training and others implicitly (eg 8, 10 and 12 on Work Plan, Protection Systems and Resource Management). There is no doubt that current funding and management is much improved but the scores do not reflect the fragility of this position. Comments on project progress There is excellent progress but as always, there is a high risk that it will not be sustained. The MTR team understood from project staff at one of the focal PAs that they are highly unlikely to switch to working as government employees in the protected area after the end of the project. Funding will be required to pay salaries, whoever is engaged to work in the focal PAs	PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Scores for target PAs / MPAs: 1. MPA S. Negra/C. da Fragata/ P.P Santa Maria 57. Percentage increase of 280% 2. MPA P do Sinó 51 Percentage increase of 240% 3. Complexo das Áreas protegidas do Leste da Boa Vista 59) Percentage increase of 227% 4. Chã das Caldeiras NP 66 Percentage increase of 8% 5. Monte Verde NP 56 Percentage increase of 330% 6. Morroços NP 55 Percentage increase of 266% 7. Cova/Paúl/R da Torre NP 56 Percentage increase of 273% (Refer to Tracking Tool/2014 for complete METT)

OUTCOME 2 INDICATOR 2. Expansion of the MPA sub-set of the PA estate through the consolidation of smaller areas and an expansion into the sea for fisheries' stock protection (representing 27,754 ha of additional area in reconfiguration of the MPA boundaries on two Islands, Sal and Boavista)		Rating: S	Rating:
Baseline Level Three MPAs have been proposed, with roughly mapped out boundaries, hectareage and borders: (i) MPA Serra Negra/Costa da Fragata, Sal Island; (ii) MPA Ponta do Sinó, Sal Island; (iii) MPA of Eastern Boavista (integrated on the PA Complex of Eastern Boa Vista) Target Level at end of project 3 MPAs effectively established with confirmed hectareage and boundaries	Level at 30 June 2012 The MPA surface expansion of 36,032 ha is embedded in the newly proposed limits for PA. This new delimitation encompasses an expansion of 3 nautical miles off the shoreline, for the 3 MPAs. The delimitation of the MPAs in Boa Vista and Sal island was concluded and mapped and has been submitted for approval and publication in the official Gazette. Level at 30 June 2013 The boundaries demarcations have been completed of marine protected areas on the islands of Boa Vista and Sal, with a growth of 3 nautical miles from the coast. These boundaries demarcations were approved by the Council of Ministers and gazetted, on April 5th and May 9th this year, by decree regulations. The expansion of these MPAs will protect the traditional fishery and its socio-economic impact among fishermen and conservation of marine / coastal, ensuring the sustainability of the National Network of APs.	Comments on indicator design This overlaps Objective Indicator 1. As written it is a process indicator corresponding to Output 2.1. Comments on indicator application Straightforward Comments on project progress The concept of combining management responsibility for these small protected areas is sound and good progress has been made with the management planning and with some management.	PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: The Marine Protected areas of Boavista and Sal island have increased substantially, mainly due to the efforts of this project to go beyond the initial target. The cumulative value of MPA is now 44.056 ha. Communities and public and private institutions participated actively in the whole process. The official publication of PA's and MPA boundaries are legal premises imposed by law for the operationalization of the any protected area.
OUTCOME 2 INDICATOR 3. The management plans are prepared and approved by the institution responsible for PA management in 2013 and are under implementation by the end of the project)		Rating: MS	Rating:
Baseline Level Only Fogo NP has a management plan	Level at 30 June 2012 6 management plans and 7 ecotourism plans (including Fogo) are under currently under preparation. First drafts have been already	Comments on indicator design As above, outcome indicators should measure changes in conditions that affect the objective – usually impacts on threats or impacts on responses	PIR – Level at 30 June 2014: Six management plans and seven ecotourism plans (including Fogo Island), crucial to the operationalization of the PA were approved by the project Technical and Steering Committees at the meetings held in October

<p>Target Level at end of project By the end of the project all target PAs and MPAs have management plans (6 plans) 3 new terrestrial PAs and 3 MPAs</p>	<p>submitted and presented locally for public discussion and review with local partners and stakeholders. Those plans were prepared on the basis of preliminary studies, namely the biodiversity reports, the socio-economic reports, the strategy and action plan for conservation, the carrying capacity analysis; and the strategy to manage IAS. At this moment, the territorial analysis is ongoing to characterize the covered land in terms of biophysical and biological status, as well as to identify conflicting uses and potential usage compabitility and propose specific management measures.</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013 The six drafts of management plans and seven ecotourism plan (including Fogo Island), were socialized and validated with local communities and regional / local authorities, missing its submission to the Steering and Technical Committees for consideration and validation, and then sent to the Government for approval. These plans were developed with the active participation of stakeholders, from basic studies, including reports on biodiversity, socio-economic, plans and conservation strategy, carrying capacity and strategy and management plan of invasive species. These management tools contain strategies and actions that will allow the conservation and protection of natural resources existing in the National Network of Protected Areas.</p>	<p>to threats. Management plans are not impacts – they are outputs and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Comments on indicator application Straightforward given that the indicator is formulated as it is</p>	<p>2013. According to local laws these plans must be approved by the Council of Ministers. Therefore, the project has followed the legal channel and submitted these documents and approval is expected during the 3rd quarter of the current year. As previously stated , the management tools are conceived as a guidelines to conservation efforts and all interventions within the PA including territorial planning. The ecotourism plans designed with an island-wide approach have identified concrete opportunities within each Protected Area and combines the efforts of conservation and the recreational potential of the Protected Areas that can add value to other sectors (i.e. tourism).</p>
<p>Outcome 3 The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas</p>			
<p>OUTCOME 3 INDICATOR 1. Level of compliance with resource and land uses' threshold limits established in the management plans for 4 terrestrial PAs</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>N/A</p>

(includes Fogo) and 3 MPAs (in particular with respect to fuel-wood collection, agriculture, tourism, fisheries, real-estate developments) (See PRODOC Box 3 for a reference)			
<p>Baseline Level</p> <p>Target terrestrial PAs (Fogo; Monte Verde NP; Morroços NP; and Cova/Paúl/R da Torre NP) and MPAs Serra Negra/Costa da Fragata, Ponta do Sinó and Complexo de Áreas Protegidas do Leste de Boa Vista do not yet count on management plans that provide guidance on resource and land uses' threshold limits within and around the areas (Proposed international consultancy as difficult to determine locally)</p> <p>Target Level at end of project</p> <p>a)Tourism : Number of tourist/day MPA B. Vista: 16.000; RN Ponta Sinó: 4.000; RN Serra Negra: 1.000; RN Costa Fragata: 1.000; PN Cova/Paul/Torre: 1.200; PN Morroços: 300; PN Monte Verde: 30; PN Fogo: 2.000 b)Fisheries MSY (Kg/year) MPA Sal: 331.000 c)Animal Husbandry (sheep/goat) MPA B. Vista: 2.000; PN Cova/Paul/Torre: 4.000; PN Morroços: 350; PN Monte Verde: 750; PN Fogo: 6.000 d)Agriculture (Ha) MPA B. Vista: 875; PN Cova/Paul/Torre:1.536;</p>	<p>Level at 30 June 2012</p> <p>Carrying capacity levels for tourism, real-estate, fisheries, agriculture and animal husbandry have been defined, using capacity thresholds and methodological guidelines by Cifuentes for tourism and by Schaefer and Fox's Model for fisheries. All compliance issues related to the proposed carrying capacity thresholds are adequately addressed in the management, business and ecotourism plans. Acknowledging the challenges of monitoring multi-sectoral compliance levels internal technical discussions are ongoing to propose a "SMARTer" indicator that could be actually measurable during the project implementation period.</p> <p>Level at 30 June 2013</p> <p>A document was elaborated on the definition and evaluation of the carrying capacity of ecosystems at the site of the project intervention in the domains of tourism, fishing, agriculture and livestock. This document was analyzed by the Technical Committee and approved by the Steering Committee at its last meeting held on 24 May. The drafts of management and ecotourism plans incorporate limits carrying capacity recommended, which will allow management of natural resources according to the principles of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Comments on indicator design</p> <p>Extremely poor link to the outcome (only goes as far as inclusion in a management plan), and levels of compliance sounds like a top down measure. Displays poor understanding of limits to use. It is impossible to simplify to the extent done so in this indicator and its targets</p> <p>A better indicator for Outcome 3 might be Number of advisory council decisions that promote sustainable development within each protected area.</p> <p>Comments on indicator application</p> <p>Achievement of the target has not and cannot be verified. Just more text.</p> <p>Comments on project progress</p> <p>Good progress has been made in engaging community groups and local government in and around the focal protected areas. It has been one of the strong points of the project. This indicator is totally extraneous to the outcome and in no way reflects the progress achieved.</p>	<p>PIR – Level at 30 June 2014:</p> <p>The limits of sustainable use of the available resources within each protected area were studied. This document was reviewed at the technical and steering committees and relevant contributions were incorporated before the final approval. This document has since been submitted to the Ministry of Environment to be finally adopted. The definition of the limit of sustainable use for different PAs has not been an easy task considering the information gap and the inconsistency of the available data. Nevertheless, methodologies were defined and validated. However, as new data become available the limits of sustainable use of the natural resources within these Protected Areas can be reviewed. During the operationalization on of protected areas, with the implementation of management and ecotourism plans, monitoring and evaluation mechanism of the limits of carrying capacity and will be created and thresholds revise and updated, when appropriate.</p>

PN Moroços: 17; PN Monte Verde: 90; PN Fogo: 2.114			
--	--	--	--

Annex 10: Tracking tools and Scorecards

Annex 11: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

<p>Evaluators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded. 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results. 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle. 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported. 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth. 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations. 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
<p align="center">Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁰</p> <p>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</p> <p>Name of Consultant: _____</p> <p>Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____</p> <p>I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.</p> <p>Signed at <u>(place)</u> on <u>date</u></p> <p>Signature: _____</p>