

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1620	
GEF Agency project ID		PIMS: 2053	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities	
Country/Countries		Seychelles	
Region		Sub-Saharan Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP 2: Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	
Executing agencies involved		Seychelles Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultations & co-financing	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations & co-financing	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		18 October 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		18 December 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		31 December 2013	
Actual date of project completion		30 June 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.3	NA
	Co-financing	.07	NA
GEF Project Grant		3.6	3.6
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	3.009	1.688
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	.624
	Private sector	2	.664
	NGOs/CSOs	2.617950	2.0385
Total GEF funding		3.9	3.6
Total Co-financing		7.69695	3.728
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.596950	7.328
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2015	
Author of TE		James Lenoci	
TER completion date		November 23 rd , 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		S	--	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	--	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	--	S
Quality of Execution		S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective was to "improve the systemic and institutional capacities for mainstreaming biodiversity management into production activities by strengthening policies, the legal framework, and cross-sectoral institutional capabilities" (TE p.11). This was part of a broader goal to secure the functional integrity of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems of the Seychelles, which is a repository of globally significant biodiversity (PD p.30).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (p.30), the development objective for the project is "for biodiversity conservation objectives to be integrated into key production sectors of the economy", thereby enabling continued economic growth. In order to do so, the project focused on three main outcomes:

Outcome 1: Systemic and institutional capacities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors are strengthened;

Outcome 2: Methods and means for integrating biodiversity and artisanal fisheries management are in place;

Outcome 3: The tourism industry is addressing biodiversity conservation as part of good practice in business operations.

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the project as relevant due to its good alignment with the Seychelles’ national priorities as well as GEF-4 strategic priorities under the biodiversity program. Similarly, this TER rates relevance as satisfactory.

This project was very well aligned to the Seychelles’ national priorities regarding biodiversity protection. At the project design phase between 2006 and 2008, the government of the Seychelles was already committed to biodiversity conservation. Indeed, the Seychelles was the second country to approve the Convention on Biodiversity, and already had a large and well-established protected areas (PA) network (PD p.38). Environmental concerns were also embedded in the country’s constitution through Article 38¹ and the country’s efforts in biodiversity conservation were largely guided by the second Environment Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS) 2000-2010 (PD p.14). A number of other national policies and plans were in place that related to biodiversity, including the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan (1997), which addressed biodiversity issues in the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity (PD p.14).

More recently, in 2016, the Seychelles launched the concept of the Blue Economy, a mechanism to realize sustainable economic development based around an ocean-based economy. Indeed, Seychelles’ intention is to implement the Blue Economy concept at the national level as a framework to foster an integrated approach for sustainable development programmes (Commonwealth Online, TE pp.31-32).

The project was also highly consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy and Operational Programme 2 for the Biodiversity Focal Area: Coastal and Marine Environments. The project concentrated on GEF Strategic Priority 2 - Mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors (PD p.37). Indeed, the project addressed several elements of the GEF strategy:

1. Strengthening policy to accommodate biodiversity management needs in production activities
2. Integrating biodiversity conservation objectives into spatial and sectoral planning systems;

¹ Article 38 of the Constitution of Seychelles states that it is “the right of every person to live in and enjoy a clean, healthy, and ecologically balanced environment,” and that that the state undertakes the responsibility of taking measures to protect, preserve, and improve the environment and to ensure the judicious and sustainable usage and management of Seychelles’ natural resources

3. Addressing barriers to the uptake of biodiversity production systems in key production sectors, in particular by strengthening management capacities at the systemic and institutional levels;
4. Establishing schemes (i.e. certification initiatives) to recognize good practices at the enterprise level; and
5. Demonstrating good production practices at the site level and engendering replication.

(PD p.37)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory, with outcomes 1 and 2 receiving a rating of satisfactory, and outcome 3 receiving a rating of moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates the overall project effectiveness to have been satisfactory, with the project having successfully developed a fisheries management plan for the Mahé Plateau, developed land use plans for 25 districts and helped develop the Seychelles Sustainability Tourism Label (SSTL) initiative. In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved those outcomes:

Overall Objective: Biodiversity conservation is integrated into key production sectors of the economy

As a result of the project, 42,260 km² have been improved or have had their conservation status increased. This success was largely due to the improved management of the demersal fisheries across the Mahé Plateau, the final management plan of which was being finalized at the time the TE was written. This surpasses the project target for the first objective-level indicator.

The second objective-level indicator called for a 100% increase in investments from production sectors in collaborative sustainable management models. This has not yet been achieved, but according to the TE, “with the upcoming implementation of the Mahé Plateau fisheries management plan, there will be likely considerably more investment from the fisheries sector” (TE p.24).

Outcome 1: Systemic and institutional capacities for the mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors are strengthened

The project appears to have successfully developed the necessary conditions to support biodiversity mainstreaming in the Seychelles. This was done through the following activities:

1. **Legal reform:** substantive contributions were made to the drafting of proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act and the Physical Planning Act. As of

2015, the two bills still had not been enacted. The project also supported the development of a draft Biodiversity Policy.

2. **Regulatory reform:** the project developed 25 district-level land use plans in the country for the three main islands. Those land use plans represented “noteworthy achievements” (TE p.25) and have been used as the basis for new Seychelles Strategic Plan. 2 of those 25 plans have been approved and gazetted, with others pending endorsement of the Cabinet of Ministers.

Following the development of those new land use plans, on the Seychelles’ three main islands, a total of 5,470 ha (26.8% of total land area) are now classified as ‘protected for conservation purposes’, and 7,066 ha (34.6%) are classified as ‘sustainable use of forest resources. In total, 12,536 ha (61%) of land area are under some type of protected classification.

3. **Capacity and knowledge building:** Activities were held to build capacity and knowledge in the areas of cyber-tracking, biodiversity inventory and caring capacity. In addition, an environmental education workshop was organised for NGOs and civil society to strengthen their capacities in conducting education and awareness campaigns related to biodiversity. (TE p.26)

Outcome 2: Methods and means for integrating biodiversity and artisanal fisheries management are in place

The most noteworthy achievement under this outcome has been “the development and implementation of a pilot collaborative fisheries management of the demersal fisheries encompassing a 611.7 km² area, surrounding the Islands of Praslin and La Digue (...) The project facilitated the establishment of the Praslin Fishers Association (PFA) and provided extensive assistance to the PFA over the past few years, including helping them form the Praslin Fishers Co-Management Coordination Committee, procurement of monitoring equipment and cool boxes, training, preparation of a photograph-based fish identification guide, and development of a Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) protocol, with the assistance of an international expert”(TE p.27). At project end, 93% of fishermen were registered members of the PFA.

This co-management pilot was then followed up by the development of a fisheries management plan for the Mahé Plateau, covering 41,400 km. Those management plans were prepared using the ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) principles, and implementation will be collaborative.

Outcome 3: The tourism industry is addressing biodiversity conservation as part of good practice in business operations

In order to realize this outcome, the project worked on two activities. First, it assisted the Tourism Department in strengthening and launching the Seychelles Sustainability Tourism Label (SSTL). The project “was instrumental in getting the SSTL programme off the ground, including supporting expert assistance in developing the supporting materials, and training programmes” (TE p.28). The SSTL program aims to encourage tourism enterprises in Seychelles to mainstream sustainability practices into their business operations to safeguard the biodiversity and culture of the Seychelles. By project end, only 5 hotels had achieved SSTL certification, short of the target of 15 hotels. According to the TE, this underachievement is probably due to weak marketing efforts from the SSTL initiative.

The second activity under this outcome has been the support of interventions demonstrating biodiversity conservation through partnerships between private tourism operators and NGOs. 11 such demonstrations were set up, some of which produced replicable models and facilitated “continued cooperation between tourism operators and NGOs” (TE p.31).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately unsatisfactory as financial management appears to have been poor, and certain activities were implemented late.

According to the TE, project management costs for this project amounted to about 24%, “much higher than the 10% project management threshold typical GEF-financed projects (the project management threshold for GEF-6 projects is 5%)” (TE pp.18-19). This was due to a misallocation of project costs and expenditures along project components, as well as to high levels of inflation that took place in the Seychelles during 2008 to 2010 (TE p.20). The 1.5-year project extension also resulted in disproportionately higher project management costs (TE p.32). The TE also reports that “the delay in the closure of the project also meant that certain activities were delivered rather late in the process, including preparation of the fisheries management plan for the Mahé Plateau and several of the 11 demonstration activities, thus limited time was available for consultation and for monitoring of implementation of some of these activities.” (TE p.32) Those efficiency issues do not appear to have affected project outcomes as the project was still able to deliver expected results.

A cost-benefit analysis was not done for the project, and this TER is therefore unable to assess the extent to which the outcomes achieved were done so in a cost-effective manner.

The TE rates relevance as moderately likely largely due to the limited financing that has so far been extended by the Government to continue supporting project activities. This TER agrees with this rating, and notes that the outputs produced by the project so far will form a solid framework to further expand the scope and effectiveness of biodiversity mainstreaming in the Seychelles going forward.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely

The TE rates the likelihood of financial risks to sustainability as moderately likely.

While the willingness of the private sector to invest in conservation was demonstrated through the partnerships supported between tourism operators and NGOs, very few long-term partnerships have been finalized and no private funds have been confirmed going forward. The financing mechanisms for some of the initiatives set up as part of this project are still unclear, including those for the Praslin Fishers Association and the Seychelles Sustainability Tourism Label (SSTL) program. Finally, the TE reports the IMF's debt restructuring programme in the Seychelles is creating restrictions on public spending (TE p.35).

On the upside, the Government is considering the potential of Blue Bonds to raise funds to support the implementation of the fisheries management plans (TE p.34) but nothing had been confirmed when the TE was written. In 2013, the Government introduced a mandatory corporate social responsibility (CSR) tax scheme, which has the potential to facilitate biodiversity mainstreaming, although there have not yet been any guidelines issues on how the revenue would be allocated (TE p.37). While there is no certainty that the Blue Bonds or the CSR tax revenue will materialize and support biodiversity conservation, this at least demonstrates the commitment of the Government to come up with financing mechanisms. In the meanwhile, the business case for the SSTL program has been made and showcased, and the Seychelles Fishing Authority is providing financial support to the Praslin Fisher's Association.

Overall, most of the financing required to maintain initiatives developed as part of the project appears somewhat precarious, but will likely materialize through a patchwork of sources and initiatives.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates the likelihood of socio-economic risks to sustainability as moderately likely.

Given the importance of fishing and tourism to the Seychellois economy, it appears likely that the Government will pursue their efforts to maintain the conservation efforts in those industries. In addition, and as mentioned above, the government is actively looking for financing options to continue project initiatives, demonstrating good political commitment to the project.

The local population also appears to be on board with the project and to be benefiting from it. The TE reports that "over the course of the project's lifespan, the membership of the PFA has remained rather

robust, indicating that the organization might be viable. Since the PFA was formed, a separate association has formed at La Digue, and the Fishing Boat Owners Association (FBOA) based in Mahé continue to strive to represent their members, who are fishing throughout the Mahé Plateau. Some stakeholders indicated concern that the Seychelles is too small to support a number of fishers associations. It will take time before certain social truces are established among the associations.” (TE p.37)

Finally, the likelihood of success is enhanced by the work of the non-governmental sector, which has been active contributors to this project and will “remain important innovation drivers in the Seychelles” (TE p.43).

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates the likelihood of institutional/governance risks to sustainability as moderately likely.

The project appears to have successfully developed the necessary conditions to support biodiversity mainstreaming in the Seychelles. Among other accomplishments, substantive contributions were made to the drafting of proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act and the Physical Planning Act. The project also supported the development of a draft Biodiversity Policy. While those acts and policies had not been enacted as of project completion, their enactment appears likely. The amended Fisheries Act, enacted in 2014, now includes a provision for collaborative management (TE p.37). Overall, institutional risks appear low.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates the likelihood of environmental risks to sustainability as moderately likely.

There are important environmental risks threatening the tourism and fisheries sector in the Seychelles. “Along with other Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the Seychelles are particularly vulnerable to climate change. The expected global sea level rise poses risks to coastal communities and livelihoods, including within the tourism sector. Impacts to coral reefs and fisheries through warming of the ocean and ocean acidification will also have negative economic effects in the Seychelles” (TE p.39). That being said, this only reinforces the importance of biodiversity conservation as promoted in the project, and would most likely act as an added incentive to pursue the initiatives developed as part of the project.

Overall Assessment

The project has achieved a great deal, and “the substantive outputs produced under the project provide enabling frameworks for further expanding the scope and effectiveness of biodiversity mainstreaming” (TE p.34). Project accomplishments so far, including the fisheries management plan for the Mahé plateau and the land use plans devised, will ensure that much of the progress that was accomplished during the project will be maintained following the end of GEF funding. However, funding for the continuation of project activities going forward remains uncertain.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

\$7.6 million in co-financing were pledged, including about \$3 million from the Government, \$2.6 million from environmental NGOs and 2 million from the private sector (TE p.11). Unfortunately, virtually none of the private sector co-financing from the Seychelles Hospitality and Tourism Association (SHTA) came through, and only about 50% of the Government co-financing was provided.

On the upside, \$0.664 million in co-financing was mobilized after project approved. The European Union, through the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) initiative, provided this funding with the "condition that the Government enact revised Environmental Protection and Physical Planning bills" (TE p.21).

The TE and the MTR do not ever mention the lower than expected co-financing having had negative impacts on project outcomes.

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

The original project closing date of 31 December 2013 was extended by 1-1/2 years, to 30 June 2015. This enabled for more project outcomes to be realized, but increased the percentage of project funds that had to be devoted to project management.

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

Country ownership for this project is assessed to have been moderate.

On the one hand, the Government is considering the potential of using Blue Bonds to raise funds to support the implementation of the fisheries management plans (TE p.34) and introduced a mandatory corporate social responsibility (CSR) tax scheme with the potential to facilitate biodiversity mainstreaming, although there are not yet any guidelines issues on allocating the revenue (TE p.37). While those financing mechanisms have not been implemented yet, they demonstrate the commitment of the Government to come up with financing mechanisms. The TE also reports relevant country representatives having been heavily involved in the project.

On the flipside, Government participation at Project Steering Committee meetings was low, and the Government has not yet approved the legislative reforms proposed as part of the project,

nor is there a clear plan for the approval of the remaining 23 district-level land use plans that are still pending. Finally, Government co-financing was only about 50% of the expected amount.

(TE p.33)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. Instead, this TER rates M&E design as moderately satisfactory due to a low M&E budget and the many flaws in the project's logical framework.

The M&E and logical result frameworks (PD pp.57-59, 76-80) presented in the Project Document provide detailed explanations of the planned monitoring and evaluation activities for the project as well as indicators, means of verification, baseline data, a work plan and a budget for M&E activities. While the M&E appears to have been systematically prepared and included all required components, the budget allocated for M&E activities was quite low, representing only about 2.5% of the GEF grant (TE p.22).

The TE reports that the baseline information referenced in the logical framework was incomplete. However, this issue only appears to concern a single figure – the baseline figure of \$295,600 in private sector investment. On the other hand, this TER finds that some of the indicators defined were somewhat vague. For example, on PD p.57, the objective-level indicator chosen is “area of terrestrial and marine ecosystems under improved management or heightened conservation status”, providing no clear definition for the meaning of ‘under improved management’. That being said, most indicators did meet the SMART criteria, and an effort was clearly made for the logframe to meet best practice standards.

Finally, the TE criticizes the logical framework for having generally set target figures that were too ambitious (TE p.12), and needed to be revised at mid-term.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately unsatisfactory due to the lack of evidence of adaptive management having taken place during the project.

The project “did a good job with reporting, producing informative quarterly reports (which were improved after the midterm review), and the annual project implementation reviews (PIRs). The PIRs included detailed narrative discussion of progress made towards the results-based indicators established to assess project performance” (TE p.22). A mid-term evaluation was conducted, albeit somewhat late in the project (after the 4th year of a 6 year project). The mid-term evaluation was taken very seriously, with “an extensive management response, making several adjustments” (TE p.22) having been developed as a response. However, only a few of the recommendations ended up being addressed. Finally, there is no evidence that any of the M&E evidence generated as part of the project was really used for adaptive management despite the overall good function of the M&E system throughout the project.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP’s quality of implementation for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER also rates it as satisfactory due to the UNDP’s comparative advantage in implementing biodiversity projects in the Seychelles and the UNDP’s active participation throughout the project.

The UNDP already had extensive experience working in the Seychelles and had a good standing with key national project stakeholders, including the Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change. The UNDP had already acted as the implementing agency for other GEF projects related to biodiversity in the country.

The TE reports “the UNDP country office was actively involved throughout the process, including participation in Steering Committee meetings, providing input and recommendations in the project implementation reviews, and supporting procurement of certain support, including international consultants. The UNDP-GEF regional technical advisor for biodiversity was also proactively engaged in the process, providing valuable guidance at the inception phase, during transitions of project managers, during the midterm review process, and also on an ad hoc basis.” (TE p.23)

However, the TE criticizes the UNDP for a weakness in project design, namely the fact that the project did not sufficiently focus on developing and piloting incentive mechanisms for the conservation activities

targeted in the project (TE p.46). Regardless, project outcomes ended up being satisfactorily accomplished.

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

The executing agency for this project was the Seychelles Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change (MEECC). In the TE, the MEECC’s quality of execution for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to the staffing issues, late execution, M&E implementation and efficiency issues that affected the project, but recognizing the overall smooth project execution and good adaptive management displayed by the executing team.

The TE reports “project management and coordination effectiveness was a particular significant strength of the project. This project required proactive management and administration, in order to steward the work among four different governmental partners, including the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Land Use and Housing, the Seychelles Fishing Authority, and the Tourism Department.” (TE p.44). Indeed, the TE describes the project team as having displayed great adaptive management abilities, notably for having been able to adapt to changes in external circumstances and priorities among project stakeholders (TE p.17).

However, the TE also describes how the 2008 downsizing in the Seychelles public sector resulted in fewer staff members being available to work on this project, and how they “were hard pressed to contribute as much time to the GEF-financed project as originally envisaged” (TE pp.44-45). The TE also describes that several activities were delivered late, “including preparation of the fisheries management plan for the Mahé Plateau, the monitoring control and surveillance protocol for the Praslin Fisheries Co-Management Plan, the biodiversity policy, and some of demonstration activities were started in the second half of last year, 2014. This late delivery diminishes the likelihood that results will be sustained, as there was limited time for consultation, monitoring, and evaluation, and for distilling lessons learned from these activities and outputs.” (TE p.45)

In addition, there has been substantial staff turnaround, with 3 different project managers having been in post over the 7.5-year timeframe of the project. However, according to the TE, “, there was no evidence of significant loss of continuity on this project as a result of the project manager transitions” (TE p.16).

Finally, and as mentioned in the M&E and efficiency sections above, the project failed to use the M&E evidence generated for adaptive management, and the project was not particularly efficiently implemented.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There have only been negligible verifiable improvements in ecological status as a result of the project. Indeed, the legislative reforms planned will need to be enacted, and the land use plans will have to be approved and implemented before any environmental impact materializes. That being said, “the development of the Mahé Plateau fisheries management plan, applying ecosystems approach to fisheries management principles, is a significant step towards stress/status change, across a broad seascape scale of more than 41,000 km²” (TE p.41).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No socioeconomic change has been reported as part of this project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Activities were held to build capacity and knowledge in the areas of cyber-tracking, biodiversity inventory and caring capacity. In addition, an environmental education workshop was organised for NGOs and civil society to strengthen their capacities in conducting education and awareness campaigns related to biodiversity. (TE p.26)

The project also facilitated establishment of the Praslin Fishers Association (PFA) and provided extensive assistance to the PFA over the past few years, including helping them form the Praslin Fishers Co-Management Coordination Committee, procurement of monitoring equipment and

cool boxes, training, preparation of a photograph-based fish identification guide, and development of a Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) protocol, with the assistance of an international expert (TE p.27). At project end, 93% of fishermen were registered members of the PFA.

Finally, the project assisted the Tourism Department in strengthening and launching the Seychelles Sustainability Tourism Label (SSTL). Indeed the project “was instrumental in getting the SSTL programme off the ground, including supporting expert assistance in developing the supporting materials, and training programmes” (TE p.28).

b) Governance

Substantive contributions were made to the drafting of proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act and the Physical Planning Act. However, as of 2015, the two bills still had not been enacted. The project also supported the development of a draft Biodiversity Policy. Once enacted, those will strengthen the governance framework regarding sustainability in the Seychelles. (TE p. 15, 24)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

Not unintended impacts were reported as part of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The pilot collaborative management arrangements developed as part of the program were designed to provide a model for replication in other areas of the Seychelles as well as internationally. The demonstration of partnerships between NGOs and the private sector were made with the explicit purpose of encouraging replication. (PD p.42)

Nonetheless, at project end, there was no evidence of replication or scaling up having taken place.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The report presents the following good practices and lessons learned:

Good Practices

1. Productive linkages with other GEF-financed projects

There have been productive linkages built between the GEF-financed biodiversity projects, sharing resources and exchanging experiences.

2. Coordination unit offers experienced and central support

The programme coordination unit provides a suite of centralized and experienced support to the implementation of the GEF-financed projects; including technical advisory services, procurement, financial management, communications, human resources, and general administration.

3. Posting consultants in government stakeholder offices enhances country ownership and sustainability

Posting project consultants in the offices of the counterpart government agencies is a good practice, which enhances country ownership and also enhances sustainability. Such arrangements provide regular opportunities for involvement of agency staff members, and enables valuable ad hoc discussions.

4. Constructive adaptation to disruptions caused by exogenous conditions

The project was successful at adapting to a number of disruptions, many of which were caused by exogenous conditions. For example, concurrent with the inception of the project the public sector in the Seychelles underwent significant downsizing, as part of the IMF-backed support. This time also coincided with a global economic downturn, starting in 2008, which seriously impacted the tourism sector in the country.

5. Project management training for the project manager

The project manager participated in project management training shortly after starting her post.

Lessons Learned

1. Stakeholder involvement should be tailored to the intended outcomes

Stakeholder involvement for the activities associated with the envisaged amendment of the Environmental Protection Act and the Physical Planning Act were mostly experts and government agency officials specialised in drafting of legal acts. The process involved in achieving approval and ultimately enactment of the bills requires additional stakeholders, including ones experienced in

lobbying and mediation. Similarly, the efforts implemented for promoting approval of the district-level land use plans were led by planners, and there was limited involvement in stakeholders experienced in social mobilisation, as well as lobbying and mediation. Stakeholder involvement should be tailored to the intended outcomes.

2. Inter-sectoral linkages need to be worked out for biodiversity mainstreaming initiatives

Biodiversity mainstreaming requires collaboration of administrative, strategic, and regulatory functions among relevant sectoral stakeholders. For example, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the fisheries sector should include a clear role by the environmental protection authority; in this case it might be the Seychelles National Park Authority (SNPA), which is under the Ministry of Environment, which is the focal agency for biodiversity in the country.

3. The non-governmental sector continues to drive change and introduce innovation to biodiversity conservation in the Seychelles

The results of the project showcased the critical role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have with respect to biodiversity conservation in the country, including introducing innovative techniques and management arrangements, and advocating for legal and institutional reform.

4. Sustainability structures should be built into project design, including cofinancing allocation

Experience within the GEF portfolio shows that considerable time is required, possibly decades, for realising verifiable impact of biodiversity mainstreaming. Sufficient resources for monitoring and evaluation should be factored into mainstreaming projects.

For example, it would be sensible to advocate for some of the cofinancing streams to flow after the GEF funding timeframe, in order to support required post-project monitoring and evaluation.

5. Project cofinancing partners should receive instruction on tracking and reporting contributions realized

At project inception, clear instructions should be delivered to cofinancing partners regarding tracking and reporting cofinancing contributions.

6. Project managers should be better informed of institutional mainstreaming knowledge among the GEF portfolio of projects

There is a wealth of knowledge among the GEF biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio of projects. It would be advisable to support project managers in identifying opportunities to remain informed of lessons learned and best practices.

(TE pp.49-50)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project:

1. A sustainability strategy should be prepared, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Prepare a “road map” for achieving the legislative reforms that were not realized by the end of the project, indicating roles and responsibilities, and also identify where external support might be warranted to facilitate the process;
 - b. Request the MLUH to identify a “champion” for managing the process of updating the land use plans and achieving district-level approval, and similarly, prepare a road map for achieving approval;
 - c. Describe how the finalization of the biodiversity policy will be managed, as this policy might not be completed and approved by the end of the project in June;
 - d. Outline the processes required for finalization and approval of the Mahé Plateau fisheries management plan and the Praslin Fisheries monitoring control and surveillance protocol;
 - e. Request the relevant partner ENGOs to develop recommendations for post-project monitoring of ongoing and uncompleted activities at the demonstration sites. The recommendations should indicate roles and responsibilities, include estimated costs associated with the monitoring activities, and describe how the monitoring results will be reported.
 - f. In the case of the demonstration activity with Matelot de Praslin and Wildlife Club, outline recommendations for mitigation measures, and evaluate if there is a legal basis to claim back funds due to lack of delivery.
2. Relevant stakeholders should rationalize land use classification protocol and update the land use plans accordingly. The current land use classifications used in the plans developed with support of the project should be synergized with possible changes or additional categories introduced in the Seychelles Strategic Plan, and planners should also decide how to represent the Sustainable Use (IUCN VI) category documented in the Seychelles’ Protected Areas Policy (October 2013), e.g., possibly for the key biodiversity areas (KBAs).
3. Results and lessons learned of case studies should be consolidated into informative case studies, and disseminated locally, regionally (e.g., with support of the UNDP country offices, the Indian Ocean Commission, or in collaboration with other fora), and globally (e.g., through the Small Island Developing States Network (SIDSnet), or in collaboration with other fora).
4. Request the MLUH and MEECC to prepare a synopsis outlining the substantive changes recommended in the draft Environmental Protection Bill and Physical Planning Bill, in relation to the currently in-force acts.
5. In the Biodiversity Policy under preparation, linkages amount relevant stakeholder groups should be mapped out; for example, showing which stakeholders are responsible for setting conservation objectives for areas under biodiversity mainstreaming and carrying out monitoring and updated biodiversity assessments in those areas, and what are the interfaces with land use planners resource management authorities, enforcement agencies, and NGOs.

6. With respect to land use planning, it would be advisable to identify which areas are slated for biodiversity mainstreaming, and develop specific conservation objectives, incentive mechanisms, and regulations specifically for such areas that are privately owned. The aim of the incentives should be to encourage conservation of ecological values through conservation easements, transfer of development rights, special augmentation of existing zoning, tax breaks, payment for ecosystem service, or other scheme.
7. As part of the monitoring, control, and surveillance programme for the targeted fisheries under biodiversity mainstreaming, socio-economic data should be monitored in addition to biophysical parameters, to enable evaluation of the progress of the mainstreaming efforts. It would also be advisable to carry out monitoring at areas not covered by the mainstreaming efforts, in order to allow assessment of whether external factors, such as the state of the economy, climate change impacts, etc., are influencing performance.
8. In terms of financial sustainability of artisanal fishers associations, supply chain analyses should be carried out, including local buyers such as hotels and restaurants. These analyses might be done in collaboration with the Fishing Boat Owners Association (FBOA), which as part of their Responsible Fishing programme, is developing a fish centre on Mahé to facilitate trade with local buyers.
9. Marketing of the SSTL programme should be strengthened, e.g., presenting the business case benefits of pursuing SSTL certification, through for example cost savings achieved by more efficient use of energy and water, by sourcing more food locally, and by implementing improved waste management programmes. These marketing efforts could be supported by preparing knowledge products (e.g., case studies) using some of the results of the demonstration activities sponsored by the project.
10. The information management systems supported by the project should be summarized; including the biodiversity database hosted by the National Herbarium, the shark database, etc. The summary should indicate responsible managers of these systems, estimated costs to maintain them, possible funding sources, and interfaces with other information systems, including the national clearinghouse mechanism.
11. The project financial expenditure records should be reviewed and a note-to-file prepared explaining possible misallocations across outcomes and project management cost centres. The adjusted financial expenditure summary should be included among the material provided to the independent financial auditor when the 2015 results are audited.

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives:

12. Biodiversity mainstreaming should be extended to the agriculture and forestry sectors, by upgrading relevant policies and legislation, developing incentive schemes, and piloting activities involving conservation agriculture, sustainable forest management, agroforestry, and other relevant initiatives.
13. Under the fisheries partnership agreement between the EU and the Government of Seychelles, a significant portion of the financial contribution from the EU is earmarked for support of the fisheries sector of Seychelles. It would be advisable to develop specific plans to follow up the results under Outcome 2, and advocate for support under this partnership agreement.
14. As general recommendations for similar GEF-financed mainstreaming projects:
 - a. Some of the cofinancing streams should be advocated to flow after the GEF project closes, to support post-project monitoring and evaluation;

- b. Project managers should receive training in biodiversity mainstreaming and be made more aware of lessons learned and ongoing activities within the GEF corporate portfolio.

(TE pp.47-48)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Really good breakdown of results by objectives and 3 outcomes, referring to the logframe indicators and clearly discussing project performance against those.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and good evidence and examples are provided to substantiate most claims. Ratings are well explained.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The discussion of sustainability is extremely thorough, and all types of risks are assessed.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are consistent with the evidence provided in the report and appear to be comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Detailed budget figures, in total and per activity, are provided. Co-financing used figures are provided.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	A thorough analysis of the M&E framework at the design stage, as well as a good description of M&E activities having taken place are provided.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

- <http://thecommonwealth.org/project/seychelles-blue-economy-strategic-roadmap-and-implementation#sthash.IBew6hT2.dpuf>
- <http://natureneedshalf.org/seychelles/>