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

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	3925
GEF Agency project ID	4190 (PIMS)
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-4
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Strengthening Seychelles' protected area system through NGO management modalities
Country/Countries	Seychelles
Region	Africa
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	SO1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems SP2: Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems SP3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks
Executing agencies involved	Ministry of Environment and Energy
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Through consultations
Private sector involvement	Through consultations
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	December 2010
Effectiveness date / project start	February 2011
Expected date of project completion (at start)	June 2015
Actual date of project completion	June 2015

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.054	.054
	Co-financing	0.11	NA
GEF Project Grant		2.1	2.6
Co-financing	IA own	0	0.02
	Government	1.5	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	NA
	Private sector	0.54	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	1.22	NA
Total GEF funding		2.16	2.65
Total Co-financing		3.37	2.67
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.52	5.32

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	March 2015
Author of TE	Veronica Nyawira Muthui
TER completion date	December 8,2016
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	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	--	L
M&E Design		S	--	S
M&E Implementation		S	--	S
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Execution		MU	--	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

> The objective as stated in the Project Document (p.31) is "to demonstrate effective models for protected area management by non-governmental organizations in the Seychelles, and enable their inclusion into a strengthened protected area system."

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

> The overall development goal for the project is to "facilitate working partnerships between diverse government and non-government partners in the planning and management of the protected area system in Seychelles" (PD p.31).

> This project will be accomplished through the following two components:

> - **Component 1**: Strengthened management framework for protected areas in Seychelles
> - **Component 2:** Expanded and strengthened management of protected areas in Seychelles

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 with 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. The government of the Seychelles was already committed to biodiversity conservation prior to project start. 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. Environmental concerns were also embedded in the country's constitution through Article 38[1] 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.26). At project start, the Seychelles had 21 formal protected areas covering a total area of 56,508 ha (TE p.3).

As described in the Project Document, "the project outcomes, outputs and activities are very closely aligned with policy objectives 3.1 and 3.2 of the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan* (NBSAP, 1998). Under these policy objectives, the project will seek to: (i) support the design of a more representative terrestrial and marine protected area system; (ii) guide the preparation of policy directions that would enable a more participative approach in the establishment and administration of the protected area system by state, NGOs, community-based organisations, natural resource users and private sector partners; (iii) improve the legislative and regulatory framework, and the institutional capacities, to facilitate the implementation of these policy directions; and (iv) assist in the establishment and management of protected areas under different NGO and private sector management regimes." (PD p.26)

The project is equally well aligned with GEF-4 strategic objectives for the biodiversity focal area. It contributes to strategic program 2 (Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems) by supporting the development of new or the improvement of existing marine protected areas. It contributes to strategic program 3 (Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks) by supporting the development of new or the improvement of existing marine protected areas. (PD pp.24-25)

---

[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

| 4.2 **Effectiveness** | Rating: **Satisfactory** |

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory as "the project has delivered on most of its original plans and built a partnership for PA management that includes Government Agencies, ENGOs, and the Private Sector in managing PAs; effectively tackling the two barriers it was established to remove" (TE p.4). This TER agrees with this assessment. In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved its objectives.

The project successfully led to the expansion of the protected area system in the Seychelles. The gazettement of the D'Arros Protected Area added 5,313 hectares of protected areas, and that of Morne Seychellois 69.32 hectares. Several other protected areas were, at the time the TE was written, close to being entered into legislation: Aldabra, Dennis, and North Island. Finally, management effectiveness scores were increased in 2 out of 4 reserves, and capacity-building targets were achieved everywhere.

Component 1: Strengthened management framework for protected areas in Seychelles

Under this component, the project aimed to strengthen the national framework for PA management. As a result of the project, 6 new IBAs (Important Bird Areas) were created, and the Cabinet officially endorsed the new Seychelles National Protected Areas Policy in October 2013. It was launched by the Minister of Environment and Energy of the Seychelles in March 2014 (TE p.34). Both state and donor funding for PAs were substantially increased (from $120,000 per year to $2,400,000 per year), and the planned capacity-building exercises took place. Most targets under this outcome have been exceeded, met or almost met. (TE pp.33-35)

Component 2: Expanded and strengthened management of protected areas in Seychelles

Under, this component, the project aimed to test new approaches to PA conservation and management in the Seychelles. As part of the project, the efficacy of new coral reef restoration techniques were successfully tested and an approach to the protection of critical habitats of whale sharks and turtles was tested. The Aldabra special reserve was expanded and its management was strengthened. The privately owned islands of Denis and North are ready to be designated as PAs (pending legislation), and habitat has been restored on each island. Finally, the design and functioning of Cousin Island Special Reserve have been improved to meet both conservation and fisheries management objectives. Most targets under this outcome have been exceeded, met or almost met. (TE pp.36-39)

| 4.3 **Efficiency** | Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory** |

The TE rates efficiency as highly satisfactory as the project adopted "strategies that increased the efficiency of the resources" (TE p.5). However, it also describes financial planning as marginally unsatisfactory due to the financial delays incurred by the project. This TER rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory.

As will be further explained below in the executing agency section, 80% of project delivery was done through environmental NGOs (TE p.6). The multiplicity of project implementing partners (Ministry of Environment and Energy, as well as the 4 NGOs) created practical issues that caused project delays. Indeed, complications with fund disbursement caused important delays during the first two years of the project, and reduced overall project efficiency. "The TE finds that funds transfer could have been made simpler and more straightforward if HACT (harmonization for cash transfer) had been implemented. This would have allowed a simpler NIM (National Implementation Modality) with four responsible parties" (TE p.29).

Despite these procedural inefficiencies, "the TE finds that overall the results obtained by the project for US$ 2.1 million represent a very good return on capital, and that delivering a new PA policy in less than 4 years is exceptional" (TE p.7). Indeed, the TE commends the project for having adopted project implementation strategies that were highly effective, including the involvement of NGOs in the partnership and the use of a single PCU as coordinator of all UNDP-GEF projects in the Seychelles. In addition, and most relevant to this project, the strategy of working with the private sector to establish PAs "provided a reasonably cheaper means of acquiring additional terrestrial PA land than purchasing it" (TE p.41).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

The TE rates sustainability as likely due to the important improvements in financial and institutional sustainability of PAs that took place as a result of this project. This TER also rates sustainability as likely.

Financial Risks – Sustainability

As part of the project, both state and donor funding for Protected Areas were massively increased (from $120,000 per year to $2,400,000 per year). While PAs in the Seychelles still do not receive enough funding to fund their activities, their financial situation is improving. A mix of private sector, NGOs and government ministries are currently contributing funding, and there does not appear to be any risks that the current funding levels decrease in the near future.

Socio-economic Risks – Sustainability

There does not appear to be any socio-economic risks. The TE does not mention any backlash from local populations against current or proposed PAs. The Seychelles' economy is largely based on tourism and fisheries, both economic sectors standing to benefit from more and better PAs. With the country's image as a "nature reserve (…) this project is seen by many, and varied stakeholders, as an important step towards making Seychelles a nature reserve and promoting tourism." (TE p.44) There are no apparent socio-economic risks for the project.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability

The Cabinet endorsed the new Seychelles National Protected Areas Policy in October 2013 (TE p.34). In addition, a new PA bill developed as part of the project "makes legal provision for CSO and private sector management of PAs. The legislation necessary to operationalize the policy is highly likely to be in place within a year – the TE found evidence that the Bill is ready for submission to parliament, and that there is a champion for the bill in the Ministry" (TE p.44). Once passed, this new legislation will improve PA governance and management in the Seychelles, without any real risk of being revoked going forward.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

Overall, this TER and the TE find that project impacts (see impact section below) "are likely to be sustained in future due to improved Management Effectiveness on all PAs and Islands, improved financial sustainability and improved systemic and individual and institutional capacities for PA management" (TE p.7).

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?

> Materialized co-financing was roughly the same as expected co-financing. The TE does not describe the specific ways in which co-financing contributed to 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?

> There were delays in finalizing the work plan for the first year of the project and in disbursement of funds in the first year (TE p.24). However, those delays were resolved and did not necessitate a project extension, nor did they seem to negatively affect project outcomes.

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 was very high, as noted in the TE (p.43). The project originated from the government's objectives for national PAs. Throughout the project, "PA and legislation formulation was led by DOE [Department of Environment], with close collaboration of all relevant national institutions, including the Attorney General's office", which helped secure government buy-in for the project (TE p.6).

Sustainability is helped by the important government contribution to the project. As explained in the TE, "the former National Director of the project is the new Minister for Environment, which puts institutional memory for the work on policy and legislation in particular, in the Minister's office (…) this means continued momentum for the legislation, and the sustainability of the impacts" (TE p.43). The government also demonstrated its support for the project by contributing co-financing.

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: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory as it was based on 'clear logic' and featured SMART indicators (TE p.5). For the same reasons, this TER also rates M&E design as satisfactory.

All M&E components required for a UNDP/GEF project were present. The PD makes plans for an inception workshop, project monitoring, reporting, as well as mid-term and terminal independent evaluations (PD pp.60-63). The PD also presents a detailed workplan and an associated budget for all project M&E activities. The logical framework presented in the PD (pp.51-53) relies on good, verifiable indicators that meet the SMART criteria (TE p.19). It also presents baseline values, targets, sources of verification as well as risks and assumptions for each indicator. The TE also notes that the original logframe was kept throughout the project and used to guide implementation, therefore appearing to have been adequate (TE p.5).

The TE does criticize some of the indicator targets for being overly ambitious: "it was unrealistic to expect the new policy to be formulated and approved within two years of project start-up and even more unrealistic to expect the legislation to be in place by the third year of project implementation" (TE p.19). Those indicators were revised as a result of the recommendations made during the mid-term evaluation.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as satisfactory as the "M&E plan was used effectively to monitor and mitigate risks" and there is "evidence of adaptive management" (TE p.5). This TER also rates M&E implementation as satisfactory.

All planned M&E activities took place as planned. The TE reports that M&E data was routinely and effectively use to monitor project progress and mitigate risks. In addition, recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation, particularly regarding the need to modify indicators, were taken seriously and implemented. Other "important changes suggested by the MTE (were) adopted to varying degrees" (TE p.26).

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: **Moderately 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 as the organization provided the necessary supervision and backstopping to the project. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to the inefficient execution modalities selected.

As mentioned above in the efficiency section, the choice to have 4 NGOs as implementing partners for the project generated substantial implementation inefficiencies. Is it not clear that "the capacities of the executing institution(s) (…) were properly considered when the project was designed" (TE p.20). Other human resources issues took place during execution, including the fact that the NGOs did not have sufficient staff to fully engage with the project, and that there was high staff turnover. Those issues should also have been better foreseen and mitigated. (TE p.20)

On the other hand, the TE commends the UNDP for having effectively used the project design period to "identify relevant projects and lessons for the PA project, which allowed the project team to work effectively with these partners in the implementation phase" (TE p.22). In addition, "analysis of APR/PIRs and the minutes of the PSC meetings show that the Country Office and the Regional Coordination Unit were fully aware of the critical risks (monitored through ATLAS) and proposed many potential solutions to the problem of delayed disbursements" (TE p.29). Overall, it appears that the UNDP adequately performed its role as implementing agency, but could have better foreseen and planned for some of the implementation issues that arose during the project.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The executing agency for this project was the Ministry of Environment and Energy. However, it must be noted that about 80% of the project budget was managed by environmental NGOs – this arrangement was defined in a project memorandum of understanding (MoU) between them and the Ministry (TE p.23). In the TE, the executing agencies' quality of execution for this project is rated as marginally unsatisfactory due to the number of project implementation partners, which caused disbursement delays and created too much institutional complexity. This TER instead rates it as moderately unsatisfactory for the same reasons, as well as the high staff turnover the project faced, but noting the ability of the PCU to deliver satisfactory project outcomes very effectively.

The TE summarizes this project's execution issues well: "The implementation set-up was complex; it seems that the project tried to demonstrate the effective functioning of partnerships in managing PAs, before the creation of the enabling environment for the same, which was the overall goal of the project. " (TE p.23).

Indeed, the multiplicity of project implementers (Ministry of Environment and Energy, as well as the 4 NGOs) created practical issues that delayed the project. Complications with fund disbursement caused severe disbursement delays during the first two years of the program and reduced overall program efficiency. The multiplicity of executing agencies also caused tensions between executing partners as each partner's role and responsibilities were not clearly defined from the start.

In addition, the fact that there was no PCU coordinator for the first six months of the project and that staff in relevant ministries frequently changed weakened the project, especially at the beginning. The PCU was also without a Project Manager for 8 months during 2013-14. Changes in staff in the PCU, as well as project managers in three of the four NGOs during the course of the project, also caused delays. (TE p.7, p.27)

That being said, the TE still describes the Project Coordination Unit as having worked very effectively and as having played an integral part in enabling the project's success: "the PCU played a significant role in connecting the project to other GEF projects and development processes in the country, with significant gains in relevance, mainstreaming, replication and catalytic role; these generated further gains in cost effectiveness (both efficiency and effectiveness)" (TE p.7)

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.

The TE reports that "the project significantly reduced threats to biodiversity in Seychelles" (TE p.47) in various ways:

1. The project increase the protected area estate by 5,677.1 hectares. Given that the Seychelles only covers 45,900 hectares, this is proportionately a significant gain. Once the planned legislation is in place, the PA estate will likely cover an additional 3,000 hectares as a result of the gazettement of North and Dennis Islands, and that of four temporal PAs. The TE reports "a proposal to designate 11 new sites in inner and outer islands under the Outer Island Project" (TE p.47), which would bring the total PA estate to 150,000 hectares.
2. The project has successfully proven a coral gardening as a methodology for coral rehabilitation. This trial by Nature Seychelles was the first time in the world that such a large-scale coral restoration project using this method was tested successfully and will be replicated to other sites. As part of the trial, over 40,000 nubbins were transplanted and are expected to survive (TE p.44).

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 was described for 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

A Capacity Development Assessment Scorecard for Protected Area Systems was completed at baseline as well as at project end, and shows that average scores increased from 36% to 60%. Particularly, systemic and institutional capacities have improved by 80% and 76% respectively. This capacity scorecard measured various actors' ability to conceptualize PA policies, implement policies strategies and programs, maintain effective partnerships, manage knowledge and conduct M&E activities (TE p.46). The increases measured by the capacity scorecard show that the project successfully achieved its goal of improving the ability of relevant stakeholders to better manage PAs.

In addition, new scientific information gathered by the survey and mapping of the Aldabra outer reef has allowed the Seychelles Islands Foundation to build a case for expanding the marine PA based on actual scientific data. It also allowed the Foundation to build a marine monitoring program owned and implemented nationally by a Seychelles institution and run by local personnel; departing from the old system where the marine monitoring program was run by scientists based abroad (TE p.40).

b) Governance

The Cabinet endorsed the new Seychelles National Protected Areas Policy in October 2013 (TE p.34). In addition, a new PA bill developed as part of the project "makes legal provision for CSO and private sector management of PAs. The legislation necessary to operationalize the policy is highly likely to be in place within a year – the TE found evidence that the Bill is ready for submission to parliament, and that there is a champion for the bill in the Ministry" (TE p.44). Once passed, this new legislation will improve PA governance and management in the Seychelles.

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.

No unintended impacts were reported as part of the TE.

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.

Replicability was planned as part of the project design (PD p.49), and the TE provides some evidence that it took place during project implementation. Three project outputs are contributing to replication. First, "the IBA (Important Bird Areas) report, which includes for the first time 'Marine IBAs' being the feeding and foraging areas of seabirds as well as the islands on which they nest, is being used as a conservation data layer within the Marine Spatial Planning process (MSP)" (TE p.21) Secondly, "the PA expansion exercise has also informed the MSP process; the consultant leading this output on behalf of the project under review has had a major influence on the structure of the MSP planning process, which, in turn, feeds into the wider debate on zoning of the EEZ and the Blue Economy" National Strategy (TE p.21). Last, the project demonstrated "the potential of the coral gardening technique in rehabilitation of corals. Although the cost effectiveness of this technique is still to be determined, the methodology is already being replicated by other projects in the country" (TE p.44).

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 lessons learned:

- **Lesson 1:** Projects targeting policy change should either be implemented over longer periods (e.g. six years) or limit the indicators to the actual contribution that use of project resources can be held accountable for (see addition to this lesson after the section on "use of M&E and adaptive management")
- **Lessons 2:** Replication is necessary for sustaining project impacts: however, for it to happen, projects need to actively link with other on-going processes, something that is often difficult when project teams are isolated and are too focused on tight deadlines. The presence of the PCU made a big difference in this project. They were able to link the project to other important GEF and national programs;
- **Lesson 3:** Active management of knowledge sharing improves chances of replication. Although knowledge sharing was, to some extent organic[2], providing knowledge sharing systems would have improved knowledge sharing and learning: however, when this is not factored in as an activity with a budget (as was the case for this project), it is likely to be downplayed. In the absence of such effort, the four sub-components were implemented as a disparate set of activities with limited cross-fertilization.
- **Lesson 4:** Seychelles is a Small Island Developing State – and will always have Human Resources issues manifested in high staff turnover in many organizations. The planning stage should be used to formulate mitigation strategies to handle the inevitable human resources issues during implementation.
- **Lesson 5:** Mainstreaming lessons from other projects is a cost effective measure because it avoids duplication and waste. The choice of Implementing Partner with the necessary linkages to other conservation programs, and the unique position of the PCU for UNDP-GEF projects in Seychelles played a key role in the excellent level of mainstreaming lessons demonstrated by this project.
- **Lesson 6:** The TE echoes the lesson highlighted by the MTE regarding operational matters in partnerships: setting up multi-stakeholder PA management regimes requires attention to trust, respect and equality for implementing partners. While putting in place neutral platforms for participatory decision making is important, the adage "perception is the only reality" matters where capacities vary amongst the members of the partnership; there is need to find a more effective means of overcoming perceptions of un-equal power relations;

Response to MTE

- **Lesson 7:** As a SIDS, all project partners need to develop more effective incentives for recruiting and retaining staff. Solving this issue is beyond this project, but it is definitely necessary for the country.
- **Lesson 8:** For projects being implemented through more than one institution, the possibility of several AWARDS in ATLAS should be considered, supported by a cost benefit analysis of the additional work occasioned by several AWARD numbers.
- **Lesson 9:** similar to the replication issue, the diligence of the partners and the PCU in ensuring that the project is informed by, and informed other relevant process played a key role in ensuring that the project catalyzes other processes. A more systematic knowledge management process, that would have ensured that the various sub-components are implemented as parts of a whole (rather than a disparate set of activities) would have increased the catalytic character of this project significantly.

(TE pp.8-9)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1:** Formulate an exit strategy that explains how the legislation approval will be followed up and coordinated with the outputs of this project, to ensure sustainability of the impacts;
- **Recommendation 2**: For future projects involving multiple partners (as the PA finance is likely to do), all efforts must be expended to avoid the single award, multiple implementers. HACT (harmonization for cash transfer) should be used so that funds transfer becomes simpler and more straightforward;
- **Recommendation 3:** The funds approval systems can be simplified by allowing the PCU to authorize all expenditures below US$ 25,000 against the normal contracts signed between the main implementer (government in this case) and the implementing partners). The important thing is to have robust contracts that would not allow abuse of resources. The current approval system puts too much burden on an already limited staffing situation. The significance of such a system is that 90% of the project expenditures fall within this range, suggesting significant efficiency gains.
- **Recommendation 4:** By being at the centre of all the GEF projects in the country, the PCU played a critical role in linking the project to other GEF projects and to relevant development programs and processes in the country. This enabled two important things: i) it ensured that implementation of any specific project is closely coordinated with all relevant projects, for the benefit of both; ii) ensured that all project outputs and processes are known to, and taken into consideration by all relevant development processes. This has increased the cost effectiveness, relevance, replicability and catalytic role of this project considerably (compared to the situation without the PCU). Although it might be difficult to establish coordination units for GEF projects in all countries, there are significant benefits to be gained by having, at a minimum, a GEF coordinator in all UNDP Country Offices, paid for by small contributions from each of the

projects. Such a mechanism would yield significant benefits especially in countries where the CO capacity is either weak or environment is not on the top agenda, or both … e.g. South Africa?

- **Recommendation 5:** Factor in knowledge management and sharing as an activity with a budget for similar projects. This will yield significant replicability and catalytic gains.

(TE p.9)

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?	The report does assess relevant outcomes and impacts, but there is confusion between effectiveness and efficiency. The achievement of objectives is discussed, but not presented in a particularly clear, systematic way.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The discussion of project achievements and issues is generally consistent, but there are some inconsistencies in ratings. For example, effectiveness is rated as HS on p.41, and as S only on p.4. Ratings are well substantiated, but explanations are not very concisely presented, and often repeated across report sections, making the information sometimes difficult to find.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability is discussed, but the sustainability rating is not very clearly justified.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence and appear comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, but not project cost per activity. Co-financing figures are missing.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of the project's M&E systems is brief, but comprehensive.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.