

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		535	
GEF Agency project ID		2377	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation and Marine Pollution Abatement	
Country/Countries		Seychelles	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		2 – Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment, Economic Planning and External Relations; Ministry of Transport, Tourism and Trade	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultations	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 1992	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 1993	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 1996	
Actual date of project completion		December 1997	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.8	1.8 (2.0, given favorable exchange rate)
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.20	0.20
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.8	1.8 (2.0, given favorable exchange rate)
Total Co-financing		0.20	0.20
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.0	2.0 (2.2, given favorable exchange rate)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
ICR completion date		June 1998	
ICR submission date			
Author of ICR		Operations Evaluation Department	
TER completion date		October 2014	
TER prepared by		Daniel Nogueira-Budny	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	HS	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	L	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	U/A
Quality of Implementation	N/A	HS	S	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	HS	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	S	U

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the project's Global Environmental Objective (GEO) is to help arrest degradation of the marine biodiversity of the Seychelles and restore marine ecosystems. The country possesses a number of small and vulnerable ecosystems that are threatened by human activity, in particular, the sharp increase in shipping at Victoria, the country's main port.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The PD detailed three Development Objectives (DOs):

- 1 To restore and preserve the Aldabra ecosystem through the rehabilitation of the scientific research station, strengthening of scientific and managerial personnel, eradication of feral goats, and preparation of a long-term management plan
- 2 To conserve biodiversity through the preparation of comprehensive management plans to prohibit or restrict the exploitation of Green and Hawksbill Turtles
- 3 To limit pollution of international waters through a feasibility study and engineering designs for the construction of facilities to receive and dispose of waste from commercial and fishing vessels at the port of Victoria

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

There were **no** changes in the GEOs or DOs during project implementation.

4. GEF EO 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 project was relevant to both the GEF and National priorities at the time of approval. In terms of GEF priorities, the Seychelles is important to global biodiversity conservation efforts due to its possession of unique flora and fauna; indeed, according to the PD, at least 75 species are endemic to the country (p 1). The Aldabra atoll has been named a World Heritage Site because of its remarkable and endangered endemic plants and animals. The country's biodiversity is at risk, given small populations, overexploitation of species, and shipping-related marine pollution. Furthermore, Seychelles has one of the highest population densities in Sub-Saharan Africa, and severe constraints on land has led to significant reclamation on coral reefs and sea grass beds. In terms of National priorities, the Seychelles' two main sources of growth are tourism and fisheries, two industries heavily dependent on a healthy environment. Given this, biodiversity conservation is of critical importance to the Seychelles.

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

According to the Implementation Completion Report (ICR) and the ICR Review (ICRR), all physical objectives were achieved, and, in some cases (such as DO 1), surpassed:

- DO1: research station was reconstructed and is now operational; feral goat population of Aldabra was brought under control, although not completely eradicated; management plan was drawn up for the Aldabra ecosystem
- DO2: turtle protection management programs were prepared and implemented for the Green and Hawksbill Turtles; additional assessment and planning carried out on the Giant Tortoise
- DO3: Feasibility study and design of a scheme to improve waste reception and disposal facilities at Port of Victoria completed (ICR, pp 4, 5-6; ICRR, p 1)

While the ICR rates project effectiveness as highly satisfactory, the ICRR downgrades its effectiveness to satisfactory. The reason for this was because, although all components were completed, they only consisted of plans and studies. According to the ICRR, for the main objective to be truly achieved, further outputs are required. It argues that, while the results provided the basis for the achievement of

the project objectives—i.e., protection of biodiversity and limitation of marine pollution—but have not, by themselves, achieved them. This review agrees with the ICRR.

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

ICR does not rate project efficiency. However, project was rated moderately satisfactory because, barring one exception (detailed below), there were no issues delays or procurement issues. ICR explains that project closing date was extended, but this was because of the availability of additional funds in the budget due to exchange rate fluctuations (pp 3-4). Furthermore, all original project components were completed within the projected budget, with the exception of the Study of Waste reception facilities, which had an actual cost overrun of 43 percent in dollar terms; this overrun was due not only to underestimation of the scope of the study, but to exchange rate fluctuations as well. ICRR mentions in passing that “initial delays” occurred for the borrower due to problems in local staffing (p 2); however, these delays do not appear in the ICR.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	------------------------------------

Sustainability is assessed along four dimensions, listed below. The ICR only touches on two of the four dimensions (see below), and analysis on those two was perfunctory.

- a) *Environmental sustainability (U/A)* – ICR provides insufficient information to provide a rating on environmental risks to sustainability
- b) *Financial sustainability (L)* – According to the ICR, the Seychelles Island Foundation (SIF) has committed itself to continue subsidizing the operations and maintenance of the research station (p 7).
- c) *Institutional sustainability (MU)* – According to the ICRR, “the availability of professional local staff remains a problem for future sustainability of the project” (p 2). The ICR also mentions the lack of adequately trained professionals who could sustain the project, given the fact that the country is home to only 73,000 people.
- d) *Socio-Political sustainability (U/A)* – ICR provides insufficient information to provide a rating on socio-political sustainability.

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?

It is unclear from the available documents as to whether co-financing by the government of Seychelles was essential to the achievement of GEF objectives. Seeing as extra GEF funding was left over, given favorable exchange rates (see below, 5.2), it appears as if co-financing was not essential. There was no difference in level of expected co-financing vs. actual co-financing.

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?

Initial delays occurred for the borrower due to problems in local staffing. Additionally, the project was extended by one year (December 1996 to December 1997), since favorable exchange rates meant that the grant generated more local currency than expected and enabled some additional activities to be completed (ICRR, p 1; ICR, pp 4-5).

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:

PD mentions that, given the island nature of the country, Seychelles is uniquely attuned to issues of biodiversity conservation. Furthermore, project is part of the new Environmental Management Plan for the Seychelles (EMPS), as well as the Biodiversity Strategy of the Seychelles.

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
-------------------------	--

M&E design at entry was rated satisfactory. PD establishes that Ministry of Environment, Economic Planning, and External Relations (MEPER) was to prepare reports reviewing the performance of implementing agencies and monitoring key indicators of progress in fulfillment of program goals (although it does not mention how often these reports were to be prepared); PD also notes that a mid-

term review was to be conducted prior to the end of 1994 (p 7). Key performance indicators are offered in Annex 7 of the PD; however, they are not SMART. The indicators proposed are guides to assist in the later development of SMART indicators through special evaluations during the project's implementation period. Furthermore, there are no targets proposed.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

ICR does not assess or adequately discuss M&E implementation to provide a rating here.

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 ICR rates the project's implementation as highly satisfactory, adding that the implementing agencies have further improved their abilities to supervise implementation of various components (cf., p 4). However, ICRR downgrades the project's implementation rating to satisfactory. It explains that, although supervision performance was superior, this by itself is not sufficient to justify a highly satisfactory rating for Bank performance. This review agrees with the ICRR and rates the project's quality as satisfactory, for, given what little information was provided in the ICR, project implementation did not seem more than satisfactory.

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

The ICR rates the quality of the project's execution as highly satisfactory; however, it does not provide an explanation for this rating and actually mentions that there were difficulties in supervising project implementation on Aldabra (cf., p 5). The ICRR downgrades the ICR rating to satisfactory, as there was high staff turnover in the initial year, leading to staffing issues and unclear responsibility questions that contributed to some slippage in the project performance. This review agrees with the ICRR and rates the quality of project execution as satisfactory, given the available information at hand.

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.

ICR does not mention any changes in environmental stress or status that occurred by the end of the project.

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.

According to the ICR, the ban of the trade of sea turtles and sea turtle shells has led to the dismantling of approximately one percent of the country's industry base, "having some negative impact on the country's economy" (p 7). However, it then goes on to say that all turtle shell artisans have been retrained and are now exercising other revenue-earning professions.

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* – The scientific research station in Aldabra was reconstructed, permitting future generations of scientists to build upon pre-existing body of work that has been conducted in the region (ICR, p 6).

b) *Governance* – The project enabled the government "to design and launch an Environmental Management Plan of the Seychelles, which takes full account of socio-economic, institutional, and legal aspects of the protection of endangered species" (ICRR, p 2). According to the ICR, the turtle shell industry is now illegal and turtles and tortoises are protected and monitored (p 4).

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.

ICR does not mention any unintended impacts arising from project. The negative socio-economic impact that arose from the ban on the sea turtle trade (see 8.2) was not mentioned in the PD; however, it was most likely foreseen.

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.

ICR does not make any mention of GEF initiatives that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up.

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.

- In countries with limited human capacity, a focal Government-appointed project coordinator, in this case the EMPS Coordinator, with experience in project management and a good understanding of the sectoral issues is key to timely implementation of the project and can ensure smooth linkages between the implementing agencies and the donor community.
- A high staff turnover during project implementation can be detrimental to the successful implementation of projects with a large number of technically different components.
- For project components involving strong socioeconomic elements, such as eliminating industries based on endangered turtles, a socio-economist or environmental economist should be involved in project design and implementation.
- For complex natural resources projects, adequate resources should be in place to ensure close supervision of the project by a multi-disciplinary team.
- For projects which will be implemented in isolated areas, such as Aldabra, project design should include measures (e.g. improved communication links, frequent staff turnaround) to alleviate human and environmental pressures on the project staff.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- Design a project to build the facilities recommended in the MARPOL study

- Further improve turtle and tortoise legislation by removing the inconsistencies in the existing laws and by enforcing a more realistic level of fines
- Strengthen the institutional capacity of the SIF should through the appointment of a high level executive officer with appropriate scientific and managerial experience
- Enhance the position of National Coordinator to better reflect the importance of its role

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 EO 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 assessment of relevant outcomes, impacts, and achieved objectives provided by the ICR was short and lacking in detail.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	While the ICR is internally consistent, very little evidence is presented and ratings are not well substantiated	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report fails to fully assess project sustainability, only looking at two of four sustainability dimensions; the two that were assessed were only done so in a perfunctory manner.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are, to a certain extent, supported by the evidence presented and are comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	ICR does not include actual project costs, nor does it include actual co-financing used	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	ICR does not evaluate M&E system.	HU
Overall TE Rating		U

Overall TE rating: $0.3 * (3+2) + 0.1 * (3+4+1+1) = 2.4$

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

GEF Concept Paper for Pipeline Entry, ICR Review