

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

**CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY OF SOCOTRA
ARCHIPELAGO**

YEM/96/G32/B/1G/31 (Phase 1)

YEM/01/003/01/B (Continuation Phase)

including

**ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION FOR
THE POPULATIONS OF SOCOTRA ISLAND, YEMEN**

YEM/00/001/01/31 – YEM/00/Z01/IF/31

Report of the Terminal Evaluation Mission

Mark Infield

Ibrahim Sharaf Al Deen

August 2003

Contents

CONTENTS	I
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Purpose of evaluation	1
B. Outcome evaluation	2
C. Key issues addressed	2
D. Methodology of evaluation	3
E. Structure of the evaluation report	3
II. THE PROJECTS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	4
A. Project start and duration	4
B. Problems the projects seek to address	4
C. Immediate and development objectives of the projects	6
D. Main stakeholders	6
E. Results expected	7
III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	8
A. Project formulation and implementation	9
1. Implementation approach and execution modalities	9
2. Country ownership / Drivenness	10
3. Stakeholder participation and public involvement	13
4. Replication approach	15
5. Financial planning	16
6. Cost effectiveness	16
7. Linkages between project and other interventions	17
8. Indicators, monitoring and evaluation	18
9. Management, cooperation and operational issues	18
10. Management by the UNDP Country office	20
B. Project achievements, outcomes and impacts	20
1. Implementation of activities	20
2. Attainment of UNDP outcome	21
3. Attainment of project goals / immediate development – environmental objectives	23
4. Attainment of project purposes / immediate objectives	25
5. Sustainability	27
6. Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff	29

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	29
A. Recommendations	29
B. Lessons learned	30
EXHIBIT 1. UNDP OUTCOME EVALUATION	32
EXHIBIT 2. PROJECT GOALS REVIEW AND SITUATION ANALYSIS	33
EXHIBIT 3. PROJECT PURPOSE REVIEW AND SITUATION ANALYSIS	34
EXHIBIT 4. PROJECT RESULTS REVIEW AND SITUATION ANALYSIS	35
EXHIBIT 5. SITUATION ANALYSIS; MAIN FINDINGS AND KEY ISSUES	37
EXHIBIT 6. CO FINANCING (IN USD X MILLIONS)	38
EXHIBIT 7. EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	39
EXHIBIT 8. RESPONSE TO MID-TERM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS	42
EXHIBIT 9. THE QALANSIA ROAD ISSUE	52
ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE – INDEPENDENT EVALUATION MISSION	54
ANNEX 2. ITINERARY	57
ANNEX 3. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	59
ANNEX 4. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS	62
ANNEX 5. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	63

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CZP	Conservation Zoning Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
EPC	Environment Protection Council
EU	European Union
GADYI	General Authority for the Development of Yemeni Islands
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOY	Government of Yemen
HCDS	High Committee for the Development of Socotra
HWP	Health and Water Project
MSP	Medium Sized Project (GEF)
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
PERSGA	Programme for the Environment of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
SAMP	Socotra Archipelago Master Plan
SBP1	Socotra Biodiversity Project, Phase 1
SBP2	Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase
SCDP	Socotra Conservation and Development Programme
SCDP CU	Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit
SCF	Socotra Conservation Fund
SES	Socotra Eco-tourism Society
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

Executive Summary

Background

1. The Socotra archipelago contains globally important biodiversity. Over three hundred endemic plant species have been identified, making the archipelago one of the most important sites for endemic plants in the world. The islands support seven endemic species of birds and further research is likely to reveal even more endemic life forms. Socotra's physical and economic isolation from the mainland and the historically sustainable management practiced by Socotrans has left the natural history of the islands remarkably intact. It has also left the people of Socotra amongst the poorest in Yemen and largely dependant on direct use of the islands' natural resources for their subsistence.
2. The situation on Socotra is changing rapidly. Improvements in health and economic circumstances are resulting in increasing pressure on natural resources. This combined with increased access by outside interests threatens the islands' unique biodiversity. The recent opening of a new airport and improved harbour and docking facilities means that Socotra is now accessible throughout the year. Further improvements to infrastructure are planned.
3. The prospects for increased trade and economic activities including the development of new industries may support improvements in the future welfare of the people of Socotra. There are real fears, however that unless these developments are carefully planned, there will be significant negative impacts on the archipelago's unique biodiversity. This will have long-term impacts on the economic options for the people of Socotra.
4. The limited development options for Socotra, resulting from its isolation and harsh environment and weather mean that future economic development is dependant on sustainable management of its natural resources. These have been identified as sustainable fishing and eco-tourism. These economic options for the future may be damaged without careful planning. The three projects evaluated here were designed to support the integrated conservation and development of the Socotra Archipelago.
5. The initial project was a GEF/UNDP Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago Project, referred to as the Socotra Biodiversity Project (SBP1). This started in 1997 with a planned duration of 5 years and a budget of approximately USD 5 million.
6. SBP1 carried out intensive research on biodiversity to provide the basis for designing a comprehensive Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP) for the islands. In parallel with this initiative the project implemented an awareness and communications programme that raised the profile of the islands biodiversity and the importance of conserving it to a local, national and international audience. The project also supported the development of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), including construction of new offices. Key outputs of this project included the ratification by government of the CZP and the articulation of a general development model for the islands based on sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism.
7. SBP1 was effectively finished by June 2001. Prior to ending, additional funding for the support of conservation and development on Socotra was leveraged. The original GEF project was extended by the Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase (SBP2) funded by UNDP and the Royal Netherlands Embassy for a two year period and designed to end in May 2003. SBP2 was designed to further the work of SBP1 by implementing the CZP, in particular by establishing pilot protected areas and pilot eco-tourism activities. SBP2 was also to complete the legal establishment of the Socotra Conservation Fund, viewed as the primary mechanism for promoting

sustainability of project outcomes. The third main element of SBP2 was to build government capacity to coordinate investments in Socotra's development and conservation by establishing the Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit (SCDP CU).

8. A third project, Environment, Natural Resources And Poverty Alleviation For The Populations Of Socotra Island, Yemen, referred to here as the Health and Water Project (HWP) was funded by UNDP and the Republic of Italy. This project was designed to enhance the conservation outcomes of SBP1 and SBP2 by improving the quality of life on Socotra through provision of health services and access to water. After delays in the development and approval process this project ran for approximately one year, starting in 2001.

Purpose and context of the evaluation mission

9. The three projects described briefly above have been largely completed. All, therefore, require external evaluation. In the case of the GEF funded SBP1 this is particularly important as a proposal for a Medium Sized Project (MSP) has been developed for submission to GEF. The GEF is unable to consider funding for this project until the original GEF project has undertaken a terminal evaluation.
10. The design of the MSP has been carried out in relation to the design of a second project phase funded by UNDP and the Republic of Italy. However, the MSP also needs to be informed by the lessons learned during the implementation of the three original projects.
11. A second phase project funded UNDP and the Government of Italy to provide ongoing support for the EPA Office on Socotra and increase support for community development began in July 2003 and will run for a period of five years with a budget of approximately USD 5 million. The project has three basic elements:
 - supporting the main engines of growth for the local economy (eco-tourism and sustainable fisheries) and implementing the archipelago's zoning plan and community based management of protected areas;
 - addressing selected, most pressing community development needs and mobilizing communities engagement in sustainable human development process and biodiversity conservation; and
 - enhancing the professional capacity of local and central government to steer a sustainable development path for the archipelago, and mobilize additional resources to support integrated conservation and development.
12. Implementation of this complex project also needs to refer to lessons learned during the implementation of the three previous projects.
13. The Terminal Evaluation was carried out by a two person team, an international consultant and a representative of the GOY from the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. The team spent 5 days in Sana'a, the Capital of Yemen, and 7 days on Socotra between 14th and 26th July 2003. The shortage of time and resources for the evaluation of a three project programme with total budgets in excess of USD 6 million has required inevitable compromises on the level of detail in the evaluation process and the evaluation report.
14. The evaluation was carried out in an atmosphere of some tension. This was attributed by the evaluation team to two factors. The first was the recent conflict over the development of a road on Socotra that would have contravened the CZP. The lobbying of support by the project to prevent this caused considerable tension on the island between the project and authorities on the island and at national level. The

second was the keen anticipation of all sectors of government of the newly signed second phase project. Implementation mechanisms for this project remain uncertain and central and local government were making a strong bid for increased roles in the project. This required that the performance of the original projects be presented in a poorer light than actual performance merited.

Main conclusions

Project concepts and planning

15. The individual projects reviewed here integrated and responded to government and local government priorities, and were planned through strong consultative processes. The final products, however, were not always as strong as the processes undertaken. The lack of a clear project logic in the form of a Project Planning Matrix in the case of two of the three projects, and the poor articulation of the goals and purposes of the Health and Water Project with the larger programme led to difficulties in implementation.
16. The underlying rationale and approach of the individual projects was strong and there was a clear understanding amongst project partners of how they related to each other. It is evident, however, that the immediate interest of government and the people of Socotra in short-term improvements in basic human needs were not well served by the projects which were designed to deal with longer-term issues of natural resource management and sustainable institutions. This led to unrealistic expectations of the contributions the projects would make to community welfare amongst the communities themselves and local government. That no other substantial investments in basic human needs by government or other projects materialised, exacerbated the demands on the SCDP.

The operating environment

17. The projects operated in an extremely difficult physical environment. The island's isolation, lack of facilities and harsh environment all made implementation difficult. The project coped well with these problems, working round them where necessary and improving the situation where possible.
18. The institutional environment in which the project operated was also extremely difficult. All institutions, both government and civil society, were very weak or non-existent when the project began. This meant that the project has to build the strength of its partner organisations almost from scratch.
19. Institutional structures on the mainland and the capital are much stronger than those on Socotra, but did not always operate in a coherent way or support the objectives of the project. Other institutions that were identified as key project partners did not come into being or remained too weak to be effective players.
20. The shortage of qualified or experience human resources on the island presented a further problem for the implementation of the project. This was dealt with by long-term ongoing technical training.

Implementation and achievements

21. Implementation of the project has been highly effective and important outcomes achieved. These include: the development and ratification of the Conservation Zoning Plan; the establishment of pilot protected areas; the development of an innovative community based process for protected area planning; the strengthening

of the Environment Protection Authority to the point where it can engage actively in vetting development proposals; initiatives to provide health services and access to water on communities on Socotra; and the leveraging of approximately USD 8 million from the original GEF investment.

22. Some problems of implementation were identified. These include: the failure of the government of establish an umbrella institution to coordinate investments on Socotra; the weak institutional lodgement of the Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit; lack of progress in strengthening GOY partners in project management; the size and unsustainability of the technical team established by the project; and the weak understanding of many stakeholders at all levels of the link between protected area development and the future economic development of the Socotra through sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism.

Recommendations

Sustaining project achievements

- The EPA Senior Management on Socotra requires strengthening. The EPA must review the managerial requirements for the authority,
- The Project must provide greater support to strengthen the management capacity of the EPA through training by sharing management responsibility.
- Pursuing ratification of the Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP: prepared by an EU-funded parallel project) by the GOY should be a priority for action.
- An institution with umbrella responsibility for coordinating all investment on Socotra must be established by GOY and its pursuit should be a project priority
- The SCDP must strengthen understanding at all levels of the relationship between conservation on Socotra, the Conservation Zoning Plan, and economic development on Socotra.
- A clearer operational strategy is required to raise implementation of the protected area process from the pilot areas to the island as a whole.
- Unrealistic expectations of communities and government of material benefits that can be provided by the SCDP must be managed more effectively.

Strengthening project design and implementation

- Issues with potentially serious consequences for achieving project outcomes must be actively addressed by all partners during tripartite meetings.
- The SCDP needs to allow stronger participation of GOY partners in project implementation without losing the impetus of progress towards achieving project objectives.

Projects for the future conservation of Socotra

- Support for local government: The Local Council must become a key player in the conservation and development of Socotra. Formed only two years ago they should be the target of an institutional strengthening project.
- Support for civil society: Provision of technical and financial support to civil society institutions on Socotra will allow them to play important roles in the development of their island.

- Sustainable resource use: Community dependence on direct use of Socotra's natural resources needs to be reduced through greater investment in the identified engines of development (sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism) and through substitution.
- Donor and GOY projects should directly support development of the identified engines of growth, and be subject to strict planning to avoid compromising sustainable fishing or eco-tourism potential. GOY and donors must recognise that significantly greater investment will be required if tourism and fisheries are to achieve sustainable improvements in quality of life on the islands.
- The Socotra Conservation Fund: The fund, established to provide a sustainable mechanism for channelling technical and financial support for conservation on Socotra, requires institutional and financial support to become functional.

Lessons learned

Capacity building

- The project has built a cadre of committed and trained conservationists. This team, however, are relatively weak in terms of management. This problem can be avoided by providing training in management skills and by developing closer management relations with government partners.
- The large parallel structure developed by the project presents a problem for sustainability. The balance between hiring in expertise and relying on existing capacity within government should allow strong project performance but also promote sustainability of outcomes.

Sector development

- The linking of economic development on Socotra directly to conservation and protected area establishment through sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism presents a model for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. It should be noted, however, that it is the lack of development alternatives on Socotra that has made this possible.

General lessons

- The GEF project extension and community development activities were integrated into a programme. The programme did not, however, have a clearly defined logic. Stronger logic would have ensured that project goals were meaningful and consistent to the programme, and ensured that project purposes and activities were realistic and address the goals.
- When successful project implementation requires significant changes in government policy and practice, monitoring progress towards this is essential. Agreed changes must be viewed as integral components of government participation and lack of progress on them must be dealt with directly by Tripartite Review Meetings.

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of evaluation

Three distinct but linked projects are the subjects of this evaluation. These are:

- The Conservation And Sustainable Use Of Biodiversity Of Socotra Archipelago Project (Phase 1). *YEM/96/G32/B/1G/31*.
- The Conservation And Sustainable Use Of Biodiversity Of Socotra Archipelago Project (Continuation Phase). *YEM/01/003/01/B*.
- The Environment, Natural Resources And Poverty Alleviation For The Populations Of Socotra Island, Yemen Project. *YEM/00/001/01/31 – YEM/00/Z01/IF/31*.

For ease of reference these projects will be referred to using the following abbreviated titles throughout this report.

- Socotra Biodiversity Project Phase 1(SBP1)
- Socotra Biodiversity Project Continuation Phase (SBP2)
- Health and Water Project (HWP)

The GEF funded Socotra Biodiversity Project Phase 1, which is the focus of this evaluation, was largely completed by the middle of 2001. At the time of the mid-term evaluation carried out in October 2000 it was evident that the majority of project funds would be expended by May 2001¹. At the time of the evaluation reported on here, all funds have been expended and all substantive activities completed.

During the mid-term Evaluation, key partners in the project stated their intention to develop a proposal for submission to GEF for continued support for conservation activities on Socotra. It was recognised, however, that bridging funds would be necessary to avoid a damaging break in conservation activities. Support was sought from the Royal Netherlands Embassy and UNDP to fund a continuation of the SBP1. The Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase (SBP2) was developed and funded and began implementation in June 2001. At the same time funding for community development activities, originally conceived as an integral component of SBP1, were granted by the Government of the Republic of Italy and UNDP, with additional support from the Government of Poland. These allowed implementation of the HWP from August 2001.

All three projects have either ended or are on the point of completion. The bulk of funds have been expended and all substantive activities completed. This evaluation is thus a terminal evaluation of all three projects. GEF require a terminal evaluation to be submitted before any proposals for additional funding can be entertained. UNDP, who have made substantial financial, implementation and supervisory contributions to all three projects, also require an external assessment.

¹ Conservation And Sustainable Use Of Biodiversity Of Socotra Archipelago. YEM/96/G32/B/1G/31 Report of the mid-Term Evaluation Mission. By Mark Infield, et al. March 2001.

B. Outcome evaluation

The projects under evaluation here were designed prior to the development of UNDP's requirement to evaluate projects using pre-selected project *outcomes*. At the request of the UNDP Mission, Yemen, the highest level of strategic objective against which the three projects will be evaluated will be the following UNDP Program Outcome.

Improved capacity of local authorities and community-based groups in environmental management and sustainable energy development.

This outcome was selected from UNDP's (2001) Second Country Cooperation Framework for Yemen (2002 – 2006), itself drawn from the Yemen Common Country Assessment (UNDP 2001). This outcome was selected as the most appropriate against which to evaluate the project as it reflects most closely the project's stated development objectives (which will be presented and discussed below). All three projects overall goals of making contributions towards the conservation of Socotra's natural environment through improved management of natural resources, with a strong emphasis on processes involving local institutions and building local capacity for environmental management. The final element of the selected outcome, that of energy development, will not be addressed as none of the projects were intended to address this issue.

Evaluation against *outcomes* is not a requirement of the GEF reporting structure. The evaluation team believes, however, that examining project achievements against this high level strategic objective will strengthen the overall analysis and assist GEF, UNDP, contributing governments and GOY to reach conclusions about the contributions of the three projects to conservation and development on Socotra.

The outcome evaluation will provide an analysis of lessons learned at the highest level of project objectives, from which recommendations will be formulated. These may have wider application within the UNDP Program in Yemen and elsewhere and will also be relevant to GEF projects within Yemen and elsewhere. Of particular concern for this evaluation however, will be to provide support and guidance for the implementation of the already approved and soon to begin UNDP / Government of Italy / Government of Yemen project to support sustainable conservation and development on Socotra (UNDP 2003). The outcome evaluation will also seek to provide a basis for the final preparation of a proposal to be submitted to GEF for a Medium Sized Project (MSP) for Socotra.

C. Key issues addressed

The evaluation team has responded to key issues indicated in both GEF and UNDP briefs to evaluators. At the same time, the situation on the ground provided guidance for the identification of key issues. Key issues addressed in this report in the subsequent sections refer to:

- the projects' original designs
- the effectiveness in achieving the identified UNDP outcome
- the sustainability of achievements
- issues relating to institutional lodgement
- the degree of ownership of and participation in the projects by partners
- the operational environment and the nature of partnerships

Reference to and discussion of these issues are found throughout the report and provide the basis for many of the observations made and conclusions drawn.

D. Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation team comprised an internationally recruited consultant and a government appointed team member drawn from the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation.

Both team members had been part of the team which carried out the mid-term review. This meant that they were familiar with the background to the projects, had some understanding of the operational issues, and were in a position to compare the situation at the end of the projects with that found in 2000, three years before.

The short time available for the evaluation (4 days in Sana'a and 6 days on Socotra, with travelling time in between) and the small size of the evaluation team meant that the evaluation was forced to concentrate on substantive and significant issues of project implementation. Detailed examination of the many activities implemented by the projects since 1997 could not be undertaken. Budget allocations and expenditures could not be examined in detail, nor could any meaningful cost effectiveness analysis be undertaken.

The evaluation team used traditional techniques to collect information for this report. These were:

- guided interviews with key informants, especially project partners (see Annex 3 for detail list);
- open discussions with key informants, especially project management team;
- group discussions, especially with project team and stakeholder groups;
- observations and field visits (see Annex 4 for details);
- examination of materials (reports, publications, awareness materials, videos, etc., see Annex 5 for details);
- questionnaire (see Annex 6; return rate for the questionnaire was 55%).

Preliminary results of the evaluation were presented in two separate meetings, one to the project implementation team (also attended by the Mayor of Hadibo) and one to UNDP Country Office staff. Comments and corrections made by participants at these presentations have been factored into the final evaluation that is presented here.

Presentations made were structured to present the evaluation team's assessment of '*Positive Achievements*' (not all activities undertaken could be listed as these are too numerous) and '*Issues Needing Attention*'. These assessments are presented in Exhibits 1 to 4 and form the basic text of this report. Discussion of the lessons that can be learned from these projects and the recommendations made also respond to the basic assessment of main findings and key issues presented Exhibit 5.

E. Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report structure is based on the GEF guidelines for terminal evaluations² with modifications to account for the particular circumstances of the evaluation, most notably that

² Global Environment Facility; Guidelines for Implementing Agencies to conduct Terminal Evaluations. April 2003.

three projects are being evaluated together. Evaluation against the UNDP outcome provides the highest level of project logic against which achievements are measured. GEF Ratings are applied to key areas of project design and implementation.

II. The projects and their development context

A. Project start and duration

The start and end dates of the three project are presented in the following table.

Project	Start	End	Duration
Socotra Biodiversity Project - Phase 1 (YEM/96/G32/B/1G/31)	May 1997	June 2001	4 years, 2 months
Socotra Biodiversity Project - Continuation Phase (YEM/01/003/01/B)	June 2001	May 2003	2 years
Health and Water Project YEM/00/001/01/31 – YEM/00/Z01/IF/31	June 2000 (Preparatory phase) July 2001 (full project)	May 2003	3 years (incl. Preparatory phase)

B. Problems the projects seek to address

The Socotra archipelago, consisting of six islands belonging to the Republic of Yemen, contains a globally important biological resource. Surveys have demonstrated just how important the biodiversity of the islands is. Of 900 identified plant species over one third are endemic species, making the archipelago one of the most important sites for endemic plants in the world. The islands also support seven endemic species of birds and research is likely to reveal a similar level of endemism amongst other taxa. Socotra has been identified as the location of the long-sought nesting grounds of the rare Persian Shearwater (xxxx) and Saunders's Tern (*Sterna albifrons saundersi*).

This biological wealth makes the islands a natural subject for international conservation support. That the islands have been all but isolated from the outside world of commerce and development until recently, and have been managed by Socotrans in an environmentally sound and largely sustainable fashion, means that the natural history of the islands remains remarkably intact. Until recently, marine resources were high due to a well managed traditional coastal fishery, and grazing resources were in balance with levels of livestock using them.

This situation is poised to change rapidly. The Government of the Republic of Yemen (GOY) have taken steps to bring the people of Socotra into the wider world, and help them overcome problems of poverty, food insecurity, poor health and education. Human populations are growing and expectations rising. The opening of an all weather air strip and construction of an airport on Socotra is encouraging increased travel to and from the island. Government plans for construction of a USD 60 million harbour and docking facility will allow year long access to the island, which is currently closed to shipping for five months of the year by the strong winds and rough seas of the area.

The people of Socotra need increased economic activity to ensure their continuing development. Finding suitable and viable economic opportunities may, however, prove difficult. Though a range of small scale activities are well established, including goat and cattle raising, date production, fishing and collection and trade in natural products (e.g. honey, cinnabar, aloe), these have not been sufficient to provide more than a very basic subsistence for the majority of Socotrans. In the future, as the population on the islands grow, these economic opportunities are likely to be even less adequate to the task of supporting the people of Socotra. The Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP) developed by SBP1 in combination with the Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP) identify only two viable industries for the island, fisheries and tourism, and present plans for their sustainable development. Both industries are dependant on the islands' natural resources and turn the islands' isolated location into an advantage rather than a disadvantage. There is a clear and recognised danger, however, that unplanned developments, especially of infrastructure, and environmentally damaging resource use would reduce or destroy the future potential of these economic activities.

Government is planning to invest large sums of capital in the islands' development. Investment in social infrastructure is necessary for the short term welfare of the community and the long term development of the islands. Investors, including many expatriate Socotrans, are beginning to show interest in Socotra as a site for investment. Private investment is also essential for future development. However, many of the ideas being proposed may be un-realistic, given the island's location and tough physical environment, and damaging to the planned development of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism.

The Socotra Biodiversity Project – Phase 1 was designed to provide the people of Socotra and the GOY with an opportunity to forestall negative environmental affects of social and economic development, thus safeguarding the future of the Socotra's economy. By undertaking in-depth analysis of the natural resources of the islands and the social, political, economic and cultural circumstances of the people, the project was able to establish a vision for economic development based on Socotra's unique landscape, people and biodiversity. This led to the preparation of a Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP) which, in conjunction with the Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP³) provide a framework for the islands' integrated conservation and development.

The mid-term evaluation noted that the work carried out and the vision created through the planning process was in danger of being lost unless further investments were made to allow implementation of the CZP. This led to the development of SBP2, without which the probability of sustaining achievements was questionable.

The third project reviewed here, the HWP, was a continuation of UNDP support to improve the living conditions of the people of Socotra which began in 1997. Socotra is one of the poorest communities in Yemen. Malnutrition, poverty and lack of basic amenities are facts of life for most Socotrans. The project was designed on the premise that community support for the detailed planning necessary to achieve the linked objectives of long term conservation and sustainable economic growth required delivery of tangible short term improvements in the quality of life. This imperative was strongly noted in the mid-term Evaluation Report and may be considered as a direct response to the evaluation's recommendations.

Though not always evident in the wording or design of the projects, the linking of development activities with planning for and implementation of conservation activities means that the suite of projects may be best considered as a single integrated conservation and development initiative. This would seem to have been the basis for the inclusion of a component within

³ The SAMP was developed with the assistance of the Economic Union (EU).

SBP2 to establish a higher order planning and management function, the Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit (SCDP CU).

C. Immediate and development objectives of the projects

The highest level objectives of the projects are presented in the table below.

Project	Overall Goal / Development Objectives	Project Purpose / Immediate objectives
SBP1	The biodiversity of the Socotra archipelago conserved through community-based resource management and implementation of a zoning plan which will integrate biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives in an holistic manner ¹	A zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented ²
SBP2	The unique biological diversity of the Socotra Archipelago conserved	Zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented through the Socotra Conservation Development Programme
HWP	Environmentally sound and sustainable development fostered ³	Poverty among the population of Socotra Island alleviated in a sustainable way ³

Notes

- ¹ The original statement of the Project Goal or Development Objective was simplified to read "Socotra's biodiversity and natural resources conserved and managed sustainably" to assist the process of evaluation.
- ² No Purpose / Immediate objective was provided in the original project document. The purpose given was developed from the project document to assist and clarify the evaluation process.
- ³ The original statement of Project Goal was "Environmentally sound and sustainable development fostered - Poverty among the population of Socotra Island alleviated in a sustainable way." The evaluation team believes that this goal or development objectives confuses the project logic which is best revealed by separating the two statements into development and immediate objectives (project goal and project purpose)

D. Main stakeholders

Four primary groups of stakeholders in the projects were identified.

- The people of the Socotra Archipelago

The people of Socotra and the other islands of the archipelago may be considered as both the immediate and long-term stakeholders in the projects. In the short term they have benefited materially from the support provided by the health and water components of HWP, by the jobs created (SCDP is one of the largest single employers on Socotra), and by the raising of awareness and knowledge on a range of issues from preventing soil and tree loss through unsustainable resource management, to control of infectious diseases and waste management. In the medium term the people of Socotra stand to benefit from improved

management of their natural resources, and strengthened local institutions which promote a locally based vision of development and provide a buffer against the power of outside interests. In the long-term the people stand to benefit from the development of sustainable livelihoods based on the islands' natural resources through the identified engines of growth, fisheries and tourism.

- Local government and non government institutions on Socotra

In order to implement its activities, the project has supported GOY institutions on Socotra. The establishment of the EPA Socotra Office provides the main example. In 1997 there was no such office. At the time of this evaluation, the EPA had a staff of 12 technical and managerial staff, operating from new offices constructed in Hadibo, plus a branch office in the second town of Socotra, Qalansia. The EPA staff have acquired the capacity to monitor the environment, carry out and enforce Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), and take a leading role in decision making concerning the development of the island.

Other GOY institutions on the islands are stakeholders in the project and have been strengthened by the work of the project. These include offices such as the Office of Health, and the office of the General Manager of Hadibo District of Socotra (the Mamour).

In addition to GOY institutions, the project has been supportive of existing civil society institutions such as the Women's Association of Yemen, as well as assisting the establishment of new community institutions such as the Socotra Eco-tourism Society, the Socotra Conservation Fund and community based protected area associations.

- The Government of Yemen, its respective agencies, and scientific institutions

In order to function administratively, the project has worked in close collaboration with and provided technical and financial support to a number of government institutions. The Government of Yemen represented by its respective agencies is thus a key stakeholder in the project. The interests of the GOY were originally represented by the Environmental Protection Council (EPC), later transformed into the EPA. The EPA is currently lodged within the Ministry of Water and Environment, which as of mid 2003 has taken on responsibility for SCDP. These agencies and several others (including the Ministry of Fish Wealth, the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, the Yemen Island Authority, the Tourism Police and the Ministry of Health) have had important historical and on-going relationships with the projects and are key stakeholders on and off the island.

- The donor community to Yemen

Though it is perhaps unnecessary to point out that the donors who have contributed to the projects are stakeholders in them, the establishment of the Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit (SCDP CU) as a key component of the SBP2 gives them a special stake. This unit was included by the Royal Netherlands Embassy as a pre-condition for their funding and was strongly supported by the Government of the Republic of Italy and UNDP. Its intention was ensure coordination of current and future funding for Socotra and in this respect can be seen as a proxy institution for donor interests and activities.

E. Results expected

The following table presents the several stated results of the three projects. These have been extracted from the logical frameworks of the projects, where these were prepared, or through examination of the project documents.

The evaluation team interprets these results in the context of the logic developed for each project. In each case the stated results should be ‘sufficient and necessary’ to achieve the immediate objectives of the projects (project purposes) given in C above.

In two cases activity sets were included in the logical frameworks of the project, presented as integral parts of the results. In these cases, the activity sets have also been give below.

Project	Results
SBP1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1. Socotran and national awareness of environmental and conservation issues raised R2. Human and institutional resources for biodiversity conservation and management strengthened R3. Zoning plan for Socotra developed R4. Selected initiatives to reduce pressure on natural resources developed R5. Project implementation capacity developed
SBP2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1. Zoning Plan implemented <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1.1 A nucleus of an effective PA management authority in place</i> <i>1.2 Pilot protected areas established with management plans developed and implementation started)</i> <i>1.3 Pilot eco-tourism activities in place and benefiting local people and protected areas</i> R2. The Socotra Conservation Fund established R3. The Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit established
HWP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1. Quality and accessibility of health care services improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Management capacity of District Health Office improved 1.2 Health Services on the district level and in rural areas strengthened 1.3 Capacity for disease control improved 1.4 Waste management in the health sector improved R2. Integrated water management system designed and implemented using traditional techniques R3. Environmentally sound water management system designed and implemented in a pilot area R.4 Integrated health and water management extension package designed and delivered

III. Findings and Conclusions

The discussion that follows is structured around the evaluation formats developed by GEF and UNDP modified to allow for the particular attributes of the projects being evaluated.

Given the interactive relationship between the implementation of SBP1 and the design and implementation of SBP2 and HWP, both project design and project implementation are discussed together.

This section, therefore:

- examines the original formulation of the projects and their integration with each other and with GOY;
- comments on the implementation of the projects within the context of the operational environment; and
- details notable strengths or problems of design and implementation that have contributed towards achievement or failure to achieve project development objectives and goals.

A. Project formulation and implementation

1. Implementation approach and execution modalities

SBP1 was implemented by UNOPS with considerable support from the UNDP Country Office. The project was lodged within the then EPC and managed at the field level by an internationally recruited CTA and the Project Implementation Unit (PIU). The intention was to establish a High Committee for Socotra, with ministerial level membership to function as a coordinating framework for the conservation and development of the islands. This committee did not come about, leaving the project largely isolated from the government process, linked only through the institutionally weak EPC.

SBP2 was also implemented by UNOPS with support of the UNDP Office but with the additional management structure of the SCDP CU headed by an internationally recruited CTA. The project was jointly linked to the Ministry of Planning and International Development, a ministry with cross-cutting and coordination responsibilities, and the Environment Protection Agency, formerly housed within the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and now housed within the newly established Ministry of Water and Environment. On the ground the project was managed by an internationally recruited CTA and linked to the Socotra office of the EPA.

The Health and Water Project was implemented through UNOPS with support of the UNDP Office. On the ground the project was managed by an internationally recruited CTA. Though not formally linked to the Ministry of Health, the project was linked through the SCDP CU to the government through the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. On the island the project was directly linked to the Socotra Health Office.

The implementation approach designed had a sound logic but has not been an unqualified success. The initial intervention on Socotra through SBP1 was linked to the EPC, at that time the only identified government agency through which the project could operate on the island. Being strongly rooted on Socotra was one of the greatest strengths of SBP1. However, during the course of project implementation it became evident that the Council did not have the political or administrative strength in Sana'a, the capital, to influence government plans for or attitudes towards Socotra's development and conservation.

This influenced the decision to lodge SBP2 within the cross-cutting Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and to the establishment of the Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit. This unit was designed to establish a capacity within the Ministry to coordinate investments, both international and GOY, on Socotra. The intention seems to have been to create a functional alternative to the failed High Committee for Socotra (HCS) or to the General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands (GADYI). In the event, this was not achieved. The Ministry of Planning did not absorb the CU or provide material, technical or political support for the unit. The result was that the CU developed a

separate operational structure, effectively linked only to the donor community. Though this may have allowed operations to continue without impediment, it did not promote the building of links with government or increase their perceptions of ownership. With the failure of the SCDP CU to become a functional unit of the GOY and with weak institutional links, the requirement for a GOY institution with real authority, capacity and political strength to coordinate investment in Socotra was not met.

A set of circumstances relating to management of the projects further undermined the ability of the SCDP CU to achieve its expected outcomes. These are discussed in Section 9 below.

GEF Rating: Marginally satisfactory

2. Country ownership / Drivenness

Responsiveness to stakeholder interests in design process

The mid-term evaluation identified problems with the design process for SBP1⁴. The process undertaken to design SBP2 was strong on consultation, aided by the solid presence of the project team on the island, but perhaps lacked responsiveness to local perspectives. The issue of responding to local demands for development initiatives in the context of designing conservation projects remains a basic problem for real stakeholder participation in the design and implementation of conservation initiatives. This is a problem not restricted to GEF projects but can be considered to affect many if not most donor and government conservation initiatives, in Yemen and elsewhere.

The failure of the HWP to respond closely to either local community or GOY interests is perhaps more difficult to understand. The HWP carried out the great majority of its activities, and largely achieved its results. That it made little impact on its stated immediate objective or purpose may be attributed to poor project design logic rather than failure of implementation. What is or greater concern, however, is that the project's considerable success was not perceived as such by many stakeholders. This may be attributed primarily to the lack of correlation between stakeholder expectations of the project and the design of the project itself. This is mainly relevant to the water component of the project. The water component was a research and development project designed to provide a functional model for future interventions. Expectations on the island were that it would make a much greater direct contribution to the problems of water access amongst communities on Socotra.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

Responsiveness to country and regional situation analysis

The underlying concept of SBP1, stated in the project's 'Brief Description'⁵ was,

"... to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of Socotra archipelago [through] an integrated resource management and development strategy, driven by local communities, and building on sound ecological and socio-economic bases."

⁴ The mid-term evaluation found that despite considerable discussion with and involvement of relevant GOY and community stakeholders in the preliminary design process, the results of these consultations and stakeholder inputs were not always strongly reflected in the final project developed by GEF staff.

⁵ Title page of project document

This concept indicates both the long-term objective of the project and the primary strategy of achieving it. Both were relevant to the context of the project at the time of development, and remain relevant today. Socotra's biodiversity is of global importance, containing very high numbers of endemic species, and is remarkably intact. Therefore, the opportunity to make an important contribution to the conservation of global biodiversity exists.

The National Environment Action Plan (NEAP) of the Republic of Yemen identified the Socotra Archipelago as an area of critical conservation importance and specified the establishment of protected areas on the islands as one of four priority actions of its' Habitat Management Action Programme. In 1996, Socotra was described by the Government of Yemen as a "special area" in urgent need of protection. The recognition of the importance of the archipelago in conservation terms had clear economic implications for the island and the GOY. Its decision to allocate YR 256 million for the development of infrastructure in Socotra bears witness to this. Furthermore, the GOY made requests to UNDP and the European Union (EU) for support in the preparation of a Master Plan for the development of the Archipelago (SAMP). The EU agreed to this request. The SBP1 was therefore both appropriate and timely in its support of the GOY's conservation and development plans for Socotra.

The SBP1 was designed in the context of other planned sources of external assistance for the Archipelago. The UNDP Basic Needs Assistance Project was developed in 1996 and planned to begin implementation in 1997 running in parallel to SBP1. In addition, other projects relevant to the long term objective of SBP1 were being funded in the region by GEF, the EU and other donor agencies. Most relevant to the SBP1 and SBP2 were the GEF National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan project, the Sub-program 5 of the National Eco-tourism Capacity under UNDP's Supported National Environment Programme (YEM/97/100), and support for the protection of the marine ecosystems of the Red Sea coast, also funded by GEF. The IV Fisheries Project, funded by the EU and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which assists the GOY to manage its fisheries resource, was also important.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

Relevance to UNDP programme

In the context of UNDP's programme focus at the time of their development, SBP1, SBP2 and HWP were directly relevant to two of the six specified areas of concentration, namely:

- poverty alleviation and grass-roots participation in development, and
- environmental problems and natural resources management.

These projects also fall under the current outcomes profile for UNDP Yemen. Specifically, they are listed as responding to the outcome stated as:

Improved capacity of local authorities, community based groups and the private sector in environmental management and sustainable energy development.

It should be noted that as well as providing strong leadership in country, and strong institutional support for project implementation, UNDP Yemen has made significant financial investments in Socotra, starting with the Basic Needs Assistance Project initiated in 1996 (USD 747,352), and including contributions to both SBP2 (USD approx. 370,000) and HWP (USD approx. 600,000) and the new phase 2003-2008 (USD 2,500,000 – project YEM/03/004 –signed July 2003).

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

Indications of institutional ownership

The most important formal achievement of SBP1 may be considered as the ratification of the Conservation Zoning Plan by GOY and its establishment in law through Decree 275 in 2000. This provides perhaps the strongest indication of the strength of country ownership of the project. That this law was strongly challenged in 2002 –2003 by powerful political and economic interests within GOY but enforced with the personal involvement of the President of Yemen again indicates ownership at the highest levels of government. It might be suggested, however, that the success of personal interests on Socotra in generating significant opposition to the CZP, requiring the personal involvement of the President, suggests a certain weakness of ownership or understanding of the zoning plan and the all important link it proposes between conservation and development.

SBP2 was developed to cement the achievements of SBP1. Though a great deal has been achieved in terms of activities implemented and progress made towards project objectives and goals, the evaluation team found that perceptions of ownership by many important GOY institutions, perhaps most importantly on Socotra itself, is not strong. Much of this failure may be attributed to the failure of government to take a leadership role. A fundamental objective of the project was to support government to establish a coordination mechanism for Socotra's development. GOY has singularly failed in this respect. As a result, there are inevitable weakness in the ownership of the project. It would be unfair to attribute them to the implementation of the project or the design of the project. It should perhaps be noted that a fundamental problem here relates to the question of the degree to which the GOY and the institutions and leadership on Socotra have 'bought in' to the concept of planning at all. An indication of concerns over this is the failure of GOY to ratify the SAMP. This failure has allowed the tendency for individuals and institutions to make important decisions concerning investment on Socotra without reference to the SAMP, the CZP or the responsible institutions to continue.

An important point to be made in terms of institutional ownership is in relation to the project implementation team itself. The project has built up a powerful and effective implementation team since 1997, primarily comprised of local Socotrans. To date 12 members of this team have been transferred to the EPA Socotra Office where they now form perhaps the strongest technical team on the island. This joint project/EPA technical team demonstrates very high ownership of the project and its objectives, a fact of considerable importance to the implementation of project activities and to the future sustainability of project achievements.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

Government ownership as indicated by GOY investment

The Government of Yemen has been the largest single investor on Socotra since the beginning of the period covered by the projects being evaluated here. These include over USD 3 million for the construction of the Socotra Airport, several government department offices constructed or under construction (USD xxxx), and construction of surfaced roads from the airport to and around Hadibo, Socotra's main town, and from the airport to Qalansia, Socotra's second largest town. In addition, there has been a detailed investment and planning process for the construction of a new port for Socotra.

As will be discussed elsewhere, investments in social and government infrastructure are critical for the future development of the island. However, there is evidence to indicate that government investments are not being channelled through planning procedures that respond to established development priorities for Socotra. This has important consequences;

- priority development requirements are receiving no or little GOY investment;

- scarce government funds are being wasted;
- poor planning is endangering the future development of a strong eco-tourism industry.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

3. Stakeholder participation and public involvement

Information dissemination

The range and depth of the project's use of information and awareness campaigns has been one of the most impressive features of all three projects. This report will not attempt to list the materials produced by the projects. Suffice to say that a broad range of posters, pamphlets, books, booklets and promotional videos has been produced. These have been designed to function as a range of different levels, from the local community on Socotra, to the general public in Yemen. Other mediums have been aimed at tourists and the wider global community. The project has also collaborated in the production of radio and TV programmes, and newspaper and magazine articles. The World Wide Webb has also been used for information dissemination.

In addition to these materials for public consumption, regular projects reports have been prepared and circulated amongst project partners and technical reports and papers have been prepared and widely circulated.

Finally, important project components have focused on awareness raising and outreach amongst the people of Socotra. A broad range of awareness messages have been developed ranging from advice on sustainable fisheries management and rangeland management, dealing with rubbish and waste disposal, to basic health messages on malaria and infections diseases control. To carry these and other messages, a network of 37 part time community based extension officers has been established, supported by a full time team of six Awareness and Education Extension Officers.

Despite high levels of achievement in disseminating information, the evaluation team were concerned that the fundamental vision developed by the project has not been sufficiently well articulated to local communities and local partners. The link between the future development of the island and well-being of the people with the conservation of its natural resources through the economic growth engines of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism is not yet sufficiently well understood or recognised by stakeholders on Socotra. That government officials and community members continue to separate the project's conservation activities from the island's future development indicates an area that needs to be further addressed.

GEF Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Consultation and stakeholder participation

Many initiatives to encourage and support direct stakeholder participation in project implementation have been undertaken by the project. These have ranged from extensive consultations during project design processes, numerous consultative meetings during implementation, and direct partnerships for implementation.

The PIU on Socotra is best understood as a joint project / government team and operates out of a shared office. This fact is an important for ensuring partner participation. Other important project activities are largely managed and implemented by government staff through project/GOY cooperation agreements. The operation of the project supported Mobile Clinic is a good example of this. Bi-monthly visits of the clinic to remote island communities are

organised and implemented by an employee of the Health Office on Socotra made available to support this component of the project.

Other key operations are being implemented in close collaboration with fledgling civil societies on Socotra and the mainland. Two community groups have been supported to become legally registered NGOs and are now in the process of establishing arrangements for the management of pilot protected areas in collaboration with EPA. This process of community institution building as a preliminary to protected area development represents a ground-breaking attempt to establish a true people – government partnership for conservation, working from the most basic institutional elements upwards towards government.

Similarly, and equally important has been the establishment of the Socotra Eco-tourism Society (SES). Also still in its infancy, SES is being developed to play a central role in the development of tourism on Socotra in such a way as to ensure that local people are real partners in the future.

The development of the Socotra Conservation Fund represents another initiative of the project to establish a civil society to take a leading role in the conservation and development of Socotra.

It may be said that these civil society institutions are actually outgrowths of the project. Though their establishment has been stimulated by and pursued by the project, these institutions represent genuine initiatives to build local capacity to both support and provide checks and balances to government institutions. Difficult issues remain in determining the autonomy of these bodies and their future relations with government and the project. However, the steps taken have been important ones and create the potential for real stakeholder participation in the project's future activities and in the conservation and development of Socotra itself.

Despite these initiatives, one of the most difficult issues for the evaluation team to address has been that of stakeholder participation. Although there have been numerous initiatives designed to ensure stakeholder participation, many senior government officials indicated that the project did not involve them or their offices in a substantive way in project implementation, either directly or through consultations. These complaints were mirrored by government officers on Socotra and by members of the Local Council.

Questionnaire returns showed clear differences between members of the project implementation team (internal respondents⁶) and members of government and local government on Socotra (external respondents) perceptions of how closely the project had worked with stakeholders. When asked, "*Has the project worked closely with local people and local community groups?*", 5 out of 8 external respondents answered 'not very closely' or 'not closely at all' while 12 out of 14 internal respondents answered "Very closely".

Similarly, when asked, "*Has the project worked closely with local authorities and departments?*", 3 out of 8 external respondents answered "Not closely at all" and 3, "Not very closely", while 4 out of 12 internal respondents answered "Very closely" and 8 answered "Quite closely".

What explains the great difference in perceptions? The evaluation team concluded that the term 'participation' as used by government officials means 'management control and personal access to financial benefits', while the term as used by project management means 'consultation'. An operational definition lying somewhere between these two would be advantageous. While retaining accountability and a results driven focus, the level of partners' participation in project implementation and management should be increased.

⁶ The questionnaire was only filled by local project team members. The CTA and other expatriate team members were not invited to fill the questionnaire

It would be generally fair to say that the degree of enthusiasm for the project amongst informants was correlated to the degree of direct benefits received from the project. Respondents who received salaries (whether full time or part time) or other financial benefits from the project were positive whilst others were not. Though this is an over simplification, it must be recognised that few opportunities exist on Socotra to earn a salary which are important for household livelihoods. At the same time, government salaries are very low.

The question of 'control' over the project is a more difficult one. The evaluation team believes that in the run-up to the next phase of the project, government officials were making a bid for a more active management role in the project. This aspiration is both legitimate and problematic. Similar issues were raised during the mid-term evaluation with respect to tensions caused by UNOPS implementation of SBP1. There was broad consensus amongst government officials, though considerably less consensus amongst donor representatives, that the project should have been nationally implemented. The same feelings were expressed concerning the management of SBP2 and HWP.

It is uncertain whether project management could have addressed this issue effectively by making greater efforts to share management responsibility with partners. Though implementation remained with UNOPS, there could have been good reasons for establishing some form of 'management committee' for the day to day management of the project which would have left the project's senior management less exposed on this issue.

It is worth noting that UNDP has already responded to these issues and the next phase of the project will be locally implemented. Respondents interviewed during this evaluation were not necessarily aware of this fact.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

4. Replication approach

The degree to which the projects have achieved replication varies depending on the individual project components. Using the GEF conception of 'knowledge transfer', SBP1 and SBP2 have performed well. As referred to above, a large number of formal and informal project documents have been prepared and disseminated. These have ranged from published papers and books to internal records and guidelines.

Project team members have participated in national level forums and public information campaigns. They are regular contributors to forums of the Programme for the Environment of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden (PERSGA). Team members have also participated in global GEF forums. Training has played an important role in the project, both in terms of experts hired to train team members, and through providing training to project partners and stakeholders.

In other respects, the project has not reached the point of replicating approaches. Protected area establishment and management has been slower than anticipated. Much remains to be done in the two pilot protected areas currently providing an important focus for the project. It is anticipated that the model being developed will be replicated in the many other proposed protected areas on the island.

A small but significant example of what GEF refers to as 'scaling up' was demonstrated within the project. The model of water catchment management developed by the project has been taken up by the GOY Social Fund in its water development projects.

Already noted above, the project has built a technically strong and committed team of Socotrans. The importance of this achievement cannot be over-emphasised for the sustainability of project outcomes and contributions to national and regional capacity in natural

resources management. This is especially so in the fields of research and monitoring, environmental awareness and education, and protected area establishment. It should be noted that the project has built this team from people with very low technical skills. Most could not originally operate a computer, few had any scientific training, and few spoke English. Team members are now able to design and undertake research and monitoring programmes, analyse and write up, and present their findings in national and international forums.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

5. Financial planning

The evaluation team was unable to carry out a detailed examination of project expenditures against activities. However, no significant financial management issues were raised by project partners or project management.

Financial systems in UNOPS, where budget tracking was carried out and disbursements authorised, are highly sophisticated. Despite some delays in authorization of disbursements and occasional procurement problems (a consignment of drugs purchased for the medicine cost sharing scheme were found to have expired; a piece of equipment was found to be faulty on arrival), no significant problems were identified by the evaluation team. Financial controls and regular financial reporting was strong, and field operations were allowed the responsibility for programming expenditures to meet needs on the ground. No financial audits were carried out during the course of project implementation, which the evaluation team views as irregular.

Only one disbursement issues was raised, an outstanding payment to the contractor responsible for the additional constructions made to the EPA / Project offices on Socotra. The UNDP Country Office and UNOPS will work with EPA to resolve this.

One of the strongest achievements of the original GEF project has been its ability to attract additional funding from a variety of sources. The entire funding and co-funding of SBP2 (USD 1,500,000) and HWP (USD 1,000,000) may be considered as funds leveraged by SBP1. A further USD 5,000,000 has been secured through the SCDP to support and extend conservation and development activities on Socotra to 2008. A further sum of USD 12,000 has been raised (now in the SCF bank account) through the Socotra Conservation Fund for small scale community development grants. and proposals are being submitted to support the SCF and implement micro-project for USD 1,000,000 (to GEF MSP/SCF), and USD 80,000 (to Japanese Grassroots Grants). Details are included in Exhibit 6.

The leverage of approximately USD 8 million through the original project is an important achievement, largely attributable to the efforts of CTA, Edoardo Zandri and his team, and the strong cooperation and support of the UNDP Country Office, Yemen.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

6. Cost effectiveness

The evaluation team is not able to comment on the cost effectiveness of the three projects. The evaluation did not permit a sufficiently detailed examination of budget structures, cost of individual activities, or analysis of expenditure in relation to budgets.

It should be noted here, however, that with respect to the HWP, many respondents were unsatisfied with the level of investment in actual development activities. This may be a fair criticism of the project design, which invested almost USD 500,000 (to develop a meteo-data collection network, GIS maps, a baseline watershed management model, etc.) but built only

two substantial water collection facilities (kareefs). It would not be fair to criticise implementation of the project, however, as objectives were met and most activities undertaken. Once again, the issue relates more to expectations than implementation. Community and government had unrealistically high expectations of the project which were not based on a close reading of the project documents itself.

Another criticism of the projects was that too much money was spent on international consultants and experts. This is a common complaint against projects of this nature. The projects' strong emphasis on building technical capacity could not have been achieved without the employment of technically strong international project staff. Whether the project needed the level of international management is a question that cannot be easily resolved.

GEF Rating: N/A

7. Linkages between project and other interventions

The entire suite of projects under evaluation had an exclusive focus on the Socotra Archipelago. The almost complete isolation of the islands from the mainland meant that the projects were implemented with few functional linkages to other projects or interventions in Yemen. Where opportunities for collaboration existed these were strongly pursued.

The strongest example of inter-project linkage is represented by the collaboration between SBP1 and the European Union funded SAMP preparation project. The result of this collaboration was that the SAMP itself was strongly influenced by the CZP. It integrated the research findings and proposals for the conservation of the island prepared by SBP1 into the master plan. Together, the CZP and the SAMP articulate a cohesive vision for the future economic development of the islands.

Other cases of linkages with other projects are presented by the collaboration with the GOY's Social Fund which has used the HWP's water management pilot developments and the data on hydrology and geomorphology to plan, design and implement micro community water projects. Similarly, the French NGO Triangle, which also undertook small scale water development projects on Socotra made good use of data provided by HWP. The HWP also worked closely with GOY interventions in the field of public health, particularly infections disease control and a malaria reduction programme.

Perhaps more significant is the role that the Environmental Protection Authority Office on Socotra is beginning to play in screening GOY and private investments on the islands. Using EIAs as a mechanism, EPA has begun to link with and provide input to developments such as the proposed port for Hadibo being planned by the Yemeni Port Authority, the road to Qalansia⁷ being built by the Ministry of Public Works and Housing , and the proposed private investment in a jetty and cement packing facility.

As indicated above, project staff are also regular contributors to the regional PERSGA initiative.

A key issue for the evaluation here is that Socotra lacks significant outside investment. Almost the entire support for the islands' people, with the exception of infrastructure projects, is coming from the SCDP suite of projects. This has led to the problem of unrealistic expectations amongst communities and partners on what the programme can deliver.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

⁷ The construction of the Qalansia road became a major issue for the project and thus needed to be addressed by this Evaluation. It is important because it relates to several fundamental aspects of the project's impact on the conservation and development of Socotra. A detailed discussion is presented in Exhibit 9.

8. Indicators, monitoring and evaluation

The lack of or weakness of indicators developed for SCP1 was discussed in the mid-term evaluation. Clear indicators for SCP2 implementation were developed and were tracked closely in project reports. Indicators of impact, however, were not clearly defined. Indicators for HWP were not presented, and no logical framework was developed. However, the small number of clearly stated activities sufficed to specify the expected outputs of the project.

Project implementation monitoring has been strong and consistent throughout the course of the implementation of the three projects. All donors interviewed here highly satisfied with the level and quality of reporting provided to them. Some project partners were less satisfied, through the nature of their dissatisfaction was not easy to determine. The evaluation team interpreted it as an indication of dissatisfaction with the level of partner involvement in management and implementation.

Internal evaluation of UNDP GEF projects is through Tripartite Review Meetings. These meetings provide the highest level of project steering available to GEF, UNDP and GOY. The success of project's may thus be ultimately attributed to these bodies meeting through this forum. The minutes of Tripartite meetings held do not, however, indicate that sufficient evaluation and guidance of project implementation was undertaken. The Tripartite Meetings seemed to have been used as little more than a brief reporting opportunity. There is little evidence that substantive issues of implementation were discussed, progress towards project goals evaluated, or substantive issues resolved.

Perhaps the most significant problem experienced by both SBP1 and SBP2, the failure of the GOY to establish an effective over-arching institution responsible for the development of Socotra, was not addressed by the responsible parties through the established forum. At various points, it was understood or proposed that this role would be performed by the High Committee for Socotra, the Environment Protection Council, the General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands, and a steering committee of ministers for the SCDP. None of these committees or authorities were given sufficient authority to coordinate the activities of other ministries. Some never actually came into being. This meant that the required institutional lodgement of the SCDP CU never came about. It also meant that coordination and planning control over outside investment on Socotra has not been achieved.

GEF Rating: Marginally satisfactory

9. Management, cooperation and operational issues

The management structure designed for the suite of projects was found to be sound. The quality of management itself, however, was variable. This led to a significant problem with respect to perceptions amongst some partners of their ownership of and participation in the project.

To allow the SCDP CU to focus on the key issue of developing GOY capacity to coordinate investment in Socotra, project documents describe a clear separation between the management of field operations and the management and functions of the SCDP CU. The appointment of Dr Edoardo Zandri, former CTA of SBP1, to manage the new SCDP CU provided strong leadership for the CU and was understood by the evaluation team to be close to a pre-condition for donor support for SBP2 and HWP.

This strength was not matched, however, by the CTA's of either SBP2 or HWP. The first SBP2 CTA failed to provide the strength of leadership required on Socotra and was let go after 12 months. His replacement was also not satisfactory and stayed only 4 months. The result was that the Protected Area Expert recruited by SBP2 was encouraged to take on

management of the project on the ground. The evaluation team found his performance to have been strong. Inevitably, however, the technical area of his responsibility, protected area development, received less attention than it required. It also caused tensions with some partners who were unhappy for a relatively young technical expert to be given effective management of field operations.

The CTA of the HWP was technically strong but his lack of strong English or Arabic language skills or project management skills left a void in terms of the establishment of partner relations.

Though both SBP2 and HWP were implemented through the SCDP, project management structures did not clarify mechanisms for their collaboration on the ground during implementation. Delays in implementation of SBP2 and the weakness of the HWP CTA meant that there was little practical integration of these projects on the ground. The requirement of the SCDP CU CTA to step in to resolve this problem and establish management coordination led to a further erosion of independence of Socotra based project management and the steady assumption of management responsibility by the SCDP CU in Sana'a.

These difficulties of project management on the ground meant, perhaps inevitably, that Dr Zandri continued to function as the manager of the projects and the CU became the *defacto* management unit. This unexpected result of the operational design being undermined by recruitment decisions had a number of important consequences for the projects.

- Several project partners suggested that it led to an unnecessary and cost-inefficient 'second tier' of project management. They felt this resulted in a weakening in the original project format that focused strongly on Socotra itself and was considered to be an important strength of SBP1. Informants within EPA suggested that the retention of management control within the CU meant that EPA staff on Socotra and in Sana'a were prevented from participating in management to the degree to which they should have done and would have liked.
- The CU was distracted from its primary task, building a GOY institution responsible for coordinating investments in Socotra's conservation and development. The growing burden of day-to-day management responsibility for two complex projects being implemented in a difficult operating environment seems to have become the primary function of the CU. As a consequence, the failure of GOY to promote a high level committee for the SCDP was not pursued.

The balance between pursuing project process and project product is always a difficult one for managers. Donors are often strongly fixated on the timeliness and quality of products. Management often responds to these pressures, especially when they are seen to influence the level of future funding that may be leveraged by strong project performance. The personal commitment of staff towards achieving conservation outcomes is also an important factor. Government partners, however, are often more interested in process, especially when that process leads to greater involvement of GOY in project implementation and management. Project management might have used the weakness of international CTAs on Socotra to strengthen the capacity of government partners to share management responsibility. This would not have been easy, as strengthening partners requires the presence of strong technical and management staff in the first place. It might, however, have been a desirable decision and would perhaps have reduced the level of political isolation of SDCP found by the evaluation team. The decision to retain and strengthen management within the SCDP led, however, to stronger project implementation than might otherwise have been achieved.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

10. Management by the UNDP Country office

The role played by UNDP Country Office in the design, implementation, extension and funding of the suite of projects has been significant from the beginning. A close functional relationship have been developed between the SCDP CU and the Country Office. The Resident Representative has taken a strong personal interest in the projects and has provided both material and political support.

The Country Office has also played an important role in facilitating communications between the SCDP CU and key ministries and authorities of GOY when direct communications became difficult due to the weakness of institutional lodgement of the CU.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

B. Project achievements, outcomes and impacts

This section will present the evaluation teams assessment project achievements. To allow for clarity, the three projects will be independently assessed on the implementation of activities and the achievement of their stated goals and purposes. Evaluation of the highest level of impact, that of the UNDP outcome, will unify the achievements of the three projects.

1. Implementation of activities

All three projects have carried out a great range and number of activities over the past six years ranging from supporting local NGOs to design and promote eco-tourism packages on the international market, and assisting communities convert from damaging lobster netting techniques to best-practice lobster trapping, to designing a master plan for the conservation zoning of the entire archipelago, and supporting research leading to the discovery and description of new plant and animal species.

The mid-term evaluation report referred to 145 separate activities specified in the SBP1 design. Both SBP2 and HWP had less numerous stated activities, with guidance for project implementation primarily provided at the level of project results⁸.

This evaluation report does not attempt to list or discuss individual activities or individual results unless they represent significant achievements that contribute directly and significantly to the attainment of project objectives. Project progress reports seen by the evaluation team provide detailed information on the level of implementation of project activities, either in relation to established indicators or in general terms.

The evaluation team found that the large majority of activities referred to in project documents had been implemented, most to a high degree of completion and with a high level of technical competence. The evaluation team also noted that many activities were undertaken in response to recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation report. Rather than replicate these recommendations, this report incorporates the responses of the management team and their partners to them. Exhibit 8 details the recommendations and the responses made to them. The following discussion will examine the degree to which implementation of these activities contributed towards specified outcomes and objectives.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

⁸ This represents an improvement in project design.

2. Attainment of UNDP outcome

“Improved capacity of local authorities and community-based groups in environmental management and sustainable energy development.”

The UNDP outcome selected by the UNDP project was retroactively fitted to the suite of projects under the Socotra Conservation and Development Programme.

The evaluation team found the selected outcome to be valid because key concepts evident in the goals and purposes of all three projects point to the intention to impact on the status of environmental management through sustainable development and the strengthening of community involvement in environmental management. Minor deconstruction of the outcome is required to provide a better fit, however, to remove reference to sustainable energy development⁹ and to make reference to biodiversity conservation and natural resource management as a key environmental issues. The reconstructed outcome reads:

“Improved capacity of local authorities and community-based groups in environmental management and sustainable natural resource-based development.”

Exhibit 1 details the evaluation teams assessment of attainment of this outcome. The team found important steps towards the strengthening of community and local government capacity for environmental management. The provision of the basic tool for sound management, the Conservation Zoning Plan, was designed during SBP1. The intensive scientific work laid the basis for the plan, and the strong education and awareness programme carried out at all levels of Yemeni society laid the basis for the plan’s ratification.

Since its ratification, SBP2 has carried out painstaking work towards implementation of the CZP. Despite evidence of considerable frustration at the slow rate of progress amongst project partners, perhaps most worryingly amongst top officials of the EPA, the evaluation team found that an exemplary process of community based protected area development is being carried. The establishment of a protected area network could have been pushed forward in a top-down manner, and a system replicating those found in many parts of the world could perhaps have been achieved. Analysis of the situation found that government institutions were too weak in management and technical terms to support this approach. Furthermore, the original conception of the project was to achieve sustainable resource management and conservation by the community itself. The PIU has worked slowly and carefully to support the establishment of two community associations who will work with the EPA to agree fundamental aspects of protected area management.

Concerns over the replicability of this approach remain due to the complexity, duration and cost of the process. The evaluation team felt, however, that the importance of the initiative outweighed these concerns.

The project has also focused attention on the development and empowerment of other community based institutions. These include the Socotra Eco-tourism Society and the Socotra Conservation Fund. Both these institutions represent the future sustainability of project impacts. It is of some concern, however, that they remain in their infancy and require considerable technical and financial support before they will be able to operate on their own.

Development of government and local government institutions is also necessary if Socotra’s people and institutions are to take a strong role in their own development. The greatest

⁹ Though energy generation is an important issue on Socotra, no project activities addressed it directly.

threats to the island probably still come from outside the island. On one hand the project has achieved a great deal in this respect. The EPA is the strongest technical body on the island and is increasingly beginning to make this strength felt through Environmental Impact Assessments of development projects. The case of the conflict over the Qalansia Road remains an important precedent in which the forces of the EPA and a strong lobby by members of the local community combined with the political strength of the project and its international donors to prevent a road being built through a protected area. This achievement stands as a benchmark for local influence on the development process. It is by no means clear that this achievement will be replicated in the future, however, as the EPA and the Local Council remain politically and institutionally weak.¹⁰ Further work to strengthen local government is required so that civil society and local government can together ensure the sound development of the island and place checks and balances on interventions championed by central government or powerful individuals.

Despite the considerable achievements discussed above, much remains to be done. Though the CZP has been ratified, the Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP) has not. This is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, the SAMP and the CZP were designed to work together, and together they articulate a consistent and consolidated vision for the future development of Socotra. This vision is based on the sustainable exploitation of the islands' biological diversity through improved fisheries management and development of community-based eco-tourism. Without ratification of the SAMP, development of Socotra remains on an uncertain footing. Secondly, once ratified, implementation of the SAMP will make issues like the damaging Qalansia road incident less likely to occur, saving the time, resources and money of all partners.

Government's failure to ratify the SAMP and its failure to establish an authority for the overall development of Socotra means that government investments to the islands are not subject to the same kind of analysis and coordination as donor investments. This is an issue of real concern. Without a clearly articulated and formally ratified development plan, and an umbrella authority charged with implementing it, events like the Qalansia road conflict will continue to occur. Furthermore, it allows individuals and political powerful groups to have a dangerous degree of influence on the development of Socotra. Whether one assumes that these groups will be well intentioned (an assumption that would not always be warranted) or not, the lack of a coherent plan is certain to result in misdirected development and quite likely, damaging development initiatives.

Though the EPA is probably the strongest institution on Socotra (excepting the Yemeni Army), it is clear that the current establishment has neither the administrative or political strength to act as an effective planning authority for Socotra. Similarly, the Local Councils, which were established only two years ago, are not strong enough to take on this role. A strong, locally based institution with authority to coordinate development and investments remains critical to the future of Socotra.

The civil society institutions established with project assistance are beginning to find a voice, and it is notable that communities lobbying against the Qalansia Road alignment through the nature reserve played a significant role in stopping it¹¹. It is also clear, however, that they are not strong enough to play an unsupported role in the development and management of protected areas or in the development and management of an eco-tourism industry.

¹⁰ A component of the next phase of the project will be an initiative to strengthen the Local Councils and the office of the Mamour through a UNDP governance project.

¹¹ The road alignment persuaded by the Ministry of Construction would not only have gone through an important nature reserve, it would also have failed to serve approximately 40 villages who would have been served by the road alignment recommended in the SAMP. It was these communities that joined the lobby against the Ministry of Construction's alignment.

This general situation cannot be attributed as a failure of the current project. The outcome refers to *'improved capacity of local authorities and community-based groups'* and this has most certainly been achieved. What must be remembered is that the base-line from which the project was working was very low, with little if any effective government bodies and no civil society groups working in environmental management. The current situation thus represents a significant achievement and a positive outcome. That more remains to be done is recognised by the inclusion of a significant role of strengthening local councils in the next phase of the project.

GEF Rating: Satisfactory

3. Attainment of project goals / immediate development – environmental objectives

The evaluation team examined the attainments of the goals of each project. This was necessary because thought they were linked within the Socotra Conservation and Development Programme, each had separately stated goals. Though SBP1 and SBP2 have functionally equivalent goals, the third project, HWP had an entirely different goal statement. The evaluation team understands that this was necessary to meet the needs of the project donors. Nonetheless, it was unfortunate for project implementation. As projects are designed to make 'contributions' to a stated goal, while 'committing to achieving' project purposes, a programme such as the SCDP which unifies the contributions of a range of parties should attempt to identify a single overall goal to which all programme elements will contribute. If the programme is comprehensive enough, it may be suggested that the programme's purpose becomes the goal of the individual projects.

Socotra Biodiversity Project, Phase 1.

Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase

Socotra's biodiversity and natural resources conserved and managed sustainably

The unique biological diversity of the Socotra Archipelago conserved

These two goals are sufficiently close as to allow a single assessment of their achievement. In both cases the wording presents an absolute. Socotra's biodiversity will be conserved. This is difficult to assess, especially as no quantifiable or measurable indicators are presented for its achievement. In any case, the projects are not seen as acting alone in achieving the conservation of Socotra's biodiversity, and assume active contributions from other sources.

If 'biodiversity conserved' is interpreted to mean that all species on the islands at the beginning of the project still exist at the end, the projects should be found to have succeeded. There is no evidence of species extinctions or of any significant deterioration of the status of species populations. The Research and Monitoring Unit of the PIU is collecting and analysing sufficient data for the evaluation team to be relative safe in making this statement.

What is more difficult, however, is to determine whether the simple retention of species is an adequate indicator of success. The goal statement of SBP1 refers to the 'sustainability of management' which is a critical issue for long-term species survival and ecosystem conservation. Again, the general fact that there have been no recorded collapses of species population suggests that the management of the islands' biodiversity is on a sustainable basis. The degree to which the projects have contributed to this is not easily measurable. Many project documents refer to the predisposition of the Socotran people towards sustainable resource management due to their historical isolation and absolute dependence on their natural resources. The evaluation team also found that the work of the project, especially the

awareness programme, has strengthened this traditional behaviour, and in some cases supported its retention or return. Research suggests that the ecosystems of the islands today are the product historical and current resource use, notably grazing of goats and cattle in the interior and fishing on the coast¹².

Asked whether Socotrans were taking responsibility for the conservation of the island's nature themselves, nearly 80% of respondents suggested that Socotrans were contributing a lot (24%) or a bit (53%) towards the conservation of their own resources. It is evident, however, that the level of active management of biodiversity by communities or government institutions has not been significantly raised as a result of project interventions¹³.

It is a guessing game to wonder what the situation on the island would have been without the projects. The evaluation team also believes, however, that the project has greatly improved the general environment for conservation and the probability that it will play an important role in the future development of the island. Without the project, there is little doubt that one of the island's most important natural sites, the Datwah Lagoon would have been destroyed or damaged by road construction. It is also likely that without the strengthened capacity of the authorities to control wildlife exports and imports, the islands' natural biodiversity would have been greatly affected¹⁴.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

Health and Water Project

Environmentally sound and sustainable development fostered

Though the evaluation team has reservations about the logic proposed for this project, and though the project made little impact on its immediate development objective (see below), the work carried out did have some impact on this goal. That the impact was small says more about the goal statement in relation to the project's scope, scale and duration than it says about the implementation of the project.

The project divided activities into three results. Elements of all these were designed to contribute towards the goal. A particularly important contribution was made by the water component which laid the basis for sound and sustainable management of water resources. As indicated elsewhere, the model designed by the project has been taken up by other development projects.

The integrated water and health extension messages designed and promulgated also fostered sound and sustainable development. The level of impact is not easily measurable but given the nature of the issues tackled, would probably not be high.

Finally, the health component, identified by the majority of respondents as delivering the greatest tangible benefits to community members of any element of the SCDP, probably contributed least to the stated goal. However, if one views the delivery of tangible benefits to people to raise their quality of life as a necessary element of pursuing long-term environmental and conservation objectives, then this component of the project was highly effective.

GEF Rating: Marginally satisfactory

¹² This is the general analysis made in the reports of Miranda Morris, and is the basis of much of the work of the SAMP.

¹³ There are several important exceptions to this, including the active conservation of turtles and protection of turtle nesting beaches, protection of shore bird nesting sites, programmes to remove exotic vegetation, the ongoing programme to eliminate the small Indian crow population, the support for improved management of the lobster fishery, and the controls over tourist use of the Hoq cave, and the development of legislation and capacity to control the removal and introduction of plants and animals to the island.

¹⁴ The project played a central role in the development of legislation controlling import and export of plants and animals, and in training police and airport officials to enforce the regulations.

4. Attainment of project purposes / immediate objectives

The evaluation team have examined the degree of attainment of states purposes of the three individual projects. The projects were designed to contribute to a broadly unified higher order goal, as discussed above.

Socotra Biodiversity Project, Phase 1

A zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented

There is little requirement for discussion here as the mid-term evaluation was carried out at a time when the project had functionally completed its work. Observations made at that time stand, as few significant activities have been carried out since. The primary achievement of SBP1 in the context of this evaluation is that it allowed funds to be secured for SBP2 and HWP.

GEF Rating: N/A

Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase

Zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented through the Socotra Conservation Development Programme

There purpose of SBP2 is essentially the same as SBP1. The only difference is the reference to the Socotra Conservation Development Programme. Though the decision to establish the SCDP was an important one, even through as discussed elsewhere the main objective of its establishment was not achieved, in terms of implementation of SBP2 it has been a great success. Despite reservations raised by several project partners, the evaluation team holds that without the steadying hand of the SCDP, considerably less would have been achieved.

The development of the Conservation Zoning Plan, the strengthening of the Environment Protection Authority, and the establishment of civil society institutions on Socotra combine to provide the key guiding instruments and institutions for the achievement of this purpose. Once again, the degree to which 'implementation' of the zoning system has been achieved is open to interpretation. No general indicators of the expected degree of implementation were presented so the evaluation team is required to use its own judgement.

At the level of results, three activity sets are indicated:

- *A nucleus of an effective PA management authority in place*
- *Pilot protected areas established with management plans developed and implementation started*
- *Pilot eco-tourism activities in place and benefiting local people and protected areas*

Examination of these activity sets is easier than examination of the purpose, in part because some targets were set. Though many respondents were highly critical of the level of protected area establishment and the initiation of active management, the evaluation team was greatly impressed by the process undertaken. The nucleus of a protected area management authority has been established comprising the Environment Protection Agency, community groups and the Tourism Police. Though the future articulation of these three elements of a protected area management authority remains to be clarified, and much detailed institutional development remains to be achieved, the nucleus is in place. The evaluation team also believes that given

the exemplary processes being undertaken to ensure active community participation, faster progress could not be expected. The temptation to work faster at higher institutional levels than communities are able to go raises the danger of a failure of the process at lower institutional levels. The project team has argued that this would weaken the future effectiveness of any management authority, and the evaluation team concurs.

Two pilot protected areas are in the process of establishment. Again, government sources complain about the slow rate of progress, and there are dangers attached to this. However, the process of community based protected area development can be viewed as a model of its kind. The evaluation team strongly supports the approach.

In more conventional terms, the project has also made progress towards establishing the two pilot protected areas. Road signs to guide visitors to the areas have been prepared and placed. Signs marking the protected areas and specifying allowable activities have also been placed. The project has worked with EPA and community groups to establish general management plans and tourism development plans for the areas, and is in the process of developing bylaws for them.

Activities towards eco-tourism development respond to the purpose's stated requirement that the zoning plan integrates development objectives. As stated earlier, the CZP and the SAMP together articulate a development vision based on sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism. Support for sustainable fisheries was outside the scope of the project, though some initiatives towards this have been undertaken. The eco-tourism activities were, however, key elements of the project.

Once again, no target indicators are provided. On the requirement of providing benefits to local people and protected areas, the evaluation team has to conclude that little has been achieved. There are a number of reasons for this, perhaps the most important being the crash in tourism in the region following the September 11th terrorist attack in New York. Yemen has suffered badly, and the other terrorist attacks that occurred within Yemen have aggravated the situation. The international tourism profile of Socotra is not sufficiently strong to overcome this problem.

Development of tourism on Socotra is not going to be easy. The islands' isolation will be a strong element in its favour amongst a certain class of tourist once the basis for tourism has been established. During the establishment phase, however, it is a problem. Investors are required and the project has been working hard to attract them. In the meantime, the project has carried out considerable work to ensure that communities are in a better position to benefit from future tourism. The Socotra Eco-tourism Society is a key element here. So too has been the training of guides, English language teaching, and the development of tours and tourist activities. The development of two tourist information centres and a considerable variety of tourist information also lays the basis for the development of the industry. Though the level of community benefit remains low, it is undeniably higher than it would have been without the support of the project, and communities are well placed to command a good share of the future industry.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

Health and Water Project

Poverty among the population of Socotra Island alleviated in a sustainable way

There is little evidence that poverty amongst the people of Socotra have been significantly reduced. The definition of poverty is wide, and can be thought to include access to basic needs, including water and health services. The evaluation team feels, however, that the purpose of this project was not well formulated. Thus, though the project implemented the

majority of its activities effectively and met a considerable part of its results, there was little overall impact poverty on the island. This partly due to the enormity of the task, partly due to the limited scope and scale of the project, and partly due to the fact that many of the project's activities were process activities rather than activities designed to have a direct impact on poverty.

The most effective set of activities in terms of the stated purpose were those supporting the improvement of health services on the island. Support for a mobile clinic has allowed basic health care to reach most communities throughout the island. The improvements made to the health infrastructure, both in the Hadibo Hospital and in Health Units around the island have also been important. The provision of an Obstetrician to the hospital has also made a great difference to women who formerly has to travel at great cost and difficulty to the mainland.

More questionable has been the degree of sustainability of these achievements. There is some question whether government has the resources to maintain improvements in the health units, or in some cases, even adequately staff them. The Director of the Health Office felt that too little had been done to strengthen the management capacity of government officers and the evaluation team agrees. Project support for the medicine cost sharing programme has, however, put in place a sustainable system for ongoing provision of drugs at an affordable price.

GEF Rating: Marginally satisfactory

5. Sustainability

Sustainability is a critical issue and GEF evaluation guidelines provide considerable perspective on what GEF understands to be the essential elements of and requirements for sustainability. Key to this understanding is the extent to which achievements of the project will continue after external assistance has come to an end. What is less clear is how assessment of sustainability should be used by GEF¹⁵. The evaluation team has considerable concerns over several elements of the project's achievements in terms of sustainability. Whether there were ways to avoid these difficulties is a subject for debate, though the team has made recommendations with respect to enhancing sustainability.

The main difficult lies with the team's assessment that despite the long-term plans to achieve sustainable conservation on Socotra, sustainability of achievements to date has not been achieved. This means that further investment is required to achieve long-term sustainability without which many of the achievements will be lost. As such the situation is not dissimilar to that three years ago when the mid-term evaluation was carried out. If investment stops, not only will many of the achievements made to date erode, but unique biodiversity, the primary interest of the project and a central concern of GEF, may well be lost in the future.

If the evaluation team goes through the nine 'relevant factors' identified by GEF as indicating the likelihood of sustainability¹⁶, the project will have been found to have addressed most of them comprehensively:

- The project has developed a 'sustainability strategy' at the most fundamental level by designing a coherent economic plan for the island based largely on environmentally sound management of Socotra's natural resources. This strategy reveals how future economic development rests entirely on maintaining and pursuing project outcomes.

¹⁵ This is an issue for all bodies that support or promote development and conservation but is especially difficult for conservation projects as conservation of biodiversity is not an intrinsically self-sustaining activity in many, perhaps most situations in developing countries where conservation projects are implemented.

¹⁶ GEF guidelines for Terminal Evaluations.

- The economic future of Socotra provides the strongest mechanism to ensure future flows of benefits for conservation. The generation of revenue will flow not only to communities but also to local government, central government institutions such as the EPA, community groups such as the protected area groups and the eco-tourism association, all enhancing sustainability of project outputs. However, these benefit flows remain in the future.
- The project has undertaken a range of activities to support the development of suitable 'organisational arrangements' for the future support for conservation on Socotra, in both the public and private sectors. They are not for the main part, however, able to operate effectively at this time without external support.
- The ratification of the Conservation Zoning Plan, a comprehensive regulatory framework, provides the greatest potential for sustainability of conservation initiatives on Socotra. Legislation, however, is only as strong as its implementation. Another key element of a regulatory framework include regulations for controlling the import and export of animals and plants.
- The incorporation of environmental and ecological factors into future benefit flows has been, as indicated above, central to the entire approach of the SCDP.
- Institutional capacity for conservation on Socotra, which was effectively non-existent prior to the first GEF project has been significantly strengthened. The EPA is now probably the strongest government institution on Socotra. It has a trained and motivated staff, first class facilities, and links to regional and international conservation bodies.
- The project has a strong political network on and off the island, as witnessed by the effective resistance to the Qalansia road and increasing reference to the EPA for environmental vetting of investment and development proposals. In addition the establishment of the Socotra Conservation Fund links local and international lobbies for conservation.
- The identification of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism as the engines of economic growth on Socotra represents 'mainstreaming' of conservation on Socotra at the highest level.

Despite this significant body of work, the evaluation team notes that the outcomes of the project are not yet sustainable. Further institutional development is essential if communities and local government are to resist outside pressures that could result in unsustainable and environmentally damaging economic development. At the same time, the eco-tourism industry requires considerable development before it can provide financial flows to support development on Socotra and funding for protected areas and conservation institutions.

Government investment in conservation is not likely to increase to the necessary levels in the short to medium term future. Therefore, continued external investment to support conservation on Socotra is necessary. This situation cannot be attributed to any specific or general failure of the project, except perhaps its design. It is increasingly evident that initiatives to conserve biological diversity are not generally sustainable but require ongoing subsidy. Whether this subsidy comes from governments, as in the case of many developed countries, or from the international community, as in the case of Socotra, without it most conservation activities are not sustainable.

GEF Rating: Marginally satisfactory

6. Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

As indicated elsewhere, the project made a major contribution to the development of a skilled cadre of Socotran conservation workers. Less achievements were noted with respect to the Health and Water Project and to engagement with the EPA at the national level.

GEF Rating: Highly satisfactory

IV. Recommendations and lessons learned

The recommendations presented here and the lessons learned are drawn from the *Issues to be Addressed* sections of Exhibits 1 to 4 and the *Main Findings and Key Issues* presented in Exhibit 5.

A. Recommendations

Sustaining project achievements

1. The EPA Senior Management on Socotra requires strengthening. The EPA must seriously review the managerial requirements for the authority, ensure appropriate staff are in place, and provide the authority with the necessary material and political support to do its job.
2. The Project must provide greater support to strengthen the management capacity of the EPA. This can be achieved through formal training, on-the-job training, and by giving the management of EPA greater responsibility for management of the project.
3. The Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP) should be ratified as a matter of urgency by the GOY. The SCPD CU should make pursuit of this recommendation a priority.
4. An institution with umbrella responsibility for coordinating all investment on Socotra must be established. To be effective the institution must have a strong Socotra base and direct links to central government. The institution should ideally be lodged within the Office of the Prime minister of similar office with cross-cutting responsibility and political authority.
5. The SCDP must strengthen understanding at all levels of the relationship between conservation of on Socotra's, the Conservation Zoning Plan, and economic development on Socotra. SCDP interventions should be 're-branded' as development to strengthen this understanding, with less emphasis placed on conservation.
6. A clearer strategy is required for raising implementation of the protected area process undertaken for the two pilot areas to the island as a whole. This strategy must be clear on the financial and human resource needs.
7. Unrealistic expectations of communities and local government of the material benefits that can be provided by the SCDP must be managed more effectively. Perceptions that the programme is not delivering are damaging both to the programme and to the conservation based model based of development being put forward by the project.

Strengthening project design and implementation

8. Tripartite Meetings are the primary vehicle for project steering. Problems identified as having a serious impact on achieving project outcomes must be addressed during tripartite meetings. For example, the problems associated with establishing a functioning authority to coordinate investments on Socotra were evident from the early years of the project, but was not effectively address by the Tripartite Meetings.
9. The SCDP needs to negotiate a stronger participation of GOY partners in the project without losing the impetus of progress towards achieving project objectives. Project partners must accept stronger responsibility for achieving project outcomes as part of being given great responsibility for project implementation. This entails acceptance of standard, monitoring, evaluation and auditing processes designed to support project implementation.

Projects for the future conservation of Socotra

10. The Local Council must become a key player in the conservation and development of Socotra. Formed only two years ago they should be the target of an institutional strengthening project.
11. Community institutions and civil society on Socotra remain in their infancy. Further technical and financial support should be provided to allow them to play important roles in the development of their island.
12. Community dependence on direct use of Socotra's natural resources needs to be reduced through greater investment in the identified engines of development (sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism) and in specific activities to reduce consumption of fuel, timber and other natural resources through substitution.
13. Donor and GOY projects should directly support development of the identified engines of growth, and be subject to strict planning to avoid compromising sustainable fishing or eco-tourism potential. GOY and donors must recognise that significantly greater investment will be required if tourism and fisheries are to achieve sustainable improvements in quality of life on the islands.
14. The Socotra Conservation Fund has been established to provide a sustainable mechanism for channelling technical and financial support for conservation on Socotra. The Fund, however, needs institutional and financial support to become functional.

B. Lessons learned

Capacity building

The project's focus on building capacity of Socotrans has led to the establishment of a committed cadre of conservationists, many of which have found employment with Government. This team is technically strong but remains relatively weak in terms of management. This problem can be avoided by providing training in management skills and by developing closer management relations with government partners. Though it is recognised that building capacity in management through on the job training can slow project progress, building capacity in management will contribute significantly to the sustainability of project achievements.

The large parallel structure developed by the project presents a problem for sustainability which is not sustainable by Government. The balance between hiring in expertise, whether local or international, and relying on existing capacity within government is difficult. Hiring in expert staff enhances short term performance, which in the conservation sector is often

important, but compromises sustainability. Executing project activities through existing government structures and relying on slow incremental building of capacity compromises the speed of achievement and often the quality of project outputs, but enhances sustainability. Project designs must take these issues into account. The contradictions between the natural interest of government institutions and staff in direct implementation, and the inevitable concern of donors for quality short-term outcomes must be recognised and balanced.

Sector development

Biodiversity conservation is a difficult objective to pursue in many developing countries, or even developed country. It can rarely be demonstrated that conservation, and especially protected areas, bring direct benefits to governments or communities. The linking of economic development on Socotra directly to conservation and protected area establishment through development of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism industries presents a valuable model for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. It should be noted, however, that it is the lack of development alternatives on Socotra that has made this possible.

General lessons

The original GEF project was extended and community development activities integrated into a programme. The SCDP did not, however, have a clearly defined logic. It is recognised that the individual requirements of donors can make integration of their projects difficult. However, designing a strong programme logic which ensures that project goals are meaningful and consistent to the programme, project purposes or immediate objectives are realistic and address the goals, and project results contribute directly to the project purpose will strengthen implementation.

When the successful implementation of a project depends on a significant change in government policy and practice, in this case the establishment of an institution with the authority to regulate the behaviour of powerful ministries and well connected individuals, progress towards this objective must be carefully monitored. The agreed changes in policy and practice must be viewed as an integral component of government's participation. Failure of government to achieve them must be dealt with directly by the Tripartite Review Meetings. The UNDP Country Office should also play an important role in supporting governments to make the necessary changes.

Exhibit 1. UNDP Outcome evaluation





UNDP Outcome: Improved capacity of local authorities and community-based groups in environmental management and sustainable natural resource-based development.	
 Positive achievements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial support provided to EPA. • Highly trained and motivated team of Socotrans in Project / EPA Office. • Innovative community based process linking communities and EPA for establishment and management of Protected Areas (PAs). • Establishment and support of Socotra Eco-tourism Society and PA NGOs. • Socotra Conservation Fund established • Technical capacity of officials and community members raised through training. • Intensive education and awareness programs for local communities, community leaders and women. • Increased awareness of environmental and conservation issues amongst local government and communities. • Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP) ratified by GOY. • EPA capacity in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) established and used. 	 Issues to be addressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA Senior Management in Socotra not strong. • Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP) not been ratified by GOY. • The SCDP CU not internalised by the GOY as intended. • Mechanism with authority to coordinate development of Socotra not established; EPA not strong enough for this role. • Local Councils not strong enough to coordinate development. • GOY investments on Socotra not subject to coordination and integrated planning. • Community institutions and civil society on Socotra remain in their infancy. • Government / local council indicate low participation in project; SCDP indicate it has been high.

Exhibit 2. Project goals review and situation analysis

SBP1 and SPB2 Goals: Socotra's biodiversity and natural resources conserved and managed sustainably. The unique biological diversity of the Socotra Archipelago conserved	
 <p>Positive achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 laid foundation for conservation and sustainable management on Socotra. Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP) prepared and made law. CZP and SAMP established vision for Socotra's development based on biodiversity and natural resources. Community awareness of values of natural resources increased through extension and awareness programs. Some community behaviours towards natural resources modified. International and national profile of Socotra's importance raised. Developments not conforming with CZP and SAMP blocked by EPA with SCDP support (e.g. Qalansia road). EPA have undertaken (EIA) on proposed developments. 	 <p>Issues to be addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community impacts on biodiversity not significantly reduced. Community dependence on natural resources not significantly reduced. External threats to biodiversity remain (unplanned development, trawling, fossil coral sales). EPA too weak to achieve significant control over development activities. Qalansia road conflict wasted resources and time and damaged relations between EPA, SCDP and Local Councils and Government. EPA remains dependant on SCDP for operational funding, planning, and vision.





Health and Water Project Goal: Environmentally sound and sustainable development fostered	
 <p>Positive achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The health of the community has improved. A sustainable water management system has been designed. Other projects are using data and design. Integrated health and water extension messages have been promulgated. Economic growth experienced; increasing jobs from construction activities and in government. 	 <p>Issues to be addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Socotran people remain amongst poorest in Yemen. GOY investment on Socotra not addressing development needs. Expectations of community for development cannot be met by SCDP. Donor support for development insufficient for real improvements. GOY seem unwilling to support sufficient investment to produce real improvements. Achieving sustainable resources use on which development model based in existing environment will be difficult.

Exhibit 3. Project purpose review and situation analysis

<p>SBP1 and SBP2 Purpose: A zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented.</p> <p>Zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented through the Socotra Conservation Development Programme</p>	
<p> Positive achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning Plan circulated, explained, discussed with officials and public. • Pilot steps towards implementation of the Zoning Plan well advanced, make developing best practice in community based protected area development and management • Legal status of the CZP demonstrated through effective resistance to road development through key protected area. 	<p> Issues to be addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic expectations of immediate benefits from PAs. • Significance of CZP for development vision not well understood by local government or local people. • Communities perceive SCDP as slow to show tangible benefits from PAs. • Island-wide plan too ambitious for community based model: Slow progress suggests failure to deliver. • Mode for 'ramping up' from pilot PAs to PAs across island not clear; financial/technical resource needs very high.



<p>HWP Purpose: Poverty among the population of Socotra Island alleviated in a sustainable way</p>	
<p> Positive achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement to the livelihoods of Socotrans resulting from collective impact of all government, donor and private investments. • Increasing significance of remittances from expatriate Socotrans. • Contributions to the health of a significant proportion of the people of Socotra • Provision of improved water sources to a small number of Socotrans • Preparation of a water management system for sustainable improvements in access to water 	<p> Issues to be addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human population increasing at levels probably above the level of economic growth • Project design not in sufficient conformity with project purpose resulting in unrealistic expectations of SCDP support for development. • SCDP remains the only significant development funder on the island

Exhibit 4. Project results review and situation analysis

Socotra Biodiversity Project Phase 1 Results:

- R1. Socotran and national awareness of environmental and conservation issues raised
- R2. Human and institutional resources for biodiversity conservation and management strengthened
- R3. Zoning plan for Socotra developed
- R4. Selected initiatives to reduce pressure on natural resources developed
- R5. Project implementation capacity developed



Positive achievements

The majority of substantive project activities completed by September 2001 and therefore already reported on in the mid-term evaluation report. Additional achievements included:

- Completion of the EPA / Project Offices in Hadibo.
- The completion and submission of outstanding consultants reports
- The publication of a visitors guide to Socotra
- The fielding of a Terminal evaluation team



Issues to be addressed

Issues to be addressed were presented in the form of recommendations for action by various parties in the mid-term evaluation report. The degree to which these were addressed is presented in Exhibit 2; Report on responses to mid-term evaluation recommendations prepared by the SCDP CU Manager for the Terminal evaluation team.

Socotra Biodiversity Project, Continuation Phase: Results

- R1. Zoning Plan implemented
 - 1.1 *A nucleus of an effective PA management authority in place*
 - 1.2 *Pilot protected areas established with management plans developed and implementation started*
 - 1.3 *Pilot eco-tourism activities in place and benefiting local people and protected areas*
- R2. The Socotra Conservation Fund established
- R3. The Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit established



Positive achievements

- Community groups established as partners with EPA for management of 2 pilot Protected Areas (PAs).
- Innovative community management model for PAs developed.
- Awareness materials, programs and Extension network established
- General PA Management Plans developed through consultative process with local communities.
- General and PA tourism plans developed.
- Capacity for resource monitoring developed.
- Authority of EPA and CZP shown over Qalansia road



Issues to be addressed

- Active management of PAs not yet achieved; little active management or direct protection of threatened biodiversity.
- Only 2 out of over 20 Protected Areas covered by current programme
- Eco-tourism not sufficiently developed to provide significant benefits to local communities
- The SCDP CU not integrated into GOY structure

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signs for pilot PAs installed. • Materials and institutions for tourism management developed • The Socotra Conservation Fund established in Yemeni law and operational • The SCDP CU established 	
---	--

Health and Water Project Results:

R1. Quality and accessibility of health care services improved

1.1 Management capacity of District Health Office improved

1.2 Health Services on the district level and in rural areas strengthened

1.3 Capacity for disease control improved

1.4 Waste management in the health sector improved

R2. Integrated water management system designed / implemented using traditional techniques

R3. Environmentally sound water management system designed and implemented in a pilot area

R.4 Integrated health and water management extension package designed and delivered



Positive achievements

- Of 15 Health Units, 6 renovated, 5 equipped, 4 partially equipped, 9 generators installed, 6 generator rooms constructed.
- Hadibo Hospital improved; buildings renovated, equipment provided and pharmacy constructed.
- Cost-Sharing for drugs supported.
- Salary of Obstetrician provided.
- Mobile Clinic makes twice monthly trips to villages throughout Socotra.
- Technical training provided for hospital staff.
- Hospital waste management system designed and support provided for general waste management.
- Extension messages for malaria, TB tree conservation and overgrazing developed.
- Awareness staff accompany the Mobile Clinic to deliver health and environmental messages in parallel with delivery of health services.
- GIS maps for hydrology, geology, morphology, land use and other aspects of watershed management prepared for whole island.
- Water monitoring system developed and implemented using 18 wells around Hadibo.
- 10 meteorological stations established throughout island to monitor rainfall and temperature, and automated meteorological station established.
- 2 model khareefs constructed following feasibility studies and consultations with communities.
- Small scale water interventions carried out to provide communities with piped water



Issues to be addressed

- SCDP did not significantly strengthen District Health Office management capacity.
- Expectations of health officials exceeded capacity of SCDP.
- Little support provided to District Health Office in Qalansia.
- Hospital waste management marginally improved.
- Extension messages on link between health, nutrition and food security not undertaken but important potential contribution to general health.
- Government and donor support not sufficient for significant improvement to the provision of water.
- Community expectations for water facility development greater than SCDP designed to provide.
- Local Water Authority not able to manage weather and water monitoring systems.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary steps for the development of an integrated Decision Support System (DSS), undertaken. | |
|---|--|

Exhibit 5. Situation Analysis; Main Findings and Key Issues

Main Findings and Key Issues

Notable achievements

- A great deal of high quality work has been achieved by the project team in difficult operational circumstances.
- The creation of a motivated, technically strong team of Socotrans within the Project Team and EPA.
- Attracting donor funding of approximately USD 8 million, leveraged from the original GEF investment
- Establishing the CZP in law

Areas of concern

- The large professional team on Socotra, only a small proportion of which are employed by government, requires substantial ongoing funding and raises questions of sustainability.
- The strong emphasis on tourism as an engine of development for Socotra at a time when regional tourism is threatened by international events

Ownership / Drivenness

- Many government respondents indicated little participation in and weak ownership of projects. SCDP believes it worked hard to encourage participation. Understanding of 'ownership' are not jointly held.
- Project Implementation Team comprises many Socotrans who demonstrate strong ownership of SCDP and its objectives.
- Recognising the relationship between 'ownership' and 'responsibility' should allow SCDP management and government partners to enter into a genuine partnership.

Influences on evaluation process

- Project Evaluation was carried out in a tense atmosphere influenced by conflict over the Qalansia road. This demonstrates that years of hard work can be undone by a single incident.
- There is a struggle for control of the up-coming Phase of the project. This is not a healthy environment for an evaluation or project implementation.

Achieving the program outcome

- That EPA was able to block the Qalansia road demonstrates the authority of EPA. That a breakdown in relations was caused indicates a problem.
- SCDP is viewed as the primary agent for development on Socotra. Communities and Local Council expect SCDP to solve all problems. This demonstrates the lack of support from GOY and donors.
- Failure of GOY to establish a coordinating authority is threatening the vision of the CZP and SAMP for the sustainable development of Socotra.
- Developing an institutional approach based on strategic planning rather than an ad hoc approach based on individual agendas represents the major challenge for the sustainable development of Socotra.
- SCDP has not conveyed its vision of development based on sustainable natural resource management to most partners. The CZP is thus viewed as an impediment to development rather than a plan for development.
- Lack of delivery of tangible benefits threatens SCDP vision; 'There is no conservation without development

Exhibit 6. Co financing (in USD x millions)

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing		Government		Other*		Total		Total Disbursement			
		Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned			
- Grants												
YEM/96/001 (UNDP/UK)		0.60				0.016			(planned 2003-2008; disbursement started July 2003)	(already disbursed as of June 2003)		
YEM/00/001 (UNDP/POL)		0.19				0.036						
YEM/01/002 & YEM/00/Z01 (UNDP/ITA)		0.24				0.58						
YEM/01/003 (UNDP/NED)		0.24				0.935						
YEM/03/004 (UNDP/ITA)		2.50				2.5						
TOTALS		3.86				4,25	8,23	8,23			5.0	3,23
- Loans/ - Concessional												
- Credits												
- Equity investments												
- In-kind support YEM/00/Z01						0.12						
- Other (*)												
- Totals		3.86				4.37	8,23	8,23	5.0	3,23		

Leveraged resources: The original GEF Project (SPB1) was the vehicle through which all other financial resources have been raised. These leveraged funds total USD 8.23 million

Exhibit 7. Evaluation questionnaire

Questionnaire: Progress Review and Situation Analysis

استبانة: تقييم الأداء و تحليل الوضع الحالي

In completing the evaluation of projects carried out under the Socotra Conservation and Development Programme, especially the Conservation And Sustainable Use Of Biodiversity Of Socotra Archipelago Project, presently being conducted, the evaluation team wants to take fully into account the opinions and ideas of all those who are involved in or have knowledge of the project. They include those who are working - or have worked - directly with the project, other government officials, and , of course, the people of Socotra. We will be meeting as many of you as possible to discuss the project with you, but we would also like to collect from some of you your considered views in writing.

كجزء من عملية تقييم النشاطات المنفذة من قبل برنامج صون وتنمية سقطرى وتحديد ما يخص صون والاستخدام المستدام للتنوع الحيوي لمجموعة جزر سقطرى الجاري تنفيذه في الوقت الحاضر، يود فريق التقييم أن يأخذ بعين الاعتبار والأهمية آراء وأفكار كل أصحاب العلاقة بالبرنامج أو من لهم معرفة به. يضم أولئك العاملين في البرنامج أو الذين عملوا به في السابق وممثلي الدوائر الحكومية وبالطبع سكان مجموعة جزر سقطرى. سيقوم فريق التقييم بمقابلة ومناقشة أكبر عدد ممكن من ذوي العلاقة كما يود أن يحصل على بعض هذه الآراء مكتوبة في هذه الاستبانة.

We would therefore be very grateful if you would take a little time to think about the progress and present situation of the project and let us have your opinions and ideas on:

- *what is positive about the project?*
- *what is negative about the project?*
- *so what?*

سيكون فريق التقييم ممتنا لإعطائكم الوقت القليل لاستكمال هذه الاستبانة التي تتعلق بأرائكم في البرنامج في المواضيع الآساية التالية:

ما هي إيجابيات البرنامج؟

ما هي سلبيات البرنامج؟

ماذا بعد برأيك؟

You do not need to put your names on the forms: you may remain anonymous if you wish.
Return the forms to us (the evaluation team) direct or through the Project / EPA office before Wednesday..

Many thanks

وضع الاسم على الاستبانة اختياري: يمكن لك أن تحتفظ بذلك لنفسك . كما نرجو إعادة الاستبانة لنا بعد التعبئة مباشرة أو من خلال البرنامج والهيئة قبل يوم الاربعاء 23 يوليو 2003.

Mark Infield and Ibrahim Sharaf Al Deen

evaluation team

مارك إنفيلد وإبراهيم شرف الدين.

Please tick the boxes where provided.

الرجاء وضع الإشارة في المربع المناسب.

Please indicate the institution you work for

اسم المؤسسة التي تعمل بها:

1. What do you think has been the greatest achievement of the project?

1. ما هو برأيك أكبر إنجاز لبرنامج صون وتنمية سقطرى؟

Why do you think this has been important?

لماذا تعتقد أن هذا الإنجاز مهم؟

2. What do you think has been the greatest failure or short-coming of the project?

2. ما هو برأيك أكبر فشل أو تقصير لبرنامج صون وتنمية سقطرى؟

Why do you think this has been a problem?

لماذا تعتقد أن هذا الفشل يشكل مشكلة؟

3. What would you like to see the project focus on in the future?

3. ما هي النواحي التي تود أن يركز عليها البرنامج في المستقبل؟

Why do you think this is important?

لماذا تعتقد أن تلك النواحي مهمة؟

4. How well has the project performed in training people of Socotra?

4. ما هو تقييمك لأداء البرنامج في تدريب سكان الجزيرة؟

Well جيد جدا

Quite well جيد

Not very well ليس جيدا

Badly سيئ

5. Has the project worked closely with local people and local community groups?

5. هل عمل البرنامج بشكل مباشر وقريب مع السكان والمجتمعات المحلية؟

Closely عمل بقرب كبير

Quite closely عمل بقرب

Not very closely لم يعمل بقرب

Not closely at all لم يعمل بقرب أبدا

6. Has the project worked closely with local authorities and departments?

6. هل عمل البرنامج بقرن من السلطات المحلية؟

Closely عمل بقرب كبير

Quite closely عمل بقرب

Not very closely لم يعمل بقرب

Not closely at all لم يعمل بقرب أبدا

7. Have Socotran's benefited from activities to conserve nature supported by the project?
هل استفاد السقطريون من نشاطات البرنامج في مجال حماية البيئة؟

A lot بشكل كبير A bit بشكل مقبول Not much بشكل قليل Not at all بشكل قليل جدا

What have been the main benefits?
ما هي أكبر المنافع التي حصل عليها السكان في هذا المجال؟

8. Have Socotrans benefited from the development activities carried out by the project?
هل استفاد السقطريون من نشاطات البرنامج في مجالات التنمية؟

A lot بشكل كبير A bit بشكل مقبول Not much بشكل قليل Not at all بشكل قليل جدا

What have been the main benefits?
ما هي أكبر المنافع التي حصل عليها السكان في هذا المجال؟

9. Have Socotran's started taking responsibility for the conservation of the island's nature themselves?
هل بدأ السقطريون في تحمل المسؤولية أنفسهم في حماية البيئة في مجموعة جزر سقطرى؟

A lot بشكل كبير A bit بشكل مقبول Not much بشكل قليل Not at all بشكل قليل جدا

In what ways?
في أي صور كان ذلك؟

Please make any additional comments here.
الرجاء إضافة أية ملاحظات أو آراء إضافية هنا.

Name الاسم

Date التاريخ

Exhibit 8. Response to mid-term Review recommendations

Prepared by the CTA at the request of the evaluation team

Immediate, general or specific recommendations

Recommendation 1. The implementation of the zoning plan must be initiated on the ground with the demarcation of protected areas and development zones before significant development activities begin. This will require the development of management plans for protected areas and the development of EIA guidelines and capacity to undertake EIAs.

Responsibility: SBP, The international donor community

Timing: SBP and EPC should attempt to demarcate the general use zone during the last months of project operations. Wider demarcation of protected areas should be carried out as soon as possible.

Actions: PA demarcation: PA demarcation on the ground was abandoned as a concept due to the complexity of land tenure issues. All boundary demarcation was completed in the GIS, but actual land demarcation was deemed inappropriate to the situation in Socotra as it resulted in conflicts between communities over land-ownership rights.

The project therefore opted for a policy of marking only key entry points to PAs with informative signs located along main roads and tracks. To date signs have been installed, marking 5 protected areas (hom, dih, qal, abelhen and mahferein). All others are gradually being installed as community agreements are being reached for each area.

EIA capacity: a EIA unit has been created in the EPA Socotra Branch. TOR and guidelines for EIA unit in place. 3 EIAs for all major existing roads have been performed and the EPA-EIA unit did also work closely with the external EIA team for the Hawlaf port project. 4 more EIAs are now in the pipeline for road construction in the year 2003. Efforts are being made to integrate activities of the EPA-EIA unit in Socotra with national-level EIA unit at EPA.

However the professional capacity of EIA unit still far below what is required and should be significantly strengthened with provision of external technical assistance, in order to enable the supervision of complex projects and EIA carried out by international firms (like in the case of the port project).

Recommendation 2. Financial and technical support for the implementation of the zoning plan and the active management of protected areas should be provided.

Responsibility: The Government of Yemen, the international donor community.

Timing: As soon as possible. The Royal Netherlands Embassy to Yemen has indicated interest in funding this activity and is strongly encouraged to do so.

Actions: Upon termination of GEF funds, the UNDP and Dutch Government finalised agreement to support a bridging phase to carry the project forward for additional two years (2001-2003), with a budget of approximately 1,500,000\$. A subsequent programme phase was developed to extend project activities for the period 2003-2008 and supported by UNDP and Italian Government, with a budget of approximately 5,400,000\$ (prodoc signed July 2003). In the meantime a parallel Medium Size project (1,000,000\$) is being submitted to GEF in mid 2003.

The above resources are providing at least the essential resources to keep the core EPA activities going and therefore partially supporting the implementation of the CZP. However

resources allocated are not sufficient to support CZP implementation. This would in fact require:

1. fund to maintain and enhance the EPA capability (current donor resources for EPA are being reduced, not increased)
2. a strong central Socotra Authority should be created (no political will has materialised within GOYU to support this move so far, in spite of GEF, EU, UNDP and donor strong support and potential technical backup)
4. significantly more resources should be allocated to community development initiatives appropriate for the island and consistent with CZP (ecotourism and sustainable fisheries development, improving local governance, and basic needs: water, health, education, food security, renewable energy, waste management, etc.)
5. strengthen conservation-oriented NGOs as a means to complement GOY limited inputs and attract additional resources for the island to address basic community needs while supporting nature conservation: Socotra Conservation Fund, Women Association, Socotra Ecotourism Society, PAs Associations, etc. etc.

Recommendation 3. The basic needs of the people of Socotra should be met through increased development assistance. Socotra is one of the poorest areas of a poor country

Responsibility: The international donor community working with the GoY.

Timing: As soon as possible; ongoing support will be needed for several years.

Actions: During and after the initial GEF project, a two pronged approach has been taken by the project team.

(a) a total of approximately 2,500,000\$ for community development projects has been mobilised by the UNDP (with support from Italian Government) as part of the wider SCDP. See projects YEM.01.002 & YEM.00.Z01 (2001-2003), plus YEM.03.004 (2003-2008). In addition to the above, some 600,000\$ were mobilized by UNDP parallel to the first GEF project (See "basic needs" project, YEM.96.001 #?).

(b) in the period 2001-2003 a new SCDP coordination unit was created in Sanaa with resource mobilization as one of its main tasks. A number of project proposals of different scale and for a wide range of donors have been developed. Unfortunately few of these are actually being funded, largely due to lack of request and support from GOY (there is a general and dangerous mis-perception within high-level GOY officials, that too much funding is being channelled to Socotra):

- Home gardening (French Embassy/MOA 90,000\$ - funded in 2000; French and Japanese Embassy/Triangle, with SCDP support: 350,000\$ pending)
- Waste management – Japanese Embassy/SCDP (300,000\$) – pending; Italian NGO/SCDP (750,000\$)- pending
- Energy – Polish Embassy/SCDP (400,000\$) – pending; Germany/UNDP (100,000\$ for Socotra component) – pending
- Local NGO development – Japanese Embassy/SCDP 83,000\$ - pending; UK Embassy/Yemeni NGO (50,000\$) pending.
- Fisheries – French Embassy/UNDP 2,500,000\$ - pending
- Ecotourism, Fisheries, Cultural Heritage Preservation, Governance, Biodiversity conservation – Netherlands Embassy (11,000,000\$) – on hold for possible re-submission after re-formulation to fit in new Dutch Government priorities.

- Fisheries and governance: an integrated offer for support by the EU to implement selected component of the SAMP was rejected by the GOY in the year 2001 and 2002 (value 8,000,000 Euro).

Recommendation 4. Initiatives to directly reduce the dependence on and use of natural resources in Socotra through the introduction or development of substitutions or alternatives to these natural resources should be investigated and implemented. This applies equally to marine and terrestrial resources.

Responsibility: the international donor community. The EU through its support for the Socotra Archipelago Master Plan Project may be the most appropriate donor.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: See above recommendation 3. on resource mobilization in general. Same considerations apply here. Natural resources management proposals and micro-project developed by NGOs, bilateral and multilateral donors in partnership with the SCDP coordination unit are being rejected by the GOY in favour of large-scale investment and construction projects. These include, i.e. port (Kuwait – feasibility 300,000\$ construction estimated at 60,000,000\$); roads (GOY – over 30,000,000\$), vocational college (Kuwait – 3,000,000\$), and construction of schools, health centres, water dams through the Social Development Fund & Public Works Projects and GOY (no EIAs, no plans for management and staffing of these structures...).

Recommendation 5. New income generation activities to reduced community pressure on natural resources must be investigated and developed. This should include alternative livelihoods for fishermen.

Responsibility: The international donor community.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: See above. New NGOs such as SCF, SES, SWA, PAs Associations, Fishermen Associations, (the only NGOs on the island) are seen as the main vehicle for the implementation of micro-project in this sector. Here is where the SCF can play a critical role in building the capacity of the above target groups. Without an organisation like the SCF these potential grant recipient or business operators do not yet have the professional capacity to implement projects.

Recommendation 6. The importance of the role of women in the management of Socotra's biodiversity, and especially their influence on the management of terrestrial resources must be reflected in the design of any future projects supporting conservation in Socotra.

Responsibility: Any future project developers.

Timing: From now on.

Recommendation 7. Women should be employed in the Education Awareness Unit with the specific task of raising the environmental awareness of women in Socotra.

Responsibility: Any future project developers.

Timing: From now on.

Actions for 6&7: After the first GEF project, the programme assigned highest priority to maximizing involvement of women and addressing gender issues in all aspects of the programme. This was achieved through the following set of specific activities and cross-cutting approaches. The SCDP programme currently employs a total 18 women (approx. 20%

of all staff) as follows: 10 environmental education and awareness extension officers; 7 support staff; 1 Programme Assistant in Sana'a.

A dedicated team led by women extension officers is managing and will continue to manage a special awareness programme targeting women groups. This takes into account the structure of society in Socotra which in most cases does not allow for joint training and educational activities. This programme focuses on aspects which hold primary importance for women in the island: mother & child care, primary health care and control of most incident diseases (malaria, TB, diarrhoea, lack of vitamin A, etc.), home-gardening & horticulture, environmental protection, etc. The team holds special events for women, develops targeted illustrative and educational materials, arranges educational site visits and training courses for women only.

The programme has supported and will continue to support the central mother and child care department of the Hadibu Hospital which was identified as the top priority for women health care in the island. Besides working side by side with the international health care specialist in Hadibu, the MOH Paramedical staff (obstetricians) will also participate in the activities of the mobile clinic and education unit which reaches all parts of the island.

The EPA (and, in the present new phase, the District Governments) have been and will continue to be encouraged to involve the two existing Socotra Women Cooperatives, and the island-wide Socotra Women Union in all aspects of the programme and namely in: training activities, information sharing meetings, District Governments' statutory management and consultation processes. All SCDP's women technical staff and the above women associations and the Socotra Women Union were involved in the preparation and development of the programme document for phase 3 of the project (2003-2008).

Recommendation 8. More efficient use should be made of existing fisheries resources including those that are currently exploited, and those that are not (i.e. diversify fisheries). Initial efforts should be focused on shark fisheries since at present as only a small proportion of shark carcasses are utilised.

Responsibility: The international donor community working with the GoY, particularly the Ministry of Fish Wealth.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: See resources mobilization above (recc. #3). The following proposals have been prepared with significant effort by the project marine team and assistance from international consultants

- Fisheries and marine conservation – French Embassy/UNDP 2,500,000\$ - pending
First proposal for FFEM (French GEF) developed in 2000 and re-formulated in 2001-2002, submitted for 1,000,000\$ in mid 2002 to French Embassy (translated in French, evaluated externally by French expert identified by French Embassy – all at project cost).
Later in 2002 French Embassy drops proposal as no FFEM fund available.
Socotra proposal listed among top priorities for joint projects UNDP-France since 2001
New proposal being developed under different French funding source (Priority Solidarity Funds). First project appraisal mission by FE, supported by the SCDP team, in June 2003.
- Ecotourism, Fisheries, Cultural Heritage Preservation, Governance, Biodiversity conservation – Netherlands Embassy (11,000,000\$) – on hold for possible re-submission after re-formulation to fit in new Dutch Government priorities.
Proposal for 3,500,000\$ developed on the basis of the SAMP recommendations (as component of the broader SCDP 2003-2008) with MOFW and final preparation workshop

with inputs by all local stakeholders and international marine biologists in Socotra, Jan 2003. Proposal dropped as Dutch funding not available.

- Fisheries and governance: an integrated offer for support by the EU to implement selected component of the SAMP was rejected by the GOY in the year 2001 and 2002 (value 8,000,000 Euro).

This would have supported at least partial implementation of the fisheries component of the SAMP.

Recommendation 9. Interim fisheries management plans for the three critical stocks (sharks, lobsters and reef fish) should be developed and implemented.

Responsibility: The international donor community working with the GoY, particularly the Ministry of Fish Wealth, at the village level.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: Fisheries Management Plan finalised in early 2001. Implementation hampered by complete lack of funds and capacity of the MOFW. Monitoring programme by EPA continues, it is being rationalised to comply with available resources and extend to 2008, but should be coupled with implementation and controls by MOFW. See above for reasons why no funding for fisheries sector is available.

Recommendation 10. The eco-tourism sector in Socotra must be further strengthened through the development of a strategy and development plan, provision of training and the establishment of pilot projects.

Responsibility: The international donor community working with the GoY, particularly the EPC, and GTA.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: Ecotourism recognised as main engine of growth for the local economy, together with sustainable fisheries. EPA/MOTE Nature-based tourism development plan developed in Feb 2003 on the basis of all prior studies and EPA capacity assessment. Implementation started at a pace compatible with the limited resources available for this sector within YEM.01.003 (2001-2003) and YEM.03.004 (2003-2008)

Recommendation 11. The Socotra Conservation Fund must be established under Yemeni law, its board of trustees formed and an Executive Director recruited through a transparent recruitment process. Its relationship with EPC must be clarified and its role in the conservation and management of Socotra's natural resources established.

Responsibility: The final stages of SCF's legal establishment and the initiation of a recruitment process should be carried out by SBP. Seed money for the fund's initial operations should be raised from the international community. The Royal Netherlands Embassy to Yemen has indicated interest in funding this activity and is strongly encouraged to do so.

Timing: In the last months of the project, up until May 2001.

Actions: SCF established as a not for profit company limited by guarantee in the UK, in November 2002. All prior attempts to establish it in Yemen failed due to strong interferences by local political interests attempting to gain control of the organization from its early stages.

- SCF highlights in first 6 months:

- SCF board of Directors & management team in place.
- SCF registered in Yemen.
- 11,000\$ raised in first 6 months of operation.
- Proposals being submitted jointly with other partner local NGOs to Japanese Embassy (83,000\$) and GEF small grants programme (50,000\$). Proposal for GEF MSP (1,000,000\$) pending since 2000 (?). Dutch funding for the SCF on hold. EU TA mission in Sana formally requested proposal from SCF.
- First two micro-projects identified and implemented – supporting local fishermen association swapping from net to trap fishing of lobsters in NE part of the island.
- See also latest progress report of YEM.01.003 (output 2) for details.

Recommendation 12. The responsibilities of the General Authority for the Development of Yemeni Islands (GADYI) with respect to the management of Socotra’s biodiversity and natural resources, and especially with regard to the development of tourism, must be clarified, and the level of resourcing of the Authority by government made clear.

Responsibility: The Government of Yemen

Timing: Immediately

Actions: Since the mid-term evaluation report, the YPDA has apparently entirely failed to fulfil its mandate mostly due to lack of resources and technical capacity.

The deputy chairman of YPDA was assigned as national manager of the SCDP in YEM.01.003. This however did not result in increased capacity of the YPDA at national level.

SCDP-YPDA Coordination at local level in Socotra has been satisfactory, although limited to information sharing and involvement in project proposal formulation. This was based largely on ad-hoc consultations and taking into account the fact that the SCDP did not have resources allocated to support the capacity of the YPDA.

Recommendation 13. EPA must be strengthened in financial, technical and managerial terms in order to play an active and direct role in the management of Socotra’s natural resources.

Responsibility: The Government of Yemen; the international donor community.

Timing: EPC must begin immediate efforts to secure increased funding from GoY with support from SBP. EPC and SBP must continue initiatives to secure funding for the EPC’s work in Socotra.

Actions: See above sections for resources mobilization. Since first GEF project, funds were secured to extend and slightly consolidate EPA team operation from 2001 to 2008. During this period the technical capacity of the local team is being gradually built up and expanded, compatibly with the limited resources available for training.

Recommendation 14. The offices of the Ministry of Fish Wealth and the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation in Socotra must be strengthened in financial and human resource terms in order for them to fulfil their mandate in the archipelago.

Responsibility: The Government of Yemen; the international donor community.

Timing: This must be an on-going effort, starting from the next budget allocation process. SBP should support these efforts.

Actions: See above on resources mobilization. The SCDP team has made significant efforts to mobilize resources for projects to be implemented in partnership with MOA and MOFW. These were mostly hampered by lack of GOY support at central level.

MOA and MOFW have been consulted during proposal development and preparation, and on ad-hoc issues. Only a few small-scale initiatives were funded, and largely through local NGOs, in some cases with support from MOA:

- Home gardening (French Embassy/MOA 90,000\$ - funded in 2000 and being implemented);
- French and Japanese Embassy/Triangle, with SCDP support: 350,000\$ submitted in 2002, approval pending.

Recommendation 15. Copies of reports prepared by the project, especially reports containing primary data, must be more widely translated and disseminated. Copies should be lodged in the libraries of all Yemeni universities, in the national library, in secure institutions in Socotra as well as to interested international institutions.

Responsibility: The Socotra Biodiversity Project

Timing: Immediately

Actions: Project does not have record of copies distributed since the mid-term evaluation, however:

- SCDP coordination unit established (Sana), & library in EPA centre (Hadibu), and widely publicised. These contain library with all socotra-related publications (project and non-project), which are available to the public.
- A significant number of copies of reports have been distributed upon request, to all interested institutions in Yemen and internationally. These may be estimated at around 300.
- Illustrated 56 pages project publication "Saving Socotra", summarising GEF project achievements was prepared for the wider public (2,500 English and 4,000 Arabic copies). This was initially distributed to key stakeholders and remaining copies are on sale to support the SCF.

Recommendation 16. Legislation to control the importation of exotic species onto the archipelago must be developed and government authorities in Socotra trained in its implementation.

Responsibility: EPC and SBP.

Timing: As soon as possible.

Actions: Guidelines and species check-list developed. Training on species identification provided to main target groups. Species Control working group established and 3 meetings held in period 2002-2003. Working group includes: MOA, Security Police, Police, Airport & Port authorities, Military Intelligence, and EPA/SCDP team. See workshop reports for details.

Recommendation 17. Eradicate the Indian House Crow (*Corvus splendens splendens*) before its numbers increase from the currently low number of less than 20 to a population that

will be effectively impossible to eliminate or even control. Current efforts must be intensified and shot-guns used.

Responsibility: EPC and SBP. GoY should facilitate the importation of shotguns and ammunition.

Timing: Immediate.

Actions: Efforts consistently extended after GEF project. Use of shot-guns tested without success. However most effective method identified working closely with communities in crow nesting areas: EPA now provides a reward for each live chick brought in by community members. Communities have been very effective at identifying nests and climbing palm trees to collect chicks. This way crows pairs do not re-depose eggs for that season (if eggs are collected, they are re-deposited). Crow population effectively under control since then, and counted at 18 individuals as of June 2003.

Recommendation 18. The practicality of controlling or eliminating rat populations on one of the smaller islands in the archipelago should be investigated.

Responsibility: The international donor community; conservation NGOs.

Timing: Not an immediate priority. Rats have probably been present for centuries.

Actions: No action taken due to lack of resources and far more pressing priorities for the EPA team.

Recommendation 19. Developments in the fisheries sector in Socotra should be subject to EIAs and should follow a long-term strategy like that being developed by the EU Socotra Master Plan Project.

Responsibility: Yemeni Authority for co-ordinating the overall and balanced development of Socotra (e.g. GADYI)

Timing: Capability to undertake EIAs should be in place before the completion of the EU Socotra Master Plan Project

Actions: See above for EIA Capacity, and also for fisheries sector development & funding thereof, as proposed in SAMP.

Recommendation 20. The EEO network should be transferred to EPC or other appropriate body (e.g. SCF) to ensure the continuation of its work.

Responsibility: EPC/SCF with external financial assistance from international donor community

Timing: On completion of the SBP.

Actions: A rationalized and strengthened EEO network is however still supported by SCDP. EPA has only absorbed some 5 additional technical staff of the core SCDP team in its payroll. This is due to lack of GOY allocation for EPA and by EPA for their Socotra Branch. Besides the EPA, EEOs may be transferred to the SCF and other local NGOs as these become fully operational (long-term objective).

Recommendations for future project development

Recommendation 1. Immediate steps must be made towards the development and funding of a second project aimed at supporting the implementation of the zoning plan and the management of protected areas on the ground. Without further financial and technical support, the considerable achievements of the project will be lost.

Responsibility: SBP and EPC, GEF, the international donor community.

Timing: Immediately.

Actions: Achieved, at least essential funding secured until 2008.

Recommendation 2. A more rigorous process of project development must be undertaken for the development of any future projects to support conservation in Socotra, and local and national stakeholders must have a greater direct role in their development. Ideally, a PPM or logical framework process should be undertaken.

Responsibility: Any parties involved in the development of future projects.

Timing: From now on.

Actions: This was done to the maximum extent possible, through stakeholder consultation, project preparation workshops, etc. However this effort has been severely constrained by: GOY and donor driven limitations and focal areas of support and limited resources. The resulting project support documents are therefore still considered unsatisfactory from.

Recommendation 3. Any future projects must have a more explicit strategy for promoting the sustainability of achievements.

Responsibility: Any parties involved in the development of future projects.

Timing: From now on.

Actions: This is severely limited by the difficult situation and by the nature of activities involved. Shifting support from EPA to local NGOs (largely through the SCF) is the cornerstone of the programme's strategy for long-term sustainability. The GEF should play a significant role in this effort but: a much-needed full-size follow-up project was rejected by GEF. A MSP has the GEF green light but is being delayed by UNDP and is not yet even submitted to GEF at the time of writing. It will be after completion of the present evaluation.

Recommendation 4. Partner agencies for any future projects must have the financial or technical capacity to play a full role in project implementation, or clear provisions must be made in the project to ensure that such capacity is developed in the early years of the project.

Responsibility: Any parties involved in the development of future projects.

Timing: From now on.

Actions: Limiting factor: total funding available. When funds are not sufficient, the primary objective is not to loose the installed capacity of EPA, addressing at least few selected community development needs, and keeping essential activities going. So far, allocated resources have been barely sufficient to do that, and no sufficient additional funds were mobilized to support other partner organizations. See above for reasons.

Recommendation 5. The respective roles of project executors, implementers and other partners must be clearly specified in the project document. The signing of the project documents will thus give them the force of an agreement or contract.

Responsibility: Any parties involved in the development of future projects.

Timing: From now on.

Actions: Best effort done by UNDP. However shift from UNOPS to NEX execution modality in 2003-2008 will be a significant challenge, requiring re-structuring of management arrangements and clarification of respective roles.

Recommendation 6. Any future projects should ensure that a more formal process of strategic planning is built into the project design and management structure.

Responsibility: Any parties involved in the development of future projects.

Timing: From now on.

Actions: See above. Comprehensive project preparation process carried out for YEM.03.004 with final workshop in Hadibu with over 50 participants from a wide range of stakeholder and donors, divided into thematic working groups and assisted by external facilitators. The workshop was supported by the SCDP technical team, UNDP Resident Representative, the Director of the UN Drylands Development Centre (Nairobi), and high-level GOY official and all relevant local authorities.

Exhibit 9. The Qalansia Road issue

The following notes are based on the evaluation team's understanding of what occurred based in interviews with interested parties.

The issue of the construction of a road from the new airport to the second town of Socotra, referred to as the Qalansia Road, bears further examination because it illuminates significant achievements of the project, while at the same time casting light on issues that need to be addressed. It was also an issue that was raised frequently by stakeholders during the process of the evaluation.

The Socotra Archipelago Master Plan (SAMP) includes a detailed proposal for road developments on the island. These were based on intensive surveys and consultations and can be considered the best option for road construction. The alignment selected by the SAMP broadly follows the existing road alignment, and by doing so avoids passing through the Datwah Lagoon Protected Area and serves 42 existing small villages. As the SAMP has not been ratified, however, its recommendations do not have any formal recognition, even though they are broadly accepted as being sound by local authorities.

Government investment for construction of the Qalansia Road was channelled through the Ministry of Ministry of Public Works and Housing, as appropriate. However, for reasons that remain unclear but seem to relate to current norms of practice within Yemen, the Socotra office of the Ministry was not consulted or involved in the decision making process.

Responding to a lobby for a 'ring road' around the entire island put forward by parties who believed this would enhance both the development and security of the island, the Ministry of Public Works and Housing instructed a construction company to begin work on a road following the coast line.

When it became apparent that the road under construction would not follow the SAMP proposed alignment the Environment Protection Authority with the support of the Project Implementation Unit raised objections. These objections did not, however, result in the contractor modifying its plans, though frequent assurances were given that the road would not pass through the protected area. When it became evident that the road would pass through the protected area the Project and EPA raise high level objections, mobilising local communities and the international community to lobby against the road. Finally, following direct intervention by the President of Yemen, the road was halted and a new alignment developed.

The success of the EPA and the Project in halting the road is a testament to the growing strength of EPA as an institution¹, and the degree of interest in and awareness of conservation issues amongst communities on Socotra. It also demonstrated and proved the power of the legislation backing up the Conservation Zoning Plan, and the personal commitment of may Yemenis, including the President to conservation on Socotra. That it took public action plus determined lobbying by the international community, most especially the funders of the projects on Socotra, and the intervention of the President indicates the weakness of existing mechanisms for dealing with investment and development planning on Socotra.

Despite the success of the EPA and its supporters in preventing the road from passing through the nature reserve, and the strength this gives the EPA, considerable short term

¹ Since this incident, the EPA has been requested to review other road development plans and has been involved in vetting development activities of both private investors and government.

damage has been done to the EPA and the project. Residents of Qalansia are convinced that the EPA and the Project has denied them the road they have been demanding for the sake of a conservation area. They have not accepted the argument that the SAMP road alignment is the best one for the development of Qalansia Town and many residents of Qalansia. The lobby for the coastal road has succeeded in making the argument seem to be the classical one of conservation against development. This is a distortion of the facts on the ground, but is already damaging the support of a considerable number of local leaders for the Conservation Zoning Plan. A core issue here is the degree to which local leaders have a sound understanding of the relationship between the CZP and the economic development of the island. The construction of the road through the nature reserve, a prime potential tourist attraction on the door step of Qalansia Town, did not seem to be seen as damaging to their interests in any way. This indicates that the significance of eco-tourism for the town's economic development was not recognised and / or that the damage the road would have caused to the tourist asset was not understood. Both failures of understanding are of concern and indicate that the project and EPA has much to achieve despite the exemplary information and awareness programme carried out to date.

The errors made over the Qalansia Road emphasis strongly the critical importance of GOY establishing an umbrella institution with authority to coordinate all investments on Socotra and targeting them on the achievement of the identified development model of the island. Quite aside from the damage that the Qalansia Road would have made for tourism development opportunities for Qalansia Town, considerable wastage of government funds resulted from having to halt and re-locate the road. It is also evident that the scale of road construction in Hadibo Town, the plans for the ring road, and the nature of many of the government funded construction projects on Socotra are wasteful of funds and damaging to prospects for eco-tourism². Furthermore, they do not contribute directly to the development of the identified 'engines of economic development', sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism. A unified development authority using strong planning regulations and byelaws and employing sound Environmental Impact Assessment processes could significantly reduce these problems.

² It is unfortunate that the EPA Offices constructed by the project were not subject to either EIA or planning regulations. It is also evident that they were not designed with either the environment conditions in mind or to be sensitive to the existing aesthetic of the island. The result is a building that is in the wrong place (too near the coast), too tall (in comparison with local buildings and for its position), too exposed to wind and not designed to cope with strong winds (the front doors cannot be opened for 5 months a year due to wind and noise inside the building is high), and clashes strongly with the local aesthetic (made from white rather than brown stone). The result is a building which is neither sound in terms of use, or sympathetic to the demands of international tourists.

Annex 1. Terms of Reference – Independent Evaluation Mission

United Nations Development Programme

Terms of Reference

Final Independent Evaluation Mission

Socotra Conservation and Development Programme (SCDP) – Phase 1 (Projects: YEM/96/G32, YEM/01/003, YEM/01/002, YEM/00/Z01)

Period: 2000-2003

1. BACKGROUND

The SCDP is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), UNDP, the Royal Netherlands Embassy, Republic of Italy and Republic of Poland. This UNDP programme aims at promoting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources, while supporting appropriate human development for the people of the Socotra Archipelago. The Programme includes four financially separate, but logistically integrated projects. These are:

Project no.	Period	Funding	Funding Source	Area of Intervention
YEM/96/G32	1997-2003	4,944,700\$	GEF	Biodiversity
YEM/01/003	2001-2003	1,835,977	Netherlands, UNDP	Biodiversity, Coordination, Soc. Cons. Fund.
YEM/01/002	2001-2003	1,114,880	Italy, UNDP, Poland	Water, Health, Env. Awareness, DSS ³
YEM/00/Z01	2000-2003	Preparatory phase for YEM/01/002 above		

The programme is executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) which is responsible for the management of funds, staffing, contracts and procurement. The Government of Yemen has designated the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA – now part of the Ministry of Water and Environment) as the national implementing partner of the project. The newly created (2002) “SCDP Coordination Unit”, attached to the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and MOWE, is responsible for the coordination of all GOY and Donor interventions concerning environment and development in the Socotra Archipelago.

Implementation of programme activities is the responsibility of the SCDP Team in Socotra, with operational base in the local EPA branch. Coordination of programme activities and logistics support from the mainland are provided by the SCDP Coordination Unit, and by the Programme Support Unit (PSU) located in the EPA in Sana'a.

The programme has been externally evaluated in the year 2000 (focusing only on project YEM/96/G32), and was subsequently subject to three TPR meetings. The present Final Evaluation will focus on the programme as a whole and its achievements in the period 2000-2003.

2. OBJECTIVES AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

- Assess the results and achievements of the SCDP in the period May 2000 (date of the last evaluation) to July 2003. In particular, the mission should focus on the following aspects:
 - List the main achievements of the programme and assess their effectiveness in addressing the biodiversity conservation and human development issues of the archipelago.
 - Assess whether the project has produced its outputs effectively and efficiently and identify the major factors, which have facilitated or impeded the progress of the programme in achieving its goal and desired results.
 - Determine the effect of the project on target groups, and in particular the quality, usefulness and sustainability of the project's achievements and outputs in terms of improving the capacity of local staff for the sustainable management of biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago.

³ DSS - Decision Support System

- Determine the degree of support given by the Government of Yemen (GOY) in integrating the project objectives and goals into the national development programmes and other related projects.
- Assess whether GOY's inputs, at national and local level, were sufficient and how they should be improved.
- Assess the contribution of the UNDP Country Office and the role it has played as catalyst in mobilizing co-funding to the initial GEF project YEM/96/G32 and in promoting and facilitating the implementation of other bi-lateral development projects in the archipelago.
- Identify the main lessons learned during implementation, identify the major impediments encountered and make specific recommendations to address these findings.
- Review and assess the efficiency and adequacy of implementation arrangements and management of the project
 - In particular, the evaluation should assess the professional capacity and review the quality of inputs and activities by the main national implementing partner of the programme: the Environmental Protection Authority (MOWE), both at headquarters and at local level.
- Review the proposal for a Medium Size Project submitted by the GOY to the GEF, and in particular:
 - Review the GEF MSP draft proposal document, and comments thereon received by UNDP/RBAS headquarters
 - Finalize the proposal by addressing all issues raised in HQ's comments, in close collaboration with the SCDP team and UNDP/RBAS in NY.

3. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation mission will complete the Project Evaluation Information Sheet (PEIS) according to the existing format, the PEIS should be handed to the UNDP Resident Representative during the final de-briefing session, and produce a report according to the structure outlined in the UNDP Guidelines for Evaluators. In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference for final evaluation
- Itinerary (actual)
- List of meetings attended
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Final revised draft of the GEF MSP proposal
- Any other relevant material

The mission should submit the mission's report to the Resident Representative for approval and distribution.

4. METHODOLOGY AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The mission will consist of an independent international consultant, as well as one independent national consultant representing the Yemeni Government. The team will be assisted by the UNDP Country Office Environment Team and by project staff in Sana'a and on the island.

International Consultant

The consultant should have a solid background in natural resource management and/or environmental biology, with a minimum of 15 years of relevant experience, especially working with local communities. Further experience in evaluating, formulating and managing projects would be preferable. He/she should be fluent in English. Knowledge of Arabic would be an asset. Prior specific experience in Yemen and first-hand knowledge of Socotra an important asset.

National Consultant

The Government representative should either be an independent consultant, with sufficient knowledge and background in natural resource management and project evaluations, or a senior official of the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation with knowledge of the programme to be evaluated. The Government representative should be able to facilitate mission's meeting with the related ministries and authorities and should be available fully for the mission's activities during its presence in Yemen.

The consultants shall familiarize him/herself with the programme through a review of relevant documents prior to beginning travel to the region. These documents include, inter alia:

- Project documents
- Project budgets
- Project mid-term evaluation report (2000)
- Progress Reports of the period 2000-2003
- Minutes of last Tripartite Review Meeting (April 2002)
- GEF MSP Draft Proposal and UNDP HQ's comments
- UNDP Handbook for Programme Managers: Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation
- Guideline for Evaluators including the Project Evaluation Information Sheet

The above-referenced documents shall be sent by email/courier or email to the evaluators in advance of the mission.

To the extent possible, the mission should allow for consultation with the programme team in Socotra and Sanaa, the UNDP Country Office representatives, related ministries and authorities, project stakeholders, beneficiaries and local authorities.

5. MISSION TIMETABLE (PRELIMINARY)

The duration of the consultancy of the **international consultant** shall be 24 working days, including travel time, based on the following tentative itinerary:

Dates (2003)	Activity days	# of
Prior to 14/7	Home base review of relevant documents	2
13-14/7	Travel to Yemen	1
14-17/7	Briefing and interviews with Programme Team, EPA, MOWE, MPIC, donors and UNDP CO in Sana'a	4
18-25/7	Travel to/from Socotra and review of programme activities and outputs on site, including final de-briefing in Sana'a	8
26/7	Travel to home base	1
After 27/7	report writing and review/finalization of GEF MSP proposal	8
TOTAL WORKING DAYS		24

The duration of the consultancy of the Government consultant/representative is the same as that for time spent in Yemen by the international consultant (12 days). The Ministry of Planning will inform UNDP CO of their selected representative.

The UNDP CO, through the SCDP team, will have the responsibility of all logistical support needed in Sana'a and Socotra including transportation and travel arrangements.

Annex 2. Itinerary

11 th – 12 th July 2003	Review of project documents, TOR, and planning for the Evaluation process
13 th July 2003	Travel to Sana'a, Yemen
14 th July 2003	Briefing; Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit Briefing; UNDP Country Office Review of project documents
15 th July 2003	Meeting; Minister of Water and Environment Meeting; Environmental Protection Authority Meeting; Directorate, Agriculture and Water, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation Meeting; former Minister of Health Review of project documents
16 th July 2003	Review of project documents Meeting; Italian Embassy Meeting; General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands Meeting; Environmental Protection Authority Meeting; Embassy of the Netherlands Meeting; Former Minister of Tourism and Environment Review of project documents
17 th July 2003	Review of project documents Planning trip to Socotra Meeting; CTA
18 th July 2003	Meeting; Women's Union, Qalansia Travel to Socotra Field visit; Tourism Office at Socotra Airport Meeting; Island Development Authority Meeting; Socotra Tourism Police Meeting; Project management team
19 th July 2003	Field visit; Tourism Information Centre Meeting; Socotra Eco-tourism Society Meeting; Environmental Protection Authority, Socotra Meeting; Project team (Awareness and Education Unit) Meeting; Project team (Protected Areas Management Unit) Meeting; Project team (Research & Monitoring Unit) Meeting; General Director (Mamour), Hadibo Meeting; Local Council, Hadibo Meeting; Department of Fish Wealth
20 th July 2003	Observation; Planning meeting - EPA / Local Council / Investment team Field visit; Hadibo Town Refuse Dump

	Field visit; Habido Hospital Meeting; Health Office, Socotra Meeting; Health Office / Mobile Clinic
21 st July 2003	Field visit; De Hamry Marine Protected Area Meeting; De Hamry Marine Protected Area Community Group Field visit; Qaria Health Unit Field visit; Homhil Protected Area Meeting; Homhil Protected Area Community Group Field visit; Samaan / Momi Kareef Over night; De Huf Village, Momi
22 nd July 2003	Field visit; Hoq Cave Field visit; Halah Village (Extension Officer observation) Field visit; Halah Health Centre
23 rd July 2003	Field visit; Qalansia road Field visit; Shatha Kareef (built by the Social Fund, GOY) Meeting; General Director (Mamour), Qalansia Meeting; Local Council, Qalansia Field visit; Datwah Lagoon Protected Area Meeting; Resident Anthropologist, Hadibo
24 th July 2003	Meeting; Office of Construction Meeting; Yemen's Women's Union, Socotra Preparation of Summary Report Presentation of Summary Report; Project Team and Mamour
25 th July 2003	Wrap-up meeting; Project management team Travel to Sana'a Finalisation of Summary report Presentation of Summary report; UNDP
26-27 th July 2003	Travel to Hanoi (Consultant's base) 7 days analysis and report writing

Annex 3. List of persons interviewed

Dr Edoardo Zandri	Programme Manager, Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit
Mr Abdul-Rahman F Al-Eryani	National Programme Manager, Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Coordination Unit
Mr Moin Karim	Deputy Resident Representative (Programme), UNDP Country Office
Mr Fuad Ali Abdulla	Programme Analyst, Natural Resources Management, UNDP Country Office
Mr Peer Gatter	Programme Officer, UNDP Country Office
Dr Mohamed Al-Eryani	Minister, Ministry of Water and Environment
Dr Mohamed S El-Mashjary	Chairman, Environmental Protection Authority, Ministry of Water and Environment
Dr Khaled Mohamed Saeed	Director General, Agriculture and Water, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
Dr Al Munibari	Former Minister of Health, Ministry of Health
Dr Gianluigi Vassallo	Deputy Head of Mission, Italian Embassy
Dr Awad Abdullah Bamatraf	Chairman of the Board, General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands
Mr Yahya M M Alkainey	Authority General Manager, General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands
Mr Hans Akerboom	2 nd Secretary and Cultural and Environment Attache, Royal Netherlands Embassy
Mr Martin De La Bay	Head of Development Cooperation, Royal Netherlands Embassy
Mr Abdul Malik Al-Eryani	Former Minister of Tourism and Environment
Ms Sheikha Ahmad	Head of the Women's Union Head; Qalansia
Mohamed Amer	Head, Socotra Office, General Authority for the Development of Yemen Islands
Salah Yeslam	Head, Socotra Tourism and Environment Police
Abdul Latif Saad Amer	Head, Socotra Eco-tourism Society
Salem Dahag	Head, Socotra Office, Environmental Protection Authority
Noah Adam Ali	PIU Awareness Officer

Ali Thani	PIU Project Procurement and Accounts
Ahmed Said Suliman	PIU Head of Terrestrial Unit
Abdul Rakib	PIU Project Accountant
Hamed Issa Affrier	PIU Protected Area Management Unit
Abdulla Ali	PIU Head, Protected Area Management Unit
Tarek Abul Hawa	PIU Protected Area Technical Advisor (Jordan)
Abdelkader Bensada	PIU Biodiversity Specialist (Algeria)
Xxxx	PIU Extension Officer, Halah Village
Xxxx	PIU Extension Officer, Samah Island
Xxxx	PIU Extension Officer, Qalansia
Dario Casarius	PIU Terrestrial Unit (Italy; Volunteer)
Salhe Ahmed Ragep	PIU Terrestrial Unit
Fahmi Abdulla Ba Ashwan	PIU Herbarium Officer
Mohammed Ismale Mohammed	PIU Marine Unit
Faud Naseeb Saeed Khamis	PIU Marine Unit
Ahmed Gumaan	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Beder Alseili	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Noah Adhem	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Amina Mohammed	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Inas Anis	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Thabet Abdallah	PIU Awareness and Education Unit
Serge D Elie	Independent PhD research student
Ahmed Ali Ahmed	Acting Director; Office of Construction, Socotra
Sumona Jaman	Head, Yemen Women's' Union Socotra
Ahmed Gunnar Al Awardi	General Director (Mamour), Hadibo
Amroun Hamis Amer	Chairman, Planning and Development Committee, Local Council. Hadibo
Hamid Abdullah Seleem	Chairman, Social Services Committee, Local Council. Hadibo
xxxx	Office of Fish Wealth, Socotra
Dr Saad Ahmed Al Kaddsom	Director General of Health Office, Socotra

Dr Osama xxxx	Health Office, Socotra; Mobile Clinic Manager
Mobarak xxxx	Head, De Hamry Marine Protected Area Community Group
Gumman Siyuki	Sheikh, Qaria
Xxxx	General Director (Mamour), Qalansia

Annex 4. Summary of field visits

Field visits were undertaken opportunistically and during the course of a three day organised field trip. Examples of project activities which could be observed were selected by the evaluation team.

- 19th July 2003: The evaluation team were escorted around the Tourist Information Centre at the Socotra Airport. The officer on duty at the time demonstrated his skills at providing information about tourist activities on Socotra, described the information available, and explained the various exhibits.
- 20th July 2003: The team visited the Hadibo Refuse Dump to examine the facility established by the project and discuss some of the issues concerning waste management on the island.
- The team visited the Hadibo Hospital and were shown equipment purchased by the project and constructions funded by the project.
- 21st July 2003 Team visited De Hamry Marine Protected Area and were given the opportunity to meet with and discuss with the De Hamry Marine Protected Area Community Group.
- The team visited the Qaria Health Unit. The improvements to the building were examined and the discussions held with the health worker. The team also met the local sheikhs and discussed the health unit and other matters
- The team visited the Homhil Protected Area and met with the Homhil Protected Area Community Group.
- The team visited and examined the Momi Kareef established by the project. Brief discussions were held with a kareef user. The management group was not available as they had migrated to other another grazing area.
- The team stayed over night in De Huf Village, Momi, where they were able to observe traditional village life and test possibilities for eco-tourism home stays.
- 22nd July 2003 The team were escorted on foot from De Huf Village to the Hoq Cave. Here they were able to observe visitor management facilities.
- The team completed the walk from the Hoq Cave to the road where they were collected and driven to Halah Village. Here the team held discussions with members of the fishing community, saw lobster traps provided through the project, and observed the Extension Officer presenting extension materials.
- The team briefly visited the Halah Heath Centre.
- 23rd July 2003 The team undertook a visit to Qalansia to examine issues related to the road development and conservation of the Datwah Lagoon Protected Area. The field visit included meetings with the Mamour of Qalansia and members of the Local Council

Annex 5. List of documents reviewed

Technical reports

Socotra: A Bibliography. Report to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago Project Michael Gwynne, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh. Undated.

Target Areas. Final Report to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago Project. Tony Miller and Miranda Morris, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh. Undated.

Socotra Islands Nature-Based Tourism Development Programme 2003-2006. Report to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago Project Peter Mackay, Chief Technical Advisor Socotra. 2003.

Saving Socotra; The treasure island of Yemen. Edoardo Zandri, Socotra Conservation and Development Programme Manager. UNDP / EPA / GEF / UNOPS. January 2003.

Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. Promotional Pamphlet. Undated.

A Botanical Contribution to the Zoning Plan for the Management of Natural Resources of Socotra. Tony Miller et al. 10th June 2000.

Eco-tourism Development Plan for Socotra Archipelago, Yemen (Phase II). Final Report. Arc. Hector Ceballos-Lascurain. September, 1999.

Faunistic Survey; Socotra Archipelago. Wranik, Rosler and Al Mahdy. Provisional Report. Undated manuscript.

Final Report on Multidisciplinary Expedition to the Socotra Archipelago, Republic of Yemen: 24th January – 24th March 1999. Anthony Miller, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh. December 1999.

Zonal Plan for Socotra Archipelago for the conservation and sustainable use of the biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago. October 1999.

Draft final report: Structure plans and regulations for the General Use Zone. April 2001

Fisheries feasibility study, April 2001

Report of the mid-term evaluation mission. Mark Infield, Ibrahim Sharaf Al Deen and Simon Wilson, October 2000.

Report for Protected Areas of Socotra, Omer Al Saghier, January 2002

Fisheries management plan for the Socotra island group. Al-Harare. January 2001

Institutional Arrangements for environment management, April 2001

Project implementation reports

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago: First Progress Report. May 1998.

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago: Second Progress Report. December 1999.

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago: Annual Programme Report (APR). November 27th 1998.

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago: Annual Programme Report (APR). March 5th 2000.

Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. Final Report. July 2002.

Socotra Conservation and Development Programme (SCDP). Progress Report. January to May 2003.

Annual Programme Report (APR). Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. April 2002

Minutes and reports from Tripartite Reviews

Minutes of the First Tripartite Review Meeting. December 1998.

Minutes of the Second Tripartite Review Meeting. March 2000.

Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. Tripartite Review; Minutes of Meeting. 28th April 2002.

Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. Tripartite Review; Minutes of Meeting. 30th April 2002.

Key documents

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago; Project Extension Document. UNDP / Government of the Royal Netherlands / Government of the Republic of Yemen. 2001

Environment, Natural Resources and Poverty Alleviation for the Population of Socotra Island, Yemen. Project Document. UNDP / Government of the Republic of Italy / Government of the Republic of Yemen. 2000

Sustainable Development and Biodiversity Conservation for the People of Socotra Island, Yemen. UNDP / Government of the Republic of Italy / Government of the Republic of Yemen. 2003

Yemen Common Country Assessment. UNDP. January 2001.

Second country cooperation framework for Yemen (2002 – 2006). UNDP. December 2001.

Strategic Results Framework; Second country cooperation framework for Yemen (2002 – 2006). UNDP. Undated.

ROAR Narrative; Second country cooperation framework for Yemen (2002 – 2006). UNDP. Undated.

Other documents

Contract for the construction of educational centre and laboratory buildings on Socotra.

Memorandum of Agreement between the Ministry of Construction, Housing and Urban Planning and UNOPS on the construction of Education and Laboratory buildings on Socotra.

Press Release: Sustainable Development and Biodiversity Conservation for the People of Socotra Island. UNDP signs a programme document with the Ministry of Water and Environment. 7 July 2003.

Project Proposal for GEF Medium Sized Project (Draft). The Socotra Conservation Fund – Supporting Community-based Management of Protected Areas. Undated.

European Union (EU) Socotra Archipelago Master Plan; Phase 1 – Findings and Recommendations. Environmental Protection Council, Ministry of Planning and Development. May 2000.

A Proposal for the Socotra Conservation Fund. June 2000.

Agreement concerning Approval of Research on Biological Resources in Republic of Yemen. Republic of Yemen, Council of Ministers, Environmental Protection Council.

Videos

“Socotra, It Is Our Island” – Arabic & Socotri language - 30. min. education & awareness video

”Socotra at a Crossroads” – English language – 24 min. SCDP and SCF promotion & awareness video

In addition to the above documents, letters, faxes, e-mail communications and internal memos were examined.