



Capacity Building for Improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles

Independent Terminal Evaluation Report

Final Version

21 January 2014

Name of the UNDP/GEF project: Capacity Building for Improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles

UNDP Project ID: PIMS 3703

GEF Project ID: 3074

Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report: Mission 1-14 Nov, 1 Draft Report 27 Nov 2013

Region and countries included in the project: Seychelles

GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program: Capacity Building

GEF Focal Area: Multifocal Area/Other

GEF Strategic Objectives: CB-2 (Cross-cutting Capacity Building)

Executing Agency and project partners: Ministry of Environment and Energy and Ministry of Natural Resources

Evaluation team member: Anne C. Woodfine

Acknowledgements: The author expresses her gratitude to the CB2 Project Manager, other staff of the PCU, wider UNDP Seychelles and Mauritius who were very helpful in managing and assisting in her TE mission. Thanks also to the many stakeholders at Ministries, the University of Seychelles, NGOs and those involved in the pilot projects that gave so freely of their time and provided information to enable her to complete the evaluation. Thanks also to all those who commented on previous versions of this report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Project Summary Table	4
Project Description	4
Evaluation Rating Table	5
Summary of Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations	8
Acronyms and Abbreviations	11
1. Introduction.....	13
Purpose of the evaluation.....	13
Scope.....	13
Evaluation methodology	14
Structure of the evaluation report	14
2. Project description and development context.....	15
Project start and duration.....	15
Problems that the project sought to address.....	15
Immediate and development objectives of the project	16
Baseline indicators established	18
Expected results	19
3. Findings.....	20
3.1 Project Design / Formulation	20
Analysis of LogFrame Analysis (LFA) (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)	20
Assumptions and risks.....	20
Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design.....	23
Planned stakeholder participation	23
Replication approach	24
UNDP comparative advantage.....	24
Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector	25
Management arrangements	25
3.2 Project Implementation	26
Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)	26
Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)	27
Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	28
Project finance.....	29
Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)	30

UNDP and Executing Agency implementation / execution (*) coordination and operational issues.....	32
3.3 Project Results	33
Country ownership	44
Sustainability (*).....	45
Catalytic role and impact	46
4. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Proposals for Future Directions.....	48
Conclusions: Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	48
Lessons Learned: Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success	48
Annexes	51
Annex 1: Terms of Reference.....	51
Annex 2: Itinerary.....	55
Annex 3: List of people met/ interviewed	56
Annex 4: Summary of field visit on 12 Nov 2013	57
Annex 5: List of documents reviewed (those indicated in red received in Jan 2014)	58
Annex 6: Evaluation Criteria Questions and Summary of Responses	60
Annex 7: Key Findings of the National Capacity Self-Assessment (2005)	66
Annex 8: Logical Framework Analysis agreed at Inception Workshop	70
Annex 9: CB2 Project Up-dated Risk Log	74
Annex 10: Degree Structure, B.Sc. Environmental Science, University of Seychelles	77
Annex 11: List of main Issues along with their respective Indicators collected for the SEO process	78
Annex 12: Pilot Sub-Projects.....	85
Annex 13: Progress Towards Development Objectives – from APR, June 2013	86
Annex 14: Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard	103
Annex 15: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form.....	109
Annex 16: Evaluation Rating Scales and Guidance	109
Annex 17: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.....	110

Executive Summary

Project Summary Table

Project Title	Capacity building for improved national and international environmental management in Seychelles			
GEF Project ID:	3074		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	3703	GEF financing:	400,000	400,000
Country:	Seychelles	IA/EA own:	0	42,160
Region:	Africa	Government:	100,000	100,000
Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area	Other:	0	?
Operational Program:	Capacity Building	Total co-financing:	100,000	142,160
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Energy	Total Project Cost:	500,000	542,160
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Industry	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 Oct 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 2012	Actual: 31 Dec 2013

Project Description

The Objective of the project (Capacity building for improved national and international environmental management in Seychelles – known as “CB2”) was **“to integrate local and global environmental management and enhance the capacity to implement global environmental management objectives within national programmes”¹** by achieving some of the desired results identified in the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) (GoS, 2005), specifically: i) international environmental conventions are effectively managed; ii) donor-funded projects are designed to help Seychelles meet international and national environmental commitments and priorities; iii) international and national environmental commitments are financed through a range of sources and mechanisms; and iv) institutional framework to effectively implement Seychelles’ environmental plan is in place. It was to be an important milestone for Seychelles to meet its obligations within the Global Environmental Conventions.

The project proposed **a new and innovative step toward institutional change in the implementation of Environmental Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS)**. This is in line with the mandate for national capacity development and the government policy of transition from implementer to facilitator of environmental management. It proposes to expand the partnerships in EMPS implementation, including public tendering of certain project elements (the role of the EMPS Secretariat, the management of the overall project and the individual pilot projects) to any appropriately qualified and agency/contractor (from public, private or NGO sectors). This will ensure that the best available capacity and resources are tapped in EMPS operations, and will also serve to build partnerships, transparency and broader national capacity.

Benefits were to be realised by linking national initiatives to international obligations, creating an enabling environment for enhanced stakeholder participation, harnessing the country’s full capacities in the coordination and implementation of environmental programmes and bridging crucial capacity gaps.

¹ Changed from the ProDoc version **“increase capacity for effective environmental management to address national and global environmental issues”** in the Inception Workshop, held on 27/01/10

This was a three-year multifocal area/capacity building project, implemented from 2010-2012 (extended to end 2013), with a total budget of US\$ 660,000. Its key outputs are the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSDS, an updated and revised version of the previous Environmental Management Plans for Seychelles EMPS1 and EMPS2), the First Seychelles Environment Outlook (SEO, a state-of-environment report), a national database with indicators derived from the SEO to report on international convention commitments, and field demo sub-projects that pilot integrated environmental management at the local level.

Evaluation Rating Table

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
A. 1. Effectiveness	Numerous Outputs not completed as planned. Key GoS staff (MEE – notably MEA FPs) who would have been expected to be closely involved knew little of project and felt the project had not delivered the expected Outcomes at Terminal Evaluation. The numerous changes in Project Manager and absence of Steering Committee meetings seem to have resulted in the project being overlooked by most GoS and NGO staff.	MU
A. 2. Efficiency	Many delays in implementation which have limited ability to complete other Components of project; MEE did not step-in during gap in PCU leadership; great expectations placed on pilot sub-projects but project support lacking during implementation has reduced support and consequently longer-term impacts / benefits. Current PCU leader (since summer 2013) making great strides to rectify situation.	MU
A.3. Relevance	Capacity building clearly required	R
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
B. 1. Financial	GoS reportedly about to commit funds to implement SSDS, but still no structure agreed - implementation delayed by years. GoS have taken-on role of collecting and managing key environmental data.	ML
B. 2. Socio Political	Participants from a wide range of sectors validated SSDS in mid-2012	ML
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	SSDS agreed and concept of SEO (including database) included in strategy	ML

B. 4. Environmental	MEE committed to MEAs; Focal Points in place and active; some pilot sub-projects being scaled-up	L
C. Achievement of outputs and activities	SSDS delayed and no progress has been made in implementation (by GoS); SEO-1 report not completed ; SEO database being developed, but data not being shared with / from non-GoS groups (e.g. NGOs); land use plans eventually completed by other GEF projects	MU
D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
D. 1. M&E Design	Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard (CDMS), APRs/PIRs, either MTE or MTR plus TE in Project Document.	HS
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	No baseline with indicators agreed at Inception. CDMS never used (at baseline or MTE/MTR), MTE / MTR ³ never completed, APRs/PIRs used to delay Outcome 2 to follow completion of SSDS.	MS
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	The M&E that was carried out was funded – but, funds would have been short to carry-out a MTE/MTR – and the CDMSs	MS
E. Catalytic Role	Agreed SSDS should catalyse mainstreaming sustainable development in range of sectors; UniSEY now teach local undergraduates students for B.Sc. in Environmental Science; pilot sub-projects widening awareness on environmental issues	MS
F. Preparation and readiness	Informants generally agree CB2 was a “much needed project”	S
G. Country ownership	No regular steering committees held (only one in entire project period), project became invisible to most, key MEE personnel had to be reminded what the project was meant to be doing during TE and felt they had not benefited	MU
H. Stakeholders involvement	Stakeholder involvement has been limited in part due to the project design. Clearly enthusiastic at start-up and in Inception Workshop, but since notably limited participation by MEA FPs. NGOs felt project had not delivered.	MU

² Even by date of finalisation of TE report (17 Jan 2014)

³ As a MST, it is accepted that a MTE is not strictly required, but both are mentioned in the ProDoc (MTE on pages 2 and 15; MTR on page 15)

	Pilot projects generated high level of interest but those involved reported they lacked PCU support.	
I. Financial planning	LFA revised as by start-up changes meant ProDoc budget would not cover all envisaged activities. All funds now reportedly spent and Audit Report satisfactory. Issue over payment to IC remains a problem.	S
J. Implementation approach	CB2 was a “much needed project”	MS
K. UNDP/GEF Supervision and backstopping	Many human resource problems in PCU (three Project Managers, 3 Programme Co-ordinators during project period), insufficient UNDP supervision / backstopping from Country Office and MEE meant project delivered well below planned performance	MU

Summary of Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The CB2 project has made significant contributions to assisting Seychelles make progress in its international obligations and also national capacity building toward improved environmental management namely:

- The project has “supported” the Government of the Seychelles to develop the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSDS), to follow-on the Environmental Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS 2000-2010), which it is envisaged will mainstream sustainable development across all sectors, beyond the traditional “environmental” sector. [Main support came from EU ReCoMap project.] However, there were delays in preparation and finalization of the document; it was not published and validated until mid-2012 (it was to have been dated 2010-2020, but it was published as 2012-2020). The SSDS 2012-2020 includes implementation arrangements, which were to be in place and functioning by the end of 2013, yet these structures are not yet in place. [Many of these issues were beyond the control of the CB2 project.] Once operational, this is the most important achievement of the CB2 project.
- By the time of the Terminal Evaluation, MEA Focal Points (FPs) knew little of the project and did not feel the project had contributed to their reporting to the MEAs on behalf of Seychelles. Better engagement would have been expected between the project and the MEA FPs in MEE, as this was a project they clearly supported at the outset.
- National capacity in environmental management has been enhanced and will benefit into the future as the project supported development of course materials for the University of Seychelles (UniSEY) to teach a B.Sc. in Environmental Science. This will expand the pool of locally trained expertise in the sector and ensure capacity is built in environmental management into the future. [Currently it is expected that 5-10 students will follow the programme each year – with additional working environmental scientists likely to be attracted to study third year modules as short courses for professional development.] This project activity did not involve a large amount of money – but undoubtedly will have, along with the SSDS, the greatest long-term impact.
- The project supported national consultants and an international consultant to develop the Seychelles Environmental Outlook (SEO-1) and a data management system to collect and maintain key environmental datasets which will help Seychelles report to international environmental conventions. The data management system is likely to meet the original aspirations and once fully operational will assist the MEA FPs to report. However, the final SEO-1 report has not yet been finalized, due to a break-down in relations between the project and the IC and datasets are not being shared to the extent envisaged.
- Pilot sub-projects are encouraging Seychellois to undertake environmentally friendly activities including rainwater harvesting, generating solar power and recycling. These were all identified as priorities in the National Capacity Self-Assessment (2005).

However, the project did not eventually include support for developing the district land use plans (LUPs) for Seychelles, as detailed in the Project Document (ProDoc), as delays between approval and start-up meant by start-up these were instead being supported by other GEF projects. The project budget could not have covered the costs of the LUPs.

Project achievements have been attained despite various constraints in management, mainly linked to human resource issues – but do not meet all the expectations, even those agreed in the Logical Framework revised at the Inception Workshop. Notably, changes in project and wider Project Co-ordination Unit staff have left the project at various times without appropriate leadership. Furthermore,

the Steering Committee met only once in the 4 year project (extended from the planned 3 year project) and no-one in MEE agrees now who the National Project Director was or is. [It seems that the various Project Managers did not appreciate this was part of their role and the Programme Co-ordinators were perhaps not aware that the meetings were not taking place.]

Project baseline was not established at start-up using the evaluation method proposed for the project in the ProDoc (the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard) and no evidence can be found of any mid-term evaluation or review having been carried-out (both included in the ProDoc, although not strictly required for a MSP). Many routine project reports could not be traced at the terminal evaluation, making finding information on the progress of the project an effort in detective work, including referring to former staff (some in Seychelles, others further afield) and others less closely involved in the project in Seychelles.

In view of the findings of this TE and the lessons learned from this project, I recommend the following:

On future project management

1. The PCU and indeed wider UNDP should ensure that all staff use an agreed system to save project-related computer files and that the PCU back-up and archive digital data regularly to ensure project documents are not lost, This is now in place.
2. When project staff leave, they should be obliged to have a hand-over meeting if their replacement has been recruited, or brief the PC and leave detailed hand-over notes to assist their successor. [Similarly, when more senior staff leave (e.g. the PC during the CB2 project period), they should brief their successor and / or leave detailed notes.]
3. When inexperienced Project Managers are recruited, as seems often to be the case in Seychelles due to wider HR issues (highlighted in the NCSA), they should be provided with greater support by their line managers. Reportedly they have regular meetings – but this does not seem to have been adequate for the CB2 – on other projects, the system seems to be working well.
4. If set-up, Steering Committee meetings should take place regularly. However for Seychelles, where the number of key GoS and NGO staff is small and individuals are involved in several GEF projects, perhaps having steering committees for each project is not workable and either a single SC for all projects (or certainly all small / MS projects) could be considered – or alternative means of communication (e.g. Facebook or Twitter) used to regularly and routinely share information and ensure sound guidance / national ownership for projects.
5. Terms of contracts should be adhered, particularly no consultant should be paid amounts due on submission of reports before reports have been submitted;
6. Should relations between a project and a consultant (whether national or international) become difficult, early actions should be taken to avoid problems later in projects.
7. Project baselines and monitoring are important in order that impacts can be quantified at later stages – M & E plans set-out in the ProDoc and agreed at Inception should be adhered to.

To follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

8. As UNDP PCU implements other GEF projects, it should continue to support and encourage GoS to set-up implementation structures and use SSDS.
9. The Physical Planning Bill and Environment Protection Act, also the LUPs, all need to be approved by Cabinet / gazetted to support environmental management in Seychelles. MEE should catalyse this.

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

10. The need for capacity building in sustainable development is on-going across all sectors. This is not a one-off activity, but needs to be continuous at all levels (schools, university, teacher training, professional development, the private sector and public awareness). All sectors in GoS need to mainstream this capacity building for sustainable development, including using existing on-line teaching resources for schools. This should be integrated well into the upcoming Medium-Term National Development Strategy
11. MEE and more widely other GoS Ministries should continue to support the development and widening of access to the SEO database – ensuring it is maintained and kept up-to-date, also that data is made accessible across GoS ITC systems – and also, if possible, NGOs and the wider public can access and up-date data via the www.
12. Issues of data sharing need to be considered more thoroughly across GoS and with NGOs, as currently NGOs unwilling to add “their” data as they recognise it to be valuable. Also GoS appears currently not willing to make available their data to the public. The mutual benefits of data sharing need to be highlighted, for example by the skilled staff of the Environmental Information and Data Section of MEE.
13. PCU and GoS (MEE) should encourage SIF and TRASS to continue to publicize their community activities and they should be supported (e.g. with funding from GoS and / or other GEF projects) to replicate them.
14. School and DA-based pilot sub-projects should be publicized by each participating organisation – helped by the UNDP / GEF signboards, to increase scaling-up by other schools, private individuals etc. The PCU Communications Officer is reported to have already been tasked to follow up on this as part of her TOR.

The above proposals (10-14) could form the core of a new cross-cutting capacity development project in the new GEF programming cycle. CB2 has demonstrated that it does not require a large investment of funds to support development of modules for a university course in Environmental Science, which will ensure future cohorts of well-trained graduates. A CB3 project should raise knowledge and understanding of sustainable development across all sectors in GoS, also in the school curricula, teacher training, professional development and in the private sector. Increased public awareness would further support the capacity building. The project could also catalyse further development of the data and information gathering and sharing across GoS, with NGOs and with the general public which has been started under CB2. The need to collect data relating to sustainable development (for MEA reporting, amongst other things) and the mutual benefits of data sharing need to be further promoted, for example by the skilled staff of the Environmental Information and Data Section of MEE. A CB3 project should aim to mainstream these actions – as capacity building is not a one-off but an on-going activity, which should be sustained beyond the life-span of any project.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AEIN	African Environmental Information Network (UNEP project)
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBD CHM	CBD Clearing House Mechanism
CB2	Capacity building for improved national and international environmental management in Seychelles project
CCD	Convention to Combat Desertification
CDMS	Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan for Seychelles 2003-2006
DoE	Department of Environment
DMC	Destination Management Company
EBA	Endemic Bird Area
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMPS	Environment Management Plan of Seychelles
EMPS CU	EMPS Coordinating Unit (secretariat)
EMPS SC	EMPS Steering Committee
EPA	Environment Protection Act
EU	European Union
FCCC	Framework Convention on Climate Change
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEM	Global Environmental Management
GNP	Gross National Product
IBA	Important Bird Area
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDGSR	MDG Status Report
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MEE	Ministry of Environment and Energy
MLUH	Ministry of Land Use and Habitat
MNRI	Ministry of Natural Resources and Industry
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Medium Size Project
MTE	mid-term evaluation
MT-IOSEA	Marine Turtles Indian Ocean South East Asia MoU
NAP	National Action Plan
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NCSA AP	NCSA Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PC	Programme Co-ordinator
PM	Project Manager
POPS	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PSC	Project Steering Committee
ReCoMap	Regional Coastal Management Programme of the Indian Ocean (EU)
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor

SARS	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
SCCI	Seychelles' Chamber of Commerce and Industry
SCG	Seychelles Coast Guard
SEO-1	Seychelles Environment Outlook, a State of Environment Report
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
SIDSnet	SIDS network
SIF	Seychelles Island Foundation
SIM	Seychelles Institute of Management
SINC	Seychelles Initial National Communication (FCCC)
SOE	State of the Environment
SSDS	Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy
TCPA	Town and Country Planning Act
TE	terminal evaluation
ToRs	terms of reference
TRASS	Terrestrial Restoration Action Society of Seychelles
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UniSey	University of Seychelles
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

1. Introduction

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of a terminal evaluation (TE) is to:

- Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents;
- Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives;
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project, including financial management;
- Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider project impacts;
- Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

Scope

The terminal evaluation is expected to consider and report on the following issues and criteria:

1. Project relevance and consistency with country priorities and the GEF Focal Area;
2. Ownership of the project at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation across local levels and partnerships developed through the project;
3. Effectiveness in realizing project immediate objectives, planned outcomes and outputs; the effects of the project on target groups and institutions; the extent to which these have contributed towards strengthening the institutional, organizational and technical capability of the government in achieving its long-term sustainable development objectives (including environmental management goals);
4. Sustainability of project achievements and impacts, including financial and institutional sustainability, and an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies;
5. Management arrangements, including supervision, guidance, back-stopping, human resources, and the Implementing Agency's (UNDP) supervision and backstopping; the quality and timeliness of inputs, activities, responsiveness of project management to changes in the project environment and other M&E feedback;
6. Financial planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of committed co-financing;
7. Efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the ways in which project outputs and outcomes were achieved;
8. Adaptive management, including effective use of log-frame, UNDP risk management system, annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other parts of the M&E system, tools and mechanisms as appropriate; evaluate whether project design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the project environment.
9. Risk management, including the UNDP risk management system within ATLAS, which is also incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluators are requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type;
10. Cross-cutting issues:
 - Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes?
 - Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes?

- Capacity development of participants and target beneficiaries, communications and use of technology.

The evaluation report is to present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project considered relevant, with special attention given to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, the role and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation (M & E) and adaptive management in project implementation.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation is to provide unbiased evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator followed a participatory and consultative approach, ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF country focal points, steering committee, UNDP Country Office, project team and key stakeholders. The evaluator conducted a field mission to Seychelles including visits to specific pilot project sites. The evaluator used interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project (see Annex 6). The key stakeholders interviewed during the TE and those unavailable but contacted after the mission by email are listed in Annex 3.

The evaluation included the review all relevant sources of information, including the Project Document (ProDoc), project reports (including Annual Reports APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports), focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. A list of documentation that the project team provided to the evaluator for review was included with the terms of reference (ToRs) and is included as Annex 5 in this report.

Structure of the evaluation report

Chapter 2 provides a brief description of the project, including the problems it sought to address, development objectives, indicators, main stakeholders and expected result.

Chapter 3 provides the main findings of the TE, encompassing aspects of the project's design, formulation, how the project was implemented and main results.

The conclusions of the TE, along with lessons and recommendations are presented in **Chapter 4**.

The Annexes include the TE terms of reference (ToRs), details of the TE mission programme (including people interviewed and sites visited), documents reviewed and details of the evaluation rating scales used.

2. Project description and development context

Project start and duration

The Project Document (signed of 15 Oct 2008) noted the project was to start in May 2009 and was due to close in May 2012. However, the first Steering Committee meeting was not held until 30 Nov 2009 and the Inception Workshop was held on 27 Jan 2010. The project had a no-cost extension to October 2012, then to December 2013, to allow project activities to be completed.

Problems that the project sought to address

The Republic of Seychelles is a small island developing state (SIDS) in the western Indian Ocean that enjoys a healthy tropical environment outside of the cyclone belt. The archipelago consists of some 115 islands with a total area of 455km², spread over an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 1.4 million km² located within 4° and 9° south of the equator. The total human population is 87,300⁴.

The islands are generally recognised as consisting of two main groups: the central archipelago of about 40 ancient mountainous granite islands and the rest, low-lying outer islands consisting of coral atolls, islands and sand banks. The environments of these two island types are very different. The granite islands are fragments of the former Gondwanaland (isolated by some 70 million years and 1000 miles from the nearest continental landmass) with globally significant and unique ecosystems typified by high endemism. The outer islands whilst less biodiverse and harbouring fewer endemics nevertheless represent important ecosystems and species assemblages most notably on Aldabra the world's largest raised atoll. Seychelles is a country of high global biodiversity significance which:

- has identified, to date, more than 1000 endemic species (GoS 2002),
- is included within the Conservation International Indian Ocean Islands biodiversity hotspot.
- is listed as having two Endemic Bird Areas (EBA) (the granite islands and Aldabra atoll) and 20 Important Bird Areas (IBA) by BirdLife International.
- has two (biodiversity) world heritage sites: Aldabra atoll and the Vallée-de-Mai on the island of Praslin.

The significance of the environment in terms of biodiversity and as the base for socio-economic development has been recognised by the Government and reflected in the declaration of half (50.59%) of all Seychelles land becoming protected under the law (by 2011) and 228km² of marine parks and reserves.

Seychelles, as a SIDS, with a large proportion of its landmass and infrastructure situated on low-lying coastal plains, is very prone to the impacts of climate change. Seychelles was severely affected by the 1997/98 El Nino Southern Oscillation event with extensive coral bleaching / death and impacts on artisanal fishery production and the basic cost of living. In recent years, changes in the duration and intensity of rainfall have been experienced resulting in flooding and seasonal water shortages. Seychelles' per capita greenhouse gas emissions are much lower than the global average and this is projected to remain the case despite increasing demand for energy. Carbon dioxide emissions and removal capacity were calculated (for the ProDoc) at 195,000 and 833,000 tonnes respectively, making Seychelles a net sink and it is estimated that this removal capacity will be maintained by targeted management practices through 2020.

The Seychelles National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) (GoS, 2005) identified core cross-cutting (systemic, institutional and individual) capacity shortcomings that limit Seychelles' ability to realise national goals and

⁴ Seychelles National Bureau of Statistics, 2010

⁵ This figure relates only to terrestrial sinks, no work has been done to estimate the sequestration capacity of reefs, sea grass beds etc... within territorial waters.

international environmental commitments (see Annex 7). Furthermore, Seychelles did not have a single overarching programme that addressed the three pillars of sustainable development (social, economic and environmental). It did however have various sectoral plans and strategies and the Environmental Management Plan (EMPS) that integrated environmental concerns in development sectors, under the guidance of the Cabinet of Ministers and addressing the national pursuit of sustainable development.

The NCSA presented an action plan to address these needs and enhance the national approach to global environmental management (GEM) - Step 2 in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The UNDP Capacity Development Process⁶

UNDP defines capacity as “the ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner”⁷

Immediate and development objectives of the project

The **Objective** of the project was “to integrate local and global environmental management and enhance the capacity to implement global environmental management objectives within national programmes” by achieving some of the desired results identified in the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) (GoS, 2005) Steps 3 and 4 in Figure 1, also see Annex 7), specifically (according to the ProDoc): i) international environmental conventions are effectively managed; ii) donor funded projects are designed to help

⁶ Source: www.undp.org

⁷ UNDP (2006), *Capacity Assessment Practice Note*. United Nations Development Programme/ Capacity Development Group. Available from: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/capacity-assessment-practice-note.html> [Accessed 08/11/13]

⁸ Changed at IW from “to increase capacity for effective environmental management to address national and global environmental issues”

Seychelles meet international and national environmental commitments and priorities; iii) international and national environmental commitments are financed through a range of sources and mechanisms; and iv) institutional framework to effectively implement Seychelles' environmental plan is in place.

The project was designed to be a new and innovative step toward institutional change in the implementation of Environmental Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS). This was in line with the mandate for national capacity development and the government policy of transition from implementer to facilitator of environmental management. It proposes to expand the partnerships in EMPS implementation, including public tendering of certain project elements (the role of the EMPS Steering Committee / secretariat, the management of the overall project and the individual pilot projects) to any appropriately qualified and agency/contractor (from public, private or NGO sectors). This was to ensure that the best available capacity and resources were tapped in EMPS operations, and will also serve to build partnerships, transparency and broader national capacity.

The **Outcomes** of the project were to be as follows:

Outcome 1: Awareness and capacity is developed for mainstreaming global environment conventions into national programmes;

Outcome 2: Environmental information and reporting is strengthened;

Outcome 3: Capacity for local implementation of global environmental conventions is developed, applied and disseminated.

Benefits were to be realised by linking national initiatives to international obligations, creating an enabling environment for enhanced stakeholder participation, harnessing the country's full capacities in the coordination and implementation of environmental programmes and bridging crucial capacity gaps.

This was a three-year multifocal area capacity building project, to implemented from 2010-2012, with a total budget of US\$ 660,000⁹. Its key outputs were to be the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSDS), an updated and revised version of the previous Environmental Management Plans for Seychelles EMPS1 and EMPS2), the First Seychelles Environment Outlook (SEO-1, a State of Environment Report), a national database with indicators derived from the SEO-1 to report on international convention commitments, and field demonstration sub-projects that pilot integrated environmental management at the local level. The sub-projects were located in areas with established land use plans and designed to be related to their implementation.

As stated in the ProDoc:

"Seychelles is party to the three main global environmental management conventions: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) and the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD). The CBD and FCCC were both ratified on the 22nd September 1992 and the CCD was ratified on the 26th June 1997. Seychelles is eligible for GEF funding due to its status as a developing country."

Since then:

The UNCBD National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) was prepared in 1997 and the country's Fourth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity was submitted in 2011;

The UNFCCC Initial National Communication (INC) in 2000 and submitted its Second National Communication on 14 April 2013

⁹ Figure taken from TE ToRs

The UNCCD first national report was finalised in 2004; the Seychelles National Action Plan for Sustainable Land Management (SLM-NAP) and its Integrating Financial Strategy (IFS) were prepared in 2011 and approved by the GoS Cabinet in 2012.

Baseline indicators established

The baseline indicators presented in the revised project Logical Framework (LFA) (dated 27/01/10, the Inception Workshop (IW)) and used in the Annual Project Reviews (APR) process are much less detailed than those in the original ProDoc. According to TE informants, this was agreed at the IW to make the project feasible within the budget allocated (note: IW report never found during TE). The revision of the LFA was also necessary given the delay between ProDoc approval and the IW – as other GEF projects had begun in the interim, which included some of the Activities / Outputs which had been in the CB2. Notwithstanding this revision, the LFA of CB2 retained developing land use plans as a major Output of Outcome 3, yet by 2010 it was clear that the land use planning activities were being funded by the then on-going and better-funded Sustainable Land Management and the current Biodiversity Mainstreaming projects.

The ProDoc states that the Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard should be used to establish a baseline – this was never done.

Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the project have been:

- Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE), particularly the Department of Environment (DoE);
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Industry (MNRI);
- University of Seychelles;
- Environmental NGOs;
- Beneficiaries of sub-projects , namely:
 - Grand Anse District Administration, Praslin (Fire Preparedness and RWH at Elderly Home) – 2 projects;
 - Grand Anse Secondary School , Praslin (tree nursery for forest rehabilitation and solar power) – 2 projects
 - Baie St Anne, Praslin (demonstration garden);
 - Praslin Development Fund (forest rehabilitation);
 - La Digue Secondary School (sustainable school project):
 - Anse Royal District¹⁰ Administration, Mahe (RWH on public buildings).
 - Seychelles Island Foundation (SIF) – 1 sub-project at Vallée de Mai;
 - Terrestrial Restoration Action Society of Seychelles (TRASS) – 1 sub-project on Praslin;
 - UniSEY – equipment for studying wetlands.
- The Ministries and Departments above differ in name from those in the ProDoc, as there have been three major institutional changes in the civil service since the preparation of the Project Document, one in late 2008, in June 2010 and again in 2012. There has been considerable re-structuring and economic reforms of the public sector of the Government of Seychelles, resulting in a reduction in staff numbers in most Ministries. [This may be a contributory factor towards explaining why there has been this lack of understanding and involvement from the Ministries concerned.]

¹⁰ The location for one of the early LUPs, funded under the BD and LD GEF projects

Expected results

The **Project Goal** was to effectively implement the Rio Conventions in Seychelles.

The project was to:

- mainstream global environmental objectives into the EMPS (since re-named the SSDS¹¹), which is the main strategic planning and coordinating mechanism for environmental management in the country;
- strengthen the capacity for and experience of integrated approaches that address climate change, biodiversity and land degradation.

There is strong public and government support for improved environmental management but the institutional effectiveness of the 2000-2010 EMPS mechanism was questionable, with broad systemic ramifications, and requires strengthening. The training and successful models of integrated approaches that mainstream global objectives are currently not available to build the necessary national capacities within government and NGOs. The integration or mainstreaming activities was to focus on:

- improve the EMPS document, mechanism and organisation;
- develop and demonstrate local measures for the joint implementation of climate change, biodiversity and land management objectives in local natural resource management.

The anticipated **benefits** of the project included the strengthening of the institutional structure, functions and capacities of the EMPS (now SSDS) by more direct focus on mainstreaming global environmental concerns, broadening the non-governmental partnerships involved in delivery of the SSDS programme, and providing improved operational capacity to deliver the expected results for national and international environmental management.

¹¹ The SSDS is the third in the sequence of plans, but is somewhat different in structure from the EMPS and thus the changed name.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

Analysis of LogFrame Analysis (LFA) (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

The project was designed to implement a number of the priorities in the action plan of the National Capacity Self-Assessment¹²(NCSA) (2005) (see Annex 7) to address the needs and enhance the national approach to global environmental management.

This was one of the early GEF Capacity Building 2¹³ projects, thus the project designer(s) could not benefit from previous experience in this type of project, but the logic of the LFA seems consistent, with the Activities contributing to the Outputs and hence the planned Outcomes, including national and global aspects of capacity building.

Reviewing the project as it nears closure, it is clear that the logic used in its design was internally sound to build capacity for improved national and international environmental management, with Outcome 1 contributing to the national strategy, Outcome 2 focusing on the information required (now as a baseline and to be up-dated in the future) for environmental management at national and international levels and Outcome 3 including developing local capacity to implement environmentally beneficial sub-projects.

The Activities and Outputs in the originally approved ProDoc were ambitious given the budget (Annex 8). The much reduced set of Activities and Outputs which remained in the LFA following the Inception Workshop (also in Annex 8) have proved a challenge to achieve, indeed some were completed under other projects (funded by GEF and also the EU).

Assumptions and risks

The ProDoc stated that:

“The critical assumptions include the hypothesis that institutional change and targeted capacity building will increase the level of progress in environmental management, and the major assumptions are that national and global objectives are operationally compatible in the EMPS implementation process, and that government, NGOs and private sector will collaborate effectively within a joint EMPS (national) - Rio Conventions (global) framework.”

The Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSSDS-which superceeded the EMPS) has been approved, but is not yet operational. It is thus too early to see whether the extent of this risk, but the very fact it has not proven operational may be a symptom of this risk.

Furthermore, the ProDoc stated:

“A key risk is the ability of governmental, private and NGO organizations to work effectively together. As government scales-down its activities, streamlines and gradually moves from the role of primary implementer to that of facilitator, frictions can occur between agencies/ stakeholders as roles, relations and portfolios change in the implementation of the Environmental Management Plan. These concerns and interactions are recognized at the outset and will be addressed in the EMPS Steering Committee (SC) capacity development, partnerships-building and programming.”

¹² Available from:

<http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/Integrating%20Environment%20into%20Development/ncsa/final%20report%20and%20action%20plan/english/ncsa-seychelles-fr-ap.pdf>

¹³ The number 2 indicates it is a follow-on from the NCSA – effectively CB1

The delay in implementing the SSDS and also problems in project implementation could indeed be, at least in part, due to frictions between agencies (i.e. over whether SSDS should be implemented within MEE or is inter-sectoral).

Other risks / external factors recognized in the ProDoc were:

- *On-going reorganization of Government of Seychelles does not preclude the establishment of sufficiently functional National Centres of Expertise to support EMPS implementation;*
 - * [TE comment - Only UniSey is close to being a functional national centre]
- *Establishment of national environmental database and reporting on the State of the Environment, may be constrained by limited availability of suitable indicators and data sets, and trend data benchmarks;*
 - * [This has been an issue – but a greater medium to long-term risk is the problem over data sharing, which thus-far means only GoS data is being included in the database – and only GoS have access. Reportedly, this is continuing to be addressed by the on-going GEF BD and PA projects]
- *Institutional framework for mainstreaming global objectives into local land and water management, as well as micro-watershed management models incorporating Rio Convention requirements, are not compatible with land use planning under the Town & Country Planning Act & other legislation;*
 - * [Institutional framework for SSDS is not yet being implemented. The revised Physical Planning Bill is not yet enacted – although the Bill and district land use plans include the mainstreaming. It does not seem to be wise to include these as indicators for projects, as PMs / PCU / UNDP have little or no control over the final enactment.]
- *Seychelles is likely to witness climatic changes (e.g. extended dry spells, more severe weather events) that may make watershed and/or district land use plans and programs out of date and ineffective.*
 - * [Planners seem well aware of potential impacts of CC and these are in LUPs, but many district land use plans not yet gazetted.]

During the first part of the TE, no up-dates of the project risk assessment could be traced. However, an up-dated risk log was found on 11/11/13, which included risks dated on 02/02/10 – and updates dated 24/05/13 (when the new CTA had assumed leadership of the project). (The full log is Annex 9 of this report). The updates on 24/05/13 seem pertinent and are outlined in the Table 1.

Table 1: May 2013 Up-dates to Project Risk Log

Issue	Details
Regarding participation in pilot projects	There have been some issues regarding delivery of some project activities, primarily an issue related to poor supervision of construction. This has not affected interest in participation in pilot projects so far, but might do so if the problem is not rectified.
Issues around data sharing	Agreements with NGOs and others for release of data and contribution to the database have still not been signed and realistically are controversial and difficult to obtain, due to the lack of a copyright law in Seychelles. The Department of Environment may need to address this issue to come up with some form of workable agreements.
The institutional set-up for SSDS	The SSDS has been published but the organization and financing of the Secretariat is still being discussed. The Ministry of Environment and Energy has not yet communicated progress and expected institutional arrangements for the secretariat. It is possible that decisions are on hold pending completion and approval of the National Development Strategy (NDS) which will be the overarching strategy document.
Mediocre performance of some national consultants on SEO	Database development is underway. The Seychelles Environment Outlook (equivalent to an SOE) is near completion, but still lacking key chapters due to mediocre performance by some consultants.
Land use plans	Legislation and land use planning guidelines, and plans themselves, are completed or nearing completion through other GOS-UNDP-GEF projects.

[On 26 Nov 2013, as the draft TE report was being finalised, the Risk Level and Management Response dated 2/2/10 was provided to the evaluator.]

One risk which has deleteriously affected implementation of the CB2 project but was not included as a risk has been the issue of staffing. The PCU has faced problems recruiting and retaining an appropriately skilled project manager, perhaps due to the limited pool of suitably skilled personnel in Seychelles (as mentioned in the NCSA) - yet in discussions during the TE most informants recognize it as the “norm” in a SIDS with small numbers of appropriately-qualified potential recruits for the role of Project Manager. There have been three Project Managers during the implementation of the project, all of who also had responsibility for another (larger) GEF project. There have also been gaps between PMs (see section below on Management arrangements).

There have also been changes and gaps in senior PCU staff with oversight of the project (the Chief Technical Advisor and Programme Coordinator posts), which have had serious impacts on the leadership of the project, affecting impetus and exacerbating the loss of continuity / project memory. The project was effectively dormant for a period during implementation.

This issue is discussed in more detail under Management (p 23).

Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

As noted above, this was one of the earliest GEF Capacity Building 2 projects, thus the project designer(s) could not benefit from previous experience in this type of project. The project was designed as a short-term and relatively low budget medium-sized project to initiate the much needed environmental capacity building in Seychelles.

Planned stakeholder participation

Due to the design of the project, following the Inception Workshop, there were only limited opportunities for stakeholder / beneficiary participation in the project (management / decision-making / activities).

The project has principally involved national consultants writing chapters for the reports in Outcomes 1 and 2, respectively: the SSDS (funded by CB2); also on SEO-1 (funded by the UNEP AEIN project, but led by an IC funded by CB2).

The focus of Outcome 1 was to support MEE develop the SSDS (formerly the EMPS). Most of this only involved a small number (2) of MEE staff, along with a project-funded assistant and the 12 project-funded national consultants. [This work was also supported by an EU-funded ReCoMap.] Full and part-time lecturing staff of UniSey were funded by the project to develop about half the modules for the Years 1 and 2 courses (Annex 10) of the new B.Sc. in Environmental Science degree – and the Head of Programme was very appreciative of this. The modules are being specifically designed by local part-time staff to meet the needs of the tropical small island context, including in environmental law and the MEAs. Currently it is expected that 5-10 students will follow the programme each year – with additional working environmental scientists likely to be attracted to study third year modules as short courses for professional development. The UniSEY is well-linked into the local NGO and GoS network and students take-up one-month work placements during their degree courses. It is reported that most students wish to remain in Seychelles to work.

The work towards the SEO report and database (Outcome 2) again involved only a small number of GoS stakeholders, contributing information to the seven national consultants who gathered information and wrote chapters, including identifying sources of data for the SEO database. An international consultant (IC) was recruited in 2012 to lead production of the SEO-1. A range of stakeholders were reportedly present when the IC presented and then validated the draft SEO-1 report at a workshop in August 2013 – although no list of participants could be found during the TE mission. The environmental database linked to the SEO is being developed by the staff of the Environment Information and Data Section of MEE, mainly using GoS data (see Annex 11 for list of datasets held). It was hoped that NGOs would also contribute data for this database – but this is proving more complex to agree and is currently being negotiated beyond this individual project, at national level¹⁴.

UNDP and PCU staff reported that NGO staff seem particularly reluctant to attend meetings and reportedly request to be paid to do so, “something we will never agree to” (pers. comm. Roland Alcindor, UNDP Programme Manager).

The main opportunities to involve stakeholders and beneficiaries in CB2 has been through their involvement in the pilot sub-projects (solar PV, rainwater harvesting (rwh), tree nurseries, fire training courses, learning materials for families with children in future, tourists (see Annex 12 for details). This

¹⁴ The PCU CTA advised post the TE mission that “The Minister of Environment has now agreed to issue data sharing agreements to assist the compilation of a national database within MEE. This is being organized by Justin and Rebecca Klaus under a PA project consultancy.”

has included pupils in primary and secondary schools, also District staff – and the wider public through publicity and open events.

University of Seychelles students, recent, current and future can also be considered to be beneficiaries of the project – and staff of UNISEY also benefited from project support.

Replication approach

As a capacity building project, this project included elements not only of training individuals but also mechanisms by which capacity could be shared and pilots scaled-up, for example:

- Funds from CB2 were used to help develop Years 1 and 2 modules for the new B.S. degree in Environmental Science – these materials will be used in future years to teach ensuing cohorts of students (perhaps with up-dates as and when required) (Outcome 1);
- Development of the database from the SEO (Outcome 2) provides a baseline, encouraging routine data collecting - and also (when completed) will highlight gaps which require to be filled;
- Outcome 3 involved developing pilot sub-projects to demonstrate environmentally beneficial practices as models for responding to the goals and obligations of the Rio Conventions – all in public places which can be shared and copied (e.g. rainwater harvesting, solar PV power, setting-up tree nurseries – also a workshop on green building technologies, held in 2010).

UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP holds comparative advantage and a sound reputation in Seychelles for lead environmental projects, not least due to the existence of the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) under the Ministry of Environment and Energy, which is physically located in an office adjacent to the main UNDP office and the GEF Small Grants Programme office in Victoria on Mahé. It was established in May 2008 to “ensure a more effective monitoring of the GEF-funded portfolio of projects in Seychelles”¹⁵.

The TE found that the PCU is working effectively to meet the objectives it was set, namely:

“to coordinate, oversee, monitor & support the implementation of national environmental projects with funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The main aim of the PCU is to help achieve environmental sustainability & environment protection whilst still achieving economic growth. The PCU currently falls under the umbrella of the Ministry responsible for Environment. In the relatively short period of its existence it has built up a good network of local consultants, raise public awareness about the work of the Unit and its portfolio of projects and to-date facilitated the implementation of six projects. It presently has a full Seychellois management team and I am quite happy to note that the PCU team has the full support of and a strong working relationship with the various Government ministries / agencies, the private sector, especially those in tourism and fisheries sectors, and the Environment Non-Governmental organisations.”¹⁶

Notably, the PCU was been set-up and works to promote environment protection and critically to optimise “the use of financial resources put at the disposal of the Government of Seychelles to deliver on its sustainable development national agenda and international commitments.”

¹⁵ <http://www.pcusey.sc/>

¹⁶ quotes by Mr Didier Dogley - GEF Focal Point for Seychelles, on PCU website

Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector

This multifocal area capacity building project clearly contributed to and benefited from many of the recent and current projects in the environment sector in Seychelles and benefited from being managed in the PCU, within which other synergistic GEF funded projects (Biosecurity, Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Sustainable Land Management) were / are managed.

Notably:

- SSDS development (Outcome 1) was also funded by an EU programme (ReCoMap);
- activities contributing to the SEO in Outcome 2 were funded not only by UNDP, but also with support from the UNEP AEIN project (UNEP funded seven national consultants; UNDP CB2 funded the international consultant).

Management arrangements

Project management was based in the GoS / MEE GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) (a GoS entity).

The factor which has had a serious impact on the continuity and successful implementation of the project has been the frequent changes and indeed gaps in Project Manager, also changes in wider personnel in the PCU (see Figure 2). While clearly it is not possible to stop staff from moving on from posts, this frequent change in personnel has clearly resulted in the loss of significant amounts of “project memory”, exemplified in that for the TE, staff were unable to find many of the routine project reports (see Annex 5). These changes have not been conducive to the sound operation of the project, as there were gaps between PMs, so no smooth hand-over periods and new PMs inevitably took some time to become familiar and assume the required leadership role of this medium-sized project.

Figure 2: Diagram to show changes in project managers and PCU staff during project

Year	2010				2011				2012				2013				
Q	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
PM	PM1 (to Feb '12)										PM2 (July '12 to May '13)				PM 3 (from end July '13)		
PC	PC1 (to May '10)		PC2 (July '10 – Oct '12)										PC3 + CTA 3 (May '13 – present)				
CTA			CTA2 (Aug '10 – Sept '11)														



= role vacant for full Q(s)

The following explanation from the UNDP Programme Manager gives more detail on the situation:

“PCU is a Govt entity and I think this comment should get the MEE thinking for the future how they manage transitions as staff turnover is there to stay regardless of pay schemes as people sometimes leave for overseas or for other jobs within the country due to better package or conditions. For example, when the previous National Coordinator left, the new PSS of MEE should have stepped in to oversee closely the PCU operations. Unfortunately this was not the case and the UNDP PM had to play the dual role of overseeing the PCU closely as well as the oversight role for the projects. The fact that the new PS

is also not too well versed with the GEF process and projects (and former PS became the Advisor to the Minister) and had a non-operational role, this led to serious impact on performance. The decision by MEE as well as signature of the project to nominate someone other than the GEF –OFP as National Project Director for this project led to some of the problems of the SC not taking place as per the ProDoc. When the NPD resigned from Govt, no new one was nominated either by the MEE.”

Without exception, the stakeholders interviewed for the TE particularly mentioned the issue of staff changes and the ensuing problems, including managers of pilot projects on Praslin reporting having had to re-explain activities to the new PM.

Project reports do not appear to have been routinely filed, nor backed-up, consequently new project managers did not have access to files from their predecessor – and many files were impossible to find (either in Seychelles or Mauritius) for the Terminal Evaluation (see Annex 5).

In the project design, a Project Steering Committee (SC)¹⁷ was envisaged to provide sound guidance and oversight of activities during the project’s implementation. A well-attended first SC meeting was held on 30 Nov 2009¹⁸, draft minutes were produced on 1 December 2009 and the minutes state they planned to meet again on 1 February 2010, following the Inception Workshop (which took place on 27 January 2010). At the first meeting, the SC minutes record:

“It was agreed for the committee to meet once every two months on the first Monday of the month for the first 6 months of project implementation and to meet every quarterly thereafter.”

Regrettably the CB2 SC has not met since.

During the TE, the evaluator endeavored to find out why the SC had not met again and indeed who the National Project Director was, but could discover neither. There appeared to be confusion in transfer of responsibilities due to changes in the PS/NPD and the lack of the Steering Committee structure. It was later explained (Jan 2014) that the initial NPD left GoS in 2012 after the restructuring, without assignment a successor. {This does not explain the absence of SC meetings in 2010 and 2011.}

It remains amazing how the project even achieved what it has, given this lack of guidance, for example to agree important aspects such as work plans, budgets, the ToRs for consultants, also their selection – and in some respects may be the cause of some of the failures of the project to achieve all its Outcomes. This is further discussed below (Section 3.3).

3.2 Project Implementation

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

The project design was changed significantly during the Inception Workshop (IW), reportedly due to the time lapse between project design (presumably 2007 and 2008), ProDoc approval (October 2008) and the project start (according to the ProDoc this was to be May 2009, but in actual fact this was early 2010/2010) – a period in which notably GEF SLM and BD Mainstreaming projects started, each including components which had been included in the CB2 design. These are evaluated as appropriate.

The reduction in number of Activities from the original ProDoc to the IW LFA was a realistic response to a very complex, perhaps over-ambitious original project design, which had a limited budget and time-scale. Furthermore, by the time implementation started, considerable changes that had occurred in the US\$:Seychelles Rupee exchange rate, which further constrained what the budget could cover.

¹⁷ The version in the ProDoc implies it would be the same committee as that steering the EMPS (Annex ?)

¹⁸ Minutes of this meeting were not in PCU records and only found in TE by a member of staff of a GoS Ministry (not MEE)

The Annual Project Review (APR – see Annex 13) includes various targets for the pilot sub-projects (Outcome 3) which are not present in the LogFrame agreed at the IW. The TE could find no evidence of why these changes were made, by whom and when – although all the new targets seem quite appropriate and based on a realistic assessment of what the project could cover. It was reported in Jan 2014 that these changes were made by PCU.

Changes were also made to the project some time in 2013 – as the final version of the APR included some new targets for project end (e.g. national centres of expertise in local and global environmental management). Again, the TE could find no evidence of why these changes were made, by whom and when. It was reported in Jan 2014 that these changes were made by PCU.

The final APR still implies that this project funded / supported development of land use plans (in Outcome 3) – yet it is accepted that these were funded and supported only by the GEF BD and SLM projects, thus should not be attributed to CB2.

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

It must be concluded at the end of the TE that there was little evidence that any strong partnerships having developed during implementation of this project, thus little remains.

The project funded 12 national consultants to develop the chapters for Volume 2 of the SSDS and supported an administrative assistant to assist in creation and catalyse formal approval of this important national policy framework. However, this role of CB2 in the SSDS seems less well recognized than might be expected at GoS levels. GoS staff mentions that CB2 “supported” SSDS, with the main player being the EU ReCoMap programme.

The project recruited an international consultant to draft the 2010 Seychelles Environment Outlook (SEO-1) Report. This role then reportedly was changed at the IC’s request (according to one informant) to the IC being responsible for editing chapters written by national consultants (NCs funded by the UNEP AEIN project). Since draft chapters for the SEO-1 were submitted (mid 2013), the MEE’s Environment Information and Data Section (EIDS) have been working to develop a database to make the data in the SEO available in digital form within GoS systems (eventually purportedly via the internet, currently only within the GoS Dept. of Information and Communication Technology (DICT). This would have been expected to develop into a strong partnership; however, this has not happened. Relations on activities across this Outcome appear have broken down completely, deadlines have been missed, indeed some individuals have refused to work with others and new NC authors had to be sought. These issues mean that this important Outcome has not been completed and the IC is currently blocking the Terminal Evaluation and indeed PCU from sight of his final document.

The TE received two differing accounts of what payments have been made to the SEO IC:

1. that PCU had already made full payment of the fees due to the IC on submission of this important national baseline environmental report;
2. that PCU had “issued the penultimate payment on the insistence of IC that draft chapters constituted the first draft of the SEO - and to encourage him to complete the work. Without this payment he was threatening to stop work at that time. We have still not issued the final payment due on completion, nor will we until we have the document in hand”.

By 17 Jan 2014, the SEO had not been submitted.

The SEO database itself is under development by EIDS staff and should be made available within the GoS systems by project closure. Annex 11 provides a listing of the issues and indicators held in the database.

According to the ProDoc and APR, this component was to include NGOs sharing data – but longstanding issues of ownership of data are blocking agreement and this issue is being discussed and will hopefully a protocol will agreed in 2014. The TCA reported that it is “generally possible to get a data sharing agreement into place but it also relies on standard clauses being put into agreements e.g. between Government and large externally funded activities such as the Nansen expedition, to ensure repatriation of the data collected”, but staff of NGOs interviewed in the TE seemed less optimistic.

Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Despite being mentioned in the ProDoc (p2 and 15), also as being planned in the 2012 APR, this project appears to have had neither a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) nor Mid-Term Review (MTR) (mentioned on p 15). The main source of information on project progress is the APR (dated June 2013, but with columns completed in June each project year), since only a limited number of in some cases very brief Quarterly Progress Reports could be found (Annex 5).

The chief indication of any use of M & E for adaptive management is that the start-up of the SEO activities (Outcome 2) involving national consultants was delayed until the limited pool of appropriately qualified consultants had completed their involvement in the SSDS process.

2012 APR/PIR stated

“The finalization of the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (SSDS) 2011-2020 (formerly known as the EMPS) had taken several months delay. Since many other activities under the CB2 Project were related to the action plans in the SSDS and also the new institutional mechanism to oversee implementation of the SSDS, this has delayed implementation under the project considerably. Furthermore, noting capacity constraints in Seychelles, some of the same individuals who were involved in the SSDS would also be involved in the State of the Environment Outlook definition as well as the training curriculum development. Thus, until a conclusive point could be reached with the SSDS, it was not practical to implement further activities under the project.”

Project finance

At the time of the TE, the last available spending report (June 2013) showed that the project has only disbursed the majority of the GEF grant (Table 2), this was confirmed in Nov 2013 by the Project Manager and PCU Finance Officer.

Table 2: Project Outcome Budget (in US\$) (source ProDoc and PCU Finance Officer)

Outcome	GEF	Co-finance		Total Budgeted	Spend to June 2013
		GoS Co-finance	Other co-finance		
1: Awareness and capacity is developed for mainstreaming global environmental conventions into national programmes	87,000	20,000		107,000	99,521.84
2: Environmental information and reporting is strengthened	90,000	20,000		110,000	108,730.80
3: Capacity for local implementation of global environmental conventions is developed, applied and disseminated	185,000	30,000		215,000	78,096.38
4: Project Management	38,000	30,000		68,000	81,623.34
Unrealized gains					252.36
Unrealized losses					4.31
TOTAL MSP	400,000	100,000	0	560,000	368,221¹⁹

The funds appear generally to be carefully managed (a conclusion backed-up by the 2012 Audit Report), although much more has been spent on project management than in the original budget and much less spent on Outcome 3. This is attributed to the project having been extended to four rather than the originally planned three year period.

Notable expenditures have been over \$54,000 on national consultants working on Vol. 2 of the SSDS \$38,000 to UniSeY to develop modules for the B.Sc. Environmental Science and \$7,200 for a workshop on green building standards.

Information on co-financing was provided by UNDP Mauritius (Table 3), but it is clear that GoS, UNDP, also UNEP AEIN and EU ReCoMap programmes have provided more than the agreed co-financing.

¹⁹ Slight rounding error

Table 3: CB2 Co-Finance Breakdown

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants			0	17,160				17,160
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support	0	25,000	100,000	100,000			100,000	125,000
• Other								
Totals	0	25,000	100,000	117,160			100,000	142,160

The analysis of annual project spending (Table 4) shows that activities started very slowly in 2010, despite a PM being in place from late 2009. Expenditure (and by implication the activity rate) increased over the following two years – and the project continued with activities at a similar level in the first half of 2013, despite the lack of a PM – presumably this was the activities around the SEO, also the pilot sub-projects.

Table 4: CB2 Project Spending by Year

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
GEF	2,706	40,047	123,628	131,996	69,844	368,221
Co-Fin	?	?	?	?	?	142,160

One problematic financial issue for the project has arisen as they responded to pressure from the SEO-1 international consultant and appear to have paid him his full monies for completion and submission of the report (the major element of Outcome 2), although he is currently refusing to submit the draft consolidated document claiming a small payment from UNDP (re an internal flight in Australia) is outstanding – when a UNDP bank trace has found this has been paid into his bank account. This is very poor practice and in future, the PCU and all involved should ensure that the contracted output(s) are received before payment is made. However, following the TE mission, the CTAS has stated that he “issued the penultimate payment on the insistence of IC that draft chapters constituted the first draft of the SEO - and to encourage him to complete the work. Without this payment he was threatening to stop work at that time. We have still not issued the final payment due on completion, nor will we until we have the document in hand”. Assuming the latter information is correct, this is no longer a financial issue – but the report remains outstanding (3 weeks after the completion of the TE mission). The IC was working on a GoS contract therefore it is recommended they include a clause on how to deal with any difficult consultant.

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

Perhaps in part due to the absence of a Steering Committee, or continuity in Project Manager, project monitoring and evaluation (M & E) has not been implemented to the level which would have been expected for a GEF project.

Clearly some targets can be identified as having been met, for example the SSDS 2012-2020 has been approved, published and circulated (as noted by the UNDP CTA in the APR dated 30 June 2013). However, it is dated 2012-2020, not 2010-2020 due to various delays. Also, project funds have been well used to support development of modules for a B.Sc. Environmental Science course at the University of

the Seychelles (UniSey) (part of Outcome 1 - see Annex 10) and pilot sub-projects have been implemented (part of Outcome 3 – see Annex 12).

The most recent APR has been a very useful document during the TE the find out how project activities progressed, when the current (recently appointed) PM has very limited knowledge of the project.

However, although a small number of figures were added to the LogFrame at the Inception Workshop (IW) which can be used as the baseline against which to measure progress during the project (for parts of Outcome 3), it is disappointingly not possible to assess less easily quantifiable indicators. The ProDoc stated:

“The project will use a capacity development monitoring and evaluation scorecard to monitor the project capacity development progress. It will monitor the relevant nine capacity development indicators for this project, which are of direct relevance to effectively implement the Rio Conventions in Seychelles. This includes integration of compliance with the specific provisions of the three conventions within the ongoing national implementation of the EMPS (see Table 5 below). This scorecard will be used to review/rate the relevant capacity development indicators at inception, at mid-point of project implementation and finally at the end of project implementation. This capacity development monitoring tools will be used by the project implementation team to monitor the project capacity development progress and also by the evaluators to conduct the MTE and the final evaluation.”

Table 5: Links between CB2 Outcomes and Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard (CDMS)²⁰

Capacity Result / Indicator	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement	
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	1, 3
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	1, 3
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	1
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge	
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	2
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	
Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	
Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development	
Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process	3
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	1
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	2
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation	
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	3
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate	
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	3
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process	

The TE could find no evidence that the scorecard was used to provide the necessary baseline (even contacting the former CTA – and interviewing a former PM).

²⁰ see Annex 14 for full scorecard

No Mid-Term Evaluation or even Mid-Term Review was carried-out (despite the clear references to both in the ProDoc), thus it was not used to monitor progress during the project and consequently, regrettably, it seemed futile to use it during the TE.

*Rating for monitoring and evaluation at entry (baseline) and implementation - **moderately satisfactory**.*

UNDP and Executing Agency implementation / execution (*) coordination and operational issues

The PCU / wider MEE do not seem to have provided the level of management, co-ordination and leadership that would have been expected for the majority of the period of this GEF project, with staff changes, gaps in staffing, poor hand-over of information, not calling SC meetings, low levels of participation of the MEA FPs and problems in management of project documents particularly affecting project activity levels also continuity and motivation of stakeholders, beneficiaries and even Project Managers. [It must be stated here that the current PCU Coordinator is doing an excellent job trying to rescue a bad situation from his predecessor.]

In Seychelles, choice of candidates for Project Manager is limited due to the small population / pool of expertise and it seems likely that either only one or none of the PMs who worked on the project had the required work experience as set-out in the ProDoc (Annex 5 – stated 6-8 years relevant experience required). These young graduates deserved to have been better supported in their roles.

Furthermore, it seems all the PMs also had responsibility for another GEF project – and in two cases (not the current PM), they clearly preferred to work on their other project and did not find the CB2 sufficiently stimulating to sustain their focus, perhaps due to a lack of interest in the project from the stakeholders, which were the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE) and particularly the Department of Environment (DoE). The latter factor is surprising given the priority given to the scope of the CB2 project in the NCSA – but this may be attributable to the delay in implementation of the project – also changes in the Focal Points themselves.

*Rating for Implementation and Execution – **moderately unsatisfactory***

3.3 Project Results

Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)

Table 6 tabulates the attainment of objectives for CB2 at the Terminal Evaluation.

Table 6: Overall Attainment of Objectives of CB2 (adapted from June 2013 APR)

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013 (completed by PCU, CTA)	Attainment of Objectives at Terminal Evaluation (Nov 2013)
To integrate local and global environmental management and enhance the capacity to implement global environmental management objectives within national programmes.	National policy framework to link global environment conventions with national programmes	Existing EMPS 2000-2010	Creation and formal approval of EMPS 2011-2020 that incorporates obligations and action plans of the Rio Conventions (by end of 2010)	Target achieved. The SSDS 2012-2020 has been approved, published and circulated.	Agreed- target achieved with support of CB2 project (also EU ReCoMap programme support), but none of agreed SSDS implementation mechanisms yet in place

	Formal policy to integrate environmentally beneficial activities and related global environment indicators into all district / regional land development plans	No policy exists	Policy document supporting incorporation of environmental activities and indicators relevant to Rio Convention goals into district / regional land development plans approved by Seychelles Cabinet (by end of project)	Target 90% achieved (largely through another project). A Physical Planning Bill, replacing the old Town and Country Planning Act, has been prepared and harmonized with the new Environment Protection Act, and will go before the Cabinet of Ministers for approval in late 2013. The PPB provides a legal basis for implementing and enforcing the revised land use plans. A consolidated National Land Use Plan, plus individual LUPs for the 22 districts of Mahe, 2 of Praslin and 1 of La Digue have all been completed and presented to or are about to be presented to Cabinet for approval. All LUPs have been developed within a planning framework that emphasizes environmental (as well as social and developmental) considerations, the first of which is based on the commitments of Seychelles to the Rio Conventions. The PBB and LUPs were developed under another UNDP-GEF project, Mainstreaming biodiversity management into production sector activities.	Physical Planning Bill and the Environment Protection Act remain in draft form and have not gone before Parliament. This, for instance, means that there is no legislation to enforce the district or national land use plans, so reportedly in some cases already developments are being permitted in areas which under the LUP were agreed to be protected. None of this was supported by CB2
Awareness and capacity is developed for mainstreaming global environment conventions into national programmes	Institutional capacity to coordinate and implement national environmental policies and programs, including those related to global environment		Creation and formal approval of EMPS 2011-2020 that incorporates obligations under and action plans of the Rio Conventions (by	Target achieved (see objective). The structure for the implementation of the SSDS has been determined. TORs for the SSDS Council, SSDS Steering Committee and key staff of the SSDS Secretariat were prepared in late 2012 and sent to the MEE for approval and subsequent implementation of the SSDS.	Little progress has been made on the implementation of the SSDS, with some remaining discussions on whether it will be within MEE of the office of the President or Vice-President. Reportedly, MEE have

	conventions		end of 2010)		requested funding from GoS to implement the SSDS structure – the Seychelles Sustainable Development Division (SSDD)
	National centres appointed and functioning effectively in local and global environmental management		(Added in 2013) At least two national centres of expertise targeted within the SSDS supported to strengthen capacity for environmental management.	Target achieved. The precise meaning of national centres of expertise is not clear within the context of SSDS implementation, although the SSDS does stress the importance of education for sustainability, and capacity strengthening for environmental management. The project has targeted S4S and University of Seychelles (UniSey) as interim national centres of expertise, these having been identified within the SSDS to assume specific roles in SSDS delivery. (See also below.)	UniSey is the only centre – target deemed only partially achieved at TE
	Relevant technical personnel aware of and able to effectively implement obligations under Rio conventions as an integrated part of national policies and programs		(Added in 2013) Capacity built in at least two centres of expertise to integrate Rio Convention obligations within national policies and programmes.	Target achieved, The project originally targeted S4S for capacity building to deliver part of the education for sustainability component of the SSDS, but subsequent to 2011-12 support for attendance of international fora decided not to provide additional support as the organization was receiving this support from other sources (including UNDP SGP). The University of Seychelles (UniSey) as the key national centre of expertise supporting the education of sustainability component has been supported to develop a training package for the integration of global environmental objectives into curricula, and completed preparation of course	As above - UniSey

				materials in June 2013.	
Environmental information and reporting is strengthened	Formalized and widely accessible mechanism for managing and reporting on environmental information in Seychelles related to global environment conventions	Numerous uncoordinated and not well known or readily accessible information sources on environment conditions and indicators	A single, consolidated and web-based open access environmental database on key indicators related to global conventions (by end of 2010) (also a library of actual printed documentation?)	Target 90% achieved. The servers and equipment for the environment database has been installed, training delivered, and data entry initiated. The equipment is up and running at the DICT. However, there seems to have been no movement on this activity since around August 2012, and a database manual and some other deliverables have not been forthcoming from the contractor. There has been some confusion caused by overlap between the CB2 inputs and the inputs of another project, Mainstreaming Biodiversity, although these are now being resolved such that work on a consolidated database can be completed in late 2013.	Work progressing with the database – although metadatabase showing info held in DBMS not yet provided to TE. Web access not possible to DICT servers – thus some compromise need to be made in the final 2 months of project.
	Active use of and contributions to environmental database by national stakeholders	0 users (database on key environment indicators for global conventions does not exist)	At least 15 organizations / agencies contributing to database and/or citing database in official reports (by end of project)	Target not yet achieved. The database is currently being populated with some data held at DOE, but indicators are not yet resolved and coordinated inputs from other organizations not yet sought. Indicators will be finalized within the context of the Seychelles Environment Outlook (below), and links with other UNDP-GEF projects and their databases/proposed databases rationalized by the end of 2013.	At least 15 organisations have reportedly provided data for inclusion in database, but it is not yet being cited in reports. NGOs reluctant to share data – CB2 (and others) have catalysed required discussions within GoS and with NGOs on data sharing.
	Consolidated, formally approved reporting	Incomplete and infrequent reporting by	At least 50% of Convention reporting	Target not yet achieved. See above.	Not yet achieved

	structure on environmental conditions in the Seychelles to support decision making, priority setting, and reporting to the Rio conventions	Seychelles to the Rio Conventions	indicators reported on as required (by end of project)		
	Completed SEO and established database	No official national report on state of the environment in Seychelles	2010 Seychelles State of the Environment Outlook produced (by end of 2010). SEO endorsed by Govt. of Seychelles (by end of project)	Target 80% achieved. First drafts of all thematic sections of the Seychelles Environment Outlook have been prepared by national consultants and reviewed by the lead international consultant. A first consolidated draft is due in July 2013 and the validation workshop will be in early August 2013, after which the revised final document will be submitted to Cabinet for approval.	Not achieved - SEO IC refusing to release consolidated draft report (compiled from reports of 7 national consultants). [<i>There remains a chance that this will eventually be completed.</i>] Relations between IC and NCs were reportedly very difficult; some NCs refused to work with IC and their roles re-assigned due to personality issues. Relations between PCU and IC have also become difficult as they tried to mediate between the IC and NCs – also over

					financial issues.
Capacity for local implementation of global environmental conventions is developed, applied and disseminated	Pilot land development plan incorporates environmentally beneficial activities that increase and provide a model for responding to goals and obligations of Rio Conventions	Environmentally beneficial practices are very minimally considered in land development plans and do not take account of Rio Conventions	One district / regional land development plan, which includes environmentally beneficial practices related to Rio Conventions, approved and under implementation (by mid-2011)	Target achieved. Land use plans have been developed for 25 districts on Mahe, Praslin and La Digue and consolidated into a National Land Use Plan, completed in June 2013 under the UNDP-GEF project Mainstreaming biodiversity management into production sector activities. Both the individual LUPs and Land Use Planning Guidelines (also completed in June 2013) include environmental considerations related to Rio Convention goals: specifically identification and delineation of areas in need of additional protection or conservation such as current forest areas, wetlands, river catchments and sensitive coastlines (classified and protected under one of the “no development zone” sub-categories, such as forest reserve, wetland, protected coastline or beachfront, or buffer zone. Additional data on key biodiversity areas as mapped by the Department of Environment is also taken into consideration. Classification into one of the “no development zones” in the LUP is considered a starting point for the declaration of additional protected areas under the new Protected Areas Law and Regulations, aiming to reach or exceed CBD targets for percentage of national land- and seascape under full protection. Remaining is the approval by the Cabinet of Ministers of all LUPs and the Guidelines: remaining documents are expected to be presented to Cabinet by MLUH during July-August 2013.	CB2 was not involved in developing LUPs.

	<p>Public participation in development and monitoring of pilot land development plan:</p> <p>- Number of public meetings held in the process of creating the pilot district / regional land development plan</p> <p>- Number of seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring</p>	0 0	<p>At least 3 public meetings</p> <p>At least 3 seminars</p>	<p>Target achieved. District LUPs were developed down to the level of individually owned land parcels and involved a high level of on-site consultation to clarify land boundaries, etc. At least one district level meeting was held to present and obtain comments on drafts of each of the LUPs. Once the LUPs are approved by Cabinet, implementation is the responsibility of MLUH and the District Administration officers. Issues pertaining to the LUP implementation will be discussed at regular public meetings convened by the DAs.</p>	<p>CB2 was not involved in developing LUPs.</p>
	<p>Environmentally beneficial activities at site of pilot district / regional land development plan</p> <p>- # of rainwater harvesting</p>	0 (TBD)	5 systems?	<p>Targets 50-100% achieved. Rain water harvesting: 1 system has been installed at the Home of the Elderly at Grand Anse Praslin, 1 system at La Digue Secondary and Primary School, and 6 systems are largely installed for public buildings at Anse Royale, Mahe. Target achieved. Solar electricity: Grand Anse Praslin Secondary School has installed a 2.8kW PV system; some solar appliances are yet to be installed at La Digue Secondary and Primary</p>	<p>11 pilot sub-projects mostly successful.</p> <p>Including:</p> <p>Fire preparedness – 1</p> <p>RWH – 2</p> <p>Demo garden – 1</p> <p>Forest rehab / tree</p>

	<p>systems installed</p> <p>- KWH of photovoltaic systems installed</p> <p>- Area of degraded hillsides that have been re-vegetated for erosion</p> <p>- Area of land cleared of invasive alien creepers</p>	<p>0 (TBD)</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p>	<p>3Kwp</p> <p>2 ha</p> <p>5ha</p>	<p>School. Target 93% achieved. Area of hillside re-vegetated: Grand Anse Praslin Secondary School has raised 250 seedlings, but these are not yet planted out; Praslin Development Fund has planted out around 2,000 seedlings (area of land covered not yet calculated); Grande Anse Praslin DAs office was supplied with firefighting equipment and fire preparedness training to prevent further deforestation through wild fires (which burn up to 10% of the upland areas each year). Target achievement unknown, likely >50%. Areas of creepers cleared: no activities were undertaken by the demo sub-projects. However, one of the demo implementers, SIF, has organized parallel activities to clear creepers from Vallée de Mai as part of the run-up to the 30th anniversary of establishment of the World Heritage Site in December 2013. Other activities related to Rio Conventions: waste bins for recycling were installed at La Digue Secondary and Primary School; environmental education activities were conducted by TRASS and by SIF on Praslin, and by La Digue Secondary and Primary School; a demo home garden has been established by Baie St Anne Praslin Primary School; wetland restoration was undertaken at Anse Royale by the University of Seychelles (area restored not yet calculated).</p>	<p>nursery – 2</p> <p>Energy efficiency (solar pv) – 1</p> <p>Sustainable school – 1</p> <p>Wetlands equipment – 1</p> <p>Public education – 2</p> <p>– target numbers partially achieved</p>
	<p>Number of persons capable of implementing environmentally beneficial activities that</p>			<p>Target not yet achieved. This has not yet been addressed systematically, although ad hoc training has been carried out in the context of some of the demo projects (above). Results so far will be collated and additional training delivered during</p>	<p>No evidence of this training having taken place</p>

	support the Rio Conventions into district / regional land development plans			the remainder of the project lifetime.	See pilot sub-projects above – no information available on numbers of staff trained – likely very limited
	• Technical Staff (Govt. + NGO)	2-3	5		
	• Rainwater harvesting systems	0	4		
	• Photovoltaic systems	3-5	8		
	• Re-vegetation for erosion control				
	• Invasive alien creeper eradication	2-3 1-2	8 10		
	• Pilot site (District/Regional) inhabitantAS	0	3 10		
	• Rainwater harvesting systems		10		
	• Photovoltaic systems	2-3			
	• Re-vegetation	2-3			

	for erosion control • Invasive alien creeper eradication				
	Procedures and tools to replicate best practices of environmentally beneficial activities related to Rio Conventions in district / regional land development plans	No tools or best practices studied or developed	A detailed manual on replicating environmentally beneficial activities related to Rio Conventions in district / regional land development plans (by end of project)	Target achieved. This is covered in the National Land Use Planning Guidelines produced in June 2013 (see above).	CB2 was not involved in developing LUPs.
	Public Awareness of revised TCPA, EPA, LUP, LDP and environmental best practices - TV spots - Newspaper articles - Radio programs	12 12 6	(Added in 2013) Strategy for delivery of public awareness raising actions developed and delivered.	Target not yet achieved. The revision of the Town and Country Planning Act (now the Physical Planning Bill) was completed in June 2013. The preparation of the Environmental Protection Act was completed in June 2013 and harmonized with the PPB. Both are awaiting approval by Cabinet. Other relevant documents such as the Biosecurity Act and Protected Areas Policy are near completion. All of these have been funded under other UNDP-GEF projects. Once these various legal instruments are finalized, the project will develop a strategy for delivery of relevant information to target stakeholders and commence dissemination	CB2 was not involved in developing LUPs.

				activities. (This will be assisted by the PCU PR Officer and coordinated with programme dissemination approaches.)	
--	--	--	--	--	--

An additional training course run by consultancy firm 'European Consultant Brussels' was included in the Q3 Progress Report in 2011:

Output 3.2: Training for key stakeholders on environmentally beneficial activities that support the goals / obligations of the Rio Conventions

This training was on "Green Building Technologies" such as the use of renewable energy, water harvesting, low-energy and environmentally friendly building techniques in the tropics to familiarize and train local architects, engineers, developers and agents in Seychelles on green building technologies". The training is expected to take place from 28th October to 2nd November 2011.

*Rating for the attainment of objectives for the CB2 project is **moderately unsatisfactory**. This is because many of the Objectives have not been achieved and others have been very much delayed.*

Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency (*)

In conclusion, the TE concludes that the project was and remains very **relevant**, as clearly national and international environmental issues remain highly relevant and national capacity is vital to respond to national and global environmental problems.

However, this evaluation concludes that the CB2 has been only **moderately unsatisfactory** in terms of both effectiveness and efficiency.

A range of factors have contributed to the poor ratings for effectiveness and efficiency, some of which should have been better handled (keeping digital project documents in an organized system, preparing hand-over notes when one PM leaves, ensuring SC meetings are called, keeping sub-project managers informed), while others are less easy to control (e.g. turn-over of staff). In 2005 when the NCSA was undertaken and in 2007 when the ProDoc was designed, national capacity identified the capacity needs of the country (Annex 7). Many of the reasons the project has been rated as moderately satisfactory in terms of effectiveness and efficiency are precisely attributable to this the lack of capacity (*inter alia* limited numbers of experienced and appropriately qualified staff, who are consequently over-stretched managing core GoS and GEF / other project activities, also the limited range of candidates for roles such as PMs and national consultants). This is a vicious circle which has many characteristics specific to the Seychelles situation, which a short-term small GEF project alone was unlikely to be able to resolve. A continual effort in capacity building is needed to successfully build national capacity.

Country ownership

The level of country ownership of the project has been very difficult to assess. Given the problems encountered in implementing the project, it must be concluded that to a large extent there was little national ownership and commitment once the project had been approved started-up (SC 1 had taken place). It is important here in the TE to consider MEE did not take a more proactive role and ownership of this project.

Clearly during and following the NCSA (2005), there was enthusiasm to build national capacity for improved national and international environmental management. However, over the period from project design in 2007 to approval in 2008 and start-up in late 2009/early 2010 enthusiasm seems to have declined – and also various other larger GEF projects started-up, which included elements in the ProDoc. Furthermore, cuts in GoS meant that fewer staff were available to be involved, as they themselves had roles in the other GEF projects, also EU and UNEP projects.

Mainstreaming

The concept of the transformation of the EMPS into the SSDS seems to have been to mainstream the concept of sustainable development beyond “environment”, where it was previously rooted, to reach all sectors. When the SSDS was validated in 2012, the ca. 70 attendees reportedly endorsed that the strategy should be implemented from the President’s Office, or the Vice-Presidents Office rather than from MEE, in order that sustainability be viewed as something which cuts across all sectors (i.e. mainstreamed), rather than being only considered a concern for MEE.

Chapter 8 of Volume 1 of the SSDS 2012-2020 is entitled Mainstreaming Sustainable Development in Seychelles and not only provides a broad definition, but also recommends a set of practical steps following adoption of the SSDS.

Furthermore, Volume 2 of the SSDS document, which was prepared and compiled by GoS with the help of sectoral consultants (funded by the CB2 project) and supported by a CB2-funded administrative assistant (for 1 year), includes chapters on thirteen sectors (Social and Human Development; Land Use, Coastal Zones and Urbanisation; Biodiversity and Forestry; Agriculture and Food Security; Fisheries and Marine Resources: Water, Sanitation and Waste Management; tourism and Aesthetics; The Economics of Sustainability; Sustainable Consumption and Production; Energy and Transport; Climate Change; Education for Sustainability; Policy, Institutional and Regulatory).

According to the 2012 SSDS document, the SSDS Council and SSDS Steering Committee are both intended to be multi-sectoral. However, information available at the time of the TE indicates that the Institutional Framework for implementation of the 2012-2020 SSDS will be in the Ministry of Environment and Energy, thus not institutionalized as agreed in the SSDS validation meeting (the President’s Office, or the Vice-Presidents Office).

Sustainability (*)

The sustainability of the elements which the project has completed is rated to be ***moderately likely***, due to the nature of the CB2 Outputs, namely:

The Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy 2012-2020 (Outcome 1):

- Documents have been approved, published and circulated;
- The structure for the implementation of the SSDS has been determined, with a Council and a Steering Committee, also four operational units (Project Management unit; Fund Raising and Outreach Unit; Knowledge Base; and M & E Unit);
- Although delayed from that anticipated in the undated SSDS 2012-2020 document, which states it will be fully operational by the end of 2013, reportedly moves are starting to appoint the Council (hopefully soon also the Steering Committee) and MEE have requested the necessary budget from GoS.

The Seychelles State of the Environment Outlook (Outcome 2):

- National consultants (funded by the UNEP AEIN project) drafted chapters on the following thematic areas for the SEO-1 and identified data sources. These were validated at a workshop in August 2013. The thematic areas were:
 - Political Environment ;
 - Natural Environment;
 - Climate Change;
 - Economic Environment;
 - Freshwater Resources;
 - Biodiversity;

- Social Environment;
 - Land Transformation;
 - Marine Environment.
- A database to store the identified key environmental indicators has been developed and is being populated with data (following screening) (see Annex 11 for listing of datasets currently held). It is based within the established Environment Information and Data Section of the MEE, using servers managed by the GoS's Department of Information and Communication Technology (DICT) – thus its continuity beyond the project life-span is assured.
 - The web interface is being developed and it is anticipated that this will be available by the end of the project – although this will not link directly to the DICT servers (i.e. contrary to the ProDoc and IW LFA), reportedly due to the need to a high level of security for GoS data.
 - A report entitled 2010 Seychelles State of the Environment Outlook was to be prepared, published and submitted to Cabinet for endorsement by GoS by the end of the project. The task was assigned (in Q2 of 2012) to an international consultant, and then national consultants recruited to draft chapters, which the IC was then to edit and compile. Relations between the IC and NCs, also the PM and wider PCU broke down and despite no-cost extensions to the IC's contract, regrettably the IC has failed to deliver the final document²¹, although drafts of the chapters were reviewed at a validation workshop in early August. This document should provide a baseline for the on-going monitoring of the state of the environment of Seychelles – yet one IC seems to hold it in his power not to release a major part of the project to GoS.

Pilot Sub-Projects (Outcome 3)

Most of the sub-projects funded under Outcome 3 are progressing well. The local managers need to be encouraged to continue the activity beyond the CB2 funding (this should have been included in contracts). Official GEF/UNDP signs should be placed at each site to publicise the status and that this relatively small step is likely to encourage those involved to maintain and publicise their activities (see recommendation 14).

Catalytic role and impact

B.Sc. Environmental Science, University of Seychelles

Probably the most important Output of the project in terms of its catalytic role has been the support the project provided to UniSEY.

UniSey is a new university – only three years old. Up-to the project start, the only environmental course they offered was a University of London external degree course in Geography and Environment (four of the five students who followed the programme are graduating in Nov 2013). The UniSEY have discontinued offering that course, as they wished to offer a programme tailored to the local tropical / small island context. The programme is being developed with stakeholder consultation, including both GoS and local NGOs.

CB2 support covered half the costs of developing the first and second year course modules for the new B.Sc. (Honours) Environmental Science course (see Annex 10), including a module entitled

²¹ IC's contract was extended (no cost) on 2nd July 2013 in which it was agreed that the "final draft of the report incorporating all comments from the workshops and the stakeholders and ready for publishing by 16th August 2013". IC now stating he will complete the work in the week 25-29 Nov 2013, providing PCU reimburse a disputed airfare (which PCU have documents to prove was authorized on 18 Oct 2013).

“Environmental Law & MEAs”. The programme involves local experts presenting the lectures and local environment NGOs are giving internships to students. Numbers on the course are small; currently there are nine students in the second year of the programme and five students in the first year. However, this will for example boost the pool of talent available for environmental jobs in Seychelles – and the third year modules being developed are to be opened to non-students (existing graduates) as short courses for professional development.

Pilot Sub-Projects

The pilot sub-projects in Outcome 3 (Annex 12) are likely to have catalytic impacts, assuming their beneficial results are well publicised (by the end of the TE mission, although most have produced some report, only three of the pilots have produced their contractually required final reports). The projects included:

Terrestrial Restoration Action Society of Seychelles (TRASS) - Communities in Action – Exploring Nature;

Seychelles Island Foundation (SIF) – Project to:

1. Design and development of an education and community outreach programme
2. Development and production of interpretation and education material at the Vallée de Mai as a tool for environmental sensitization and awareness campaigns

Grand Anse District Administration, Praslin - fire preparedness and RWH at Elderly Home (2 projects);

Grand Anse Secondary School, Praslin - tree nursery for forest rehabilitation and solar power (2 projects);

Baie St Anne, Praslin - demonstration garden;

Praslin Development Fund - forest rehabilitation;

La Digue Secondary School - sustainable school project;

Anse Royal District Administration, Mahe - RWH on public buildings;

UniSEY – equipment for studying wetlands.

4. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Proposals for Future Directions

Conclusions: Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

Design

The design was challenging for a 3 year medium-sized project with a GEF budget of \$400,000. The Inception Workshop reduced the scope of the project considerably – but retained activities such as land use planning, which by the time of the IW had been included in the SLM and BD projects. This means it appears that the CB2 project failed to complete the LUP, when in fact it was not being thought of as part of the project from the early stages.

Implementation

GEF projects are required to have a Steering Committee. The CB2 project SC only met once and the resultant lack of this direction / national ownership may be major factors which have led to the poor performance and outcomes from the project. For Seychelles, where the number of key GoS staff is small and individuals are involved in several GEF projects, perhaps having SCs for each project is not workable and either a single SC for all projects could be considered – or alternative means of communication used to regularly and routinely share information and ensure sound guidance / national ownership for projects.

Signs that SEO drafting was not going well were not addressed when they first arose in late 2012 and the problem got out of control at a time there were no senior PCU staff in Seychelles to address it, resulting in chapter authors refusing to work with the IC and eventually the then PM resigning. When senior staff leaves and posts are vacant, more senior managers in MEE should pay particular attention to the issues. The impasse remains and the IC is refusing to submit his final report – which is in fact the work of 7 other authors and a major component of Outcome 2. Indeed commendably UNDP got involved at this time to try to rectify the situation.

M&E

Despite being included in the ProDoc, no baseline was conducted using the recommended scorecard (CDMS), nor was it used at the mid-term.

Brief annual reports (using the APR template) were prepared by the PM or PCU staff for 2011, 2012 and 2013.

The numbers of participants should have been recorded at project events (workshops, training courses etc) and feedback collected at each to assess the quality of these activities.

Lessons Learned: Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Best:

- SSDS completed;
- Rio Treaty Focal Points in place;
- UniSey educating undergraduates on B.Sc. Environmental Science using tailored modules for local situation;
- Other pilot sub-projects (rwh, tree nurseries, solar panels) [still some issues in some – and all need GEF / UNDP signs to publicise for scaling-up].

Worst:

- Record keeping (saving, archiving, handing on project files) within PCU;
- M&E – scorecard never used at baseline, nor MTE / MTR etc. – meaningless now to do at TE;
- Hand-over between PMs;

- Poor support to PMs by PCU (CTAs and PCs) and wider UNDP staff;
- Lack of an active Steering Committee and National Project Director;
- Unfortunate situation regarding SEO IC, which could have been avoided by earlier prompt action of previous PM and also PCU

Recommendations: On future project management

1. The PCU and indeed wider UNDP should ensure that all staff use an agreed system to save project-related computer files and that the PCU back-up and archive digital data regularly to ensure project documents are not lost, This is now in place.
2. When project leave, they should be obliged to have a hand-over meeting if their replacement has been recruited, or brief the PC and leave detailed hand-over notes to assist their successor. [Similarly, when more senior staff leave (e.g. the PC during the CB2 project period), they should brief their successor and / or leave detailed notes.]
3. When inexperienced Project Managers are recruited, as seems often to be the case in Seychelles due to wider HR issues (highlighted in the NCSA), they should be provided with greater support by their line managers. Reportedly they have regular meetings – but this does not seem to have been adequate for the CBs2 – other projects seem to be working well.
4. If set-up, Steering Committee meetings should take place regularly. However for Seychelles, where the number of key GoS staff is small and individuals are involved in several GEF projects, perhaps having steering committees for each project is not workable and either a single SC for all projects (or certainly all small / MS projects) could be considered – or alternative means of communication (e.g. Facebook or Twitter) used to regularly and routinely share information and ensure sound guidance / national ownership for projects.
5. Terms of contracts should be adhered, particularly no consultant should be paid amounts due on submission of reports before reports have been submitted;
6. Should relations between a project and a consultant (whether national or international) become difficult, early actions should be taken to avoid problems later in projects.
7. Project baselines and monitoring are important in order that impacts can be quantified at later stages – M & E plans set-out in the ProDoc and agreed at Inception should be adhered to.

Recommendations: To follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

8. As UNDP PCU implements other GEF projects, it should continue to support and encourage GoS to set-up implementation structures and use SSDS.
9. The Physical Planning Bill and Environment Protection Act, also the LUPs, all need to be approved by Cabinet / gazetted to support environmental management in Seychelles. MEE should catalyse this.

Proposals: For future directions underlining main objectives

10. The need for capacity building in sustainable development is on-going across all sectors. This is not a one-off activity, but needs to be continuous at all levels (schools, university, teacher training, professional development, the private sector and public awareness). All sectors in GoS need to mainstream this capacity building for sustainable development, including using existing

on-line teaching resources for schools. This should be integrated well into the upcoming Medium-Term National Development Strategy

11. MEE and more widely other GoS Ministries should continue to support the development and widening of access to the SEO database – ensuring it is maintained and kept up-to-date, also that data is made accessible across GoS ITC systems – and also, if possible, NGOs and the wider public can access and up-date data via the www.
12. Issues of data sharing need to be considered more thoroughly across GoS and with NGOs, as currently NGOs unwilling to add “their” data as they recognise it to be valuable. Also GoS appears currently not willing to make available their data to the public. The mutual benefits of data sharing need to be highlighted, for example by the skilled staff of the Environmental Information and Data Section of MEE.
13. PCU and GoS (MEE) should encourage SIF and TRASS to continue to publicize their community activities and they should be supported (e.g. with funding from GoS and / or other GEF projects) to replicate them.
14. School and DA-based pilot sub-projects should be publicized by each participating organisation – helped by the UNDP / GEF signboards, to increase scaling-up by other schools, private individuals etc. The PCU Communications Officer is reported to have already been tasked to follow up on this as part of her TOR

The above proposals (10-14) could form the core of a new cross-cutting capacity development project in the new GEF programming cycle. CB2 has demonstrated that it does not require a large investment of funds to support development of modules for a university course in Environmental Science, which will ensure future cohorts of well-trained graduates. A CB3 project should raise knowledge and understanding of sustainable development across all sectors in GoS, also in the school curricula, teacher training, professional development and in the private sector. Increased public awareness would further support the capacity building. The project could also catalyse further development of the data and information gathering and sharing across GoS, with NGOs and with the general public which has been started under CB2. The need to collect data relating to sustainable development (for MEA reporting, amongst other things) and the mutual benefits of data sharing need to be further promoted, for example by the skilled staff of the Environmental Information and Data Section of MEE. A CB3 project should aim to mainstream these actions – as capacity building is not a one-off but an on-going activity, which should be sustained beyond the life-span of any project.

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized country projects implemented by UNDP with GEF financing must undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Capacity Building for improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles

Objective

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (2011).

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

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in the Project Document and other related documents
- Assess project relevance to national priorities, as well as UNDP and GEF strategic objectives
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project
- Critically analyze the implementation and management arrangements of the project, including financial management.
- Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider project impacts
- Document lessons and best practices concerning project design, implementation and management which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

Scope

The TE is to consider and report on the following evaluation issues and criteria:

1. Project relevance and consistency with country priorities and the GEF Focal Area.
2. Ownership of the project at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation across local levels and partnerships developed through the project.
3. Effectiveness in realizing project immediate objectives, planned outcomes and outputs; the effects of the project on target groups and institutions; the extent to which these have contributed towards strengthening the institutional, organizational and technical capability of the government in achieving its long-term sustainable development objectives (including environmental management goals).
4. Sustainability of project achievements and impacts, including financial and institutional sustainability, and an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies.
5. Management arrangements, including supervision, guidance, back-stopping, human resources, and the Implementing Agency's (UNDP) supervision and backstopping; the quality and timeliness of inputs, activities, responsiveness of project management to changes in the project environment and other M&E feedback.
6. Financial planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of committed co-financing.
7. Efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the ways in which project outputs and outcomes were achieved.
8. Adaptive management, including effective use of log-frame, UNDP risk management system, annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other parts of the M&E system, tools and mechanisms as appropriate; evaluate whether project design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the project environment.

9. Risk management, including the UNDP risk management system within ATLAS, which is also incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluators are requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type.
10. Cross-cutting issues:
 - Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes?
 - Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes?
 - Capacity development of participants and target beneficiaries, communications and use of technology.

Lessons and Recommendations: The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project s/he considers relevant. with special attention given to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, the role and effectiveness of M & E and adaptive management in project implementation.

Evaluation Approach and Method

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF country focal points, steering committee, UNDP Country Office, project team, and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Seychelles including specific project sites. The evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. Key stakeholders to be interviewed are listed in Annex 1.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports (including Annual Reports APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports), focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. A list of documentation that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included with this Terms of Reference (Annex 2).

A least 1 week prior to the evaluation mission²², the evaluator will submit a brief (2 page) inception note, to include:

- Further elaboration on the intended approach & method, consistent with this TOR.
- Planned timing for carrying out the evaluation mission.
- Any requests to include additional participatory techniques, such as surveys and focus groups, or other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data that are otherwise not specified in the TOR, and which may entail additional time or cost.
- Requests for additional project background information not included with this TOR.

On arrival in Seychelles the evaluator will conduct interviews with involved personnel including:

- UNDP-GEF staff who have project responsibilities;
- Staff of the Project Coordination Unit;
- Staff of the Executing agencies;
- Members of the Project Board;

²² This requirement was waived and a note provided to UNDP 2 days before the mission, despite lack of project-related documents.

- Project stakeholders, including participating members of the demo sub-projects;
- Relevant staff in participating government departments.

Field visits will be undertaken to demo sub-project sites on Mahe, Praslin and La Digue.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Logical Framework (Annex 3), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**, as defined and explained in the guidance manual. As agreed with GEF, ratings will be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. In addition, a rating must also be provided for project implementation. The obligatory rating scales are provided (*Annex 4*).

A set of questions covering each of evaluation criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex 5) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

Evaluation Ratings			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA execution	rating
M&E Design at Entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall Quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional Framework and Governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

Mainstreaming

UNDP/GEF projects are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required outcomes. Based on a review of key documents, including the Project Document, UNDP Country Programme (CP), plus key stakeholder interviews, the evaluation will provide a brief assessment of the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP strategic priorities, such as poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and the empowerment of women.

Impact

The evaluators will offer their assessment of the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, lessons and recommendations**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO for Mauritius and Seychelles. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country (Seychelles) for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government etc. This should be done at least 2 weeks ahead of the evaluation mission to allow sufficient time for the evaluator to provide input and confirm that they can meet the proposed schedule.

Project finance/co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP financing (US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/ Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

Duties and Responsibilities

The evaluator conducting the TE for this Project will be an international consultant with in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects, including evaluation experience. S/he will be responsible for developing the evaluation methodology, conducting the evaluation and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation. The evaluator will work with a small consultative group from PCU and UNDP Seychelles. Because of high turnover of project managers for this project (three), the evaluation exercise will be supported and facilitated by the PCU Programme Coordinator responsible for the effectiveness of the unit in conjunction with UNDP Seychelles. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP to undertake the CB2 Project TE and will be bound by its terms and conditions set out in the agreement.

Annex 2: Itinerary

Date	Activity
1-2 Nov 2013	Background reading for CB2 TE
3 Nov 2013	Left UK
	Delayed in Dubai due to aircraft fault
5 Nov 2013	Arrived Seychelles Began meetings
6-8 Nov 2013	Meetings on Mahé
9-10 Nov 2013	Reading project materials and drafting TE Report
11 Nov 2013	Meetings on Mahé
12 Nov 2013	Visit to Praslin to see pilot sub-projects Preparing for TE workshop
13 Nov 2013	TE Workshop to present initial findings and final meeting with A. G.-J. (UNDP PCU CTA), during which he requested I delay submission of draft TE report until week beginning 25 Nov, to allow IC time to submit SEO
14 Nov 2013	Travel to UK
18 - 26 Nov 2013	Finalised draft TE report and submit to UNDP SEZ
27 Nov 2013	Submitted draft v1.0 of TE report to A. G.J. and Project Manager (A.F.)
3 and 4 Dec 2013	Received comments from A.G.-J. and A.F. and revised draft
4 Dec 2013	Submitted v2.0 of TE report to A.G.-J. for circulation to stakeholders
13 Dec 2013	A.G.-J. reported no stakeholders had made any comments on v2 report (one member of UNDP staff had sent comments)
15 Jan 2014	Received comments on v2.0 report from Roland Alcindor (UNDP Programme Manager)
21 Jan 2014	Received comments on v2.0 report from Tom Twining-Ward (UNDP Regional Technical Advisor)
21 Jan 2014	Final TE report submitted to UNDP

Annex 3: List of people met/ interviewed

Date	Name	Role / Affiliation
05/11/13	Andrew Grieser Johns	UNDP PCU CTA
	Anniké Faure	CB2 Project Manager
	Roland Alcindor	UNDP Programme Manager
	Preethi Sushil	UNDP
	Rebecca Loustau-Lalanne	First Secretary, MFA
	Didier Dogley	MEE
06/11/13	Begum Nageon de Lestang	MEE
	Dorothy Payet	MEE
07/11/13	Kelly Hoareau	UniSey
	Frauke Fleisher-Dogley	SIF
	Rowena ?	SIF
	Alain de Comarmond	DG, MEE
	Justin Prosper	MEE
	Florain Rock	Ex MLUH
08/11/13	Norman Lucas	PCU (Finance)
	Elvina Henriette	TRASS
11/11/13	Shama Blaga	Nature Seychelles (former CB2 PM)
12/11/13	Mr Moses Barbe	Grand Anse Praslin DA
	Mr Michael Antoine	Head Teacher, Grand Anse Praslin Sec. School
	Mr Danial Latulipe	Teacher, Baie Ste Anne Primary School
	Ms Maria	SIF, Vallée de Maie
13/11/13 ²³	Grieser Johns	UNDP PCU
	Preethi Sushil	UNDP
	Elvina Henriette	TRASS
	Alain de Comarmond	MEE (CCD FP)
	Begum Nageon	MEE
	Gilbert Gendron	SNPA
	Emile Pool	MEE
	Flavian Joubert	MEE

I also:

- tried to contact Joseph Rath (former Project Manager) but never received any reply to my various messages;
- arranged to meet Ben Vel (a national consultant on the SEO), but our planned meeting had to be cancelled due to another over-running meeting;
- tried to meet M-M Jeremie (CBD FP), but she was overseas;
- tried to meet Wills Agricole (UNFCCC FP) – but he was overseas at the COP, then never replied to the list of questions I sent him;
- spoke with Tom Twining-Ward (UNDP CB expert);
- contacted Steve Raaymakers (SEO IC) by email and received a reply – but despite my delaying the TE report to allow him time to submit (already months overdue), he did not submit his final report in time to be included in the TE

²³ All attended TE initial findings presentation

Annex 4: Summary of field visit on 12 Nov 2013

Venue	Project	Key Comments
District Administration, Grand Anse, Praslin	Fire preparedness	Good selection of equipment being securing stored and available in the event of fires
District Administration, Grand Anse, Praslin	Rwh on home for elderly	System seems to be working satisfactorily and local people being encouraged to view system and some have fitted systems on their homes
Grand Anse Secondary School, Praslin	PV panels	Various problems with PV system – which is not generating as much electricity as expected and data logger not working. Also no income being received when electricity “exported” to the grid (arrangements not yet in place in Seychelles). These problems had been reported in June 2013 and since there has been at least one (or two) visits by the PV installer, to rectify. I agreed to report them again to the PM (who was overseas in week 2 of the TE) to resolve before project closure. Reportedly the GOS-UNDP-GEF PV project has ‘adopted’ the system as a demo and will ensure that the system is correctly aligned with the grid and that feed-in tariff is applied when the national legislation to allow this is in place. When this happens the system will not only help power the school but provide a source of income during school holidays, etc. (Although the staff on site do not seem to be aware of these arrangements.)
Grand Anse Secondary School, Praslin	Tree nursery	Site was used – but saplings were never planted-out by students – eventually TRASS was mobilized by the project to do this together with the students. Site now looks very neglected. I recommend contracts should have included a clause that schools should continue to use the facility.
Baie St Anne Primary School, Praslin	Demo garden	Garden seems to have been successful in the rainy season – but there is not water available to continue growing much in the dry season. As with the secondary school, the site now looks very neglected. I recommend contracts should have included a clause that schools should continue to use the facility.
Vallée de Mai, Praslin	Information signs etc	Signs not yet delivered – but I viewed intended locations and am sure they will greatly improve information on environmental issues and particularly on the coco de mer for visitors.

Annex 5: List of documents reviewed (those indicated in red received in Jan 2014)

CB2-specific documents:

- Project Document (20/01/09 resubmitted version)
- Inception Workshop (27/01/10) materials
 - Proposed Agenda (05/01/10)
 - Opening statement by PS Faure
 - LogFrame presented for discussion
 - Revised LogFrame (16/02/10)
- Project implementation reports (PIRs)
 - 2011 Annual Project Review (APR) (*provided on 26 Nov 2013*)
 - 2012 Annual Project Review (APR) (*provided on 26 Nov 2013*)
 - 2013 Annual Project Review (APR) – June 2013
- Annual WorkPlan and / or Budget
 - 2011
 - 2013

• Quarterly budgets

Year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2009				
2010				
2011			✓	✓
2012				
2013	✓	✓	✓	✓

• Quarterly progress reports

Year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2009				✓
2010	✓		✓	✓
2011	✓	✓	✓	
2012			✓	✓
2013	✓	✓	✓	

• Quarterly Operational Workplans

Year	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2009				✓
2010	✓	✓	✓	✓
2011				
2012				
2013	✓	✓	✓	✓

- Auditors Report 2012 by Pool and Patel (covering period 1 Jan 2009 to 31 Dec 2012, dated 30 April 2013)
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and any other project management meetings
 - Steering Committee Draft minutes – Meeting 1 – 30/11/09 (minutes dated 01/12/09)
- **CB2 Monthly Project Management Meeting Minutes – dated May 2011 – but file not openable**
- Pilot Sub-Project Reports
 - TRASS
 - SIF
 - La Digue School
 - Praslin Secondary School (2 projects)

- Praslin DA (2 projects)
 - UniSey (2 projects)
- Updated management response and risk levels – dated 2 Feb 2010 (following Inception Workshop)
(provided on 26 Nov 2013)
- Risk Log Up-date – 25/05/13

Guidance documents:

- M&E Operational Guidelines
- Financial and Administration guidelines
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks (no project M & E Framework found).

Annex 6: Evaluation Criteria Questions and Summary of Responses

Questions	Indicators		TE Results
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? (Note that there was no MTE and thus design issues are also addressed by the TE.)			
Relevance of CB2 to international convention objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">How does the project support national objectives for conventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Convention priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Project Document indicated CB2 aimed to do this (but none of FPs do not believe this has been achieved)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Level of uptake within key documents (SSDS, SEO) and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SSDS briefly mentions and includes objectives of UNFCCC / UNCCD / UNCBD – but nothing regarding Seychelles obligations re reporting etc.SEO-1 report has not been submitted to PM
Relevance of CB2 to Seychelles environment and sustainable development objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of Seychelles as detailed in the SSDS?Is the project aligned with other donor or government projects and programmes?Is the project country-driven?What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?Have the implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)?Was the project responsive to threats and opportunities that emerged during the course of the project?	Based primarily on the SSDS and SEO: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SSDS - very highSEO-1 not completed so impossible to determineSEO database largely in place but on-line access not yet agreed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Very good, as project supported the development of SSDS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Level of involvement of Government officials and other partners in the development of the key documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SSDS involved GoS (MEE), also an assistant and 12 national consultants funded by CB2SEO-1 chapters drafted by 7 national consultant
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to CB2 engagement and recognition of national realities and existing capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">National stakeholders had varied awareness of CB2 – those closely involved in SSDS some contribution of CB2, most others had a very low level of awareness of the projectInvolved NGOs, DAs, schools etc appreciativeUniSey very appreciative of the contribution of the project to their new B.Sc. in Environmental Science.
Is the project addressing the needs of Government and other target beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">How does the project support the needs Government and partners?Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government as defined in policy and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The SSDS is a crucial document – and was part-supported by the CB2But SSDS implementation structure not yet in place.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Degree to which the project meets expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Some informants in MEE hoped CB2 would catalyse establishment (and fund) implementation of the SSDS (SC etc).Others in MEE and in other GoS Ministries, hoped SSDS would be established in the Office of the President / Vice-President, to be inter-sectoralCB2 support to UniSey will have long term benefits by increasing the numbers of locally-trained graduates, also providing short courses for in-service training
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			

Effectiveness of the project in achieving its intended purpose and outputs, and extent to which the project will contribute to the overall goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project performed against its indicators and targets (given in the logframe)? Which have been the key factors leading to project achievements? To what extent can observed results be attributed the project or not? Has the project failed in any respect? Have there been notable changes in the enabling environment for the project? How has the project contributed to raising capacity of Government and partners to address aims of the project? What are the views of the various stakeholders on the achievements of the project? How well has the project documented is achievements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of targets as laid out in the logframe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logframe revised in IW Some key targets achieved (SSDS 2012-2020 approved, published and disseminated, structure for implementation approved) but SSDS structure not yet in place. Physical Planning Bill and Environment Protection Acts still drafts and most District Land Use not gazetted therefore being flouted. SEO database largely in place but on-line access not yet agreed No SEO-1 report published. One national centre of expertise established (UniSey) Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings – only minutes of 1st meeting available – SC never sat again
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which DoE and other ministry technical staff are actively participating in the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoE closely involved in SSDS aspects of project Few other technical staff seemed aware of CB2 at TE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of uptake of project documentation and results within Government strategic planning/thinking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reportedly SSDS already being used in GoS activities and planning SEO database still requires to be publicised to increase usage
Lessons that can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of lessons learned documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence is very sparse, few project documents found for TE (see Annex 5) TRASS documenting project-supported field activities designed for families and SIF also using this material at Vallée de Mai UniSey have produced mass of documents on course outlines – PM should encourage them to prepare a summary of the contribution of CB2 Rainwater harvesting system at DA, Praslin being used as a model and copied by local householders Other pilots projects supported under Outcome 3 have very recently prepared draft reports
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of application of lessons learned (e.g. uptake of demos) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRASS documenting project-supported field activities designed for families, they and others plan to replicating events to raise awareness Rainwater harvesting system at DA, Praslin being used as a model and copied by local householders
Management of risks and risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk log only up-dated once (May 2013) in 4 year project Up-date makes no mention of implementation issues due to changes in PM / PCU staff, or delays in implementation of SSDS structures / completion of SEO-1
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of attention paid to up-dating risks log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little evidence – as no SC meetings held following 1st meeting on 30/11/09 Risk log up-dated on 24/05/13 (when new CTA /

			PC began work) but not since – despite major issue re SEO-1 IC and on-going issues at some pilot projects (e.g. PVs on Praslin)
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Financial efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? Have funds been available transferred efficiently from donor to the project) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities? Were funds used correctly: explain any over- or under-expenditures? Were financial resources utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? Were issues raised in audit reports and how efficiently were they addressed? Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of available documentation and interviews with current and last PM, also PCU financial staff showed that CB2 has achieved the Outcomes of the ProDoc to a limited extent – and not even achieved all the Outputs of the IW version of the LFA. However, all funds have been spent – it is reported as the original budget was inadequate and inflation / exchange rate fluctuations limited the scope of the project
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of transparency in the use of funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial records appear to be in good order and fund disbursement has followed required procedures
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No audit reports were available. Partners actually involved in the project activities were largely satisfied with the contribution made by the project, notably the pilot projects (Outcome 3) National consultants, along with the current PM and PCU staff not satisfied with the use of the funds on the SEO-12 report, which has not been delivered by the IC. IN-kind contributions from UNDP, GoS and an EU programme co-financed the project beyond the amount anticipated in the ProDoc (notably for the SSDS)
Implementing efficiency (including monitoring)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project logical framework and work plans change during implementation? Was the project implemented as planned, including the proportion of activities in work plans implemented? Has monitoring data been collected as planned, analysed and used to inform project planning? Has project implementation been responsive to issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which project activities were conducted on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project work plans and reports showed that Activities towards Outcome 2 were delayed as these had to follow Outcome 1 (as the same small number of national consultants were involved in both activities) Outcome 1 delayed for various reasons beyond the control of the PM / PCU / UNDP and SSDS report now dated 2012 – 2020, rather than 2010-2020 Interviews with some of the NCs involved in Outcome 2 frustrated with delays in the editing etc of their work for the SEO-1 Various extensions were given to the SEO-1 IC, the latest in August 2013 – but as yet his final report has not been received by PM / PCU. For some reason, the IC has already been paid the full

	<p>arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What capacity building and learning processes have been implemented, who has benefitted and how has this influenced project outcomes? • Were progress reports produced timely, and did they include adaptive management changes? • Did the project experience any capacity gaps (e.g. staffing gaps)? • Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? • How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by PCU and UNDP? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners 	<p>amount due to him, thus achieving the major Output of that Outcome remains in jeopardy – with serious implications for Seychelles, as this was to be an important baseline document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LFA was reduced at the IW – and yet still many activities not delivery (e.g. land use plans became part of the SLM and BD mainstreaming projects). • Particularly, the FPs are disappointed that the CB2 failed to deliver the training etc they anticipated • SEO-1 not produced • Pilot projects mostly relatively successful, despite lack of good support by some PMs – and hence without intervention in closing weeks of project, long-term benefits may be missed.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback of partners regarding the responsiveness of previous project managers was poor
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of satisfaction expressed by DOE in regard to PCU and UNDP back-stopping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CB2 failed to live up to expectations
Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEE involved in SSDS and SEO database development, committing time and resources • Participants in pilot projects also committed some time – although some less than had they been better supported (notably the case for school teachers)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEE committed to continuing CB2 activities re SSDS and SEO database • UniSey will continue using course materials and equipment supplied by the project • RWH systems seem well received and will continue to be used • PV on Praslin still not functioning well – may require support in future from GEF PV project • Tree nursery sites seem neglected and teachers need to be encouraged to continue using them despite project closure otherwise investment has been wasted
Lessons that can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? • Could the project have been more efficiently carried out (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc.)? • What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of satisfaction in project implementation arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regrettably, this has been an example of how not to run a project – notably changes in PMs, their role managing 2 projects simultaneously, gaps between PMs, changes in PCU staff, ineffective archiving of project reports, absence of an effective steering committee
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions put forward by partners for possible improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider replacing individual project steering committees with a single GEF UNDP Projects SC • Replace SCs with greater use of on-line communications, for example using Twitter / Facebook / blogs by Project Managers • Ensure all project reports are correctly archived • Work to reduce PM staff turn-over

	improve its efficiency?		
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Enabling environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainable uptake of project interventions? Are there early signs of activities being taken up by Government? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence to which Government planning supports project interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government supportive in developing SSDS – but decisions need to be taken in implementation, also draft PPB and EPA need to be enacted otherwise work supported by GEF projects to draft these documents and District Land Use Plans will have been squandered
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which Government programmes are in line with and provide additional support to project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As project supported dev. Of SSDS, clearly very supportive.
Project sustainability measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What project sustainability measures exist and what factors are likely to negatively affect project sustainability? What are the key constraints to sustainability of project interventions? Have Government and partners successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities? Does the project have a clear exit strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which Government and partners are considering post-project actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MEE has requested funds from GoS to implement SSDS in 2014 Actions have been taken to begin setting-up the SSDS Steering Committee
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Planning impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has knowledge and appreciation of the role and practice of international conventions improved? What impact has the project had on policy, legal and institutional frameworks relating to sustainable natural resource management, as a whole? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of uptake of new knowledge/ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDS SEO database – to become on-line UniSet modules for Years 1 and 2 B.Sc. Environmental Science – to be presented annually for the foreseeable future Demo site s
On-the-ground impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What impacts has the project had or is it likely to have on people's approaches to natural resources management, renewable energy, etc. Has the project had any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of early uptake (replication) of interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports from demo sub-projects Project reports Partners interview data
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of satisfaction of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of project documentation Interviews with project partners Demo site visits
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally good – although numerous report poor

	<p>impact on gender equality and economic empowerment for women and other marginalized groups? Was it intended to?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are project demos documented, what lessons are likely to be learnt and will this inform local policy processes? 	project interventions	project support by certain PMs – and effects of gaps between PMs
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of gender equity in selection and implementation of demos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not relevant for this project – as demos will benefit men, women and children
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well has the project documented lessons learned? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few project report have been produced No reports found on for example the green buildings workshop Only some pilot projects have yet reported – PM and PCU should ensure that all do so before project closure. TRASS produced documents which can be used by others for children. families to use for studies of rivers in Seychelles SIF are producing long-lasting information boards to inform visitors on biodiversity issues at Vallée de Mai – which will reach a wide audience

Annex 7: Key Findings of the National Capacity Self-Assessment (2005)

1. International Convention Management	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Seychelles is a signatory and active participant in the three Rio Conventions and numerous other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. Focal Points are in place and there is an International Convention Unit in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Improved convention management, including better defined responsibilities and improved record-keeping.</p> <p>Prioritization among conventions and more systematic implementation of commitments in national programmes.</p> <p>More and better-qualified delegates to international meetings, using expertise inside and outside government. Better dissemination of convention information and greater stakeholder involvement.</p>
2. Donor Project Development and Management	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Seychelles is relatively effective in accessing donor funds from multi & bilateral organisations, NGOs and academia. It is the highest per capita Global Environment Facility (GEF) recipient in the world (pop. 83,000).</p> <p>NGOs and the private sector have undertaken numerous ecosystem rehabilitation projects, often supported by donor and/or private funding.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Diversification of donor base through information on new sources of international funding, including convention-related programmes.</p> <p>Improved capacity in donor project design and management within staff of government and NGOs.</p> <p>Standardized procedures for processing donor projects.</p> <p>Better links to donors and diverse models for donor support, such as innovative partnerships and revolving funds.</p>
3. Financing and Economic Instruments	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Government spends a significant sum on environmental management in per capita terms. There is substantial private capital spending on environment on islands with tourism and ecotourism.</p> <p>The Environment Trust Fund (ETF) provides a vehicle for business financing of environmental projects.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Innovative funding mechanisms and partnerships among government, private and NGO sectors to create sustainable financing for environmental management.</p> <p>More systematic implementation of key national environmental plans, e.g., EMPS, NBSAP, SINC, with tourism and ecotourism.</p> <p>The Environment Trust Fund (ETF) provides a vehicle for business financing of environmental projects, including long-term national budget support, combined with diverse foreign financing.</p> <p>Improved individual and organizational capacity to use environmental economics to integrate conservation and sustainable use of resources into decision-making.</p>

	Financial and non-financial incentives to leverage support for “environmental best practices” from the private sector, including greater use of the Environment Trust Fund.
4. Institutional Framework	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>There is a significant body of environmental and land use laws, regulations & plans. Many existing laws conform to the three GEF-related conventions. An Environmental Legal Unit operates under MENR-PPS to advise on, and secure compliance with, environmental laws and regulations.</p> <p><i>Environment Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS) 1990-2000</i> achieved many goals and implemented numerous programmes. EMPS 2000- 2010 seeks to build on these successes and continue to integrate sustainable development into key sectors</p> <p>The EMPS Steering Committee includes numerous key Government, NGO and private sector stakeholders.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>More systematic implementation of existing laws, policies and plans through greater political will and better funding.</p> <p>A legislative review to harmonize and streamline existing legislation.</p> <p>Improved enforcement, compliance and success in gaining convictions through: political direction; more consistent application of laws and regulations; more and better trained enforcement officers, Police, Attorney-General and court personnel; and public awareness programmes to promote voluntary compliance.</p> <p><i>Environment Management Plan Seychelles 2000 – 2010:</i></p> <p>Better mechanisms to implement the plan, design projects and secure funding. Clearer mandate, accountability, and reporting relationships for Steering Committee. Possible revised structure to increase efficiency and effectiveness. Improved reporting on EMPS implementation, and linking of member organizations’ programmes to the Plan.</p> <p>Strengthening of EMPS Coordinating Unit.</p>
5. Integrated Management (IM)	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Many EMPS 2000-2010 programmes promote integrated management.</p> <p>Several initiatives on sustainable tourism and integrated coastal zone management are underway. Seychelles is part of regional collaborations on IM.</p> <p>There is a national mobilization on Invasive Alien Species (IAS), including a multi-stakeholder committee preparing a national IAS Strategy, and a National Plant Conservation Strategy. Several IAS regulations are in place and there are good examples of IAS control and eradication on small private and NGO managed islands.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Increased use of integrated management for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) priority topics, i.e., land use planning, physical <i>planning</i> and infrastructure, ecotourism; EIA; (2) priority sectors, i.e., fisheries, tourism, agriculture, infrastructure; and (3) priority areas, i.e., outer islands, private islands, highlands and coastal lowlands. <p>Dissemination of the results of successful IAS initiatives and new partnerships to build on these successes.</p> <p>Completion and implementation of the IAS Strategy and Action Plan with new and/or revised laws and regulations. Increased capacity for IAS research and management, including knowledge of interactions and feedback</p>

	mechanisms among invasive species, biodiversity, climate change and land degradation.
6. Information Management	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Seychelles is active in several international and regional country groupings which are promoting information exchange and improved data systems and data-sharing, e.g., African Environmental Information Network (AEIN). There is good baseline data for some topics, e.g., birds, fisheries, higher plants, some island ecosystems, and some aspects of climate.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Increased capability to conduct credible field and lab research as well as data analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>Standard protocols for data-gathering on key topics.</p> <p>Mechanisms and incentives to promote more locally driven research. Better protocols with foreign researchers to ensure proper referencing, co-authorship and “repatriation” of data from overseas.</p> <p>Centralized documentation showing which environmental information is held where within government, possibly expanded to outside organizations (“meta-databases”).</p> <p>Multi-party agreements on data management, including incentives for data-sharing and joint research.</p>
7. Technology Development and Transfer	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Several key national policies and plans recognize the importance of identifying appropriate, environmentally-friendly technologies as part of promoting sustainable development.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Policy direction on science and technology development and transfer within Seychelles and internationally, including technical assistance.</p> <p>Public and private sector capacity to transfer and adapt environmentally-friendly, especially related to energy and water conservation, and information technologies.</p>
8. Human Resources Development (HRD)	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Dramatic increase in numbers and skills of environmental professionals and technicians over the past decade, through local and foreign scholarships, technical workshops and meetings, and donor projects incorporating capacity development.</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>Better communication of needs for environmental expertise to national manpower authorities for inclusion in national HRD planning.</p> <p>Diverse options for developing environmental capacity, e.g., professional development, overseas and local training, peer exchange, mentoring, and donor projects.</p>
9. Education, Awareness and Advocacy	
<p>Strengths</p> <p>The National <i>Environmental Education (EE) Policy</i> promotes environmental values, knowledge and skills among staff and students. It is supported by an EE Unit, website, newsletter, multi-</p>	<p>Capacity Needs</p> <p>In-depth curriculum and extra-curricular materials on priority environmental topics in Seychelles. More EE specialists and training for non-specialists. More and better labs, tools and</p>

<p>stakeholder Coordinating Committee, teacher training, EE curriculum, and extra-curricular activities.</p> <p>Numerous awareness-raising campaigns by Government, NGOs, and the media have produced extensive materials and widespread public awareness of environmental issues.</p>	<p>equipment for student research projects.</p> <p>More effective public awareness and education campaigns, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · are integrated with other environmental programmes, including work related to international conventions; · define specific objectives, key target groups and behaviours; · evaluate success, using qualitative and quantitative measures.
10. Stakeholder Involvement	
<p><i>Strengths</i></p> <p>The EMPS Steering Committee includes diverse stakeholders. NGOs and civil society have their own environmental management projects. Diverse stakeholders have cooperated on numerous projects.</p>	<p><i>Capacity Needs</i></p> <p>Good governance mechanisms, including greater transparency and increased stakeholder consultation and engagement.</p> <p>Improved communication, collaboration and innovative partnerships among Government, non government and private sectors.</p>

Annex 8: Logical Framework Analysis agreed at Inception Workshop

Project: Capacity Development for Improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles

Project Objective: Enhanced capacity for global environmental management by strengthening the national institutional framework, technical skills and related capacities to manage commitments under the global environmental conventions in conjunction with national objectives.

Inception Workshop - 27 January 2010

REVISED LOGFRAME (January 2010)

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicators	Baseline	Target		
Goal: To effectively implement the Rio Conventions in Seychelles. This includes integration of compliance with the specific provisions of the three conventions (biodiversity, climate change, land degradation) within the ongoing national implementation of the EMPS					
Objective of the project: Integrate local and global environmental management and enhance the capacity to implement global environmental management objectives within national programmes. This focuses on mainstreaming global objectives at the operational level	National policy framework to link global environment conventions with national programmes 				

<p>Awareness and capacity is developed for mainstreaming global environment conventions into national programmes</p>	<p>and implement national environmental policies and programs, including those related to global environment conventions</p> <p>Broad and effective stakeholder participation in oversight and reporting of global environment conventions in Seychelles</p> <p>Relevant technical personnel aware of and able to effectively implement obligations under Rio conventions as an integrated part of national policies and programs</p>	<p>has limited capacity & resources and unclear mandate</p> <p>Responsibility for and execution of national obligations under global environment conventions limited to convention focal points</p> <p>Awareness of obligations under Rio conventions limited to 3 focal points (all within Department of Environment) who have received limited relevant training</p>	<p>strong capacity, clear role and responsibilities, and operates with transparency and accountability (by end of project)</p> <p>At least 3 convention focal points and 15 others certified as “national experts” in global environment conventions; and working in close collaboration to oversee and report on global environment conventions (by end of project)</p> <p>3 convention focal points, as well as 20 other relevant technical personnel, have received targeted training on implementation of Rio Conventions (by end of project)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terms of Reference for EMPS Secretariat, staff, and oversight body - Rosters of national experts for each convention - Published documents on modalities for work of rosters of experts - Course modules & materials - Post-course evaluations by participants - Training programs and materials - Post-training reports - Project evaluation reports 	<p>for the EMPS Secretariat is provided by the government and/or the Environment Trust Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government and civil society willing to work in partnership to promote and manage global environment conventions
<p>Outcome 2: Environmental information and reporting is strengthened</p>	<p>Formalized and widely accessible mechanism for managing and reporting on environmental information in Seychelles related to global environment conventions</p>	<p>Numerous uncoordinated and not well known or readily accessible information sources on environment</p>	<p>A single, consolidated and web-based open access environmental database on key indicators related to global conventions (by end of 2010) (also a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEO and other reports on global and national environmental issues using new database 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database development may be restricted or constrained by limited availability of data relevant to Rio

	<p>Active use of and contributions to environmental database by national stakeholders</p> <p>Consolidated, formally approved reporting structure on environmental conditions in the Seychelles to support decision making, priority setting, and reporting to the Rio conventions</p> <p>Effective national reporting to the Rio Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD)</p>	<p>conditions and indicators</p> <p>0 users (database on key environment indicators for global conventions does not exist)</p> <p>No official national report on state of the environment in Seychelles</p> <p>Incomplete and infrequent reporting by Seychelles to the Rio Conventions</p>	<p>library of actual printed documentation?)</p> <p>At least 15 organizations / agencies contributing to database and/or citing database in official reports (by end of project)</p> <p>2010 Seychelles State of the Environment Outlook produced and endorsed by Govt. of Seychelles (by end of 2010)</p> <p>At least 50% of Convention reporting indicators reported on as required (by end of project)</p>	<p>sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database website, documentation centre in place • National reports to Rio Conventions submitted on schedule and with necessary reporting • 2010 SEO report 	<p>Convention indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder willingness to provide data for the database and SEO report
<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>Capacity for local implementation of global environmental conventions is developed, applied and disseminated</p>	<p>Pilot land development plan incorporates environmentally beneficial activities that increase and provide a model for responding to goals and obligations of Rio Conventions</p> <p>Public participation in development</p>	<p>Environmentally beneficial practices are very minimally considered in land development plans and do not take account of Rio Conventions</p>	<p>One district / regional land development plan, which includes environmentally beneficial practices related to Rio Conventions, approved and under implementation (by mid 2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot land development plan • Project reporting on indicators • Manual for integrating environmentally beneficial activities in land development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government support for land development plans, and for environmentally beneficial activities within the plans, continues to be a priority • Sufficient interest exists among

	<p>and monitoring of pilot land development plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of public meetings held in the process of creating the pilot district / regional land development plan - Number of seminars on civil participation in plan development and plan monitoring <p>Environmentally beneficial activities at site of pilot district / regional land development plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # of rainwater harvesting systems installed - KWH of photovoltaic systems installed 	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p>	<p>By end of project:</p> <p>At least 3 public meetings</p> <p>At least 1 seminar</p> <p>By end of project:</p> <p>5 systems?</p> <p>5 KWH?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public meeting and seminar minutes / reports • Training reports and post-training evaluations • Field surveys of pilot project results 	<p>inhabitants of pilot district / region to participate in environmentally beneficial activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society organizations have the capacity and willingness to assist local stakeholder groups
--	--	---	---	--	--

Annex 9: CB2 Project Up-dated Risk Log

Type	Date Identified	Description	Date	Comment or Mgt Response (UPDATES TO BE INSERTED)	Critical Flag
OPERATIONAL	02/02/2010	The SLM NAP is complete.		None	N
ENVIRONMENTAL	02/02/2010	Seychelles is likely to witness climatic change (e.g. Extended dry spells, more severe weather events) that may make watershed and/or district land use plans and programmes out of date and ineffective		None	N
STRATEGIC	02/02/2010	Sufficient interest exists among inhabitants of pilot district/regions to participate in environmentally beneficial activities	24/05/2013	There have been some issues regarding delivery of some project activities, primarily an issue related to poor supervision of construction. This has not affected interest in participation in pilot projects so far, but might do so if the problem is not rectified.	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	02/02/2010	Civil society organizations have the capacity and willingness to assist local stakeholder groups.		None	N
OPERATIONAL	02/02/2007	Database development may be restricted or constrained by limited availability of data relevant to Rio Convention indicators	24/05/2013	Agreements with NGOs and others for release of data and contribution to the database have still not been signed and realistically are controversial and difficult to obtain, due to the lack of a copyright law in Seychelles. The Department of Environment may need to address this issue to come up with some form of workable agreements.	Y
ORGANIZATIONAL	02/02/2007	Long-term funding for the EMPS secretariat is provided by the Government and/or the Environment Trust Fund	24/05/2013	The SSDS has been published but the organization and financing of the Secretariat is still being discussed. The Ministry of Environment and Energy has not yet communicated progress and expected institutional arrangements for the secretariat. It is possible that decisions are on hold pending completion and approval of the National Development Strategy (NDS) which will be the	N

				over-arching strategy document.	
REGULATORY	02/02/2007	Sufficient interest exists among inhabitants of pilot district/regions to participate in environmentally beneficial activities		None	N
OPERATIONAL	02/02/2010	SLM NAP is completed; NBSAP and the National Climate Strategy are still relevant.		None	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	02/02/2010	On-going reorganization of the Government of Seychelles does not prelude the establishment of a sufficiently functional National Centre of Expertise to support EMPS implementation			Retired
OPERATIONAL	02/02/2010	Establishment of national environment database , and reporting on the State of the Environment, may be constrained by limited availability of suitable indicators and data sets, and trend data benchmarks	24/05/2013	Database development is underway. The Seychelles Environment Outlook (equivalent to an SOE) is near completion, but still lacking key chapters due to mediocre performance by some consultants.	N
OPERATIONAL	02/02/2010	Institutional framework for mainstreaming global objectives into land use plans, as well as micro-watershed management models incorporating Rio Convention requirements, are not compatible with land use planning under the Town and Country Planning Act and others	24/05/2013	Legislation and land use planning guidelines, and plans themselves, are completed or nearing completion through other GOS-UNDP-GEF projects.	N

STRATEGIC	02/02/2010	Government support for land and development plans, and for environmentally beneficial activities within the plans, continues to be a priority			Retired
-----------	------------	---	--	--	---------

Annex 10: Degree Structure, B.Sc. Environmental Science, University of Seychelles

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
		Specialization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Earth and Atmospheric Science ➤ Biological Principles & Interactions in Tropical Ecology ➤ Introduction to Global Environmental Change ➤ Concepts in Sustainable Development ➤ Introduction to Statistics ➤ Research Methods & Skills in Environmental Science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Earth Systems Science ➤ Introduction to Geoinformatics & Field Studies in Environmental Science ➤ Introduction to Natural Resource Economics ➤ Environmental Law & MEAs ➤ Managing Environmental Change in Small States ➤ Human Geography of Small States 	Marine & Fisheries Science
		Integrated Coastal Management
		Climate Change Politics & Management
		Tropical Biodiversity Conservation
		Education for Sustainability

Annex 11: List of main Issues along with their respective Indicators collected for the SEO process
(See ²⁴ below)

Political Environment

1. Government stability
2. Transparency and integrity (governance)
3. Institutions and capacity (including levels of administration and responsibilities)
4. Policies, regulations and laws
5. Application of International Conventions (including international influence and interference)

ISSUE INDICATOR	DATA AND UNITS
Government stability	No. of conflicts No. of state failures
Transparency and integrity (Governance)	% of persons paying bribes Transparency Index
Institutions and capacity (Levels of administration and responsibilities)	No. & types of national environmental institutions in place Strengths of institutions Responses to international environmental reporting obligations and data collections
Policies, regulations and laws	No. & types of national Environmental laws and policies in place Application of the national environmental laws and policies
Application of international conventions and treaties	Environmental conventions signed and ratified Application of the conventions and treaties

Natural Environment

Still working on this one

²⁴ Information provided by J. Prosper, Environment Information and Data Section, MEE

Climate Change

1. National contribution to global emissions
2. More extreme weather events
3. Sea level rise
4. Coastal inundation and erosion

ISSUE	INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
National contribution to global emissions	Carbon intensity	0.55 MT CO ₂ /\$1K GDP
	Per capita CO ₂ emissions	3.37 MT
Extreme weather events	Number of tropical cyclones	3TC
	Extreme high tides & storm surges	2.0 m, 2.1 m 2.5 m
Sea level rise	Change in mean sea level relative to fixed datum	1.1 m
Coastal inundation and erosion	Number of flooding events	13 events, Extent 50 m (max extent)
	Number of eroded areas	10 areas Extent 10-30 m

Economic Environment

1. Economic growth (GDP contribution by sectors of the economy)
2. Waste Management
3. Market instruments

ISSUE	INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
Economic growth	GDP	\$10,707/capita
	GNI	\$5416/capita
Waste Management	Kg/capita/day	0.8kg/person/day
Market instrument	No & type of instruments	Qualitative

Freshwater Resources *(Other data to be provided by IC, as he worked last on this chapter)*

1. Water supply and demand
2. Water use efficiency
3. Pollution and water quality
4. Water harvesting
5. Sewage and sanitation
6. Desalination

ISSUE	INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
Water Demand & Supply	Domestic household demand	163 l/capita/day
	Water supply	42,253 m ³ /day
Water use efficiency	Unaccounted For Water	34%
Water quality	Total coli form	4604 cfu/100ml
	E Coli	1852 cfu/100ml
Sewage & sanitation	Sanitation coverage	98% of households

Biodiversity

1. Integrity of the biodiversity resource
2. Sustainability of use of the biodiversity resource
3. Invasive species
4. Endemic species
5. Loss of species (combined with 4 in assessment below)

ISSUE	KEY INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
Integrity of resource (protected area system)	No. & % of total area in PAs	No. PAs (36 PAs including 22 terrestrial PAs & 14 MPAs) % land area protected (47% i.e. 209 km ² of total land area protected)
Sustainability of resource use by sector: Species utilization rates (e.g. Coco-de-mer) Harvesting (birds eggs) Species trade	No. birds eggs harvested over time No. captive bred tortoise/captive tortoise breeders/quota No. Coco-de-Mer exported over time No. of curios exported/No. CITES export permit No. bats harvested	Nos. eggs collected (160,000 – 170,000 from 1988-2012) No. tortoises exported (107 – 442 from 2003 to 2012. Export quota – 500 juvenile tortoises) No. Coco-de-Mer collected & exported (48T kernel exported since 2004, 17093 nuts harvested since 2007) No of shell & corals sold (3000 to 6 shells and 235 to 13 corals exported from 2006 to 2012)

		Bat consumption (15,650 bats captured in 1997)
Increase in Invasive species:	No. of invasive species over time Changes in range over time.	Species / pa Area (m ² / km ²)
Endemic species & Loss of species:	Changes in population over time. No. of extinctions over time Changes in range over time IUCN status	Pop ⁿ . estimates No. species lost over time (21 species extinctions since 1800) Species range/distribution No. threatened species - IUCN category

Social Environment

1. Demography
2. Gender,
3. Land use and management
4. Housing
5. Employment
6. Poverty
7. Health
8. Education
9. Crime
10. Culture

ISSUE	INDICATOR	DATA AND UNITS
Demography	Changes in population over time	Population total, growth rate
	Changes in demographic profile over time	% by age groups & gender
	Net migration	% migration
	Total Fertility rate	% live birth in 1000 live births

ISSUE	INDICATOR	DATA AND UNITS
Gender	Number of women and men involved in environmental work / livelihoods	No., % of men and women in environment-related work Labour force by age, gender, sector
Land use and management	Percentage of land used for farming Percentage of land used for housing	% of land for farming % of land for housing
ISSUE	INDICATOR	DATA AND UNITS
Employment	Labour force, by gender, sector	No. & % by gender, sector, year
Poverty	Housing type Households with computers Internet connections Population under national poverty line	% of housing type % of household with computers No. of internet connections per 100 persons % of household with internet connections % of pop ⁿ . under natl. poverty line
Health	Access to primary health care Life expectancy (male / female) Drug dependence	% of pop ⁿ . having access to primary health care No. of years (male / female) % of drug users % of PWID
Education	Primary school enrolment by gender Literacy rate	% of boys / girls enrolled in primary school % of men / women able to read

Land Transformation

1. Natural forest
2. Planted forest
3. Commercial agriculture
4. Subsistence agriculture
5. Housing/urbanization
6. Industry
7. Tourism

ISSUE	INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
Land-use competition (housing/ tourism/ agriculture/ industry/ conservation/ natural beauty/ social amenity): Spreading of Urbanization :	Area of each category Existing / Area of each category LUP CS + 50% of the land territory protected Wetland Reclamation Change in area of urbanization over time(CS - La Digue) Increase in road network	Area of each category (m ² / km ²) Area (ha) dedicated per sector Remote sensing. (m ² / km ²) Ortho-photos km
Risks (Hill-slope stability, Forest Fire & Flooding)	Nos of landslides Increased density of housing in higher altitudes Number of landslides Mapping of risk areas Number of Fires Coastal flooding studies ?	Area / Volume Frequency
Erosion & Soil Loss:	Area & volume of affected areas Run-off from rivers (sediment load) Change of vegetation over time (CS - MFF/TRASS) Turbidity in rivers?	(m ² / km ²) & m ³ Mineral & pH content

ISSUE	INDICATOR	Data & (Units)
	Diversity & abundance of inverts in river beds	
	Mapping of sensitive areas	
Soil Degradation: Pollution Sustainable agriculture:?? Agricultural chemicals (fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides) Salinity	Quality changes over time Area & volume of affected areas Soil salinization Level of water extraction Levels of mineral depletion Depletion of soil structure National sales of chemicals	Litres per m ² Soil Analysis results Import & sales records. (kg / litre)

Marine Environment

Awaiting data from Steve R. (SEO International Consultant)

Annex 12: Pilot Sub-Projects

The Seychelles Island Foundation (SIF) was funded by CB2 (Outcome 3) to improve their outreach and education work at the UNESCO biodiversity world heritage site at Vallée de Mai. The funds are being used to develop new, long-lasting and environmentally friendly interpretation panels to raise awareness among the large numbers of visitors (including both members of the local Praslin community and tourists) of the importance of the site for biodiversity conservation and issues around poaching. SIF also have a member of staff on Praslin, employed to run Friends of the Vallée de Mai clubs in each school on the island, also holiday camps – including developing materials for outdoor classrooms and running holiday camps.

The Terrestrial Restoration Action Society of Seychelles (TRASS) was also supported with funds from CB2 (Outcome 3) on a project they entitled “Communities in Action – Exploring Nature” to develop teaching materials (e.g. River Watch Praslin) and posters for raising awareness and understanding of the local environment with families on Praslin. During the project, these were used with ca. 50 participants of all ages and TRASS intend to re-run these annually using the CB2-supported materials. Other NGOs (e.g. a neighbourhood Recreation Association) has requested TRASS permission to also use the materials – increasing the catalytic benefit of this relatively small financial investment by the project.

Other sub-projects were:

Grand Anse District Administration, Praslin - fire preparedness and RWH at Elderly Home (2 projects);

Grand Anse Secondary School , Praslin - tree nursery for forest rehabilitation and solar power (2 projects);

Baie St Anne, Praslin - demonstration garden;

Praslin Development Fund - forest rehabilitation;

La Digue Secondary School - sustainable school project;

Anse Royal District Administration, Mahe - RWH on public buildings;

UniSEY – equipment for studying wetlands.

Annex 13: Progress Towards Development Objectives – from APR, June 2013

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2009	Level at 30 June 2010	Level at 30 June 2011	Level at 30 June 2012	Level at 30 June 2013 (completed by PCU, CTA)
Project Objective: To integrate local and global environmental management and enhance the capacity to implement global environmental management objectives within national programmes.	National policy framework to link global environment conventions with national programmes	Existing EMPS 2000-2010	Creation and formal approval of EMPS 2011-2020 that incorporates obligations and action plans of the Rio Conventions (by end of 2010)	N/A	Recruitment of all national consultants (lead consultant and 12 thematic consultants) have been completed and formulation of the third generation EMPS is underway. First inception workshop for inputs from all stakeholders in the process has also been concluded.	Final draft of the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy 2011 - 2020 (formerly known as the EMPS) is now in circulation and the national validation workshop is planned for 3rd August 2011	The SSDS document was presented to the Cabinet of Ministers for endorsement late 2011 and it was officially launched in February 2012 at the Le Meridiens Barbarons in the presence of several key stakeholders. Only a limited number of the document has been printed due to changes foreseen in the design and also in its organisational structure. The document is now with the Department of Environment to	Target achieved. The SSDS 2012-2020 has been approved, published and circulated.

							finalize the structural arrangements for the implementation of the actions / monitoring of activities.	
	Formal policy to integrate environmentally beneficial activities and related global environment indicators into all district / regional land development plans	No policy exists	Policy document supporting incorporation of environmental activities and indicators relevant to Rio Convention goals into district / regional land development plans approved by Seychelles Cabinet (by end of project)		N/A	N/A	N/A	Target 90% achieved (largely through another project). A Physical Planning Bill, replacing the old Town and Country Planning Act, has been prepared and harmonized with the new Environment Protection Act, and will go before the Cabinet of Ministers for approval in late 2013. The PBB provides a legal basis for implementing and enforcing the revised land use plans. A consolidated National Land Use Plan, plus individual LUPs for the 22 districts of Mahe, 2 of Praslin and 1 of La Digue have all been completed and presented to or are about to be presented to Cabinet for approval. All

								LUPs have been developed within a planning framework that emphasizes environmental (as well as social and developmental) considerations, the first of which is based on the commitments of Seychelles to the Rio Conventions. The PBB and LUPs were developed under another UNDP-GEF project, Mainstreaming biodiversity management into production sector activities.
Outcome 1: Awareness and capacity is developed for mainstreaming global environment conventions into national programmes	Institutional capacity to coordinate and implement national environmental policies and programs, including those related to global environment conventions		Creation and formal approval of EMPS 2011-2020 that incorporates obligations under and action plans of the Rio Conventions (by end of 2010)	N/A	Recruitment of all national consultants (lead consultant and 12 thematic consultants) have been completed and formulation of the third generation EMPS is underway. First inception workshop for inputs from all stakeholders in	Final draft of SSDS in circulation with recommendations on new institutional structure to steer the implementation of the document therein for validation at the national level on 3rd August 2011.	Consultations took place between the long term EMPS Associate paid for under the project to finalize the objectively verifiable indicators database with the different thematic and sectoral focal persons involved with the SSDS, to enable the monitoring and	Target achieved (see objective). The structure for the implementation of the SSDS has been determined. TORs for the SSDS Council, SSDS Steering Committee and key staff of the SSDS Secretariat were prepared in late 2012 and sent to the MEE for approval and subsequent implementation of the SSDS.

					the process has also been concluded.		evaluation program for the next ten years	
	National centres appointed and functioning effectively in local and global environmental management		(Added in 2013) At least two national centres of expertise targeted within the SSDS supported to strengthen capacity for environmental management.		Process of definition of most appropriate structure for involvement of all stakeholders in the implementation of the EMPS had been discussed at the inception workshop for the formulation of the new EMPS	N/A	The interim high level committee to oversee the institutional mechanism for the SSDS implementation met a few times during the twelve month period and worked on finalizing the Terms of Reference for the SSDS management oversight. The matter is now being dealt with at Ministerial level and a Council (the Seychelles Sustainable Development Council) will now have oversight. The terms of reference has	Target achieved. The precise meaning of national centres of expertise is not clear within the context of SSDS implementation, although the SSDS does stress the importance of education for sustainability, and capacity strengthening for environmental management. The project has targeted S4S and University of Seychelles (UniSey) as interim national centres of expertise, these having been identified within the SSDS to assume specific roles in SSDS delivery. (See also below.)

							been finalised.	
	Relevant technical personnel aware of and able to effectively implement obligations under Rio conventions as an integrated part of national policies and programs		(Added in 2013) Capacity built in at least two centres of expertise to integrate Rio Convention obligations within national policies and programmes.		Not started yet	Modality of engagement of different stakeholders in the implementation process has been agreed. A training plan is to be finalized to formalize this process.	The project nonetheless capacitated the participation of one NGO (S4S) and the CB2 Project Manager to participate as part of the Seychelles delegation to the UNFCCC COP17 meeting which was held in Durban, South Africa late 2011. A memorandum of understanding will be signed with S4S such that they will act as a centre of expertise to the SSDS process on climate change issues. This was put on hold until recruitment of new project manager for CB2 project. One of the three study	Target achieved, The project originally targeted S4S for capacity building to deliver part of the education for sustainability component of the SSDS, but subsequent to 2011-12 support for attendance of international fora decided not to provide additional support as the organization was receiving this support from other sources (including UNDP SGP). The University of Seychelles (UniSey) as the key national centre of expertise supporting the education of sustainability component has been supported to develop a training package for the integration of global environmental objectives into curricula, and completed preparation of course materials in June 2013.

							<p>guides being financed under the project and being developed by the University of Seychelles has been completed and validated in a stakeholder workshop hosted by the University. That is the study guide on “Concepts in Sustainable Development”. The module was rolled out in March 2012 when the University took on its first cohort of students to follow the BSc in Environmental Sciences. The development of the other two modules is ongoing by the Degree Development Consultant.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Outcome 2: Environmental information and reporting is strengthened	Formalized and widely accessible mechanism for managing and reporting on environmental information in Seychelles related to global environment conventions	Numerous uncoordinated and not well known or readily accessible information sources on environment conditions and indicators	A single, consolidated and web-based open access environmental database on key indicators related to global conventions (by end of 2010) (also a library of actual printed documentation?)	N/A	Consultations with Information Technology companies to assess and confirm availability of local capacity to develop and implement the national database had been completed.	Local information technology firm had been contracted to undertake the development of the environment database and the work is on-going.	The prototype for the environment indicators database was submitted during the 3rd quarter 2011 and following endorsement, the consultant moved on with its full development. Extensive discussions / consultations have taken place with several key stakeholders during the course of the 4th quarter 2011 and 1st quarter 2012 in order to agree on the key indicators for the database. The latter has been finalised and installed on the Department of Environment servers. The Web interface has also been made	Target 90% achieved. The servers and equipment for the environment database has been installed, training delivered, and data entry initiated. The equipment is up and running at the DICT. However, there seems to have been no movement on this activity since around August 2012, and a database manual and some other deliverables have not been forthcoming from the contractor. There has been some confusion caused by overlap between the CB2 inputs and the inputs of another project, Mainstreaming Biodiversity, although these are now being resolved such that work on a consolidated database can be completed in late 2013.
--	--	--	--	-----	---	--	--	---

							<p>available. The project has also finalized and initiated the procurement and partial payment for the hardware required to operationalize the database when its development is completed. Negotiations also started with the consultant for an extension of the TOR to cover or incorporate other databases being operated by DOE. This extension will be undertaken under the BD project. The Department of Environment is now to start inputting data.</p>	
	Active use of and contributions to environmental database by	0 users (database on key environme	At least 15 organizations / agencies contributing to		See above	See above	<p>The database has links with other projects such as the BD project</p>	<p>Target not yet achieved. The database is currently being populated with some data held at DOE, but</p>

	national stakeholders	nt indicators for global conventions does not exist)	database and/or citing database in official reports (by end of project)				and the Protected Area project. Through the related activities under these projects stakeholders including local NGOs are being engaged and the right mechanism being agreed upon to provide relevant data / reports. (The Department of Environment and at least the 4 NGOs under the Protected Area project)	indicators are not yet resolved and coordinated inputs from other organizations not yet sought. Indicators will be finalized within the context of the Seychelles Environment Outlook (below), and links with other UNDP-GEF projects and their databases/proposed databases rationalized by the end of 2013.
	Consolidated, formally approved reporting structure on environmental conditions in the Seychelles to support decision making, priority setting, and reporting to the Rio	Incomplete and infrequent reporting by Seychelles to the Rio Conventions	At least 50% of Convention reporting indicators reported on as required (by end of project)		See above	See above	The consultations on the key indicators mentioned above has also provided the relevant information for the reporting to the Conventions	Target not yet achieved. See above.

	conventions							
	Completed SEO and established database	No official national report on state of the environment in Seychelles	2010 Seychelles State of the Environment Outlook produced (by end of 2010). SEO endorsed by Govt. of Seychelles (by end of project)		Draft terms of reference for the recruitment of the lead consultant to coordinate the formulation of SEO in circulation for input from stakeholders.	So as not to overburden the small pool of local experts who could work on this activity - noting that these experts are already involved and engaged in finalizing the SSDS mentioned above, this activity is ready to be rolled out the soonest that all activities related to the SSDS are finalized.	Recruitment process for the SEO started during the 2nd quarter of 2012 and the international consultant is expected to start on the 14th August 2012. Delays were encountered due to unavailability of consultant to start the work. Selection of local consultants will be done following recruitment of the international consultant.	Target 80% achieved. First drafts of all thematic sections of the Seychelles Environment Outlook have been prepared by national consultants and reviewed by the lead international consultant. A first consolidated draft is due in July 2013 and the validation workshop will be in early August 2013, after which the revised final document will be submitted to Cabinet for approval.
Outcome 3: Capacity for local implementation of global environmental conventions is developed, applied and	Pilot land development plan incorporates environmentally beneficial activities that increase and provide a model for responding to goals and obligations of	Environmentally beneficial practices are very minimally considered in land developm	One district / regional land development plan, which includes environmentally beneficial practices related to Rio	N/A	Not started yet	Local consultant had been recruited to coordinate inputs from all relevant stakeholders regarding activities to be	The three pilot project proposals for implementation in the Anse Royale district and on Praslin and La Digue respectively have been	Target achieved. Land use plans have been developed for 25 districts on Mahe, Praslin and La Digue and consolidated into a National Land Use Plan, completed in June 2013 under the UNDP-GEF project Mainstreaming biodiversity management

disseminated	Rio Conventions	ent plans and do not take account of Rio Conventions	Conventions, approved and under implementation (by mid 2011)			implemented at the local level that demonstrates implementation of the convention provisions. Initial consultations have been completed with all three main Rio Conventions focal points concerned and these are now being undertaken with representatives in the districts concerned.	submitted by the consultant. These three districts were chosen given that LUPs have been finalised and approved by Cabinet of Ministers. The proposal for Praslin was validated in a stakeholder workshop and roll out of activities started during the 3rd quarter 2011. The proposal for the Anse Royale district was validated during the first quarter of 2012 and roll out of activities has also started. MOUs have been signed with all partners for the demo projects for both Praslin and Anse Royale. The proposal for La Digue has also	into production sector activities. Both the individual LUPs and Land Use Planning Guidelines (also completed in June 2013) include environmental considerations related to Rio Convention goals: specifically identification and delineation of areas in need of additional protection or conservation such as current forest areas, wetlands, river catchments and sensitive coastlines (classified and protected under one of the “no development zone” sub-categories, such as forest reserve, wetland, protected coastline or beachfront, or buffer zone. Additional data on key biodiversity areas as mapped by the Department of Environment is also taken into consideration. Classification into one of the “no development zones” in the LUP is considered a starting point for the declaration of additional protected areas
--------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							been finalized and it shall be validated on 4th October 2012.	under the new Protected Areas Law and Regulations, aiming to reach or exceed CBD targets for percentage of national land- and seascape under full protection. Remaining is the approval by the Cabinet of Ministers of all LUPs and the Guidelines: remaining documents are expected to be presented to Cabinet by MLUH during July-August 2013.
	Public participation in development and monitoring of pilot land development plan: - Number of public meetings held in the process of creating the pilot district / regional land development plan - Number of seminars on civil participation in plan development and	00	At least 3 public meetings At least 3 seminars		Not started yet	See above	In addition to the above, consultations are on-going with the general public and relevant stakeholders in the districts each time a land use plan is finalized. Each district will have at least one general consultation meeting with approx. 15 to 20 people attending.	Target achieved. District LUPs were developed down to the level of individually owned land parcels and involved a high level of on-site consultation to clarify land boundaries, etc. At least one district level meeting was held to present and obtain comments on drafts of each of the LUPs. Once the LUPs are approved by Cabinet, implementation is the responsibility of MLUH and the District Administration officers. Issues pertaining to the LUP implementation

	plan monitoring							will be discussed at regular public meetings convened by the DAs.
	<p>Environmentally beneficial activities at site of pilot district / regional land development plan</p> <p>- # of rainwater harvesting systems installed</p> <p>- Kwh of photovoltaic systems installed</p> <p>- Area of degraded hillsides that have been re-vegetated for erosion</p> <p>- Area of land cleared of invasive alien creepers</p>	<p>0 (TBD) 0 (TBD)</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p> <p>0 (TBD)</p>	<p>5 systems?</p> <p>3Kwp</p> <p>2 ha</p> <p>5ha</p>		Not started yet	See above	See above	<p>Targets 50-100% achieved. Rain water harvesting: 1 system has been installed at the Home of the Elderly at Grand Anse Praslin, 1 system at La Digue Secondary and Primary School, and 6 systems are largely installed for public buildings at Anse Royale, Mahe. Target achieved. Solar electricity: Grand Anse Praslin Secondary School has installed a 2.8kW PV system; some solar appliances are yet to be installed at La Digue Secondary and Primary School. Target 93% achieved. Area of hillside re-vegetated: Grand Anse Praslin Secondary School has raised 250 seedlings, but these are not yet planted out; Praslin Development Fund has planted out around 2,000 seedlings (area of land covered not yet calculated);</p>

								<p>Grande Anse Praslin DAs office was supplied with fire fighting equipment and fire preparedness training to prevent further deforestation through wild fires (which burn up to 10% of the upland areas each year). Target achievement unknown, likely >50%.</p> <p>Areas of creepers cleared: no activities were undertaken by the demo sub-projects. However, one of the demo implementers, SIF, has organized parallel activities to clear creepers from Vallée de Mai as part of the run-up to the 30th anniversary of establishment of the World Heritage Site in December 2013. Other activities related to Rio Conventions: waste bins for recycling were installed at La Digue Secondary and Primary School; environmental education activities were conducted by TRASS and by SIF on Praslin, and by La Digue Secondary and Primary School; a demo</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

								home garden has been established by Baie St Anne Praslin Primary School; wetland restoration was undertaken at Anse Royale by the University of Seychelles (area restored not yet calculated).
	<p>Number of persons capable of implementing environmentally beneficial activities that support the Rio Conventions into district / regional land development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Staff (Govt. + NGO) • Rainwater harvesting systems • Photovoltaic systems • Re-vegetation for erosion control • Invasive alien 	<p>2-3</p> <p>0</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p> <p>2-3</p>	<p>5</p> <p>4</p> <p>8</p> <p>8</p> <p>10</p> <p>3</p> <p>10</p>		Not started yet	See above	<p>Training session on "Green Building Technologies such as the use of renewable energy, water harvesting, low-energy and environmentally friendly building techniques in the tropics to familiarize and train local architects, engineers, developers and agents in Seychelles on green building technologies" was completed. 19 people attended.</p>	<p>Target not yet achieved. This has not yet been addressed systematically, although ad hoc training has been carried out in the context of some of the demo projects (above). Results so far will be collated and additional training delivered during the remainder of the project lifetime.</p>

	creeper eradication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot site (District/Regional) inhabitantAS • Rainwater harvesting systems • Photovoltaic systems • Re-vegetation for erosion control • Invasive alien creeper eradication 	2-3	10					
	Procedures and tools to replicate best practices of environmentally beneficial activities related to Rio Conventions in district / regional land development plans	No tools or best practices studied or developed	A detailed manual on replicating environmentally beneficial activities related to Rio Conventions in district / regional land development plans (by end of project)		Not started yet	See above	See above	Target achieved. This is covered in the National Land Use Planning Guidelines produced in June 2013 (see above).
	Public Awareness of revised TCPA, EPA,		(Added in 2013) Strategy for		Not started yet	One stakeholder workshop had	An awareness workshop on the	Target not yet achieved. The revision of the Town

	LUP, LDP and environmental best practices		delivery of public awareness raising actions developed and delivered.			been held and aired on national television station on the review exercise for the Town and Country Planning Act.	La Digue aerial survey was conducted early in 2012. Likewise consultations and awareness to the La Digue LUP was also undertaken. The review of TCPA and EPA legislations is on-going and work is expected to be finalised during October 2012.	and Country Planning Act (now the Physical Planning Bill) was completed in June 2013. The preparation of the Environmental Protection Act was completed in June 2013 and harmonized with the PPB. Both are awaiting approval by Cabinet. Other relevant documents such as the Biosecurity Act and Protected Areas Policy are near completion. All of these have been funded under other UNDP-GEF projects. Once these various legal instruments are finalized, the project will develop a strategy for delivery of relevant information to target stakeholders and commence dissemination activities. (This will be assisted by the PCU PR Officer and coordinated with programme dissemination approaches.)
	- TV spots	12						
	- Newspaper articles	12						
	- Radio programs	6						

Annex 14: Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard
(from Annex 4, ProDoc)

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement						
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0				
	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1				
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2				
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3				
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0				
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1				
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2				
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional	3				
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0				
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1				
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2				
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge						
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs)	0				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)	1				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3				
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0				
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1				
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2				
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3				
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0				
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1				
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2				
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3				
Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and	No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies	0				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
policy development	and programmes					
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes	1				
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2				
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3				
Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0				
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1				
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2				
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development						
Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0				
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used	1				
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding	2				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	constraints and/or other problems					
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3				
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0				
	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1				
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2				
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3				
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0				
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1				
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2				
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation						

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0				
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1				
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2				
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3				
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0				
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1				
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2				
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate						
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0				
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1				
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3				
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0				
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1				
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2				
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						

Annex 15: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Anne C. Woodfine (Dr)

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): Independent Consultant

I confirm that I have reviewed and will abide by the 2008 UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

Signed at Edenbridge, Kent, UK on 26 November 2013

Signature: Anne C. Woodfine

Annex 16: Evaluation Rating Scales and Guidance

Ratings Scales		
<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings:</i>
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): any shortcomings are of negligible significance 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks <i>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A)</i>	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)

Guidelines for Ratings for Project Implementation:

Progress toward achieving project objectives

Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective: Taking into account the cumulative level of progress compared to the target level across all of the objective indicators, please rate the progress of the project towards meeting its objective, according to the following scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project

	is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Progress in project implementation

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Annex 17: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

<p>Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by</p> <p>UNDP Country Office</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>UNDP- GEF- RTA</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p>	
---	--

(to be completed by CO and RCU and included in the final document)

