TERMINAL EVALUATION
OF THE
CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT
OF
ERITREAN COASTAL, MARINE AND ISLANDS BIODIVERSITY PROJECT (ECMIB)

ERI/97/G31/B /1G/99/

Philip Tortell, *Consultant*

Asmara/Wellington, August 2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous assistance I received from many individuals and organizations in carrying out the evaluation.

Firstly, I would like to thank the staff of the ECMIB Project Management Unit, especially the Project Manager Kaleab Negussie and the Technical Advisor Alain Jeudy de Grissac, who received me warmly, shared their long experience of the project with me and provided me with all the documents and other information I requested. The Unit was also most helpful by arranging the schedule of appointments, hosting many of my meetings and assisting with logistics. I am also very grateful to all other project personnel who met with me, sometimes more than once, and who patiently provided me with all that I asked for. The insights provided by all those involved in the implementation of the ECMIB Project were invaluable.

I am grateful to Habtom Tewelde who looked after me very well. He took me from Asmara to Massawa and back, and made sure I arrived at all my appointments on time and safely. His observations, particularly on Massawa, were also very valuable.

I also would like to extend my thanks to all the officials from the Ministry of Fisheries, starting with HE the Minister, as well as officials from various other Government organizations dealing with National Development, Environment, Transport and Communications and Justice, together with Massawa Municipality, the National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students, and the new College of Marine Science and Technology, who shared their views and experiences of ECMIB and its various activities with me in a transparent manner and described their relationship with the project.

Finally, I would also like to thank the UNDP Environment team, led by Yoseph Admekom, and particularly Isaac Habte, for inducting me into and updating me on the intricacies of ECMIB, especially its turbulent first years, as well as for providing me with background documentation and briefings; Isaac was also my travelling companion, accompanied me to my meetings and always responded right away to the incessant questions and other requests which I made.

To all I am sincerely grateful.

Philip Tortell
Consultant
Environmental Management Limited
P O Box 27 433, Wellington, NEW ZEALAND
Tel +64-4-384 4133,   Fax +64-4-384 4022,   Email <tortell@attglobal.net>

CONTENTS

ANNEXES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Project Report
CMI	Coastal, Marine and Island
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DG	Director General
ECMIB	Eritrea Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (Project)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
ICAM/ICM	Integrated Coastal Area Management / Integrated Coastal Management
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
LogFrame	Logical Framework Matrix
MinFish	Ministry of Fisheries
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NEX	National Execution (of UNDP projects)
NPM	National Project Manager
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NSC	National Scientific Coordinator
PCC/PSC	Project Coordination Committee / Project Steering Committee
PIR	Project Implementation Report (for GEF)
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPER	Project Progress and Evaluation Report
PRIF	Pre-Investment Fund
ProDoc	Project Document
RAF	Resource Allocation Framework (of the GEF)
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (of the GEF)
TA	Technical Advisor
TPR	Tri-Partite Review
UNDP-CO	United Nations Development Programme Country Office
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the independent Terminal Evaluation of the project of the Government of Eritrea, supported by UNDP/GEF, on the Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity, carried out in July/August 2007.

The project was originally a 5-year initiative executed by the Ministry of Fisheries with the Project Document signed in December 1998. However, implementation delays led to an extension to the end of 2007. It was designed to target the conservation and sustainable use of the globally significant biodiversity of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island ecosystems which were threatened by the rapid expansion of fisheries, tourism, and other developmental activities. The ECMIB Project has supported the sustainable development of Eritrea's coastal resources through a participatory management framework; the establishment of conservation areas and species protection programmes; an operational information system; and increased public awareness of the needs and benefits of CMI biodiversity. Following extensive reviews, the project was refocused towards an integrated coastal area management approach.

The original **Development Objective** as proposed by the ProDoc did not change :
> *To ensure the conservation management of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity*

However the Immediate Objectives did change from the original four and the revised ones were the following:

Immediate Objective 1: Up-to-date biodiversity information is used in CMI planning and management activities

Immediate Objective 2: Awareness increased at all levels (community groups, managers, administrators, and private sector) of the need for, the benefits of, and mechanisms to sustainably use and manage Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity resources

Immediate Objective 3: Policies for ICM programs developed and ICM approaches implemented in priority areas

Immediate Objective 4: A core of a national MPA network and species conservation programme established, and management of exotic species improved

For the first 3-4 years the project faced serious implementation difficulties – it achieved little and used up $1.1 million in the process. This led the Mid-Term Review to recommend project closure as a serious option.

The project design is not perfect but is not seen as the cause of these difficulties. It is obvious in hindsight that the cause was lack of capacity. Possibly, the project was premature for Eritrea. It was known that capacity was weak at the time but the extent of this weakness was not appreciated. Project management, particularly human resources management, was the aspect that suffered most from weak capacity and this is still not very strong today. The significant achievements of the project in capacity building have been mainly in the technical sphere.

The situation was exacerbated by the fact that project governance overall has been somewhat frail. In particular, the Project Steering Committee (misnamed Project Coordination Committee) failed to provide the steering and guidance necessary to the project management.

However, one positive element in all this was the degree of commitment and ownership by the Government – these are still very strong today and augur well for the sustainability of the project's benefits after closure. Maybe because of this, or maybe because of the vision of stakeholders, the project was allowed to proceed when the Mid-Term Review recommended closure and when the

Technical Management Review found virtually nothing positive about management. This was very risky for UNDP and GEF, as well as for the Government. A prematurely closed project looks bad for everyone, but a project which is allowed to proceed and then fails is an even worse embarrassment.

In the event, the faith and optimism of those who made the decision, have been vindicated and the turnaround is absolutely dramatic, the results very impressive.

Circumstances did change somewhat, and a lot of learning happened very quickly, but the transformation from a failure to a success is widely acknowledged as the result of knowledgeable and dedicated individuals. The successful achievement of the Project's Objectives is a credit to all who have been involved.

Progress towards the Development Objective is satisfactory and if the project develops an effective exit strategy that strengthens the chances of its products being sustainable, progress towards the Development Objective could even be considered as highly satisfactory.

The project has also been clearly successful with regards to Objectives 1 and 3. Objective 4 is unlikely to be achieved fully since it was a very ambitious objective but good progress has been made. Objective 2 is an enigma – the Outputs have been achieved, but it cannot be ascertained whether the Objective has been achieved. This is due to the poor selection of indicators and recommendations have been made regarding this to the project team.

By the time of project closure it is likely that three of the four Immediate Objectives would have been fully achieved, and the fourth one is likely to be only partly achieved. Overall achievement of the Immediate Objectives is considered to be between satisfactory and highly satisfactory.

By virtue of where it is being implemented, the benefits accruing from this project have a global dimension. The high degree of endemism (highest of any oceanic water body in the world), the rich diversity of some groups (richest diversity west of Indonesia) and its most interesting geological features, make the Red Sea truly unique ecologically – if these species and ecosystems cannot be protected here, they cannot be protected anywhere else, and the project has initiated the protection process.

At the national level, the project will leave behind a very valuable legacy to the Government and people of Eritrea – an effective, balancing mechanism through which to obtain the maximum benefit from the coastal environment, with the minimum impact, on a sustainable basis. The project has had a significant impact on the capacity to manage coastal resources, including a significant parcel of new data, information and knowledge. It has also established a consensual and collaborative institutional framework (comprising policy, legislation and procedures) within which various sectors including government, private and community can come together and target the common good. The time frame within which this has been achieved makes it a particularly impressive achievement. Finally, the project leaves behind a heightened awareness and sensitivity, at various levels, of the values and vulnerabilities of Eritrea's Red Sea coastal resources

These benefits are considered sound and with a good exit strategy should be sustainable. The basis for this assumption is the widespread sense of ownership and commitment that the evaluator has met with in all Government officials he has consulted. Right from HE the Minister of Fisheries down, there is no hesitation in affirming the Government's commitment to the continuation of the good work of the project. The evaluator concludes that all indications are in favour of sustainability of the project benefits.

However, in spite of the current auspicious situation, the work is still not finished, and the time left is not very long. The project should leave behind a very valuable legacy to the Government and people of Eritrea, but sustainability is not yet guaranteed. The gains in capacity – institutional as well as human; the gains in legislation, procedures and systems; and the gains in philosophy and approaches, need to be safeguarded by an effective exit strategy which aims for:

- a structured close-down of the project,
- a managed handing-over,
- a rational allocation of assets with recognition and receipts
- an exchange of appreciation and commitment letters, especially from beyond the Ministry of Fisheries
- more work on financial sustainability (without relying on fines and penalties as a source of income)
- an assessment of staff performance leading to a reference they can take with them
- an effective knowledge management system
- a more inclusive approach to communities – with meaningful participation (not just information)
- a viable proposal to overcome the potential gap between the end of the project and the commencement of follow-up activities

While the Government commitment is beyond question, it will be some time before the necessary resources can be made available, and an even longer time before a degree of self-funding can be attained to support the integrated coastal area management developed by the project.

In the short term, the Government requires support to continue developing the ICAM system until such time as it can run it on its own. This support will ensure that the investment made by UNDP and the GEF through ECMIB, will be safeguarded. Moves are already underway to develop the concept for such further assistance from GEF under the RAF for Eritrea. In order to make sure that the momentum generated by the project is not lost, the minimum requirement is for modest assistance until such time as more structured support is obtained from the GEF or elsewhere. It would be prudent to plan for this assistance to be available for 18-24 months and comprise a total of about US$1.0 million.

Of the numerous experiences generated by the project that are worth recording, the following are considered as the five most salient ones:

- A participatory approach overcomes the cynicism and suspicion often felt by line ministries when the development of ICAM is led by an existing ministry. True participation also results in ownership arising out of the various collective decisions that have to be taken.
- It is comparatively easier to identify and address capacity needs of a technical nature; conversely, managerial, leadership and management capacity is harder to assess, but it is even more important for project success.
- A good, collaborative relationship between the NPM and the CTA is probably the most important single element of project management – it can make or break the project.
- National Execution (NEX) of projects must be preceded by a capacity needs assessment and the identified needs must be addressed before NEX can be expected to function successfully.
- Adequate time and resources for inception, setting-up, and similar pre-operational phase activities of a project are crucial, particularly where capacity is known to be weak.

1.   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background

The Project Document (ProDoc) describes how Eritrea, which won its independence in 1993, is one of world's poorest nations with an average per capita income for the country's 3.5 million people estimated at the time of project formulation in 1994, to have been US$70 -150.   The ProDoc continues by saying that the primary economic development opportunities for Eritrea lie in its coastal, marine and island (CMI) areas, and that these opportunities include fisheries, trade, petroleum, services and tourism.   The development of these sectors could have significant impacts on the environment of the Red Sea as a whole, as well as on the globally important biodiversity of Eritrea's CMI area.   As a result, Eritrea is committed to ensuring that this development is sustainable, the quality of the Red Sea environment as a whole is maintained, and that the integrity of its coastal, marine and island biodiversity is not compromised.

Eritrea's 1,200 km coastal plain ranges from 20-60km in width and contains 59% of the country's land area.   It is largely underdeveloped due to its arid nature and the absence of any permanent rivers. The total coastal mainland population was estimated by the ProDoc to be 73,000, including 35,000 people in Assab (the strategic southern port city), 20,000 in Massawa (Eritrea's other deep-water port) and 15,000 in scattered settlements in between. Only ten out of about 350 Eritrean islands are inhabited, with a total population of about 2,600 in 20 villages.   At the time of project development, existing infrastructure was limited and levels of fishing were thought to have little environmental impact.   However, major developments were either already in progress (fisheries) or were being planned (oil and tourism).

The Red Sea supports the highest degree of endemism of any oceanic water body in the world - an estimated 18% of 1,250 fish species and 20% of 220 coral species. Although biodiversity research in the region is fairly recent and has largely been conducted in the northern half of the Red Sea, Sheppard *et. al.*[1] noted that some groups of Red Sea organisms comprise the richest marine diversity west of Indonesia.   However, because of its relatively small size, limited oceanographic circulation and high endemism, the Red Sea as a whole is particularly susceptible to pollution, loss of species and reduction in ecosystem productivity according to Sheppard *et.al.* op. cit.

Eritrea's CMI area covers more than 121,000km^2, includes more than 350 offshore islands and 1,350km of coastline (18% of the Red Sea continental coastline) not including the islands.   The extensive coral reefs, seagrass meadows and mangroves support globally important biological diversity and maintain the ecological stability and productivity of the CMI systems.   Despite limited research, more than 250 species of reef fish from 49 families and 110 marine and shore bird species from 41 families have been recorded.   The 210 islands of the Dehalak Archipelago support globally significant breeding populations of turtles and dugongs and serve as breeding, nesting and wintering sites for European, African and Asian migratory birds.   Healthy relict populations of Eritrea's larger wildlife species, *e.g.* gazelle and wild ass, have also been found in the coastal and island areas.

The Dahlak Archipelago and its geological twin, the Farasan Archipelago in Saudi Arabia, are relicts of large Pleistocene reef platforms that have been modified over time by tectonic displacement and erosion.   These platforms provide the substrata for modern reef development and their varied topography includes sand banks, shoals, shallow cemented areas, and large gullies up to 150m deep, which cut into the archipelagos and support unusual species.   The Red Sea is the only semi-enclosed water body in the world containing such archipelagos.   While the Saudi islands are extensively developed, the Dahlak region is underpopulated and pristine, providing an ideal baseline for biodiversity research and conservation.   As a result, the entire Dahlak Archipelago has been proposed as a marine reserve (UNEP/IUCN)[2].

---

[1] Sheppard, C., Price, A. and Roberts, C. (1992) *Marine Ecology of the Arabian Regions: Patterns and Processes in Extreme Tropical Environments*. Academic Press, San Diego, 359 pp.
[2] UNEP/IUCN (1988) *Coral Reefs of the World. Vol 2: Indian Ocean, Red Sea and Gulf.* UNEP Regional Seas Directories and Bibliographies. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge and UNEP, Nairobi, 389 pp.

1.2   The Project

The Conservation and Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (ECMIB) Project was originally a 5-year initiative of the Government of the State of Eritrea funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the Ministry of Fisheries (MinFish). The Project Document was signed by the Ministry of Fisheries and the office for Macro Policy and International Cooperation (now the Ministry of National Development) and UNDP/GEF in December 1998. Implementation delays led to approval to extend the project to the end of 2007.

The project, with a total budget of US$5 million, is designed to target the conservation and sustainable use of the globally significant biodiversity of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island (CMI) ecosystems. These were threatened by the rapid expansion of fisheries, tourism, and other developmental activities. The ECMIB Project has supported the sustainable development of Eritrea's CMI resources through a participatory management framework; the establishment of conservation areas and species protection programmes; an operational information system; and increased public awareness of the needs and benefits of CMI biodiversity.

The ECMIB Project encompassed four principal components to achieve its overall development objective, each leading to an immediate objective as follows:

1   **Building a CMI Information System:**   Establish a system for ensuring that up-to-date biodiversity information is used in all coastal, Marine and island planning and management activities
2   **Awareness of Biodiversity value:**   Increase, at all levels, awareness of the need for sustainable management of Eritrea's coastal marine and island biodiversity resources
3   **CMI Management Framework:**   Develop a comprehensive, integrated and participatory management framework for the conservation management and sustainable development of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity
4   **Conservation of special habitats and species:**   Develop and implement a participatory management programme for critical conservation areas and for habitats and species of special concern outside conservation areas

According to the Project Document, the vision espoused by the Project was:

"an overall management framework for Eritrea's coastal, marine and island areas … to ensure that during the current rapid development of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island environment, the globally significant biodiversity is maintained … the development of awareness, together with the necessary skills and capacities of Eritrean stakeholders, to put in place conservation areas and habitat and species conservation programmes, as well as an appropriate overall management framework for the coastal, marine and island environment … strong communication and cooperation between all government agencies, the private sector, and local communities; a development and zoning plan; an understanding of and action plans for addressing development impacts on the CMI environment; EIA guidelines; a strategy for sustainable financing of CMI conservation activities; and effective mechanisms for regional and international collaboration …a marine protected areas system … including initially three conservation management areas, as well as programmes for the conservation of important habitats and species outside protected areas … baseline inventory and information system which currently focuses on fisheries stocks will be extended to cover all marine biological diversity, a baseline data set on Eritrea's CMI biodiversity will be completed, and this information will be widely available and used in sectoral planning … all stakeholders, schoolchildren, and the public will have a broad understanding of the need for, benefits of, and how to sustainably manage CMI biodiversity."

This biodiversity project fell within GEF Operational Programme No.2: Coastal Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. It promoted the conservation and sustainable use of the globally important

biological diversity of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island ecosystems in the Red Sea. The project remains relevant today in spite of the new Strategic Priorities of GEF for Biodiversity (Strategic Objective 1 on Protected Areas and Strategic Objective 2 Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Productive Sectors).

In addition, the project contributed to Eritrea's response to the obligations it took on when it signed a number of international conventions and agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the Ramsar Wetlands Convention.

1.3   The Evaluation Mission

1.3.1   Evaluation objectives and Terms of Reference

This evaluation was commissioned by the UNDP Country Office in Eritrea as the GEF Implementing Agency for the ECMIB Project, as required by the procedures of the GEF, the main funding source. The objectives of this Terminal Evaluation are to be found in the Terms of Reference in Annex 1. Following are the operative objectives of the evaluation based on the Terms of Reference:

1. Assess overall performance and review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes
2. Analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation
3. Assess the sustainability of results
4. Make recommendations on measures that could have increased the likelihood of success
5. Make recommendations on the design of future projects of a related nature
6. Identify and document the successes, challenges and lessons learned
7. Advise on activities for a transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability of the ECMIB initiatives
8. Assess the need for possible future GEF assistance and provide guidance for future GEF interventions

1.3.2   Mission activities

Work on this evaluation commenced on Sunday 08 July 2007 from homebase with assignment planning, preparation of the schedule of work, interpretation of the Terms of Reference, documents review and websites searches. Saturday 14 and Sunday 15 July were spent travelling to Eritrea and the evaluator arrived in Asmara in the evening of Sunday 15 July. Monday 16 July was taken up with a series of briefing and introductory meetings and on Tuesday 17 July the evaluator travelled to Massawa where the project is based.

The evaluator was in Massawa from Tuesday 17 July until Saturday 21 July when he travelled back to Asmara. The time in Massawa was devoted to an extensive programme of consultations with project personnel, stakeholders and others.

On returning to Asmara, the evaluator spent a further week during which he conducted further consultations with key stakeholders and undertook the drafting of the Evaluation Report. A presentation of findings was made to the PCC and other stakeholders on Friday 27 July. The evaluator provided a final draft of the Evaluation Report to the UNDP on Tuesday 31 July, having departed Asmara on Sunday 29 July. Following a brief period for comments on the draft, the Evaluation Report was finalized and dispatched in early August 2007.

The full Schedule for this assignment is in Annex 2.

1.4   Methodology of the evaluation

1.4.1   The approach adopted

Overall guidance on terminal evaluation methodologies is provided by the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation[3]. The evaluator based his approach on this guiding document together with the ToRs, and in consultation with UNDP Eritrea.

This has been a participatory evaluation and opinions and information were obtained through the following activities:
- Desk review of relevant documents and websites
- Discussions with UNDP Eritrea senior management
- Consultation meetings with Central and Local Government and other stakeholders and partners
- Visit to the project office in Massawa and discussions with project personnel, as well as with government officials, community members and other stakeholders and beneficiaries

According to the Handbook[4], *"Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Project evaluation can be invaluable for managing for results, and serves to reinforce the accountability of project managers. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and ADRs, and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility"*. As a result, all full and medium-size projects supported by the GEF undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation.

As this is a terminal evaluation, it would normally be expected to go back to the original formulation stages of the project and its ProDoc. However, as this is the third evaluation (there has been a Mid-Term Review[5] and a Management Review[6]) for the project, this Terminal Evaluation has focused particularly (although not exclusively) on the period following the other evaluations, *i.e.* post 2004. In addition, since lack of capacity has been acknowledged widely as the root cause of the problems faced by the project in its early days, the evaluation has concentrated especially on capacity.

1.4.2   Documents reviewed and consulted

The evaluator was provided with an initial list of documents by the Project Team. Further advice on relevant documents was provided by UNDP. The evaluator sought additional documentation to provide the background to the project, insights into project implementation and management, a record of project outputs, etc. The list of salient documents reviewed and/or consulted by the evaluator is in Annex 3 which also contains a reference to the project website which was visited and reviewed.

---

[3] *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* (2002) United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office
[4] *Op. cit.*
[5] Wells, Sue and Magnus Ngoile (2004) *Final Report to UNDP of Mid-Term Review*. Conservation and Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island (CMI) Biodiversity Project
[6] Njeru, Alphan (2004) *Technical Management Review Report*. Eritrean Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (ECMIB) Project. PricewaterhouseCoopers Limited

1.4.3 Consultations with key stakeholders and government officials

Consultations by the evaluator took place mainly in Massawa. However, meetings were also held in Asmara.

The evaluator consulted 28 individuals in all. These came from a wide spectrum of sectors associated with the project – from within UNDP, Central Government organizations, Local Government organizations, NGOs and one community organization. Most meetings followed the same pattern, namely, a brief introduction on the purpose of the mission followed by an identification of the relationship that the consultee had with the Project, if any, and his/her views on the Project.

A full list of persons met and consulted by the evaluator is to be found in Annex 4.

It is also worth noting that there were four submissions of comments on the draft Report. These comments were consolidated and taken into account fully when the final Report was being prepared. Feedback to those who made comments was provided.

1.4.4 Structure of this report

The evaluator analyzed the information obtained and presented a preliminary report for discussion and feedback. Following this, this report was finalized with the benefit of the input received.

This report is intended primarily for UNDP CO in Eritrea and the GEF. It is structured in three main parts. Following the Executive Summary, the first part of the report comprises an Introduction which also covers the methodology of the evaluation and the development context of the project. The next part covers the Findings and is made up of a number of discrete but closely linked sections following the scope proposed for project evaluation reports by the UNDP Guidelines. The final part comprises the Conclusions and Recommendations. A number of annexes provide additional, relevant information.

2   FINDINGS: PROJECT DESIGN, REVIEWS AND REVISIONS

2.1   Project design

The project design, as illustrated by the ProDoc version available to the evaluator, is basically quite sound. It is well laid out and in general it is easy to follow. As the STAP Review said at the time *"the project has been carefully put together"*.

The project structure is logical. According to the text and the LogFrame annex of the ProDoc, the project has one overall Development Objective, four Immediate Objectives, one under each of the four Components, a number of Outputs are identified under each Objective and various Activities are prescribed for each Output.

Unfortunately, terminology (as often) has been used loosely in terms of this project and this can create confusion. This is not helped by the fact that development agencies (UNDP and GEF) use different terminology, and that the terminology of each of them has been changed in recent times.

As noted above, there are four Immediate Objectives, and not 21 as suggested by the MTR. What the MTR refers to as Objectives are in fact Outputs, which is what they are correctly called in the

ProDoc and its LogFrame. Outputs are tangible, achievable products which contribute to one or more Objective/s. Almost without exception, the Outputs put forward in the ProDoc fit this definition.

The reference by the MTR to 68 Activities is correct. Activities are actions or tasks that must be carried out in order to achieve a specific Output. The project formulators may have provided more detail than was absolutely necessary in determining so many Activities, and in so doing the ProDoc could have constrained the flexibility of the project manager in planning for project implementation. However, all the Activities appear relevant and practical and mostly obvious if the respective Outputs were to be achieved.

Other elements of the project design such as the timescale, the proposed budget and the implementation framework could have been stronger and these are discussed in more detail in their respective sections below.

The biggest criticism of the project design could probably be levelled at its failure to recognize the real extent of the weak in-country capacity, having identified this as a risk. The ProDoc says that the PRIF phase *"carefully assessed"* capacity building needs, and goes on to say *"PRIF activities have strengthened these in both the MFish and the DOE, they are still limited and the activities of the project have been carefully phased to take these into account and ensure that all project activities can be successfully achieved"*. Unfortunately, these assessments seem to have been limited to technical capacity, and since UNDP did not carry out a specific capacity needs assessment before the project was assigned for national execution (NEX), the need for capacity in project management, project governance and project implementation in general, was not identified.

The situation was exacerbated by a further deterioration in capacity – it actually got worse for a while as graduates left the Ministry of Fisheries and staff left the University Marine Department.

2.2   The Mid-Term Review and the Technical Management Review

Having started this evaluation at the beginning with the ProDoc, the evaluator wanted to skip the first few unproductive years of the project since these had been the focus of a Mid-Term Review and a Technical Management Review. Project management was therefore invited by the evaluator to provide a response to these two reviews and the full tabulated responses are found in Annex 5. Following is a synopsis of the two reviews and of the management response.

2.2.1   The Mid-Term Review

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) was carried out in November/December 2003 and the report presented in January 2004.

The MTR noted the objective of the project and its four principal components and determined that 21 objectives and 68 activities were involved. An early conclusion of the MTR was that *"given the pristine nature of the coastal environment and the optimism engendered by the declaration of independence in 1993, the project objective and components seemed highly appropriate"* at the time of formulation, *"however, its broadness and ambition must now be considered inappropriate."*

The MTR commented on the fact that Eritrea is a relatively new nation with limited capacity and that since the project started, the pace of coastal development had increased much faster than anticipated and the policy and legislative framework for the project had changed substantially. Despite these changes, the MTR considered the overall framework of the ECMIB project as sufficiently general that the necessary modifications could be made to suit the then current national context.

The MTR noted that although the project was into its fifth year, the delays in implementation and over-ambitiousness of the LogFrame had meant that it was too early to see any achievements in terms of immediate objectives. At the end of its review of the work undertaken, the MTR found that no activities had been completed and many had yet to be initiated.

The MTR also conducted a preliminary analysis of some of the management problems that had contributed to the poor rate of implementation and that led to the conclusion that a management audit of the project should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

A detailed technical analysis of the LogFrame was also carried out and recommendations were made for its revision to ensure implementation of activities that will have a demonstrable impact. Among the salient recommendations were the following:

- Refocusing the proposed national level survey of coastal and marine biodiversity to surveys of specific sites of key importance
- Production of awareness raising materials, such as a 'State of the Coast' report
- Refocusing of the component concerning the development of a full ICM programme to initiation of the recommended '2-track ICM approach' involving parallel development of an ICM policy and 1-2 local level demonstration ICM programmes
- Refocusing of the component concerning development of a system of conservation management areas to establishment of a number of demonstration areas that will provide the necessary experience and information needed for preparing a nation-wide system

The MTR concluded that "*unless effective implementation begins, the closure of the project should be considered*". As its recommendation, it then put forward two options -

Option 1. A 3-4 month period (e.g. until the end of June 2004) during which significant changes are made and demonstrable progress made in resolving the obstacles to implementation, in which case the project continues. The specific required changes addressed management, performance, delivery, oversight, and technical aspects.

Option 2. The TPR should review progress made in early July 2004. If this is not satisfactory, UNDP/GEF should consider either immediate closure or substantial redesign.

As can be seen from the tabulated response in Annex 5a, the project, with the support of the PCC and UNDP, rejected the possibility of project closure and satisfied most of the requirements of Option 1, albeit on a different timescale to that suggested. The LogFrame was revised and most of the recommendations implemented, even if only partly for some of them. The factor which most influenced implementation of recommendations and led to only partial realization was the lack of capacity. Another reason given often for not implementing MTR recommendations was "national procedures applied – NEX". This was especially the case with recommendations related to staff management. This evaluator rejects this as a reason for not implementing recommendations. If the national procedures and systems can be improved upon, this can be done in spite of NEX and better procedures implemented – this is part of the capacity building.

One other recommendation that appears to have been rejected is regarding the adoption of an exit strategy. It would seem that project management and the PCC misunderstood the purpose of an exit strategy and this is discussed further in section 5.4 below.

The final recommendation and the issue raised in the management response are of concern to this evaluator. It is incumbent on UNDP to provide the necessary guidance for project implementation through the appropriate documentation, training, etc. While UNDP strongly asserts that it conducted three NEX training workshops, provided exclusive training to ECMIB project staff as per the MTR recommendations, and provided frequent informal guidance and training to the NPM and the Project Accountant, project management did not consider this adequate.

2.2.2 The Technical Management Review

A Technical Management Review, as recommended by the MTR, was commission by UNDP and carried out in 2004 by PricewaterhouseCoopers. The Review discussed project personnel, addressed operational and administration processes and controls, outlined financial matters, covered record keeping and inventories as well as technical issues, overall management, administrative procedures and other quality control mechanisms. It also provided input to the proposed management training. The review made 28 recommendations in all.

The management response to the Technical Management Review is in Annex 5b. Recommendations similar to those in the MTR regarding improvements to staff management procedures and the development of an exit strategy were rejected on the same grounds as above. This evaluator restates his concern regarding this attitude.

It would seem that while some recommendations were accepted and implemented, the majority were rejected, partly for the reasons referred to above, as well as for other reasons. This evaluator feels that the management response to the Technical Management Review was unnecessarily defensive.

3 FINDINGS: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

3.1 Project governance

3.1.1 The project implementation framework

UNDP and the Government agreed that the project will be executed under the NEX (national execution) modality which is the norm for UNDP projects. The UNDP Programming Manual[7] states that "*NEX is used when there is adequate capacity in government to undertake the functions and activities of the programme or project. The UNDP country office ascertains the national capacities during the formulation stage.*" As has already been discussed above, the degree to which capacity was lacking was underestimated at the time of project formulation. Project implementation was therefore placed on a very unsteady foundation right from the start.

In the absence of adequate capacity, there was a need for a strong and supportive framework for the project management team, with clear lines of accountability, continuous monitoring and reporting, guidance and support. Unfortunately, this does not seem to have been the case.

The ProDoc is not very clear about the implementation framework. Its description of the implementation mechanism presents a rather complex situation - "*implementation of the project will be led by a planning team based in the MFish and will involve staff from all divisions of the Mfish. The planning team will consult with other relevant line ministries as the need arises. The project staff will be the focal points for implementing the day to day aspects of the project. MPIEC (now the Ministry of National Development) will deal with strategic and integrated planning issues at a policy level and will handle inter-ministerial, local community, private sector, and other stakeholder coordination in consultation with the planning team*".

---

[7] *UNDP Programming Manual.* UNDP, New York, 2000

3.1.2 The Project Steering Committee

All projects of a certain size will benefit from an effective steering committee and it is standard practice to discuss this in the ProDoc, often including Terms of Reference for the committee as one of the annexes. However, the ProDoc appears completely silent on such a body.

The first TPR in February 2000 noticed the gap in project governance and recommended that "*A Project Coordinating, Planning and Implementation Committee (PCPIC) should be established to improve coordination and integration, and should include representation by key national stakeholders*". This committee met for the first time in January 2001 and renamed itself as (more manageable title) Project Coordination Committee (PCC). The minutes of that meeting are somewhat cryptic but the recommendations that were recorded indicate that some very valuable issues had been discussed. Unfortunately, like the rest of the project, the PCC went into suspended animation until sometime in 2004 and even after that, records and minutes of the meetings are not readily available.

It would seem that the role of this very important committee has been misunderstood, even by the Technical Management Review. The prime role of this committee is to steer and guide the project, hence its usual name – Project Steering Committee – it is not intended to coordinate or implement the project. Project implementation should not be by committee – this is the responsibility of the Project Manager and his/her team.

Together with the TPR, the PSC is the highest governance level for the project. As such, it must have both the authority and the power to set policy for the project, monitor its performance and provide guidance and directions to the Project Manager and other project stakeholders. It should also support UNDP which, as the GEF Implementing Agency, retains the ultimate accountability for the delivery of project products and the administration of project funds according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between UNDP and the Government.

Among the tasks of the PSC are the following:
- To set policy and provide strategic guidance to ensure the timely and cost-effective realisation of project objectives
- To review and recommend approval of Annual Work Plans
- To monitor progress in project implementation against agreed Outcomes and Outputs
- To validate Project Outputs
- To resolve conflicts and problem areas as needed to facilitate project delivery
- To ensure that country commitments, including of co-financing, and technical and operational support, are met

The membership of the Project Steering Committee should comprise :
- Representatives of each of the main stakeholders
- Representatives of major donors and/or other partners
- Representatives of the UNDP Country Office and UNDP/GEF
- Representatives of the beneficiaries

The Project Manager is required to attend and report on progress, assisted by other project personnel as required. Team Leader of the Technical Advisory Group should also attend and be available to advise the PSC on any technical matters that may arise.

It is strongly recommended that for future projects with a significant budget (say, over $100,000) and timescale (say, over 24 months), a Project Steering Committee is established with a mandate based on the above discussion.

3.1.3   The Project Technical Committee

The TPR of October 2004 recommended the "*strengthening of the Project Technical Committee by including all relevant stakeholders*" and the first meeting was held in March 2005. By October that same year, it had met seven times and it continues to do so regularly. This and the quality of some of its products reviewed by the evaluator (*e.g.* the State of the Coast Report), are clear illustrations of the degree of activity and commitment which characterized this committee. This has been an effective committee, providing technical guidance to the project and the PCC, as mandated by its Terms of Reference.

A technical committee, supporting and advising the PSC and the project implementation team, is not always set up for all projects – this depends primarily on the technical content of the project. In the case of ECMIB, such a committee was more than justified, it was essential.

Although in this case, it appears to have worked very well in favour of the project, such committees in the future may consider a slightly different basis for membership. Instead of inviting institutions to nominate representatives, it may be more appropriate to base membership on technical expertise. In such an approach, members will be appointed in their own personal capacity taking into account the technical expertise they are expected to contribute.

3.1.4   The Project Management Unit

3.1.4.1 The relationship between the National Project Manager and the Technical Advisor

The existing situation based on sharing and cooperation between the NPM and the TA is indeed good to watch and has certainly produced results. It appears based on the fact that the two incumbent individuals are mature, knowledgeable and experienced and, more importantly, work well together, complementing each other's strengths.

But it has not always been like this. The project has "gone through" four TAs and two NPMs and this is not a relationship that can be taken for granted. The ability of one to be able to work with the other is of paramount importance in the selection process.

Another element which may not have been present in the past (and which is not required now because of the cooperative situation) is assertiveness on the part of the NPM. The ToRs are clear as to which position is dominant and the NPM may have needed to assert that dominance. A perceived lack of management experience and confidence ("not a scientist", "not a technical expert") on the part of the NPM appears to have precluded such decisive action.

3.1.4.2 Project staff

The staff at the project are engaged on the basis of four different arrangements. Some are recruited and appointed by the project and are fully on its payroll on a renewable annual contract; others are also full-time on the project payroll but their terms of engagement are on a three-months contract basis; others still, are seconded from the Ministry of Fisheries, on salary, to work full-time on the project with an additional incentive payment together with DSA from the project; the final group is seconded from various Ministries, also on salary, working about 40% of full time on the project with DSA paid by the project for field visits. Such significant differences in the terms of engagement of individuals who must work side by side, could be expected to lead to tensions and other problems,

however, this does not seem to be the case from observations of the evaluator and this is a credit to all concerned.

Some of the staff that were consulted reported that they were unsure of their role within the project. They felt that their Terms of Reference were not much help and as no induction or introductory courses were held they were invariably left to their own devices to determine what they should do. Many brought up the need for an annual performance assessment with the Project Manager where they could review their work over the past year, obtain feedback on their performance and agree on a set of tasks and targets for the coming year. The evaluator agrees that this would be very beneficial since it is a well-know fact that even the best Terms of Reference become stale and uninspiring after a while, and recommends such a process for future projects.

3.1.4.3 Cohesion as a team

In his brief encounter with project team members in their office environment, the evaluator noticed a lack of cohesion as a team. They are an excellent group of knowledgeable and dedicated individuals, but there does not seem to be much synergy between them. There seem to be too many boundaries surrounding each individual staff member and the individual work rooms without a common room for cross-fertilization of ideas and joint initiatives, does not help.

Many staff lamented the absence of regular team meetings where they could float ideas and interact with their peers in a structured way. They wished to be involved more meaningfully, as a team, in initiatives such as the setting of the AWP. They reported a lack of guidance, leadership, feedback and nurturing. Even if this situation is more perceived than real, it is certainly something that project management needs to address.

3.1.4.4 Capacity building

In the ProDoc and elsewhere, there is a strong assertion that ECMIB is a project about capacity building – but then most development projects are! Having started from such an assertion, it is not surprising that the project created a large number of formal training opportunities and as many informal ones such as participation in relevant global events. The full list of training opportunities (study tours, workshops and conferences) abroad, as provided by project management, is in Annex 6. The project sponsored 37 of these training opportunities abroad for a total of 622 man/days of training.

In addition, the project sponsored two students to study for their doctorates and one for his masters (six had been targeted). One of the doctorate students gave up when he could not raise the necessary additional finance. The other was remiss with his agreed reporting and unilaterally changed his course of study (apparently with the connivance of his academic institution). One of these had been serving as National Project Manager at the time of his award. In neither case has there been any benefit to the project or its objectives, and the benefit to Eritrea is also in doubt.

The masters student duly completed his studies and gained his MSc in Applied Science Protected Area Management. He returned to Eritrea and after 19 months he was recruited by the UN to the post of Field Safety and Security Coordination Assistant, a loss to the project and its objectives.

In addition to the training abroad, the project also provided an impressive amount of training opportunities in-country. There were 30 international consultancies (see Annex 7) awarded by the project (some individuals being engaged more than once) and some of these provided formal training courses, others provided training "on the job" through working with counterparts and mentoring.

The conclusion that is drawn by the evaluator on capacity building by the project, is that a great deal has been achieved both formally and informally and coastal management in Eritrea is all the richer for it. The beneficiaries have been mainly from the Ministry of Fisheries but other bodies with coastal

responsibilities have also benefited. One further conclusion is that the sponsoring of doctorate fellowships by a project which is meant to last five years is a waste of money. The sponsoring of masters fellowships is feasible but marginally so. It is recommended that in the light of this experience, UNDP should review its policies[8] on training, particularly fellowships, and apply them judiciously so as to obtain the utmost benefit for projects and their objectives. Among the matters that need to be considered is whether a Project Manager can send himself/herself away on a fellowship, whether it should be a requirement that the thesis topic address one of the project objectives, and whether there needs to be an unequivocal commitment by the award holder to return to the project, and how long for.

3.1.5 The role of UNDP

As implementing agency, UNDP is responsible to the GEF for the timely and cost-effective delivery of the agreed project outputs. It achieves this through its understanding with the Government and its contractual arrangement with UNOPS. UNDP has an obligation to ensure accountability, and its efforts in this respect are spearheaded by the Country Office which has legal responsibility for the GEF funds.

The UNDP Resident Representative in Eritrea may approve, following consultation and agreement with the UNDP/GEF Regional Office and the Government signatories to the project document, revisions or additions to any of the annexes of the ProDoc, revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, and mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or to take into account agency expenditure flexibility. The UNDP Resident Representative also co-chairs the Annual Tripartite Review, coordinates inputs into the annual Project Implementation Review for submission to UNDP/GEF, ensures that project objectives are advanced through the policy dialogue with the Government and undertakes official transmission of reports to the GEF focal point.

The work of the UNDP Country Office is supported by the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Office, which also provides coordination within the whole UNDP/GEF portfolio of projects for the region. More specifically, the UNDP/GEF Regional Office provides technical support to the UNDP Country Office and the Government GEF Operational Focal Point, assists the executing agency with the recruitment of senior project personnel, approves the project inception report and terminal reports, reviews budget revisions prior to signature, follows up closely on implementation progress, assures the eligibility of project interventions in light of GEF policy guidance and approved project design, represents UNDP/GEF on the PSC, and approves Annual Project Implementation Reports, including performance ratings, for submission to GEF.

As is accepted practice, UNDP receives a fee aimed at reimbursing the costs of project development and supervision, and for monitoring project implementation.

All the above is irrespective of whether the project is executed nationally through the NEX modality or otherwise.

UNDP advised the evaluator that the project has been a difficult one right from the start, with long delays in obtaining recruitments and in securing a project office. The Country Office has attempted to balance its responsibilities as outlined above with the delegation of responsibility that is implied in the NEX modality. UNDP also maintains that it has and continues to provide support and backstopping to the project and monitors its performance through regular field visits, participation in the PCC meetings and contributing to the mandatory annual reporting tasks.

It is unclear whether and to what extent a capacity needs assessment was carried out by UNDP before deciding on the NEX modality, as required by the Programming Manual. There is some

---

[8] *National Execution (NEX) Guidelines.* UNDP-Eritrea, 2005

difference of opinion as to the extent of training that was provided by UNDP administration and finance personnel to their counterparts in the executing agency. The evaluator concludes that even if such a needs assessment had been carried out, it clearly failed to determine the low level of capacity; and that training provided is considered insufficient by the target beneficiaries.

Finally, UNDP confirmed that a performance assessment is carried out for the project Technical Advisor, however, this was not the case for the Project Manager who was employed by Government and presumably was assessed by Government. The evaluator believes that an annual performance assessment of all project managers, by UNDP, would be mutually beneficial.

3.2 Financial management

This terminal evaluation is not intended to be a financial audit and the focus of this section is on whether the project has given value for money. Financial audits have been conducted regularly and from all reports the auditors have been happy with what they found and no issues have been raised.

From a superficial point of view, the project design, with a budget of almost $5 million over a five year period, could be considered over-budgeted. The "absorptive capacity" of Eritrea even now, struggles somewhat to plan for and implement the rational use of such funds and until it gathered momentum, the project was underperforming when assessed against the budgeted expenditure. The table below (from project management) provides a summary of the ratio of funds spent compared to the forecast.

Table 1.   Comparison of Budget Forecasts and Actual Expenditure

YEAR	BUDGET FORECAST	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE	
1999	1,414,400.00	125,497.00	8.8%
2000	2,505,110.00	141,943.00	5.6%
2001	1,032,800.00	255,430.00	24.7%
2002	700,600.00	151,877.00	21.7%
2003	1,084,860.00	428,928.00	39.5%
2004	1,182,767.00	564,812.00	47.7%
2005	1,516,548.00	1,189,010.00	78.4%
2006	1,003,799.00	1,060,691.00	105.6%
2007 (est)	1,067,000.00		

It is understood that the budget for the first five years was based on the assumption that the project is to be completed in five years time (and presumably that the money had to be spent). This is an unfortunate example of management by inputs and it is a relief to note that the budget for the past three years has been based on the work plan.

Of the original budget, the allocation for equipment was $1.4 million and this is to be expected in a project so focussed on capacity building. However, enigmatically, the allocation for training was $0.8 million. As an observation, the amount allocated for personnel and administration was more than 20% at $1.2 million. This may appear excessive, however, this figure includes the cost of staff positions which are tagged directly to the delivery of Outputs and Objectives and which is therefore not an administration expense. Since the setting of the original budget, the UNDP accounting system has undergone changes and it is now easier to elicit meaningful information on changes resulting from budget revisions.

It must also be noted that during the initial period of some 3-4 years, when the project stagnated and produced little or no outputs, it still used up $1.1 million. This means that in effect the project has delivered its benefits at a cost of under $4 million.

One further observation is that, to date, expenditure in country is less than half of expenditure abroad and only in the first year of the project did local expenditure exceed offshore. This is to be expected in a project which targets capacity building. The following table illustrates the proportion of funds spent locally when compared with those disbursed by UNDP and UNOPS which are assumed to have been offshore.

Table 2.   **Local to UNDP/UNOPS expenditure ratio in US Dollars**

YEAR	LOCAL	UNDP/UNOPS	LOCAL TO UNDP/UNOPS RATIO	
1999	78,690.00	46,807.00	1.00:0.59	67.70% local
2000	64,755.00	77,188.00	1.00:1.20	45.62% local
2001	36,438.00	218,992.00	1.00:6.00	14.26% local
2002	56,458.00	95,419.00	1.00:1.69	37.16% local
2003	90,861.00	338,067.00	1.00:3.72	21.18% local
2004	169,115.00	395,697.00	1.00:2.34	29.94% local
2005	380,729.00	808,281.00	1.00:2.12	32.02% local
2006	302,954.00	757,737.00	1.00:2.50	28.56% local
Total	**1,180,000.00**	**2,738,188.00**	**1.00:2.32**	**30.12% local**

As far as can be ascertained, little can be shown for the $1.1 million spent over the first 3-4 years of the project. However, expenditure since then has been effective and efficient, has contributed to the project Objectives and has been good value for money.

3.3   Stakeholder participation

The ProDoc is not strong on stakeholder participation, there is no stakeholder participation plan, and consideration of stakeholders and beneficiaries is covered in one small paragraph. There is no indication of the extent of stakeholder participation in the design and formulation of the project which is known to have been considerable. The ProDoc notes that "*the project involves multiple partners and beneficiaries, including policy makers, government institutions, traditional leaders (Baitos), fishing communities, the private sector, and other community members. Partner agencies for conducting the activities include relevant line ministries and other government institutions. Furthermore, community groups such as fishing co -operatives and women's groups will be involved in all aspects of the project*". However it does not identify the relationship that the listed stakeholders will have with the project.

It is likely that participation by stakeholders in project implementation was meant to be satisfied primarily through the active role that was to be given to key government institutions. The prime beneficiaries and stakeholders are the leadership and staff of the Ministry of Fisheries which is the designated implementing agency for the project. Staff of the Ministry have been involved in the project to the absolute maximum and have shown true ownership of the project. The Ministry has also provided a large number of staff on secondment, full or part time, to the project and this has had mutual benefits. Other key stakeholders are those Government organizations represented on the PCC, the Technical Committee and similar bodies.

The evaluator suspects that similar active participation by community members (who are major stakeholders) was not considered. In the original LogFrame, Immediate Objective 2 does mention Baitos and community groups as targets for awareness raising; and "community liaison centres" are

mentioned in one Output. Immediate Objective 4 also mentions "participatory management programme" but it is not clear about participation by whom. In the revised LogFrame, the reference to "Baitos" and "community liaison centres" is dropped.

There is no doubt that the project has undertaken a substantial amount of work with communities. Socio-economic surveys have been carried out, awareness raising programmes have been implemented, information has been shared, and there is a plan to assist one community through the provision of water storage tanks. All this is excellent work and good for public relations. However, having invested in the communities, the project needs to devise ways and means of capitalizing on its investment and providing the opportunities for communities to participate meaningfully in decision-making on resource use. Imparting information and raising awareness is not enough, and it certainly not what is meant by "participation". Participation is a two-way relationship.

The evaluator recommends that the project, as part of its exit strategy, develop a community participation strategy as part of the ICAM process. The strategy should acknowledge that coastal communities are the *de facto* owners of the resources that ICAM aims to manage and that MPAs aim to protect and as "owners" they must be part of the decision-making. It should ensure that traditional rights are safeguarded and that benefits are shared equitably.

3.4   Monitoring and evaluation

3.4.1 Project performance monitoring and adaptive management

Monitoring of the ECMIB project is a joint responsibility of project management, the Ministry of Fisheries as Executing Agency, and UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. Provisions for project performance monitoring are covered in the ProDoc through the standard arrangements which include:
- Initial tripartite planning meeting at the beginning of the project
- Annual tripartite review meetings thereafter starting within the first 12 months of full implementation and where possible held in co -ordination with and incorporating the substantive monitoring and review mechanisms
- An independent mid -term evaluation of the project approximately mid -way through the project
- A final independent evaluation at the end of the project

The ProDoc also commits the Ministry of Fisheries to prepare the following:
- An initial "inception report" which will describe the plans for the first year of the project and will be presented at the first review meeting noted above
- A standard annual PPER report in preparation for each TPR
- Annual GEF PIR (Project Implementation Review) reports
- A "terminal report" on the 5-year project period to be presented at the final tripartite review meeting as noted above

Strictly speaking, these do satisfy the requirements of UNDP and GEF. However, this sort of monitoring is felt to be mostly mechanical and not analytical enough to inform project performance assessment and adaptive management. In particular, the annual nature of the listed monitoring elements is not able to provide project management with an effective tool for adaptive management. Neither is there recognition of the valuable role that the PSC can play in monitoring project performance.

The evaluator notes that it is not enough to monitor – there must be a commitment to do something with the results of monitoring. Monitoring records departures from the baseline as well as trends away from or towards established targets. An analysis of the data obtained from monitoring can be used to predict and forecast outcomes, and corrective action (adaptive management) can be implemented before problems become irreversible. For this to be effective it needs to be carried out

more frequently than once a year and provide more in-depth analysis. In fact, the evaluator was advised that in addition to the monitoring provisions in the ProDoc, daily desk monitoring, field monitoring, and regular financial analyses on a quarterly basis were also carried out and contributed to project performance and adaptive management. It is recommended that these be recognized as the most valuable monitoring tools for adaptive management.

3.4.2 The Logical Framework Matrix and outcome indicators

The project LogFrame is arguably the most important single tool for adaptive management. It provides a summary of the project scope and elements. It provides Indicators to be assessed as a measure of progress towards the Objectives and it notes the risks and assumptions recognized by the project designers. Monitoring against the LogFrame is an effective way of gauging project progress. However, effective project management requires that the LogFrame itself remains sufficiently "alive" and subject to fine-tuning to reflect changing circumstances, experience gained, and shifts in priorities. Revisions of the LogFrame are a good manifestation of adaptive management. As far as the evaluator can ascertain, the ECMIB original LogFrame from the ProDoc was revised in June 2004 following the PCC meeting and as part of the response to the MTR and again at the end of 2006 (and referred to as the Implementation Plan and Status, end 2006).

In the revision, the Development Objective remained unchanged but the Indicators were changed into somewhat more quantifiable parameters. However, the evaluator believes that even the revised Indicators are not reflective enough of the intended thrust of the Development Objective. This is discussed further in section 4.1.1 below.

Each of the four Immediate Objectives was changed. Some of the changes are merely a tightening of the wording and this is an improvement. However, other changes are more substantive. For example, changes to the wording of Immediate Objective 3 shifted the emphasis from the development of a management framework to the developing of policies and the implementation of ICM approaches. This is quite a significant change and the evaluator considers it an improvement on the original – it is a good example of adaptive management.

The wording of Immediate Objective 4 was also changed significantly. The emphasis of the original wording was on the development of a participatory management programme. The new wording is much broader and encompasses three distinct, albeit related, focuses – an MPA network, a species conservation programme and exotic species management. The evaluator does not see this change as an improvement. It is too broad and ambitious and this seems to have been borne out by events (see discussion below in section 4.1.2).

Not only was the wording of the Immediate Objectives changed, so were the Indicators. The changes to the Indicators for Immediate Objective 1 are not considered necessarily an improvement. The new Indicators for Immediate Objective 2 are definitely worse than the originals. As noted in the discussion below, the new Indicators do not measure the Objective whereas the old ones did this a bit better. The original Indicators for Immediate Objective 3 were far more in number than the revised cluster. This reduction in number creates a better focus and is considered as an improvement. The significant changes in Immediate Objective 4 are reflected in the new Indicators. The evaluator does not find these new Indicators as helpful to assess whether progress has taken place towards this Objective; but this is mainly because of the broad scope of the Objective.

4   FINDINGS: RESULTS AND IMPACTS

4.1   Results achieved

In recognition that the MTR carried out a thorough evaluation of progress over the first few years of the project, and in the belief that there is nothing to be gained by repeating this, this evaluation has concentrated on the results that have been achieved since the MTR according to the revised LogFrame.

4.1.1   The Development Objective

The Development Objective as proposed by the ProDoc did not change following the MTR, namely -
> *To ensure the conservation management of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity*

The evaluator finds this Development Objective as somewhat uninspiring. It is also difficult to assess progress towards it.

The key words in this statement of intent are "*ensure*" as the operative word and "*management*" as the object. It is very difficult to be certain about "ensure", how do you measure it? And, the attainment of "management" does not in itself guarantee that resources have been conserved. It would have been more direct and more pithy to have adopted as a Development Objective something like –
> *The conservation of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity*

In an attempt to measure progress towards the Development Objective, the project adopted two Indicators according to the revised LogFrame dated June 2004. These were increased by a further four indicators by the APR/PIR 2006 which appear to be an attempt to retrofit indicators based on newly adopted Outputs (and considered as adaptive management). In the following table, which lists the Indicators and records progress as reported by the APR/PIR 2006 which is the latest available, the evaluator comments on progress.

Table 3.   Progress towards the Development Objective according to Indicators

INDICATORS OF PROGRESS TOWARDS DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE (as in revised LogFrame and as added to by the APR/PIR 2006)	PROGRESS AS REPORTED IN THE APR/PIR 2006	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
Stable or improving status of vulnerable and threatened species and habitats in the Eritrean CMI environment	- Basic data through rapid assessment for 80% of the coast and 70% of the 350 islands. - Accurate data on biodiversity are collected allowing proposal for conservation	The Indicator as formulated is very difficult to ascertain. The progress that is reported does not relate to "stable or improving status".
Existence of management areas (Marine Protected Areas and Integrated Coastal Management Areas) with legal basis and functioning management.	- Sheik Seid Island Administrative documentation delivered to the Minister of Fisheries, reviewed by Ministry of Justice and ready for declaration. - Dissei Madote Islands Management Plan under preparation with stakeholder participation. - 15 priority sites identified for biodiversity	This is a clear indicator and although the target is not quantified, it can be measured. The reported progress is confirmed.
Coastal policy prepared and adopted	Coastal Policy approved by stakeholders and to be adopted by the Government soon	This is not an Indicator, it is an Output but progress has certainly been made.
Preparation of an integrated coastal area management plan with legal basis	- ICAM plan draft under preparation, with guidelines for activities	This is not an Indicator, it is an Activity/Output and some progress has

and proposed administration body	- Legislation to be prepared with definition of the implementing administrative body	been achieved.
EIA process implemented for any coastal and marine project	Active cooperation with multiple stakeholders (environment, land, tourism, public works, transport - communications) for preparing EIA studies and implementing EIA national procedures	The Indicator requires implementation of EIA for <u>any</u> project. According to the reported progress, the Indicator has not been satisfied.
National capacity enhancement and Sustainability	- From different ministries and administration, in house (by 5 trainers in 2006) and abroad training (23 participants in 2006) provided to national staff (junior and senior) including study tours and conferences. - Ministry of Fisheries has allocated permanent and part time staff to the project.	This Indicator is difficult to measure meaningfully, particularly how do you measure "sustainability". The training reported is acknowledged as significant enhancement of capacity. The reported allocation of staff to the project is not necessarily a measure of capacity enhancement.

Based on the above, it can be said that progress towards the Development Objective, according to the adopted Indicators, is satisfactory. Since "conservation" implies a need for sustainability, if the project develops an effective exit strategy that strengthens the chances of its products being sustainable, progress towards the Development Objective could be considered as highly satisfactory.

4.1.2 Immediate Objectives and Outputs

The following table provides an analysis of results achieved and progress reported towards the Immediate Objectives and Outputs as in the revised LogFrame.

Table 4. Progress towards project Objectives and Outputs as reported by the Project Team together with comments from the evaluator

PROJECT ELEMENT/COMPONENT	PROGRESS TO DATE	
	ACCORDING TO PROJECT TEAM	**EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS**
Immediate Objective 1: Up-to-date biodiversity information is used in CMI planning and management activities	Sound base established: stakeholders participation, ICAM policy & legislation, ICAM planning guides, etc	Objective targeted an ecosystem information management system and proof that it is being used effectively. The system can be considered as established, its use is gathering momentum. Objective mainly achieved.
Output 1.1. Baseline biodiversity and socioeconomic information gathering completed and made available in priority CMI areas.	Data collected from 95% of the coast and 80% of the islands, to be stored (database) and analysed end of each mission. Partly used by stakeholder	Data gathering successful; availability and use not yet fully achieved
Output 1.2. Literature base on CMI resources and management expanded	Library operational with 1000 books and 500 electronic documents	Very good result. Output achieved
Output 1.3. Operational Geographic Information System established	Fully operational, no operator since March 2007. Looking for cooperation	It cannot be claimed to be operational without an operator and without the necessary resources.
Output 1.4. A 'State of the Coast' report summarizing the current state of knowledge of Eritrea's CMI environment produced and disseminated	Produced with the participation of key stakeholders and forwarded for approval and printing.	Report produced and awaiting printing and distribution – almost achieved.
Output 1.5. Monitoring programs established in Priority Areas	Baseline for most of the coast and islands (see 1.1) Monitoring sites established for coral reefs, birds and turtles	The baseline is a very good start, but where is the programme? What is the monitoring strategy? Output not yet achieved.
Output 1.6. CMI biodiversity information widely available for use in relevant sectoral planning and activities in Priority Areas	Database under final construction. Data properly stored to be included. Preliminary data analyses done and used	Partly achieved – the ultimate target is the availability of info for use in planning.

	by some sectors.	
Immediate Objective 2: Awareness increased at all levels (community groups, managers, administrators, and private sector) of the need for, the benefits of, and mechanisms to sustainably use and manage Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity resources	Implemented to a satisfactory level	This is hardly a report on progress. The Outputs may have been obtained, but how did the project measure an "increase" in "awareness" at "all levels"? Strictly speaking, the Objective may not have been achieved as targeted. However, awareness is known to have been increased – see the discussion below
Output 2.1. A CMI awareness action plan produced.	Overall, annual and quarterly plan, revised on need	This is not an Output but an Activity. Not sighted by evaluator, but assumed to have been produced.
Output 2.2. Awareness materials produced and disseminated, as described in the Action Plan	Implemented, permanently going on	Some good awareness materials examined. Output achieved.
Output 2.3. International Awareness of Eritrea's biodiversity values increased	Implemented-high visibility of the project and the country achieved (website, conference, international requests for information or participation)	The project has provided proof that this output has been achieved.
Immediate Objective 3: Policies for ICM programs developed and ICM approaches implemented in priority areas	ICAM Policy and relevant legislations prepared , expected to be approved before end of the 2007	Good result, the objective mainly achieved in spite of shortcomings at the outputs level.
Output 3.1. Effective co-ordination and participatory involvement mechanisms for coastal, marine and island biodiversity planning and management in ICM Priority (pilot) Areas.	Policy, legislation and planning guides prepared with the full participation of stakeholders.	This output was targeting the development of mechanisms for coordination and participatory involvement, not policy and legislation and planning guides. Output not yet achieved.
Output 3.2. Sectoral studies on development impacts on CMI biodiversity and living resources produced, to inform development of CMI-EIA guidelines, and ICM committee activities	Draft sectoral development plans included in the ICAM planning guide, ICAM expected to have a coordinating body report to the highest government organ	The output targeted studies on impacts, the project delivered development plans. Output not yet achieved.
Output 3.3. CMI EIA Guidelines Developed	Draft EIA prepared and in use.	If the Guidelines are in draft, should they be "in use"? When will they be adopted? However, since guidelines developed, Output has been achieved.
Output 3.4. Coastal, Marine and Island (CMI) Development and zoning plans developed and implemented for priority areas	Implementation in priority areas basically south of Massawa including the islands, to start in September	Plans not sighted by evaluator. It would be wise to defer implementation until Authority is operational – legal basis does not exist yet. Output partly achieved.
Output 3.5. Development of coordinated exit strategy, to be carried out by ECMIB and UNDP, overseen by PCC	ICAM is the basis for new activities, not an exit	This statement does not report on progress towards an exit strategy. Is there any intention of achieving this output?
Immediate Objective 4: A core of a national MPA network and species conservation programme established, and management of exotic species improved	Within ICAM, all territorial waters and watersheds are considered a multiple use management area. Inside, a protected areas network is under identification including Sheikh Seid Island for education and public awareness, Dissei Madote as managed resources protected area and Buri Peninsula/Hawakil Islands as a huge National Park. Multiple other sites identified for one or multiple biodiversity interests.	The objective envisaged a network of MPAs, plus a species conservation programme, plus improvement of exotic species control. According to this note the project has focused only on one output – see below. According to the reported progress, Objective only partly achieved.
Output 4.1. Three contrasting Coastal, Marine & Island Protected Areas (MPAs) established at Green Island (Sheikh Seid), Dissei-Madote and Ras Fatuma.	See previous	Good distinction for 3 different pilot MPAs. Output achieved.

Output 4.2. Guidelines for a national network of MPAs developed, and endorsed by stakeholders	To be implemented through ICAM as agreed by stakeholders	The output target was a set of guidelines first and endorsement by stakeholders next. Implementation was not a target. Output may yet be achieved but time is running out to obtain endorsement by stakeholders (including coastal communities).
Output 4.3. Strategy for sustainable financing of MPAs in Eritrea developed and implemented	Part of the process. Options for local funding have been explored. Protected areas will need a phase with external funding.	More work required on this with some lateral thinking. Involve finance and revenue sectors of Government. Output not yet achieved.
Output 4.4. Species conservation plans and programs established, for marine turtles and dugong	Implemented for Marine Turtles through IOSEA LOU, under preparation for dugongs through same regional organisation	Good progress achieved. The output will be achieved.
Output 4.5. Improved management and control of alien species in the CMI environment	Preliminary meetings and lectures organised, responsibility of the Ministry of transport and Communication, Department of Maritime transport and Port Authority Massawa and Assab	The output required improved management and control, the project delivered meetings and lectures. Output not achieved and unlikely to be achieved as targeted.

The following table is a summary of the extent to which the four Immediate Objectives have been achieved with comments by the evaluator.

Table 5.   Summary of the extent to which the four Immediate Objectives have been achieved

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE	EXTENT OF ACHIEVEMENT	EVALUATOR'S COMMENT
Immediate Objective 1: Up-to-date biodiversity information is used in CMI planning and management activities	Partly achieved	One Output is fully achieved and all the rest are partly achieved. This Objective is expected to be achieved by the time of project closure.
Immediate Objective 2: Awareness increased at all levels (community groups, managers, administrators, and private sector) of the need for, the benefits of, and mechanisms to sustainably use and manage Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity resources	Uncertain whether it has been achieved as targeted	The three Outputs under this Objective have by and large been achieved and yet the Objective itself does not appear satisfied. Reference to the Indicators is not conclusive since they target the Outputs (process) rather than the Objective (product).
Immediate Objective 3: Policies for ICM programs developed and ICM approaches implemented in priority areas	Achieved	One Output achieved; two are partly so; two are not yet achieved but are expected to be by the time of project closure.
Immediate Objective 4: A core of a national MPA network and species conservation programme established, and management of exotic species improved	Partly achieved	One Output has been achieved and two are on the way; one other Output may be achieved but time is running out. The final Output is unlikely to be achieved as targeted by the time of project closure.

The project has been clearly successful with regards to Objectives 1 and 3. Objective 4 is unlikely to be achieved fully since it was a very ambitious objective but good progress has been made. Objective 2 is an enigma – the Outputs have been achieved, but it is not certain whether the Objective has been achieved. This is thought to be due to the poor selection of indicators. The indicators required should be able to answer the question "has awareness been increased?"

It is recommended that the project instigate a new activity under Objective 2, comprising an awareness and attitude survey of key stakeholders. This could use a questionnaire for some stakeholders, anecdotal evidence for others and visits and discussion groups with judicious questions

for some others such as coastal communities. If results indicate, as expected, that awareness has been increased, Objective 2 can be added to those considered to have been successfully achieved.

In conclusion, by the time of project closure it is likely that two of the four Immediate Objectives would have been fully achieved, one may be achieved but this is not certain, and the last one is likely to be only partly achieved. Overall achievement of the Immediate Objectives is considered to be between satisfactory and highly satisfactory.

4.2   Project impacts

4.2.1 Global environmental impacts

By virtue of where it is being implemented, the benefits accruing from this project have a global dimension. The high degree of endemism (highest of any oceanic water body in the world), the rich diversity of some groups (richest diversity west of Indonesia) and its most interesting geological features, make the Red Sea truly unique ecologically – if these species and ecosystems cannot be protected here, they cannot be protected anywhere else, and the project has initiated the protection process.

According to the ProDoc, quoting UNEP and IUCN[9] among other authorities, the extensive areas of coral reef, seagrass and mangroves of the Eritrean coastal environment, support globally important biological diversity. More than 250 species of reef fish from 49 families and 110 marine and shore bird species from 41 families have been recorded. The approximately 210 islands of the Dhalak Archipelago support globally significant breeding populations of turtles and dugongs as well as breeding, nesting and wintering sites for European, African and Asian migratory birds. Healthy relict populations of Eritrea's larger wildlife species, *e.g.* gazelle and wildass have also been found in the coastal and island areas.

The global significance of ECMIB benefits is indisputable.

4.2.2 National level impacts

At the national level, the project will leave behind a very valuable legacy to the Government and people of Eritrea – an effective, balancing mechanism through which to obtain the maximum benefit from the coastal environment, with the minimum impact, on a sustainable basis = ICAM.

As part of the package, the project has had a significant impact on the capacity to manage coastal resources, including a significant parcel of new data, information and knowledge. It has also established a consensual and collaborative institutional framework within which various sectors including government, private and community can come together and target the common good. The time frame within which this has been achieved makes it a particularly impressive achievement. Finally, the project leaves behind a heightened awareness and sensitivity, at various levels, of the values and vulnerabilities of Eritrea's Red Sea coastal resources.

---

[9] UNEP/IUCN (1988) *Coral Reefs of the World. Volume 2: Indian Ocean, Red Sea and Gulf.* UNEP Regional Seas Directories and Bibliographies. IUCN, Gland and Cambridge, UK/UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya., 389 pp.

5 FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY

5.1 Institutional sustainability

The institutional and systems benefits of the project have been discussed elsewhere in this report. They are considered sound and with a good exit strategy should be sustainable. The basis for this assumption is the widespread sense of ownership and commitment that the evaluator has met with in all Government officials he has consulted. Right from HE the Minister of Fisheries down, there is no hesitation in affirming the Government's commitment to the continuation of the good work of the project. The Minister went so far as to say that he was against the use of the phrase "exit strategy" because as far as he was concerned there will not be any exit, there will be continuation.

Another feature which augurs well for the sustainability of the gains made by the project is the high degree of secondments that have been made from the Ministry of Fisheries to project positions. When the project closes at the end of the year, these staff will be re-absorbed into the Ministry and essentially continue doing what they were doing in the project.

A further project achievement which points towards institutional sustainability is the package it has prepared for Integrated Coastal Area Management. This package which comprises policy, legislation, procedures, etc, has been adopted by the Minister of Fisheries, who has forwarded for endorsement to the executive level of Government. A formal proclamation is expected before project closure.

The evaluator concludes that all indications are in favour of sustainability of the project benefits.

5.2 Financial sustainability

Institutional sustainability provides the mechanism for the continuation of project activities but it does not make them happen. It is the financial resources that will enable them to be operationalized. And, ownership and commitment also mean responsibility on the part of the Government. Government funds are limited and it remains to be seen whether and to what extent the institutional commitment is complemented by the commitment of financial resources.

While it is reasonable for the Government to expect assistance to continue the good work of the project, it cannot rely on such assistance in the long term. Management of coastal resources must be accepted as a core Government function with at least basic funding being available from central budgetary allocations. This is not necessarily "new money", but could be the result of a reallocation of priorities, recognizing the all-round gains and savings for the economy that a well-managed coastal environment should be able to bring.

In addition, the ICAM operation has good potential to be self-funding to a great extent and the project will need to explore such mechanisms as part of its exit strategy. A wealth of experience exists from other countries, including some from within the region, who have applied ICAM successfully and for whom it is virtually a self-funding operation.

5.3 Knowledge management

Part of the legacy of the project is the impressive cache of data, information and knowledge that it has generated and accumulated (see Annex 8 for a list of the key publications of the project), the reference materials in the library that it has established, the website it has set up, and the network of contacts and sources it has acquired.

The project has also set up the systems for managing this valuable resource, particularly its database on a GIS platform.

It is essential that the project prepare the way for the handing over of this asset to <u>trained</u> individuals who will manage and augment it for the benefit of all who live and work on the coast. Work towards this aim has already started and will be completed during the exit strategy.

5.4   Exit strategy

The ECMIB project is unusual in that it has a specific Output in its LogFrame (Output 3.5) devoted exclusively to the development of an exit strategy. Unfortunately, there are no Activities indicated for this important Output and the evaluator encourages project management to plan for (including budgetary resources) and identify such Activities as soon as possible.

The hope of HE the Minister for a seamless transformation from project activities to activities of line ministries of Government, is shared by the project (see Annex 9), but whatever the action is called there must be a phased, structured close-down of the project comprising:

- a managed handing-over of the various functions of the project (such as policy and legislation drafting initiatives, survey work, etc)
- a rational handing-over of the archives, office templates, software and similar assets
- a rational allocation of physical assets, office as well as field, with recognition and receipts from the recipient entity
- an exchange of appreciation and commitment letters, especially from organizations beyond the Ministry of Fisheries
- more work on the financial sustainability of both the ICAM process and the MPA system (without <u>relying</u> on fines and penalties as a source of income)
- an assessment of individual staff performance leading to an acknowledgement and reference which they can take with them in their next career move
- an effective knowledge management system, including the capacity and capability for its management and application
- a more inclusive approach to communities – with meaningful participation (not just information and awareness)

These and similar actions will enhance the prospects for sustainability of the valuable products of the project.

5.5   Replicability and follow-up

5.5.1 Replication

When the project ends in December 2007, it is everybody's hope that the work will continue. The project has laid the foundations and tested approaches on a pilot basis, for various mechanisms and tools required for coastal resources management. Its work is therefore just the beginning and without continuation and replication, the benefits will not survive.

It is therefore necessary to replicate the work that has been done particularly in terms of coastal survey, identification and establishment of MPAs, collaboration and generation of consensus among stakeholders, species protection plans, etc. This work needs to be replicated up and down the Eritrean Red Sea coast.

However, in addition, there is good potential for the models and approaches that have been tried successfully by the project in Eritrea, to be replicated elsewhere within the Red Sea basin and outside. In addition, the process applied by the project for the establishment of the ICAM system, and particularly its success in reaching consensus among disparate Government agencies, has good potential for replication in similar situations outside Eritrea.

5.5.2 Follow-up project

While the project and the Government are restricted in what they can do towards replication outside Eritrea, they are in a good position to influence what goes on within the country and there are substantive plans being drawn up by the Government with the collaboration of the project.

As noted above, it is to be expected that according to the Government commitment, the work started by the project will continue. However, even when the Government formally recognizes that ICAM is a core function which should be within the mandate of an existing or new agency, it will be some time before the necessary resources can be made available, and an even longer time before a degree of self-funding can be attained. The Government also recognizes that even when the system is more or less running on its own, there will always be the need for outside assistance with particular elements of the process such as further ecological survey work, specific parcels of expertise and know-how, piloting of new approaches to ICAM, etc.

In the short term, the Government requires support to continue developing the ICAM system until such time as it can run it on its own. This support will ensure that the investment made by UNDP and the GEF through ECMIB, will be safeguarded. The Eritrean GEF Operational Focal Point advised the evaluator that the Government considers ECMIB as a successful project and sees GEF support for a follow-up activity as a priority. Moves are already underway to develop the concept for such further assistance from GEF under the RAF for Eritrea. In order to make sure that the momentum generated by the project is not lost, the minimum requirement is for modest assistance until such time as more structured support is obtained from the GEF or elsewhere. It would be prudent to plan for this assistance to be available for 18-24 months and comprise a total of about US$1.0 million.

The Objective of such assistance would be the strengthening of the foundations for ICAM, including a PA network, laid down by the ECMIB.

Among the Outputs that could be considered, are the following:
- Development and formulation of project concepts and proposals for resource mobilization
- Extension of ecological survey work started by ECMIB
- Consolidation of the GIS database and rendering it operational
- Structured monitoring of ecological and socio-economic parameters
- Support for the establishment of approved MPAs (legal, planning, management, funding)

Given the serious commitment by Government towards the rational management of the Eritrean coastal, marine and island environment and the protection of its biodiversity, and the strong foundation laid by ECMIB, it is imperative that the momentum is maintained. The proposed assistance will enable this.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and recommendations have been drawn throughout this report. They are restated together here in order to facilitate follow-up action.

6.1 Project concept and design

The project design is basically sound and its structure is logical. It is well laid out and in general it is easy to follow. As the STAP Review said at the time *"the project has been carefully put together"*. It set out to establish protected areas on a strong basis as a means of protecting biodiversity, according to the practice prevalent at the time.

The Development Objective is considered weak and uninspiring and better attention to the wording could have created a more direct and pithy long term target.

However, the biggest criticism of the project design could probably be levelled at its failure to recognize the real extent of the weak in-country capacity, having identified this as a risk.

6.2 Project governance

In the absence of adequate capacity, there was a need for a strong and supportive framework for the project management team, with clear lines of accountability, continuous monitoring and reporting, guidance and support. Unfortunately, this does not seem to have been the case.

The role of the Project Steering Committee (referred to as the Project Coordination Committee) appears to have been misunderstood, even by the Technical Management Review. The prime role of this committee is to steer and guide the project, hence its name – Project Steering Committee – it is not intended to coordinate or implement the project.

It is strongly recommended that for future projects with a significant budget (say, over $100,000) and timescale (say, over 24 months), a Project Steering Committee is established with a clear mandate to guide and support the project.

6.3 Project management

The current senior management level of the project, comprising the NPM and the TA, has established an effective partnership based on sharing and cooperation and has certainly produced results. It appears based on the fact that the two incumbent individuals are mature, knowledgeable and experienced and, more importantly, work well together, complementing each other's strengths.

But it has not always been like this and this is not a relationship that can be taken for granted. The ability of one to be able to work with the other is of paramount importance in the selection process.

One aspect of project management which requires attention is staff supervision and guidance. Project management must provide more leadership, team cohesion, vision, guidance, mutual support, encouragement and recognition, feedback, meaningful participation in project administration and management.

Monthly staff meetings are recommended, with encouragement to staff to schedule field work so as to allow participation at least every 2 months. Annual performance assessment for all project personnel should also be carried out. This includes the TA and the NPM who should be assessed by UNDP.

6.4   Achievement of targeted outputs and objectives

Development Objective

With the current wording of the Development Objective it is not easy to determine whether progress has been made towards it. However, according to the adopted Indicators, Progress can be deemed to have been satisfactory. Furthermore, since "conservation" implies a need for sustainability, if the project develops an effective exit strategy that strengthens the chances of its products being sustainable, progress towards the Development Objective could be considered as highly satisfactory.

Immediate Objectives

The project has been clearly successful with regards to Objectives 1 and 3. In spite of good progress, Objective 4 is unlikely to be achieved fully since it was very ambitious in the first place. Objective 2 is an enigma – the Outputs have been achieved, but it is not certain whether the Objective has been achieved. This is thought to be due to the poor selection of indicators which should be able to answer the question "has awareness been increased?" It is recommended that the project instigate a new activity under this Objective, comprising an awareness and attitude survey of key stakeholders. If results indicate, as expected, that awareness has been increased, Objective 2 can be added to those considered to have been successfully achieved.

In conclusion, by the time of project closure it is likely that two of the four Immediate Objectives would have been fully achieved, one may be achieved but this is not certain, and the last one is likely to be only partly achieved. Overall achievement of the Immediate Objectives is considered to be between satisfactory and highly satisfactory.

6.5   Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring as planned by the ProDoc does satisfy the requirements of UNDP and GEF. However, this sort of monitoring is felt to be mostly mechanical and not analytical enough to inform project performance assessment and adaptive management. In particular, the annual nature of the listed monitoring elements is not able to provide project management with an effective tool for adaptive management. Neither is there recognition of the valuable role that the PSC can play in monitoring project performance. However, in addition to the monitoring provisions in the ProDoc, daily desk monitoring, field monitoring, and regular financial analyses on a quarterly basis were also carried out and contributed to project performance and adaptive management.

While current monitoring is satisfactory, recognition of the quarterly progress reports and their use to record departures from the baseline as well as trends away from or towards established targets, will lead to corrective action (adaptive management) before problems become irreversible.

6.6   Financial management

As far as can be ascertained, little can be shown for the $1.1 million spent over the first 3-4 years of the project. However, expenditure since then has been effective and efficient, has contributed to the project Objectives and has been good value for money.

6.7   Stakeholder participation, community empowerment

The project has undertaken a substantial amount of work with communities including socio-economic surveys, awareness raising programmes, the sharing of information and even assistance to one community through the provision of water storage tanks. This is excellent work and good for public relations. However, having invested in the communities, the project needs to devise ways and means of capitalizing on its investment and providing opportunities for communities to participate

meaningfully in decision-making on resource use. Imparting information and raising awareness is not enough, and it certainly not what is meant by "participation". Participation is a two-way relationship.

As part of its exit strategy, the project should develop a community participation strategy as an important element of the ICAM process. The strategy should acknowledge that coastal communities are the *de facto* owners of the resources that ICAM aims to manage and that MPAs aim to protect and as "owners" the communities must be part of the decision-making. It should also ensure that traditional rights are safeguarded and that benefits are shared equitably.

6.8   Capacity building and other Project impacts

The greatest impact of the project at the national level has been the level of capacity building it has achieved both formally and informally, and coastal management in Eritrea is all the richer for it. The beneficiaries have been mainly from the Ministry of Fisheries but other bodies responsible for coastal management have also benefited.

One further conclusion is that the sponsoring of doctorate fellowships as a means of capacity building by a project which is meant to last five years is a waste of money. The sponsoring of masters fellowships is feasible but marginally so. It is recommended that in the light of this experience, UNDP should review its policies on training, particularly fellowships, and apply them judiciously so as to obtain the utmost benefit for projects and their objectives.

It is too early to assess global environmental impacts of the project that will accrue by virtue of where it is being implemented. The high degree of endemism (highest of any oceanic water body in the world), the rich diversity of some groups (richest diversity west of Indonesia) and its most interesting geological features, make the Red Sea truly unique ecologically and of clear global significance – if these species and ecosystems cannot be protected here, they cannot be protected anywhere else and the project has initiated such protection.

6.9   Sustainability

The institutional and systems benefits of the project are considered sound and with a good exit strategy should be sustainable. The basis for this assumption is the widespread sense of ownership and commitment that the evaluator has met with all Government officials he has consulted. Right from HE the Minister of Fisheries down, there is no hesitation in affirming the Government's commitment to the continuation of the good work of the project. The Minister went so far as to say that he was against the use of the phrase "exit strategy" because as far as he was concerned there will not be any exit, there will be continuation.

Another feature which augurs well for the sustainability of the gains made by the project is the high degree of secondments that have been made from the Ministry of Fisheries to project positions. When the project closes at the end of the year, these staff will be re-absorbed into the Ministry and essentially continue doing what they were doing in the project.

The ICAM institution has also the potential to achieve financial sustainability and the project will need to explore such mechanisms as part of its exit strategy. A wealth of experience exists from other countries, including some from within the region, who have applied ICAM successfully and for whom it is virtually a self-funding operation

The project has also set up the systems for sustainably managing the valuable data and information it has acquired, particularly its database on a GIS platform. It is essential that the project prepare the way for the handing over of this and related assets to <u>trained</u> individuals who will manage and augment it for the benefit of all who live and work on the coast. Work towards this aim has already started and will be completed during the exit strategy.

These and similar actions will enhance the prospects for sustainability of the valuable products of the project.

6.10   Exit Strategy

The project has a specific Output in its LogFrame (Output 3.5) devoted exclusively to the development of an exit strategy but there are no Activities indicated. Project management is encouraged to plan for (including budgetary resources) and identify a cluster of Activities towards a phased, structured close-down of the project. This should comprise: a managed handing-over of the various functions of the project, a rational handing-over of the archives, office templates, software and similar assets, a rational allocation of physical assets with recognition and receipts from the recipient entity, an exchange of appreciation and commitment letters, more work on the financial sustainability of both the ICAM process and the MPA system, an assessment of individual staff performance leading to an acknowledgement and reference which they can take with them in their next career move, an effective knowledge management system, a more inclusive approach to communities – with meaningful participation (not just information and awareness)

6.11   Replicability and follow-up

Even when the Government formally recognizes that ICAM is a core function which should be within the mandate of an existing or new agency, it will be some time before the necessary resources can be made available, and an even longer time before a degree of self-funding can be attained. In the short term, the Government requires support to continue developing the ICAM system until such time as it can run it on its own. This support will ensure that the investment made by UNDP and the GEF through ECMIB, will be safeguarded. In order to make sure that the momentum generated by the project is not lost, assistance is required for a period of 18-24 months totalling around US$1.0 million.

6.12   Experience gained and lessons learnt

Of the numerous experiences generated by the project that are worth recording, the following are considered the five most salient ones:

A participatory approach overcomes the cynicism and suspicion often felt by line ministries when the development of ICAM is led by an existing ministry. True participation also results in ownership arising out of the various collective decisions that have to be taken.

It is comparatively easier to identify and address capacity needs of a technical nature; conversely, managerial, leadership and management capacity is harder to assess, but it is even more important for project success.

A good, collaborative relationship between the NPM and the CTA is probably the most important single element of project management – it can make or break the project.

National Execution (NEX) of projects must be preceded by a capacity needs assessment and the identified needs must be addressed before NEX can be expected to function successfully.

Adequate time and resources for inception, setting-up, and similar pre-operational phase activities of a project are crucial, particularly where capacity is known to be weak.

ANNEX 1   Evaluation Terms of Reference

I. Introduction:
The Conservation and management of Eritrea Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (ECMIB) project was originally a 5-year initiative of the Government of the State of Eritrea funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and executed by the Ministry of Fisheries (MoFish). The Project Document was signed by Ministries of Fisheries and Macro Policy and International Cooperation (now Ministry of National Development) and UNDP/GEF in December 1998. Delayed implementation has led in approval to extend the project to 9 years in the 2003 and 2006 TPR meetings.

The project is designed to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of the globally significant biodiversity of the State of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island (CMI) ecosystems. These are currently threatened by the rapid expansion of fisheries, tourism, and other developmental activities. The ECMIB Project is engaged to support the sustainable development of Eritrea's CMI resources through a participatory management framework; establishment of conservation areas and species protection programs; an operational information system; and increased public awareness of the needs and benefits of CMI biodiversity.

The ECMIB project encompasses four principal components to achieve its overall objective with subsequent immediate objectives:
(1) Building a CMI Information System: establish a system for ensuring that up-to-date biodiversity information is used in all CMI planning and management activities,
(2) Awareness of Biodiversity value: increase at all levels awareness of the need for sustainable management of Eritrea's coastal marine and island biodiversity resources,
(3) CMI management Framework: develop a comprehensive integrated and participatory management framework for the conservation management and sustainable development of Eritrea's coastal marine and island biodiversity, and,
(4) Conservation of special habitats and species: develop and implement a participatory management program for critical conservation area, and for habitats and species of special concern outside conservation areas.

This biodiversity project falls within GEF Operational Programme No.2: Coastal Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. It promotes the conservation and sustainable use of the globally important biodiversity of Eritrea's coastal, marine and island ecosystems in the Red Sea. In addition the project enables Eritrea to respond to a number of international conventions and agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), CITES or RASMAR.

II. Objective and Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation
The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:
i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E.

In accordance, all full and medium-size projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of Evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation and on completion of the Project.

The overall objectives of this Terminal Evaluation (TE) are to:
9. Assess overall performance and review progress towards the project's objectives and outcomes, including efficiency and effectiveness);
10. To critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation;
11. Assess the sustainability of results achieved;
12. Provide recommendations that could have increased the likelihood of success;
13. Provide recommendations on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature
14. Identify, document and disseminate widely the successes, challenges and lessons learned;
15. Advise on activities for a transition phase, replication strategy and ongoing sustainability of the ECMIB initiatives after December 2007;
16. Assess the need for possible future GEF assistance and provide guidance for future GEF interventions in the biodiversity conservation.

III. Lessons Learned
In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio. Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
- Country ownership, initiative and leadership;
- Community level assessment and participation at all stages of the project cycle;

- Communications approaches and strategies and their impact on behavioral change and raising awareness at all levels - both in country, regionally and international;
- Regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
- National cooperation, intra government cooperation, and other project management initiatives;
- Stakeholder participation (at the project site, regional and national levels);
- Adaptive management processes;
- Efforts to secure sustainability after December 2007;
- The role of M&E in project implementation and as required by GEF guidelines.

IV. Format
The Report of the TE will be a stand-alone document, not exceeding 50-70 pages that substantiate its recommendations and conclusions. The Report should be targeted at meeting the evaluation needs of key stakeholders (GEF, UNDP, Ministry of Fisheries)

V. Scope
The three main elements to be evaluated are Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness.

Project Delivery
The TE will assess to what extent the ECMIB has achieved its immediate objectives? It will also identify what outputs, impacts and results have been produced and how they have enabled to achieve its objectives? The section will include an assessment of the following priority areas:

1. Institutional arrangements
- Strategic planning, preparatory work and implementation strategies,
- Consultative processes,
- Technical support,
- Capacity building initiatives,
- Project outputs,
- Assumptions and risks, and
- Project-related complementary activities.

2. Outcomes/ Results and Impacts:
- Efficiency of all project activities under the four major components,
- Progress in the achievement of immediate objectives (level of indicator achievements when available).

3. Partnerships
- Assessment of national-level involvement and perceptions,
- Assessment of local partnerships, and involvement of other stakeholders,
- Assessment of regional collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations.

4. Risk Management:
- Were problems/constraints, which impacted on the successful delivery of the ECMIB project identified at project design and subsequently as part of the Mid term Evaluation (MTE)?
- Were there new threats/risks to project success that emerged during project implementation?
- Were both kinds of risk appropriately dealt with?
- Are they likely to be repeated in future phases?
- Were recommendations arising from the MTE addressed?

5. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
- Assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the project implementation.
- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project and how was this developed?
- Is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- Has M&E been used as a management tool in directing project implementation in a timely manner and ensuring on-going participation at all levels?
- Is this framework suitable for replication/ continuation for any future Project support?

Project Implementation
Review the ECMIB management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost-effectiveness. This includes:
1. Processes and administration:
- Project-related administration procedures,
- Milestones, (Log-frame matrix)
- Key decisions and outputs,
- Major project implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful, and
- Processes to support national components of the Project.
2. Project oversight and active engagement by the following agencies:

- GEF; UNDP
- Participating country mechanisms (Tri Partite Review TPR, Project Coordination Committee PCC)

3. Project execution:
- MoFish as the Executing Agency (under the UNDP National Execution NEX modality)

4. Project implementation:
- UNDP as the Implementing Agency

Project Finances

How well and cost-effective did financial arrangements of the ECMIB worked? This section will focus on the following three priority areas:

1. Project disbursements.
- Provide an overview of actual spending vs. budget expectations:
- With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "directly" in-country against total funds spent
- With appropriate explanation and background provide a breakdown of the ratio of funds spent "indirectly" in-country (i.e. external consultants and regional training) against total funds spent, and
- Critically analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.

2. Budget procedures
- Did the Project Document provide enough guidance on how to allocate the budget?
- Review of audits and any issues raised in audits; and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations;
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

3. Coordinating mechanisms
- Evaluate appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between national agencies, UNDP and the GEF.
- Does the ECMIB approach represent an effective means of achieving the objectives?
- How can the approach be improved?

VI. Methodology

The TE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, visits to selected sites, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including (but not restricted to): UNDP/GEF, line ministries and communities.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:
- Desk study review of all relevant ECMIB documentation;
- Massawa and Asmara based consultations with UNDP, the TPR and PCC.
- Visits to specific sites as feasible within budgetary and timeframe constraints.

VII. Final Products

The Terminal Evaluation report will include:
- An executive summary of the findings and conclusions in relation to the issues to be addressed identified under sections II and III of this TOR;
- Assessment of gaps and/or additional measures needed that might justify future GEF investment in the Eritrean CMI environment
- Guidance for future investments (mechanisms, scale, themes, location, etc), and
- A summary of lessons learned from the Project.

The Draft report will be submitted to ECMIB and UNDP Mid September 2007 just before the end of the mission in Eritrea.
The Final report, based on comments received by end September 2007.

The final report will be formally presented to the TPR/Final Steering Committee by a representative of UNDP. It will be also forwarded to the GEF for review and extraction of the broadly applicable lessons by the Independent M&E Unit.

The reviewers will provide ECMIB and UNDP with an electronic copy of the draft and final reports at the time of their submission.

VIII. Reviewer Attributes

Team Leader and UNDP/GEF M&E Specialist (international):
- Academic and/or professional background in both academic and institutional aspects of biodiversity conservation projects. A minimum of 15 years relevant experience.
- An understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits.
- Experience in the monitoring and evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and donors.

- Experience in the monitoring and evaluation of GEF-funded international waters and/or biodiversity conservation projects.
- Demonstrated experience in institutional analysis.
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions.
- Excellent facilitation skills.

Biodiversity Conservation Specialist (national)
- Academic and professional background in biodiversity conservation with demonstrated practical experience in participatory processes and socioeconomics preferably in Red Sea environments;
- An understanding of GEF principles and expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- An understanding of participatory approaches and practices in the natural resource area and able to engage in a participatory way with all stakeholders
- A minimum of 10 years relevant work experience;
- Experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects; an understanding of UNDP and GEF activities;
- Skills and experience in ICAM-related processes and projects;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills, and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

IX. Tentative Schedule

PERIOD	ACTION
Early June 2007	Calls for Request for Proposal
First week July 2007	Selection of Reviewers
End August – beginning September	Evaluation Mission
First week of September	Presentation draft report (Asmara)
Third week of September	Submission of all comments
End of September	Final report to UNDP-ECMIB
FOLLOW UP BY ECMIB UNDP	
Mid October 2007	TPR meeting
Mid December 2007	Final report

IX. TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE

Executive summary
- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context
- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions
- Project formulation
  - Implementation
  - Stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Indicators
- Implementation
  - Delivery
  - Financial Management
  - Monitoring and evaluation
  - Execution and implementation modalities
  - Management by the UNDP country office and other partners
  - Coordination and operational issues
- Results
  - Attainment of objectives
  - Sustainability

- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for consideration in future projects
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

ANNEX 2   Mission Schedule

TERMINAL EVALUATION – UNDP/GEF PROJECT - CONSERVATION-MANAGEMENT OF ERITREAN COASTAL, MARINE AND ISLANDS BIODIVERSITY PHILIP TORTELL – SCHEDULE		
Sun 08		Formal start of contract from Homebase – Assignment planning, Schedule of work, Initial briefings (electronic, Skype, etc), First contact (electronic) with national consultant Documents and websites review Adopt report framework, Division of duties
Mon 09		
Tue 10		
Wed 11		
Thu 12		
Fri 13		
Sat 14	0900 1400 2335	d. Wellington a. Auckland 1000 d. Auckland a. Singapore 2035 d. Singapore
Sun 15	0255 1740	a. Dubai d. Dubai transit Djibouti ; a. Asmara 2205
Mon 16	0830 0900 1100 1500 1630	UNDP: Mr Isaac Habte, Programme Associate – initial briefing UN Security: Mr Kahase Taddese – Security briefing UNDP: Res Rep Mr Macleod Nyirongo; Dep Res Rep Mr Bartholomew Nyarko-Mensah ; Programme Specialist Mr Yoseph Admekom Ministry National Development: Dr Girmai Abraham, Senior Economic Advisor Ministry Fisheries: HE Dr Ahmed Haj Ali, Minister
Tue 17	0900 1400	Depart Asmara for Massawa by road ECMIB Project Manager, TA and Staff
Wed 18	0800 1100 1700 1900	Ministry Fisheries: DG Fisheries Resources Management: Mr Andom Gebretensae, DG Tewelde Woldemichael Dept Environment: Mr Aman Salah Massawa Ports Authority: Afeworki Tesfarion, General Manager Min Fisheries: Awet Yemane, Head Fisheries Training Centre
Thu 19	0800 1030 1200	National Youth Organization Massawa Municipality Engineer ECMIB Local Expert – Sammy Mahmud
Fri 20		Meetings with ECMIB Management and Staff Mr Kaleab Negussie, National Project Manager Mr Alain Jeudy de Grissac, Technical Advisor Mr Sammy Mahmud, Conservation Specialist Mr Dawit Semere, Conservation Unit Mr Yohannes Teklemariam, Conservation Unit Mr Mehari Tewelde, Sociologist Ms Minia Woldai, Sociologist Mr Abraham Teclemariam, Accountant/Assistant Administrator Ms Virginie Tilot de Grissac, Marine Survey Consultant
Sat 21	0700	Travel back to Asmara. Start drafting
Sun 22		Drafting
Mon 23	1500	Meet: DG Environment and GEF Op Focal Point, Mr Mogos Woldejohannes Meet: Zoba Coordinator, Ibrahim Hassan, National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students
Tue 24	1500	Drafting of Report Meeting UNDP
Wed 25		Drafting of Report
Thu 26		Project Manager + Alain Jeudy, et al arrive in Asmara Drafting of Report
Fri 27	0900	Presentation of the Draft Report to PSC and UNDP
Sat 28		Final drafting of the Draft Report
Sun 29	1000 2000	d. Asmara; transit Djibouti; a. Dubai d. Dubai
Mon 30	0730 2135	a. Singapore d. Singapore
Tue 31	1120 1430	a. Auckland d. Auckland NZ; a. Wellington 1530
Wed 01-Fri 10 Aug		Period for comments and submissions on the Draft Evaluation Report
Sat 11 - Mon 13 Aug		Revision of Draft from Homebase – Taking into account comments and submissions received
Tue 14		Dispatch of Terminal Evaluation Report

ANNEX 3   Documents reviewed

The evaluator was offered, and requested, a number of documents. Some of these were simply sighted, others were reviewed more deeply. The salient ones that were reviewed are the following:

Raynes, Peter, Chief Technical Advisor (August 2000) *ECMIB Inception Report*. Ministry of Fisheries, Asmara

Anon (June 2006) *The Evaluation Policy of UNDP*. Item 15 of the provisional agenda of the 2006 annual session of the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Anon (August 1998) *Project Document: Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity*. United Nations Development Programme, Asmara

Anon (January 2005) *National Execution (NEX) Guidelines*. United Nations Development Programme, Asmara

Anon (2002) *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results.* United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, New York

Wells, Sue and Magnus Ngoile (2004) *Final Report to UNDP of Mid-Term Review*. Conservation and Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island (CMI) Biodiversity Project, Asmara

Njeru, Alphan (2004) *Technical Management Review Report*. Eritrean Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (ECMIB) Project. PricewaterhouseCoopers Limited, Nairobi

ECMIB Project Management (various dates) *Tripartite Review Meeting Minutes* for 2003, 2004 and 2007. Ministry of National Development, Asmara

UNDP/GEF (various dates) *Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Report (APR/PIR)* for 1999, 2002, 2003 and 2005, 2004 and 2006. UNDP/GEF Biodiversity

ECMIB Project Management (various dates) *Project Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes* for 2001, 2005 June and November.

ECMIB Project Management (various dates) *Project Technical Committee Meeting Minutes* for 2005 March and October.

The Project website, http://www.eritrearedsea.org/ was also reviewed

ANNEX 4   Persons consulted

United Nations (UN) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Mr Macleod Nyirongo, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative
Mr Bartholomew Nyarko-Mensah, Senior Deputy Resident Representative
Mr Yoseph Admekom, Programme Specialist / Manager Energy and Environment
Mr Kahase Taddese, UN Field Safety and Security Coordination Assistant
Mr Isaac Habte, Programme Associate Environment
Mr Alan Rodgers, UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator for Biodiversity

Ministry of Fisheries
HE Mr Ahmed Haj Ali, Minister of Fisheries
Mr Andom Ghebretinsae, Director General
Mr Tewelde Woldemichael, Director General
Mr Awet Yemane, Head Training and Research Centre

Ministry of National Development
Mr Girmai Abraham, Senior Economic Advisor to the Government of Eritrea

Department of the Environment
Mr Mogos Wolde-Yohannes, Director General and GEF Focal Point
Mr Aman Saleh, Massawa Branch Office

Eritrea Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity (ECMIB) Project
Mr Kaleab Negussie, National Project Manager
Mr Alain Jeudy de Grissac, Technical Advisor
Mr Sammy Mahmud, Conservation Specilaist
Mr Dawit Semere, Conservation Unit
Mr Yohannes Teklemariam, Conservation Unit
Mr Mehari Tewelde, Sociologist
Ms Minia Woldai, Sociologist
Mr Abraham Teclemariam, Accountant/Assistant Administrator
Ms Virginie Tilot de Grissac, Marine Survey Consultant

Ministry of Transport and Communications
Mr Afeworki Tesfatsion, Chairman Massawa Port Authority

National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students
Mr Ibrahim Hassan, Local Coordinator Northern Red Sea Region

Massawa Municipality
Mr Tesfaldat Afeworki, Municipal Chief Engineer

College of Marine Science and Technology
Dr Zekeria Abdulkerim Zekeria

Dissei Village, Dissei Island
Mr Mohamed Osman, Baito

Ministry of Justice
Mr Amanuel Yohannes, Head Northern Red Sea Region Court

ANNEX 5   Management response to reviews of the project

a) Response to the Mid-Term Review

RECOMMENDATION BY THE MTR	PROJECT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
Option 1. A 3-4 month period (e.g. until the end of June) during which significant changes are made and demonstrable progress made in resolving the obstacles to implementation. These changes would include:	
☐☐TPR to approve Mid-Term Review recommendations	Presented in 2004, no serious comments
Management audit undertaken	Undertaken in April May 2004
Appoint new staff and UNVs	Yes, except national information office recruited end 2004
☐☐Hold training workshop on planning, reporting and M&E	In Massawa in July 2004
Revise log-frame and work plan for 2004, and prepare M&E plan with indicators; hold PCC to finalize log-frame, work plan and M&E plan and ensure that all stakeholders fully understand the objectives of the project	Attempts made by but not as required and within the time frame. Objectives understood by stakeholder but log-frame not fully. Validity of new log-frame June 2004 could be discussed as not approved by TPR or GEF
UNDP to improve project oversight, delegating day-to-day management activities to additional staff as necessary	Lack of personnel with relevant expertise in UNDP, recruited UNV then local expert as project focal point, partly funded by project (totally in 2007) even if only 65% of time allocated to project and most of the time less than target
Improve office management – repair broken equipment, purchase new equipment, re-instate weekly meetings etc	Done, but not within the given time frame, is now a standard procedure of the office
☐☐Data collection and planning for a 'State of the Coast' report	Started in 2005 by stakeholder under project guidance, final draft sent for approval (official censorship by Ministry of Information) before printing
Survey work started in selected coastal sites in Massawa area (sites located, methodologies identified, personnel determined, training undertaken)	500 man days but mainly after July and TA departure under the responsibility of the UNV Conservation
Methods for biodiversity monitoring programmes determined	Discusssed and coherent with international and regional standards
Clarify remaining PhD and MSc support	One Phd support cancelled, the other funded until 2006 but progress and reporting not satisfactory. No support for 2007.
Option 2. The TPR should review progress made in early July 2004. If this is not satisfactory, UNDP/GEF should consider:	
Immediate closure	Not accepted, not even considered by PCC and TPR
Subject to GEF approval, redesign of the project as a medium-sized project (max $1 mill), focusing on one major activity and appropriate capacity building, which if appropriate could incorporate a technical assistance agency such as IUCN or WWF to provide backstopping capacity and to help with project implementation arrangements	In 2005, the approach changed from species and habitat conservation to coastal zone management including multi sectoral activities with potential impacts and protected areas as one sector of activity
6.1.1. Revision of Project Logframe	
The revised log frame should be discussed and approved by stakeholders at a workshop. Suggested revisions were described earlier in section 4, and are summarised here: The log frame was revised in June 2004 *Component 1. Building a CMI Information system*	
☐☐Replace national biodiversity survey with area-specific surveys with clear objectives (e.g. areas selected for local ICM programmes, MPAs) (*TA and NSC to identify methods, select sites etc*)	From 2005 till now, surveys were conducted all along the coast (90% coverage) and for 290 islands of the 354 (80%) allowing to focus on specific sites according to their specific or multiple interests, setting up the basis for a national protected areas network. At the same time the ICAM approach was developed to control and manage all activities, present and future
Collate and analyse existing data to prepare a national 'State of the Coast' report aimed at	Conducted in 2005 and 2006 with sectors documents prepared by relevant stakeholders or

providing all stakeholders with an understanding of the current status of knowledge about the coast, its economic and scientific importance, the key threats, and the current socio-economic, legislative and governance context. (*TA and NSC*)	by selected experts when necessary. Activity coordinated by the Technical Committee, progress slow but final product ready for printing pending authorisation
Develop and implement monitoring programs initially for specific areas being surveyed, using simple methods appropriate to capacity and skills of those involved (*TA and NSC*)	Methodology according to international and regional standards, with up to date technology and specific training when possible. Monitoring sites in place for coral reefs, birds, marine turtles, mangroves and seagrasses.
Retain activities relating to training, development of a reference collection, supporting the GIS Unit, but define these more precisely	Training on going process. Reference collection under construction for coral reefs and sea grasses/seaweeds
Component 2. Awareness-raising	
Publish and disseminate the 'State of the Coast' report, and prepare the website	2007 Launch of the web site (hosted abroad due to national restriction) 2007 print of state of the coast pending censorship authorisation (problem of maps)
Prepare leaflets, posters etc for tourists	Permanent activity, numerous documents available, some new ones under production
Carry out awareness raising seminars for key decision makers on coastal management issues e.g. tourism study visit, highlighting fisheries over-exploitation issues	Awareness raising started mid 2004 and progressed well, in particular after the training session of end 2005 on public awareness, and the preparation of an overall plan including activities already under development and new ones. The plan has been fully implemented and even more in 2006 and 2007. Numerous workshops, general and targeted seminars , newsletters, articles, TV and radio broadcast focusing mainly on the tow Red Sea regions, youth and students.
Prepare educational materials for schools (rather than attempting full integration of CMI information in school curriculum)	Educational material on the marine environment has been prepared, accepted by the Ministry of Education & used starting from the 2006 school year. In addition, contests (quiz) were organised for middle & high schools in Massawa (3), Assab (2) and Asmara (1).
Component 3. Integrated Coastal Management framework	
Establish a national ICM committee (may evolve from project committees)	ICAM Committee established end 2005 and working effectively since with numerous meeting including 11 plenary sessions
Carry out sectoral studies (as planned)	Stakeholders have prepared their sectoral studies to be used for ICAM, Conservation and socio economic Unit of ECMIB conducting numerous surveys (coast and islands) to identify biodiversity hotspots.
Develop a national ICM policy and draft legislation	ICAM Policy adopted by stakeholders and sent for approval. Legislation prepared and in final draft before transmission to Ministry of Justice
Initiate local ICM programs in Massawa and Assab	Priority zones, on going activities in the two cities, Massawa to Hawakil priority zone more advanced
Assist EIA Unit to prepare coast-specific guidelines and support EIA implementation	Unit for EIA established in the project and reacting more than being proactive. Guidelines to be prepared are the responsibility of each sector and have been introduced in the ICAM guidance manual
Complete component to provide support to relevant PhD and MSc courses	One Phd support cancelled, the other funded until 2006 but progress and reporting not satisfactory. No support for 2007. No MSc could be planned during the 2005-2006 period due to national restriction for travelling abroad
Replace development of a *financing* strategy with development of an *exit strategy*	At the present stage and considering the results of the project, the government is not considering and exit strategy but a continuation of the project, looking for option from different funding sources
Component 4. Habitat and Species Protection	
Focus MPA activities on establishment of one or two MPAs in the Massawa area (e.g. Green I., Madote/Dissei Is) as demonstration sites	1.In 2005 Green Island was studied, management plan prepared and legislation in draft was sent and reviewed by the Ministry of Justice. Pending declaration 2. In 2006 Dissei Madote Islands management plan was prepared after numerous surveys including conservation, socio-economic and EIA units. Final document under preparation

	after stakeholders consultation
Continue support to proposed Buri Peninsula Conservation Area (e.g. design of marine management area)	2007 following discussion, MoFish and MoA joint marine and terrestrial protected area covering Buri Peninsula and all Hawakil Islands approved by the two ministries and to be submitted to GEF for $1.00 million funding through the Department of Environment GEF focal point
Establish turtle conservation program at Ras Fatuma and establishing an MPA	End 2005, Government of Eritrea (MoFish) has signed the IOSEA memorandum of understanding on marine turtles. The signature was followed by the preparation of a National Action Plan for Marine Turtle Conservation including education, public awareness and conservation at key sites. Efforts end 2006 and 2007 focusing on Southern Red Sea Region and the Ras Fatuma and Berasole sites.
Maintain low-level work on exotic species (ballast-water, aquaculture, mangrove restoration) primarily as awareness raising - e.g. production of publicity materials, guidelines etc	This activity is under the responsibility of the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Department of Maritime Transport and Port Authorities of Massawa and Assab. Lectures and advices were provided and strong recommendations for Eritrea to join the Law of the Sea Convention will really assist in this topic when processed.
6.1.2. Initiation of specific activities that will demonstrate clearly and quickly the value of the project to Eritrea	
Activities should be selected from the provisionally revised log-frame for immediate implementation, to demonstrate the value of the project in ensuring sustainable development of the country. The Minister of National Development stressed that the project needed to do this as a matter of urgency. Even quite small activities could have a major impact if highly visible	In addition to the national level efforts, specific activities carried out in Dahlak Hotel, Cause way construction and oil spill from scrap recovery, Tio Tourist Village, removal of oil leaking ship near Green Island and Dahlak Island Development project. In addition to ICAM as a main focus, all these activities have shown the importance of the project
6.1.3. Establish good working relationships with existing partners, and initiate partnerships with other key agencies	
The project Document envisages that a number of agencies will be involved in the implementation of the project, given the broad range of topics to be addressed which go beyond the mandate and capacity of any single government agency. Activities that can be implemented by partner agencies should be identified as soon as possible (i.e. during the revision of the log-frame). Organizations involved in implementing project activities should have clearly defined roles and responsibilities, laid out in TORs or agreements	Giving specific activity to a stakeholder proved unrealistic given the capacity limitation; but activities carried out in cooperation and most cased full participation of key stakeholder. In particular for the State of the Coast, their input was important. See also the list of participants in ICAM meetings, PCC, PTC, study tour, in situ training, etc.
6.1.4. Follow up on international linkages that have been made to ensure that these result in action	
This should be carried out as discussed in section 5.9.	Links with Persga, IUCN, Birdlife, IOSEA, EEAA Egypt, Reef Check,….
6.2. Recommendations relating to project management *6.2.1. Carry out a management audit of the project*	
This would clarify NEX procedures and determine whether they have been correctly implemented so far. It could also clarify roles and implementation mechanisms, for the main agencies involved in the project, and recruitment issues; define and review government in-kind contributions and secondment of staff vs project recruitment; and review procedures for performance evaluation and human resource management	Management review carried out but little of the MTR recommendations assessed and elaborated. Government contribution has been identified and supporting documents prepared. Secondment of staff is operational full time or part time. National procedures are followed for recruitment, evaluation and incentives.
6.2.2. Resolve outstanding human resources issues	
1. Recruit national project staff and UNVs immediately	Implemented
2. Ensure that all staff have letters of appointment and appropriate TORs (as required under UNDP procedures), and understand what their future employment prospects are when the project ends (this will differ for seconded government staff and those directly hired by the project)	Job description prepared and given with letter of employment. Letter of employment clearly defines conditions of employment. Basically governed by applicable national rules and regulations
3. Ensure that the line managers for each individual are clearly identified and establish a method for performance appraisals	Line management established. Each individual has TORs, Performance appraisal according to government procedures (NEX)
Specific recommendations for the three key project staff (NPM, NSC and TA) are as follows:	

NPM to manage the project proactively in such a way that the technical and scientific work is facilitated. It must be fully understood that unless this happens, implementation of the project activities will continue to be delayed and the project risk closure. Immediate activities for the NPM are outlined under 6.2.4	All possible done to facilitated technical and scientific activities, as far as communications channels were open
NSC, in addition to working with TA on activities listed above, to prepare the personal action plan as required by the training course he attended in Sweden and to put this into action. The MTR team discussed with the NSC how he might do this (information on this available from his trip report to Sweden)	NSC left the project early 2005, finding replacement well acquainted with objectives and activities was not easy. In replacement, the NSC is working with TA.
TA to focus on technical work as outlined in his TOR; in particular he should:	
Complete the revision of the logframe, – identify activities to be carried out first, then responsible organisations/partners/individuals, then timing and budget line, and only subsequently re-adjusting activities to fit any limitations in resources and capacity	Basis Peter Reins in 2000; slightly revised in June but not rigorously as guide for implementation and recommended by TPR and MTR. All adhered to log-frame in basic project document. No review after June 2004
Prepare a draft annual work plan in collaboration with other project staff and key stakeholders	Basis Peter Reins in 2000; slightly revised in June 2004 but not rigorously as guide for implementation and recommended by TPR and MTR. All adhered to log frame in basic project document. Annual work plan is mandatory for each unit, compiled by the management
Develop preliminary plans, based on current best scientific knowledge and practices, for (a) survey work, including methods (b) focused long-term biodiversity monitoring programmes (c) development of national and local ICM processes (d) establishment and management of MPAs	Since 2005 ICAM is the umbrella plan, with annual work plan and quarterly for each unit. Permanent improvement and refinement for each topic
Ensure that the Project office has access to key current scientific and management documents	Library operational since mid 2005 with now 1000 documents and numerous electronic reports and documents (purchase and donations)
☐☐Work with the NSC on a daily basis to build the capacity of the latter in the above activities	NSC has left early 2005 and work is processed daily with all units
6.2.3. Establish and ensure appropriate functioning of oversight committees	
1. Establish PCC: ensure full understanding of TOR and roles of members by all; initiate regular 6-monthly meetings (or more frequently if necessary); consider carefully whether this body may be the appropriate one to evolve into a national ICM steering body	PCC established composed of key stakeholder, regularly meet, at time monthly. In 2005 every three moinths, in 2006 2007 through ICAM steering committee from all concerned stakeholders
2. Establish lower level technical committee – Core Planning Team for Implementation – assuming this is necessary; a careful evaluation of its role and functioning in relation to the PCC is required and TOR should be developed	Project technical Committee established early 2005 and working well, nearly monthly meeting in 2005, in 2006 and 2007 all involved in ICAM meetings
6.2.4. Implement appropriate procedures in Project office	
1. Quarterly and annual work plans and reports to be prepared on a regular, timely basis and must be of an appropriate quality (meeting the requirements in the UNDP/GEF guidelines).	Reporting as follow since 2005: 1TPR January February, 2.PIR/APR June, Internal monthly or quarterly update. Update for the Ministry on request (full project or topics), Unit reports for each mission and summary report once a year (under preparation for 2007).
2. Purchase necessary new equipment and repair broken equipment	Since 2005, prepared by the TA following unit requests.
3. Re-introduce weekly staff meetings with immediate effect	Regular meeting with full staff difficult due to field missions, occasional meetings realised when necessary, open door for NPM and TA for any discussion/topic. Staff participating to PTC and PCC when invited to present reports or findings
4. Introduce a system to record presence/absence from office; absence only granted under certain procedures (staff should not be spending time in Asmara except on approved project business)	According to Government procedures. Administrator keep record, authorisation for official trip. Difference between project and seconded staff and part time staff.
5. Consider introducing time sheets for staff to record their daily activities and achievements on a daily or weekly basis	Not in Government procedures, realised as far as possible but incomplete for support staff
6. Document in writing all events, decisions, meetings and discussions and ensure that	Improved but still needs refinement. Official documents recorded.

written documentation is filed and readily accessible	
7. Organise a 'library' for technical documentation, relevant papers, publications etc (e.g. Project does not have a copy of the fisheries legislation and many other docs)	Done sea above 6.2.2 documentation
8. Establish a project e-mail address for all formal correspondence, to ensure transparency in project tracking. An account name has been identified with the UNDP CO computer officer but has not been implemented. At present all staff have their own individual addresses, the cost being paid for by the project.	Not possible in the country, neither through UNDP for a NEX project. Recently as an option of the recently operational website (July 2007)
6.2.5. Improve project oversight and monitoring by UNDP Country Office	
1. UNDP CO to increase support to the project: Day-to-day management and oversight to be delegated to UNDP staff with more time to play an active support role, and undertake training and guidance; where changes are made in roles of staff in the project, the new functions and responsibilities must be clearly defined and understood by all players. Role of UNDP to be more clearly explained so that the issue of ownership of the project is clearer.	UNDP ready to cooperate and assist but cannot really help in details; it needs expertise that the UNDP cannot have for single project. For 2006 5 months and for all 2007, a full time UNDP staff is paid by the project (but allocated only 65%), mostly for administration (Travel authorisation/claim, security clearance, consultants,…) follow up financial aspects (payments and transfers), preparation and minutes of the TPR and revision of some documents.
2. UNDP CO to review quarterly reports and other materials submitted by the project, respond to these as necessary; require improvements to quality of reporting, make regularly visits to project office to assess technical progress as well as budgetary issues	Review not a priority Regular visit as per request or common issues to solve (inventory, finance)
3. Training workshop to be organised on project planning, reporting, management and evaluation for all Project staff, key UNDP staff and relevant partners; to include a half day session to explain UNDP and GEF procedures. M&E expert to be hired to do the training. The course should include explanation of the formats for annual plans and progress reports, review and revision if necessary of current quarterly planning and reporting system, training in preparing minutes of meetings, reports of field visits and other project events, hiring consultants and issuing contracts, and developing a filing and documentation system for the office	Implemented by UNDP in July 2004
4. Monitoring and evaluation plan to be prepared and implemented according to UNDP/GEF guidelines. The project document requires that 'appropriate impact indicators and procedures for their measurement and verification will be established under the relevant project components. These will include ecological, socio-economic and institutional capacity parameters'. This will need to be done with the revised log frame	APR/PIR prepared by project for technical aspects and by UNDP for financial aspects, according to GEF and UNDP format. Log frame results of the year provided for each TPR Technical: each unit reporting and TA and management reviewing.
5. Project team to be provided with all relevant guidelines (e.g. UNDP/GEF Information Kit on M&E) and sample work plans, monitoring plans, reporting formats etc. Although not an immediate priority, since there will be a further review (the final evaluation), the project team should learn what this involves and how to prepare for it and participate in it. This would include preparation of documentation and information about the project, provision of this to the review team in timely manner, pro-active assistance with the mission program etc	Guidelines and rules of procedures from UNDP, even if requested several times and for specific topics, have never been provided (consultants, training, travel, payments), purchase abroad. Each aspect discussed verbally and subject to discussion even inside UNDP. Only clear guidelines are coming from the security office with reminder for each change of security phase.

b) Response to the PricewaterhouseCooper Technical Management Review

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPER REVIEW	PROJECT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
Provide a comprehensive medical cover for all staff and their immediate dependants. Membership of the medical insurance cover should be compulsory unless the staff member can provide documentary evidence that he or she is covered under another scheme acceptable to the Project	1. Recommendation out of governing employment rules and regulations. 2. Medical insurance started late 3. Researchers ensured abroad for diving related illness
The PCC should develop an exit strategy for the Project to ensure smooth transition and sustainability of the Project initiatives	Since 2005, no exit strategy but ICAM approved by the PCC, TPR and all stakeholders to serve as the basis for future coastal and marine activities
Weekly meetings should be done with NPM leadership and issues that keep recurring and which are not actioned on should be resolved fast. Otherwise these should be referred to the PCC	For normal requests or emergencies the NPM has always been available for meetings.
Institute a leave policy and the manager should develop a leave schedule for all the staff working in the Project	Government leave policy applied for nationals. Given the nature of the work and weather of the areas leaves are always in July/August.
Ensure an appraisal system is in place to monitor staff performance vis a vis ToRs. The TA and NPM should be evaluated by the PCC and the evaluation should be pegged on their annual development plans derived from their ToRs	Assessment done but not on strict evaluation of the basis of TOR; the main job is a team work
Ensure a recruitment policy is in place specific for the Project that will ensure transparency, competence competitiveness, consistency and speedy recruitment	The project recruitment policy defines positions and TORs. Procedures followed by the project (NEX) in line with Government regulations
Equipment, particularly those of high value should be insured against such things as fire, theft or damage Ensure a framework for networking with a view of sharing information and experiences with national, regional and international groups is in place and adhered to	Vehicles ensured but not other items, no practice in government offices, project NEX. Insurance for staff was considered for diving and implemented from 2005. In 2007 the new boat was insured immediately
Ensure the institutional arrangements are well established and the role of each stakeholder is adequately documented and communicated. This could be in the form of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) that will guide the working relationship between the Project and the stakeholders	TPR, PCC, PTC, are the basic elements of the institutional arrangements. Special letter of understanding was prepared with the COMSAT (College of Marine Science and Technology, previously department of Marine Science of the University of Asmara. Similar LOU signed with international researchers willing to work with the project.
Ensure time bound action plan is prepared to implement recommendations of the PCC and TPR. This should indicate the responsible person(s) for each recommendation	Recommendation usually time bound and prioritised; usually given to a team because of the nature of the project.
The NPM should ensure outstanding recommendations from staff meetings are actioned on. Alternative strategies should be devised if recommendations are taking too long to implement	Initiated and prepared by each unit, submitted to NSC, TA and NPM, then processed after decision by the management
Ensure a format is in place for field visits to help monitor implementation activities	Field trip format is in use since second part of 2004. We also introduced DSA, other than minimal advanced, payment after the team produces field trip report
There should be an impact assessment framework for the Project . Impact assessment should be on a periodic basis	Done by regular reports, PTC, PCC, TPR, MoFish, UNDP and GEF
Ensure efficiency in Project use of resources. This can be achieved through effective monitoring and evaluation system by the PCC and UNDP. Technical monitoring should be primary and its success will depend on how well the NPM manages the Project	Technical monitoring is too broad but effective resources use monitoring by MoFish, UNDP, PCC and external auditors in place
A qualified accountant should be recruited to head the accounting unit. This accounts function should be appropriately overseen by the NPM with support from the UNDP office	Implemented, the administrator is in charge of accounts, inventory, financial reports and requests and staff.
Ensure the preparation of a detailed Project cash flow. The cash-flow statement is a	Implemented per UNDP requirements

document that models the flow of money in and out of the Project	
Maintain all records of direct payments from the Project by UNDP, UNOPS etc to ensure full financial control and accountability	UNDP effects payment when project presents direct payment request. Getting the final documents to project office still difficult
Ensure GoE contribution plan is in place and adhered to	Payment in kind, at the disposal of the project, as there is no cash flow, no need of time framed plan. Estimated submitted in 2005, new one under preparation.
A documented policy and format for recording lessons learnt from field activities should be in place	Lessons learned appears in all presentation to GEF and TPR
Ensure contract administration is open and all involving to assist all stakeholders buy in and own the process and the work products	Foreign contract per UNDP rules and regulations, local contract (employment) per Eritrean rules
The Project needs to urgently complete the revision of the log frame and embark on developing a detailed work plan for the year. This would then be used by management of the Project in developing a comprehensive procurement plan to ensure all goods and services required for specific activities as outlined in the work plan are procured in time	See comments on MTR on the issue
Fixed assets should be closely monitored by ensuring a laid down procedure for ascertaining existence of fixed assets e.g. periodic physical counts, which should be reconciled to the register and tagging of all fixed assets for identification purposes	Implemented and verified by external auditors, based on the administrator documentation. Purchase by UNDP is also controlled by UNDP
A complete fixed assets and reference materials register should be maintained	Implemented
A muster roll/payroll should be maintained and used whenever salaries and benefits to staff are paid. This should have details of the employee name, gross pay, statutory deductions, net pay and signature of the staff on receipt of the funds	Implemented by the Administrator
Management training should be as objective and participatory as possible to ensure management issues are addressed for the project to be effective and beneficial to Eritrea	Since 2005, Permanent through daily activities, specialised sessions and abroad
Ensure the NPM and the TA are engaged in a short training on Project management	Partly done by UNDP for all staff in July 2004
The PCC should meet and establish (with help of technical people) a monitoring an evaluation system to review performance of the Project. It should review progress every three months and hold the NPM and the TA accountable for Project implementation	PCC should be taken as representatives of stakeholders and overall monitoring organ and not technical. PTC monitors technical aspects
A comprehensive Project operations manual and an implementation plan should be developed specific for the ECMIB Project. This should incorporate best practices, GoE rules and regulations and the NEX guidelines. It should include financial and procurement procedures	Not done and not necessary as the project is already operational using GoE and UNDP regulations as applicable

ANNEX 6   Training abroad, study tours, workshops and conferences

YEAR	F U L L N A M E	EMPLOYER	FIELD OF STUDY/PURPOSE OF TRIP	OBJECTIVE	COUNTRY	DURATION (DAY)	EST. COST, USD	R E M A R K S
2003	Biniam Asfaha	ECMIB	Sustainable Coastal Development	3	Sweden	30	2480.00	Left January 2005
2004	Abraham Feseha	MoFish	Sustainable Coastal Development	3	Sweden	30	2840.00	Left, November 2004
2005	Dr. Zekaria Abdulkerim	MoFish	International Coral Reef Sympos.	1-4	Japan	20	5579.00	Dean of COMSAT College
2005	Biniam Asfaha	ECMIB	Annual Sea Turtle Symposium	1-4	USA	13	5296.00	Left January 2005
2005	Sammy Mahmud	ECMIB	Annual Sea Turtle Symposium	1-4	USA	13	5301.00	ECMIB
2005	Dr. Frank Hobbs	ECMIB	PERSGA	1-2	Egypt	7	1595.00	UNV, left, end of contract
2005	Dr. Frank Hobbs	ECMIB	PERSGA	1-2	S. Arabia	8	1838.00	Left, end of contract
2005	Legesse Abraham	ECMIB	PERSGA	1-2	S. Arabia	8	1838.00	Left in April 2007
2005	Mohamednur Ahm	MoFish	PERSGA	1-2	S. Arabia	8	1838.00	MoFish
2005	Yohannes T/mariam	MoFish	Marine Turtle Biology Conservation	1-4	Cyprus	14	5367.00	MoFish, seconded to ECMIB fully
2005	Simon W/yohannes	MoFish	Marine Turtle Biology & Conservation	1-4	Cyprus	14	5367.00	MoFish, seconded to ECMIB partially
2005	Dr. Steffen Howe	ECMIB	Australian Coral Reef Society Conference	1-2-3-4	Australia	25	9912.67	AVOS &UNV, end of contract
2005	Sammy Mahmud	ECMIB	Australian Coral Reef Society Conference	1-2-3-4	Australia	25	9912.67	ECMIB
2005	Henok Bereket	MoFish	Australian Coral Reef Society Conference	1-2-3-4	Australia	25	9912.67	Left the country
2005	Seid Mohamed	MoFish	Africa GIS Conference	1	S. Africa	8	5734.00	MoFish,
2005	Legesse Abraham	ECMIB	Africa GIS Conference	1	S. Africa	8	5734.00	ECMIB
2006	Ismael Mussa	MoFish	Fishing and Marine Turtle Workshop	2-4	Oman	7	2112.00	Head of NUEYS in SRS Region
2006	Tekle Mengistu	MoFish	Fishing and Marine Turtle Workshop	2-4	Oman	7	2112.00	MoFish
2006	Minia Welday	ECMIB	Community Based Marine Turtle Conservation Training and Tour	1-2-3-4	Sri Lanka	25	4420.00	ECMIB
2006	Yohanes T/mariam	MoFish	Community based Marine Turtle Conservation Training and Tour	1-2-3-4	Sri Lanka	25	4420.00	ECMIB
2006	Dawit Semere	MoFish	Conservation, MPA & Development	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	MoFish,seconded to ECMIB FT
2006	Legesse Abraham	ECMIB	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	Left the in April 2007
2006	Salah Idris	MoFish	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	ECMIB
2006	Yosief Hiyabu	MoFish	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	MoFish, partially ECMIB
2006	Yonas Afewerki	MOFish	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	Same as above
2006	Amanuel Yemane	MOFish	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	Same as above
2006	Ghezae Zersenay	Tourism	Same	1-2-3-4	Egypt	15	3958.00	Left Tourism
2006	Seid Mohammed	MOFish	Environmental Policy & ICAM	3	Netherl.	38	20295.00	MoFish
2006	Sammy Mahmud	ECMIB	Environmental Policy & ICAM	3	Netherl.	38	20295.00	ECMIB

2006	Izedin Mohamed	MoFish	Environmental Policy Course EIA	3	Netherl.	20	12421.00	ECMIB
2006	9 PCC Members	Stakehold	Study Tour and Discussions	1-2-3-4	Egypt	10	21636.00	
2006	Seid Mohammed	MoFish	Marine Conservation work Shop	2-4	U.A.E	7	3910.00	MoFish
2006	Sammy Mahmud	ECMIB	Marine Conservation work Shop	2-4	U.A.E	7	3910.00	ECMIB
2006	Yohanes T/mariam	M oFish	Marine Turtle Incidental Catch	1-4	Mayotte	10	10310.00	MoFish, fully seconded
2006	Simon W/Yohanes	MoFish	Marine Turtle Incidental Catch	1-4	Mayotte	10	10310.00	Left Mofish in April
2006	Izedin Mohamed	MoFish	ICAM Training & Tour	2-4	China	50	540.00	Left MoFish
2007	Dawit Semere	MoFish	Sea Birds Symposium	4	Italy	7	5823.00	MoFish, fully seconded
	GRAND TOTAL					**622**		

ANNEX 7   International consultants

TOPIC	NAME	OBJECTIVE	TIME ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE	DAYS	EST. COST (USD)
1999-2003					
Capacity Assessment	Canadian Fisheries Co.Ltd (CFC		Not Available (N.A)	N.A	N.A (UNDP/UNOPS)
Mid term Evaluation	Sue Wells (UK)		November 2003	17	N.A, (UNDP.UNOPS)
	Magnus N'Goile			14	
Management Audit	Pricewaterhouse S .Mutunda	2	05 06 of 2004	20	N.A. (UNDP/UNOPS)
Management training	2 from UNDP, Tanzania	2	July 2004	20	N.A. (UNDP/UNOPS)
Marine Turtle Action Plan	Nicolas Pilcher (UK)	1-2-4	**04/10 – 13/10**	10	N.A. (UNDP/UNOP)
2005					
Information Training	Gwen VanBoven (Netherlands)	2	06/10 – 20/10	15	12,500
ICAM	Michel Pearson (Canadian)	2-3	02/11 – 24/11	23	25,300
Ecology (Geneal)	Andrew Price (UK)	1-2-4	21/11 – 01/12	11	14,000
Ecology (Coral Reefs)	Virginie Tilot (Belgium)	1-2-4	21/11 – 04/12	13	12,000
Marine Turtle Action Plan	Nicolas Pilcher (UK)	1-2-4	25/11 – 30/11	6	10,000
Marine Protected Areas	Khaled Allam (Egypt)	1-2-4	30/11 – 11/12	12	8,000
Information Mission 2	Gwen VanBoven (Netherlands)	2	05/12 – 15/12	15	12,500
Hyperbaric Chamber	Adel Taher (Egypt)	2	11/12 – 18/12	7	6,000
2006					
ICAM	Michael Pearson (Canada)	2-3	**30/01 – 21/02**	23	26,000
Remote sensing GIS	Rebecca Klaus (UK)	1-3	**29/03 – 12/04**	15	11,000
ICAM	Michael Pearson (Canada)	2-3	**12/04 – 27/04**	15	17,000
ICAM	Michael Pearson (Canada)	2-3	**12/06 – 24/06**	13	15,500
ICAM	Michael Pearson (Canada)	2-3	**06/09 – 20/09**	15	17,000
Ecology	Virginie Tilot (Belgium)	1-2-4	**02/09 – 16/09**	15	13,500
Ecology	Andrew Price (UK)	1-2-4	**05/09 – 24/09**	20	17,000
Remote sensing GIS	Rebecca Klaus (UK)	1-3	**27/09 – 11/10**	15	11,450
ICAM	Michael Pearson (Canada)	2-3	**29/11 – 12/12**	15	17,500
Ecology	Virginie Tilot (Belgium)	1-2-4	**13/11 – 06/12**	23	18,000
Ecology	Andrew Price (UK)	1-2-4	**21/11 – 06/12**	15	10,000
Marine Protected Areas	Khaled Allam (Egypt)	1-2-4	**29/11 – 13/12**	15	10,000
2007					
Ecology Sea cucumber	Andrew Price (UK)		**09/05 – 23/05**	21	21,000
ICAM	Michel Pearson (Canada)		**06/06 – 23/06**	21	16,600
Ecology Coral reefs	Virginie Tilot (Belgium)		**01/07 – 16/07**	20	16,000
Final Evaluation	Philip Tortell (New Zealand)		**15/07 – 29/07**	24	24,000
Coral reefs	Charlie Veron (Australia)		**09/2007**	25	28,000
GRAND TOTAL				**493**	

ANNEX 8   Main technical reports and documents produced by ECMIB 2005 – 2007 (as reported by Project management)

Education and Public Awareness Unit (EPA)
- Overall plan for EPA (and annual with quarterly detailed programme)
- Dagurnai newsletter
- Calendar 2006-2007 (2008 under preparation)
- Cursus on Marine Environment (teacher document and student document)
- Posters on environment, marine turtles and for special events
- Leaflets on Project, Green Island, Marine Turtles (under preparation for coral, birds, seagrass, mangrove and sea cucumber)
- Web site www.eritrearedsea.org
- Report of the consultant on Public awareness training (Gwen Van Bowen)
- Summary report 2007 on overall activities (draft)

GIS Unit
- Overall plan for GIS (and annual with quarterly detailed programme)
- Atlas of the Coast (under final preparation before printing)
- Status of mangrove of Eritrea (2006 update)
- Consultant report on GIS Unit status and development
- Summary report 2007 (to be prepared)

Conservation Unit (C)
- Overall plan for Conservation (and annual with quarterly detailed programme)
- Survey Methodology Manual
- Summary reports December 2005 for Coral, seagrass, mangrove, marine turtle and bird
- International publication on birds (final), mangroves (final) and marine turtles (draft)
- Summary report 2007 on overall activities (under preparation)
- Database on environmental assets of the Eritrean sea and coast
- Consultant report on Marine Turtle – National Action Plan
- Consultant report on Ecology – Rapid Assessment Methodology - Sea cucumber
- Consultant report on Coral Reef Monitoring – Methodology – underwater video monitoring
- Consultant report on Marine Protected Areas Management – Management Plan for Dissei Island
- Consultant report on Diving Safety
- SEA for Dahlak El Kebir (environmental aspects)

Socio-Economic Unit (SE)
- Overall plan for Socio-Economic (and annual with quarterly detailed programme)
- Database on village surveys (72)
- SEA for the free Zone
- SEA for Dahlak El Kebir Island (socio-economic aspects)
- Socio-economic survey of sea cucumber fisheries
- Summary report 2007 on overall activities (draft)

Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM)
- Overall ICAM Plan report December 2005
- National Coastal policy
- Coastal Proclamation
- Coastal Authority Proclamation
- Guidance for ICAM implementation
- Priority area planning (Massawa to Hawakil Bay and Islands - under preparation)

ANNEX 9   Exit Strategy (as provided by project management)

CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT OF ERITREA'S COASTAL, MARINE AND ISLAND BIODIVERSITY (ECMIB) PROJECT

<u>THE WAY FORWARD</u>

In line with the four objectives of project, the overall target of the ECMIB up to December 2007 is the establishment and start-up of the Coastal Authority, coordinating body for the sustainable management of the coastal area as define in the National Coastal Policy. The following are the key activities:

Human Resources: Two field work coordinators, team leaders and all members of the several teams are government employees. As only the two field work coordinators are fully assigned to the ECMIB, the Government, through the Ministry of Fisheries, has agreed to assign full time additional three scientists. The staff has already been identified (from ECMIB team leaders and operatives) and request forwarded to their employer (National Fishing Corporation under the Navy). Transfer of the additional staff is expected to be finalised within a month. With five permanent scientific staff and readily available research leaders and operatives, the ECMIB will serve as basis for establishing strong Coastal Authority.

Institution Building: In cooperation with stakeholder and based on best practise prepare the organogram of the Authority and TOR for its component units.

Permanent Office: The renovation of the building given to ECMIB/ICAM will be completed late September or early October. The office of ECMIB will move to the new building (in November) and establish dependable facilities even if it requires additional financial outlay for additional items and works- some already identified and in process. Such an office is one of the key building blocks for strong Coastal Authority and implementation of the coastal policy objectives.

Policy and Legal Regimes: The National Coastal Policy that had been prepared and endorsed by all stakeholders is expected to be declared in the fourth quarter of the year. Declaration of the policy by the government will enhance coordination of sectoral plans and activities, and facilitate establishment of legally empowered coordinating body.

Two legal regimes: Draft final of Coastal Area and Coastal Area Authority Proclamations have been prepared. These two proclamations will be endorsed first week of August and will be forwarded to the Ministry of Justice before end of August.

The Ministry of Fisheries, ECMIB and the stakeholders will do all possible so that the policy and proclamations are declared and enacted before end of the year.

Guidelines: ICAM Implementation Guidelines prepared by different sectors with the assistance of the facilitator had been discussed with each sector and in plenary meetings. Such guidelines are expected to be approved by the stakeholders in a meeting first week of August. The document will be printed and distributed to stakeholder latest by September. This guideline in addition to the "State of the Coast" Report (under review for printing) will be good basis for coordinated and sound planning in the coastal area.

 Preliminary Zoning for the Priority Area: Preliminary Zoning exercise for the area between Massawa and Hawakil Bay to start in September 2007. This area is considered priority area for developmental activities, and it is rich in terrestrial and marine biodiversity. The ECMIB office and stakeholder will have an understanding of zoning and will establish preliminary set back distance in the priority area before end of the year.

Database: All available data shall be put into the data base, analysed and be available for use before end of the year. User training is expected to be completed mid August and analyses to start the same

month and be completed by November. Information gaps shall be filled by conducting focused surveys. All stakeholders will be informed of the availability and content of the database.

Funding and Sustainability: ECMIB explored different alternatives of potential sources but concentrated on two options:

First, the Ministries of Fisheries and Agriculture (two ministries authorised to establish and manage protected areas) are working on joint marine and terrestrial protected area covering the Buri Peninsula, the Hawakil Bay and Islands. The project is to be presented to GEF by the Department of Environment (focal point) in November session. GEF fund, even if approved cannot be of use at least up to early 2008.

The second is related to the European Fund for Development available for Eritrea. Discussions have been held with concerned ministries and the EU Delegation Office in Asmara. The Ministry of Fisheries in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance is following the issue.

As the two above mentioned source of fund can take time to secure, the project in cooperation with the Ministry of Fisheries and UNDP should look funds for the interim period say up to mid 2008.