



ANNEXES

INDEPENDENT COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION – SEYCHELLES

CONTENTS

ANNEX 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
ANNEX 2. KEY PROJECTS FOR ICPE	11
ANNEX 3. IEO ASSESSMENT OF SEYCHELLES COUNTRY OFFICE RESULTS REPORTING	12
ANNEX 4. LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED	17
ANNEX 5. DETAILED MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	19

ANNEX 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously known as “Assessments of Development Results (ADRs),” to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national effort for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.¹ The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles have been selected for ICPEs since their country programmes will end in 2020. ICPEs will be conducted in 2018–19 to feed into the development of new country programmes for these countries. The ICPEs will be conducted in close collaboration with partner Governments of the two countries, UNDP country offices, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

This Terms of Reference covers both the Mauritius and Seychelles ICPEs. However, the process will result in two separate reports, one covering each country.

2. CONTEXT

Mauritius and the Seychelles are small island states in the Indian Ocean and have many of the vulnerabilities typically faced by countries in this grouping.

They have small populations. Mauritius has a population of just under 1.3 million (158/235) in the United Nations list of the world countries and areas ranked by population. Seychelles population of 95,000, places it 30th from the bottom of this list (201/235). This creates labour market and capacity constraints, and also a constrained tax base from which to cover the costs of government.

They are geographically isolated, with their nearest neighbours over 1,000km away from their centres.

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf. The ICPE will also be conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (www.uneval.org).

This imposes high costs on trade. Imports are costly, and exports are less competitive. The costs of service delivery to populations in remote islands is prohibitively expensive.

They are ocean states, with limited land masses and resources, but large marine areas. Mauritius is among the largest marine territories in the world with an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 1.9 million square km and a co-managed economic zone with Seychelles of 0.4 million square kilometres. Seychelles has an EEZ of approximately 1.4 million km², about 3,000 times the size of its land territory or 2.5 times the size of France.

They are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Mauritius (not Seychelles), is amongst the most exposed countries for risk of natural disasters (cyclones), which will become more acute as a result of climate change. As coastal nations, both Mauritius and Seychelles will have to bear the costs of sea level rises, including likely increases in coastal erosion, damage to coastal infrastructure, and salination of soil and aquifers.

Mauritius and Seychelles strong performance demonstrates that the challenges they face as small island states are not insurmountable. With a GNI per capita of \$10,140 Mauritius is in the top tier of upper-middle-income economies and is pushing towards the Bank's threshold for achieving high-income status. The Seychelles achieved high-income status in 2012, exceeding the World Bank's threshold for graduation of GNI per capita of \$12,056 or more and graduated to the OECD's high-income list in 2018. Absolute poverty is minimal in both countries and the two countries have done well on many social indicators. Gender Mainstreaming has now been incorporated as one of the top ten priorities of Mauritian Government in its current three-year Strategic Plan.

Preservation of environmental and marine assets is a significant feature of Mauritius and Seychelles national development strategies. This reflects the importance of marine resources to their economies, including fisheries and tourism. Seychelles' economy has benefitted its reputation as a world biodiversity hotspot. This reputation is one it is keen to preserve given tourism accounts for about a quarter of Seychelles GDP and employment (it accounts for around 13 per cent of GDP in Mauritius), and is a key source of foreign exchange.

Mauritius and Seychelles' emphasis on environmental sustainability in their development plans also reflects the vulnerability of the two countries to the impacts of climate change. Given neither country is a significant contributor to global greenhouse gas emissions, efforts to develop renewables and improve energy efficiency are driven less by mitigation objectives than by offering an alternative to their dependence on imported fossil fuels which is a source of economic vulnerability.

A more detailed analysis of some of the context of UNDP programmes in Mauritius and Seychelles is contained in Annex 1.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN MAURITIUS AND SEYCHELLES

Reflecting the importance of managing the impacts of climate change in both countries, and availability of funds, UNDP's portfolio is mostly comprised of energy, environment and climate projects. TRAC resources are very limited, which means there is little scope for programming in other areas, including social protection (which is a focus of both countries CPDs), and gender equality challenges, public sector transformation (focus for Mauritius only). Since 2017 Mauritius has received \$150,000 TRAC annually,

while Seychelles has received a third of that amount.

Limitations on TRAC resources reduce scope to mobilize resources from other donors, which in any case have become scarce. In recent years donors have responded to the strong economic performance of both countries by reducing or phasing out their ODA. Seychelles reached high income status in 2015 and graduated from ODA eligibility in 2018, which will further constrain resource mobilization opportunities. Mauritius is pushing towards graduation, recording a GNI per capita of \$10,140 in 2018, which is not far off the threshold for high-income status (\$12,056). Regardless of their income levels, both Governments have continued to seek technical and financial assistance from UNDP.

Assuming Seychelles' current economic trajectory, access to finance can be expected to become increasingly difficult. As a middle-income country, the window for Mauritius to access to development finance is still open, and the recent mobilization of a large GCF grant (\$28.2m) and \$37.9m French Government loan for a renewable energy project shows there are still such opportunities around. However, continued strong growth will make grant and concessional finance progressively harder to access.

Relative to the size of Mauritius' and Seychelles' economies UNDP's contribution is small, representing less than a quarter of one per cent of general government expenditure in Mauritius and less than one per cent in the Seychelles. This means that UNDP's ability to generate benefits directly is limited by the small scale on which its interventions operate, or by its ability to use resources to generate larger impacts by prompting deep, systemic and sustainable impacts in their areas.

Given the limited number of Resident Agencies in Mauritius and Seychelles, combined with the limited existence/scope of existing Programming Frameworks, they are classified as "Category C / non-harmonized cycle" countries for which a CCA/UNDAF process is not mandatory. In lieu of these frameworks, UNDP has developed strategic partnership frameworks to formalise their work in the two countries. Mauritius' partnership framework is under development, but it has completed a CCA to position the UN system in the country and inform programming decisions. With the upcoming UN reform where UNDP will no longer be responsible for the United Nations Resident Coordinator function, the UNDAF will take on renewed importance as the document guiding UN delivering as one.

Table 1: Mauritius Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2020)			
Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$ million)	Expenditures to date (US\$ million)
Outcome 1	Improved public sector management supporting poverty reduction, social inclusion and gender equality is promoted through responsive strategies.	Regular: 0.9 Other: 0.9	0.3
Outcome 2	Design and implementation of a portfolio of activities and solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, integration of ecosystem services approaches, sound management of chemicals and waste while ensuring that climate change challenges in terms of adaptation and mitigation are fully addressed	Regular: 0.1 Other: 46.9	7.9
Total		48.8	8.2

Source: UNDP Mauritius Country Programme Document 2017-2020 (DP/DCP/MUS/4)

Table 1: Seychelles Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2020)			
Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$ million)	Expenditures to date (US\$ million)²
Outcome 1	A sustainable Seychelles with enhanced economic growth, income opportunities and social inclusion, supported and promoted by responsive strategies towards poverty reduction and gender equality. Building economic and environmental resilience through the design, implementation and integration of sustainable solutions into development planning processes at national and subnational levels to support the blue economy concept, while ensuring climate change adaptation and mitigation concerns are fully addressed.	Regular: 0.4 Other: 35.9	
Total		36.3	4.3

Source: UNDP Seychelles Country Programme Document 2-17-2020 (DP/DCP/SYC/3)

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme to feed into the development of new country programmes. The results of the ICPEs will also feed into a thematic evaluation being conducted by the IEO of UNDPs assistance to vulnerable developing countries for disaster risk reduction and climate change resilience, and of UNDP's support for middle income countries.

The IEO previously conducted an evaluation of the Seychelles country programme in 2009. The ICPE will consider the recommendations of this past evaluations to the extent that they remain relevant given the length of time that has elapsed since it was completed. This is the first ICPE of the Mauritius country programme.

ICPEs focus on the UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board. The country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The scope of the ICPEs includes the entirety of UNDP's activities in the country and therefore covers interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds. There will also be initiatives from the regional and global programmes that are included in the scope of the ICPE. It is important to note, however, that a UNDP county office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these 'non-project' activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

The scope of the evaluation (in particular the short time available for fieldwork), will not allow systematic collection of beneficiary views and unintended consequences of the project on non-target groups. Where this information is not available it will be identified as a limitation.

The extent to which the evaluation will be able to assess outcomes from different aspects of UNDP's

² Executive snapshot report. Figure covers 2017 expenditure, and 2018 expenditure to July 2018.

work will also depend on the stage of completion of different components of the work. Where projects are in their early stages, the focus of the evaluation will be on whether there is evidence that their design reflects learning or builds on outcomes achieved from previous projects. The projects that are proposed as being in the scope of the evaluation are set out in the tables to Annex 1. These have been identified on the basis that:

- A) they are or have been active in the current CPD period, or they are precursors to currently active projects;
- B) they are evaluable, in the sense that they are doing work in their area that has been a focus for UNDP over a long enough period to be able to say something meaningful about their progress, likely or actual outcomes;
- C) they are large enough to warrant specific attention.

Given the small size of the Mauritius and Seychelles portfolios, it is proposed that all projects that meet these criteria are included in the scope of the evaluation.

5. METHODOLOGY

The ICPEs will address the four evaluation questions.³ These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?
4. What can UNDP learn from the evaluation about how it can best position itself to support small island states that are pushing towards graduation, or have graduated from ODA eligibility?

The ICPEs are conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes. Where data gaps are apparent, a qualitative approach will be taken to fill those gaps to aid in the evaluation process. As part of this analysis, the CPD's progression over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD's progression, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at. The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analysed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outcomes and the extent to which these outcomes have contributed to the intended CPD objectives. Both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that have influenced—both positively or negatively—UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined under evaluation question 3. They will be examined in alignment with the engagement principles, drivers of development and alignment parameters of the Strategic Plan⁴, as well as the

³ The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

⁴ These principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development;

utilization of resources to deliver results and how managerial practices affected achievement of programme goals. Qualitative rating scales will be used to assess (i) the degree to which a factor was a significant constraint on effectiveness of program implementation and achievement of outcomes; and (ii) the degree to which the UNDP was successful in addressing/managing the constraint.

Finally, some consideration will be given to whether there are broader lessons for UNDP from the evaluation, about how it can best address the needs of small island states, and in particular those that have graduated, or are moving towards graduation from ODA eligibility.

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender equality approach to data collection methods. To assess gender across the portfolio, the evaluation will use the gender marker⁵ and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed by the IEO, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. Beyond information collected in stakeholder interviews, the evaluation will not involve primary data collection. The rigour of the evaluation's outcome assessments will depend on the quality of the available documentation about the objectives and outcomes of UNDP's work, with interviews used to identify data sources and explore lines of inquiry. The evaluation will seek to tap into a diversity of data sources, including government data and documentation, project documentation reporting, media reporting and independent reviews and evaluations. The evaluation will assess whether there is valid and reliable information about the views of intended beneficiaries about UNDP projects and where this is available, will include this in reporting. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed, and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Effort will be made to tap into a diversity of views about UNDP's work, to develop a fuller understanding of the political context.

Data collection methods. Specific evaluation questions and the data collection method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome analysis, following consultation with Mauritius and Seychelles program staff. The IEO and the country offices will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. Document reviews will include: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners and other UN agencies during the period under review; programmatic documents such as workplans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners, including the quality assurance reports. All information and data collected from multiple sources will be triangulated to ensure its validity. The evaluation matrix will be used to guide how each of the questions will be addressed organize the available evidence by key evaluation question. This will also facilitate the analysis process and will support the evaluation team in drawing well substantiated conclusions and recommendations.

gender equality and women's empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.

⁵ A corporate tool to sensitize programme managers in advancing GEWE through assigning ratings to projects during project design to signify the level of expected contribution to GEWE. It can also be used to track planned programme expenditures on GEWE (not actual expenditures).

Stakeholder involvement: a participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPEs in consultation with the UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles country offices, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Mauritius and Seychelles Governments. The IEO lead evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country Offices in Mauritius and Seychelles: The Mauritius and Seychelles country offices will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The COs will provide support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; assistance for field site visits). To ensure the anonymity of interviewees, the country office staff will not participate in the stakeholder interviews. The COs and IEO will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the COs will prepare management responses in consultation with RB and will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPEs. The team will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, preparing/ finalizing the two ICPE reports; and organizing the stakeholder workshop, as appropriate, with the country office.
- **Consultants:** Depending on availability, a suitable national consultant may be recruited to help assess the programme and provide technical guidance to the lead evaluator. Depending on skills and experience, under the guidance of LE, he/she will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE reports.
- **Research Assistant (RA):** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and documentation.

The roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome			
Country	Outcome	Report	Data collection
Mauritius	Outcome 1	LE	LE and consultant
	Outcome 2	LE	LE and consultant
	Strategic positioning issues	LE	LE and consultant
	Operations and management issues	LE	LE and consultant
Seychelles	Outcome 1	LE	LE and consultant
	Strategic positioning issues	LE	LE and consultant
	Operations and management issues	LE	LE and consultant

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPEs will be conducted according to the approved IEO process⁶. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute framework for conducting the evaluation.

Phase 1: Preparatory work. The IEO prepares the TOR and evaluation design and recruits evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals. The IEO collects data first internally and then fill data gaps with help from the country offices, and external resources in various ways. Further data will be collected through interviews (via phone, Skype etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. The evaluation team will conduct desk reviews of reference material, prepare a summary of context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome theory of change, specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection.

Phase 2: Field data collection. During this phase, the evaluation team will undertake consecutive one-week missions to Mauritius and Seychelles, starting with Mauritius. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6 with responsibilities outlined in Section 8. The evaluation team will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders, other partners and beneficiaries. At the end of each mission, the evaluation team will hold a debrief presentation of the key preliminary findings at the country office.

Phase 3: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE reports. The first drafts (“zero draft”) of the ICPE reports will be subject to peer review by IEO and the International Evaluation Advisory Panel (IEAP). It will then be circulated to the country offices and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa for factual corrections. The second drafts, which incorporate any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles country offices will prepare management responses, under the overall oversight of the regional bureau. The reports will then be shared at final debriefings where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. Ways forward will be discussed with a view to

⁶ The evaluation will be conducted according to the [ICPE Process Manual](#) and the [ICPE Methodology Manual](#)

creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations and strengthening national accountability of UNDP. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be published.

Phase 4: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE reports and brief summaries will be widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of its approval of new Country Programme Documents. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Mauritius and Seychelles country offices and the Governments of Mauritius and Seychelles will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The reports and the management responses will be published on the UNDP website⁷ as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The regional bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.⁸

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively⁹ as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	August 2018
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	September 2018
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	Sept-October 2018
Phase 2: Data Collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	26–30 Nov 2018 3–7 Dec 2018
- Mission to Mauritius		
- Mission to Seychelles		
Phase 3: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE	December 2018
Zero draft ICPEs for clearance by IEO and EAP	LE	January 2019
First draft ICPEs for CO/RB review	CO/RB	January 2019
Second draft ICPEs shared with GOV	CO/GOV	February 2019
Draft management responses	CO/RB	February 2019
Final debriefings with national stakeholders	CO/LE	March-April 2019
Phase 4: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	March-April 2019
Final reports and Evaluation Briefs	IEO	March-April 2019

⁷ web.undp.org/evaluation

⁸ erc.undp.org

⁹ The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.

ANNEX 2. KEY PROJECTS FOR ICPE

Source of funds	Project name	Type of project	Imp period	Project description	Grant amount	Co-financing			DIM/ NIM	Expense 2012 - 2018	Notes
						Gov. co-financing	UNDP	Other			
Adaptation fund	Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change in Seychelles	National	2014 - 2020	Reduce the vulnerability of the Seychelles to climate change, focusing on two key issues—water scarcity and flooding. The climate change projections in the Seychelles show that rainfall, while increasing in overall terms, will become even more irregular.	6,455,750				NIM	2,751,846	No evaluation TBC
GEF	Seychelles Protected Area Finance Project	National	2015 - 2020	To improve the financial sustainability and strategic cohesion of Seychelles protected area system while also dealing with emerging threats and risks to biodiversity in a shifting national economic environment.	2,776,900	15,013,654	50,000		DIM	1,405,241	No evaluation TBC
GEF	Management of Outer Island Protected Areas in Seychelles	National	2013 - 2018	To promote the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Seychelles' Outer Islands by integrating a National Subsystem of Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (CMPAs) into the broader land- and seascape while reducing the pressures on natural resources from competing land uses.	1,964,050		150,000	10,000,000	NIM	1,322,793	MTR (2017)
GEF	Resource Efficiency Project in Seychelles	National	2014 - 2018	To significantly reduce the rate of electricity consumption and water usage in Seychelles among underserved communities in the residential sector.	1,770,000	9,728,503	80,000	446,700	NIM	1,252,440	MTR (2017)
European Commission	Global Climate Change Alliance Seychelles Programme	National	2016 - 2020	Supporting adaptation to climate change to increase coastal and flood protection in the vulnerable areas of La Digue Island.	EURO 3m				DIM	428,647	No documents

ANNEX 3. IEO ASSESSMENT OF SEYCHELLES COUNTRY OFFICE RESULTS REPORTING

Indicator ¹⁰	Baseline ¹¹	Target	Status/Progress	IEO assessment of significance of indicator and of UNDP contribution*	
			2017	Significance of indicator	Significance of indicator
SYC_OUTCOME17 - Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded.					
1. No. of institutions using vulnerability and poverty profiles data for evidence-based policymaking and implementation of social schemes.	0 (2016)	5 (2020)	<i>Some progress (1)</i> The newly established Poverty Secretariat established end of 2016 has now undertaken additional survey to establish poverty and vulnerability in Central 2 region. This survey is a direct result of the 2015 Poverty digest prepared by the national Bureau of Statistics.	<i>Moderate</i> Data can help gov. identify and target assistance to vulnerable	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i>
1.2. Vulnerability scale for Seychelles				<i>High</i>	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i>
1.3. Percentage of people benefitting from poverty alleviation and livelihoods schemes, disaggregated by sex.	0 male, 0 female (2016)	20% male, 30% female		<i>Moderate</i> Significant if implemented	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> UNDP not engaging in poverty alleviation strategy due to limited TRAC funds.

¹⁰ Indicators were extracted from CPD.

¹¹ "Baseline," "Target," and "Status/Progress" were extracted from ROAR.

Indicator ¹⁰	Baseline ¹¹	Target	Status/Progress	IEO assessment of significance of indicator and of UNDP contribution*	
			2017	Significance of indicator	Significance of indicator
2.1. No of social protection schemes targeting the poor and other at-risk groups, especially women and youth, disaggregated by sex.	0 (2016)	4		<i>Moderate</i> Intermediate step for poverty alleviation; no evidence of implementation	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> UNDP not engaging in poverty alleviation strategy due to limited TRAC funds.
2. Percentage of households benefiting from social protection schemes, disaggregated by sex	0 male headed households, 0 female headed households (2016)	20% male headed households, 40% female headed households	<i>Some progress</i> A total of 19,579 individuals benefited from some sort of social protection in 2017. In terms of welfare provision for the Home Carer Scheme, 5.9% of female headed households and 2.4% of male headed households benefited from the Scheme. Data is not yet disaggregated by sex or at household level. However, in 2017, NBS has started to undertake steps to provide more disaggregated data with support from UNECA and in line with SDG monitoring. The data is captured as per type of benefits.	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> Led by gov't with support from other agencies
3.. No. of households benefiting from grant and loan schemes for Renewable Energy Technology and Energy Efficient appliances, disaggregated by sex	0 poor and 35 female-headed households (2016)	200 poor and 300 female headed households (2020)	<i>Some progress</i> 0 47 applications for SEEREP grants were approved by SEC during 2017 (excluding December); not all may have been accepted by	<i>Low-Moderate</i> Grants not yet distributed	<i>Low</i> Grants not yet distributed

Indicator ¹⁰	Baseline ¹¹	Target	Status/Progress	IEO assessment of significance of indicator and of UNDP contribution*	
			2017	Significance of indicator	Significance of indicator
			the banks subsequent to their own checking procedure. Data not yet available by sex for 2017.		
Indicator 3.2. No. of green jobs created, disaggregated by sex	20 men, 12 women (2016)	100 men, 60 women		<i>Low</i> Small scale, no evidence of implementation	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> Output from UNDP projects
4. Extent of modern energy coverage (wind/solar)	Less than 1%	5% by 2020; 15% by 2030	<i>Some progress</i> 32 The 8 wind turbines and solar PV is producing a total of 5 MW of total energy consumption in Seychelles by end of 2016 (IRENA Report 2017 statistics)	<i>High</i> Increase Seychelles energy capacity, overall contribution to lowering climate impact	<i>Moderate</i> UNDP working on solar projects
5. Area of watershed outside protected areas brought under integrated planning for sustainable development	0 (2016)	2,169 hectares (2020)	<i>No change</i> No progress yet under this indicator. The main reason why new areas outside existing PA has not been included in new management is due to the non-enactment yet of the revised Nature Conservancy Act (Protected Area Act) which would define new areas for protection status. The delays are due to two factors. First, the new National Assembly has formulated a committee to look at all the work ongoing on the Outer islands and to make recommendations to the National Assembly. Secondly the draft Bill requires additional work following a review meeting held in May 2017. The Bill has been sent back to the Attorney	<i>Moderate</i> Not yet implemented	<i>Moderate</i> Focus of UNDP water mgmt. projects

Indicator ¹⁰	Baseline ¹¹	Target	Status/Progress	IEO assessment of significance of indicator and of UNDP contribution*	
			2017	Significance of indicator	Significance of indicator
			General's Office for review before presentation to stakeholders a second time.		
4.2. No. of disaster risk reduction and adaptation strategies/action plans with clearly defined institutional responsibilities and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms	0	1		<i>Low</i> No evidence	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> No evidence
5.1. No of systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify use of climate finance				<i>Low-moderate</i> Intermediate step, no evidence	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> No evidence
5.2. Hectares of coastal ecosystems under management/ restoration	1,293 ha Marine Protected Areas and Mangroves (2016)	4,020 ha marine protected areas and 3,000 ha sea grass beds (2020)	<i>No change</i> No new marine protected areas yet declared. However with the finalization of the Marine Spatial Plan due in 2018, additional marine areas will be declared as protection areas.	<i>Moderate</i> Not yet implemented	<i>Moderate</i>
5.3. Area of forest managed to reduce flooding and protect water resources during drought	3,102 hectares - Morne Seychellois 2016	5,337 hectares (2020)		<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Moderate</i>
				Draft Nature Conservancy Bill once enacted will facilitate demarcation of new protected areas -not yet implemented	UNDP technical/ advisory support for bill

Indicator ¹⁰	Baseline ¹¹	Target	Status/Progress	IEO assessment of significance of indicator and of UNDP contribution*	
			2017	Significance of indicator	Significance of indicator
6.1. No. of UNDP-supported alternative livelihood initiatives developed, disaggregated by sector	0 (2016)	5 (2020)		<i>Low</i> Not implemented	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> CO has not engaged in poverty alleviation commitment due to limited funds
6.2. No. of woman-headed-households benefiting from alternative livelihood initiatives	0 (2016)	300 (2020)		<i>Low-moderate</i> Not implemented	<i>Insufficient evidence/low level of influence</i> CO has not engaged in poverty alleviation commitment due to limited funds

* Assessment approach loosely follows a methodology developed by Clear Horizon titled “Significant Instances of Policy and Systems Improvement”, with adaptations made to reflect the resource constraints on this evaluation. The assessment of the significance of the indicator is a measure of scale of the achievement its attainment would connote in terms the way programs are run or services are delivered. The assessment of UNDP’s capacity to influence is based on the extent to which there is a clear line of contribution between UNDP’s program and any changes to the target indicator

ANNEX 4. LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

UNDP

Alcindor, Roland, Programme Manager

Benoit, Marille, Programme Assistant

Faure, Annike, National Project Coordinator, BIOFIN/ABS

Mendez, Johan, Hydrologist/Engineer, Ecosystem-Based Adaptation to Climate Change (EbA) Project

Nair, Preethi, Programme Officer

Prosper, Joanna, Programme Coordinator, Programme Coordination Unit (PCU)

Quatre, Rodney, Project Manager, Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA+)

Romain, Daig, Project Manager, Protected Area Finance (PAF) Project

Rylance, Andrew, Technical Advisor, Protected Area Finance (PAF) Project

Sekharan, Sujitha, International Operations Manager

Seraphine, Betty, Project Manager, EbA Project

Talma, Elke, Programme Coordinator, Programme Coordination Unit (PCU)

Tirant, Meggy, Programme Assistant, GCCA+

Umotoni, Christine N., Resident Coordinator/Resident Representative

Government

Agathine, Elizabeth, Principal Secretary, Department of Economic Planning, Ministry of Finance, Trade, Investment, and Economic Planning

Bargain, Rose-Marie, Principal Secretary, Blue Economy, Office of the Vice-President

de Letourdie, Helena, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, National Bureau of Statistics

Dogley, Didier, Minister, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Ports and Marine

Ernesta, Lindy, Director General for International Relations, Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA)

Jasmin, Jennifer, Director General, Department of Economic Planning, Ministry of Finance, Trade, Investment, and Economic Planning

Marie, Patricia, Third Secretary, DFA

Matatiken, Denis, Special Advisor to the Minister, Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC)

Michaud, Philippe, Special Advisor, Blue Economy, Office of the Vice-President

Moustache, Antoine, Principal Secretary, Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture

Muzungaile, Marie-May, Director General, MEECC

Padayachy, Amanda, Director General, DFA

Pillay, Selvan, Director General, Climate Change Division, MEECC

Pool, Herve, Third Secretary, DFA

Remy, Selby, CEO, Seychelles National Park Authority

Renaud, Errol, Principal Officer for Tariff and Economic Affairs, Seychelles Energy Commission

Saldanha, Sheena, Senior Economist, Department of Economic Planning, Ministry of Finance, Trade, Investment, and Economic Planning

Civil Society

Fleischer-Dogley, Frauke, CEO, Seychelles Island Foundation

Rowat, David, Chairman, Marine Conservation Society Seychelles

Development Partners

Parboteeah, Rajesh, Project Manager, European Union

ANNEX 5. DETAILED MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Prepared by: Roland Alcindor	Position: Programme Manager	Unit/Bureau: Seychelles/RBA
Cleared by: Amanda K Serumaga	Position: Resident Representative	Unit/Bureau: Mauritius/Seychelles
Input into and update in ERC:	Position:	Unit/Bureau:

Overall comments: Overall the ICPE evaluation has made some pertinent observations, findings and recommendations, which will inform the formulation of the next country programme document. The Country Office has extracted findings and issues raised in the report and provided a management response as per below:

Evaluation Finding Issue 1:

Due to a lack of adequate human and financial resources, UNDP's consistent engagement with or influence regarding Seychelles policies, legislation or institutional capacities for poverty reduction is highly constrained

Management Response:

The Country Office's (CO) agrees with this finding.

It should be noted that there are two examples of UNDP support and engagement which have been meaningful and influential at a structural level in terms of institutional development and data analysis linked to poverty reduction; for which limited capacities hampered the ability to bring them to scale as substantive programmes. First, UNDP regularly engaged with the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in the development of multi-dimensional poverty indicators; and supported previous studies to establish a national poverty line. Furthermore, UNDP in Seychelles contributed to the establishment of the Seychelles Conservation & Climate Adaptation Trust (See <https://seyccat.org/about-us/#our-history>), providing catalytic resources necessary to set up what is now the pioneering mechanism for empowering the fisheries sector on governance, sustainability, value and market options and to trial and nurture business models to secure sustainable development in the blue economy <https://seyccat.org/about-us/#our-vision>

The CO thus agrees with the evaluation findings which highlight the suboptimal financial and human resource capacity of the office to undertake extensive work at scale in the area of poverty reduction. In our view, this may speak to the limitations in the overarching UNDP offer in U/MIC and NCC countries; and more so, to the SIDS offer noting the vulnerability context, which we note has undergone review by the UNDP Executive Board in September 2019.

It is worth noting that the office submitted proposals under TRAC II and the Innovation Fund to secure finances to further develop the multi-dimensional poverty index and enhance the analysis of the Household budget surveys neither of which were successful. It is expected that in 2019

UNDP will support the NBS in the development of a vulnerability scale to assess the dimensions in which people are susceptible; and would need welfare assistance. This will be in the form of scaling up the MPI pilot study and capacity building in formulation of evidenced-based policies, analysis and their coherence across the various sectors dealing with welfare programmes using the limited TRAC 1 resources available.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Status	Comments
1.1. Develop Annual Work Plan for support to NBS on the MPI	August- September 2019	UNDP	Completed.	AWP approved by UNDP in Q1 2019.
1.2 Participate in the high-level decision makers forum on MPPN and engage with national actors	July 2019	Family Affairs	Completed	
1.3 – Implementation of the MPI study at national level and drafting of policy recommendations and building capacity for evidenced based policy-making in collaboration with NBS and OPHI.	Oct-December 2019	UNDP/NBS	Pending approval of Engagement Facility to support the NBS in the upscaling of the MPI in Seychelles and capacity building in Policy formulation for poverty alleviation.	

Evaluation Finding Issue 2:

UNDP's work in water resource management has a significant but as yet mostly unrealized potential, with impacts constrained by basic project management challenges. The impact and potential scalability of innovations trialled by UNDP has yet to be thoroughly assessed, although there are some positive signs that some of these have reasonable prospects for replication and sustainability.

Management Response:

The CO agrees with these findings and acknowledges that there is also a need to improve communications on development impact and results. In this context, and as part of the MTR recommendations, the Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EBA) project has prepared a Communications Strategy and retained a consultant to improve on communicating project results.

While the impact of the water resources management has yet to be quantified and reported on; we can update that the community of Val d'Endor has embraced the project and been fully engaged with the management of the watershed. In addition, some of the project management challenges mentioned above and in the MTR of the EBA Project have now been addressed. For example: Training in project Management has been undertaken for all Project Managers of the PCU and conducted by staff of the UNDP Regional Service Centre. The newly approved COMESA project aims to develop synergies with the ongoing project to ensure that water resources are managed to minimize the impact of climate change on farming (for example Drought/flooding/erosion). Baseline data will be collected through the SGP funded Project with S4S and with SAA to

ascertain project impact post project. In addition, the Project has also reviewed the key indicators, with a set of shadow indicators now approved, which are better suited to the context of a SIDS like Seychelles.

The CO also notes the need for UNDP to consider the “core” architecture of an MCO programme office, particularly as work evolves to upstream policy advisory and institutional development interventions in U/MIC contexts. Without a ‘strategic partnerships and communications’ function, the capacity to engage and leverage ‘proof of concept’ projects to bring them to scale or for replication is severely constrained. The office has now embarked on enhancement of the communications function on a temporary basis to better position UNDP to share development impact and carry forward a narrative on bringing projects to scale.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
2.1. Implement the Communications Plan for EBA. And Initiate timeline for activities	September 2019- Dec 2020	PCU- EBA PIT	Communications plan finalized and part time Comms manager recruited to implement activities until Dec 2020	
2.2. UNDP Twitter feed activated Increase the frequency of Facebook and Twitter posts per week	July 2019	UNDP	The accounts are active. Posting needs to be done more frequently	
2.3. UNDP Communications Specialist on Detail Assignment to CO to improve website, training, and social media footprint	October 2019	UNDP	Comms Specialist already in Mauritius	
2.4 Revised log frame with new set of indicators prepared and approved by Adaptation Fund as part of the PPR 2019	June 2019	PCU/UNDP	Latest PPR for the EBA submitted in July to Adaptation Fund.	

Evaluation Finding Issue 3:

Despite some challenges, progress in the area of protected area management towards the outcomes, outputs and indicators set out in the CPD has been adequate. UNDP has provided valuable support toward the revitalisation of the Seychelles National Parks Authority (SNPA), contributing to a major reform to its mandate, which will potentially help it to increase its effectiveness as a conservation organisation rather than simply a revenue collection agency.

Management Response:

The CO agrees with these findings, and further notes that while UNDP can provide the necessary platforms to build capacity and improve on areas of efficiency; institutions and national stakeholders retain the responsibility for ensuring that the transfers of capacity and knowledge are utilized effectively.

We note that the Evaluation findings highlight inadequate management of the SNPA, and that the CO has been a key partner for government to ensure successful implementation of GEF resources allocated in the management and sustainability of Protected Areas.

It is also worth noting that the current financial sustainability project builds on the successes of establishing and creating the legal context for both terrestrial and marine protected areas. The ongoing collaboration with The Nature Conservancy has also given impetus to the Marine Spatial Planning process and has assisted Government secure the Debt for Adaptation Swap by pledging 30% of its EEZ for conservation.

Notwithstanding the delays in the approval of Nature Protection and Conservancy Act, some new categories of protected areas have not yet been gazetted and can only be proclaimed upon approval of the Act by the National Assembly.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
3.1 Finalization of TNC Act	Dec 2019	MEECC, NA others	Currently under review by AGs office. Expected approval in Assembly by December 2019	
3.2 Improve Communications for PA results	July 2019	PCU, UNDP, SEYCCAT	Ongoing	

Evaluation Finding Issue 4:
Whether UNDP's work on protected area management succeeds in elevating the conservation status and improving the management of important marine and terrestrial biodiversity will ultimately depend on decisions outside the control of the projects

Management Response:
The CO takes note of this finding.

The Nature Conservancy Act has been pending approval since 2013. As of July 2019, the legislation was at White Paper stage and the Attorney General's Office is consolidating the comments received. It is expected to be presented to the National Assembly in Q3 of 2019. If passed, this would provide a legal basis for UNDPs ground work on marine and terrestrial biodiversity conservation; and, trigger the expansion of protected areas in Seychelles as new ones are proclaimed under the new categories in the Act. Notwithstanding, the UNDP interventions remain an important contribution to pathways for success.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
4.1 No further Actions required at this stage (As above)				

Evaluation Finding Issue 5:

UNDP's contribution to improved resource efficiency has been modest and has fallen well short of targets. The scope for it to make a more substantial contribution may improve when a review of energy sector policies being conducted by the Seychelles Government is completed. This will help to clarify which energy efficiency strategies and incentives are likely to be most effective, something that is currently unclear.

Management Response:

The CO takes note of this finding. As with Issue number 4, success in this area will ultimately depend on decisions outside the control of the UNDP projects including political will and the policy, legal and regulatory environment.

It should be noted that at the time of project development, one of the priorities for Government of Seychelles was to improve energy efficiency and ensure support to the policy and legislative enabling environment for resource efficient technologies to thrive. While the Photovoltaic (PV) project, which ended shortly before the current CPD cycle, saw an impressive uptake of PV in the Seychelles; the current project has been hindered by inadequate government impetus in updating the necessary legislation. Nonetheless, awareness raising on energy efficient appliances with all stakeholders from importers to customs to households has had a significant impact in the uptake of energy efficient appliances through, for example the LED exchange scheme.

An additional impediment to progress has been the unavailability of relevant feasibility studies and necessary information from the Public Utilities Corporation, which would have enabled the development of a project to the Green Climate Fund to upscale Renewable Energy in Seychelles and ensure that the intended national contributions were met by 2030.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
5.1 Finalization of the terminal evaluation of the Renewable Energy project and undertake necessary follow up actions on key recommendations.	August 2019	UNDP/PCU/MEECC /Energy Commission	Terminal Evaluation of Resource Efficiency Project Completed and Management response to be finalized	
5.2 Finalization drafting of EE legislations and strategies	December 2019	SEC, MEECC	Currently ongoing	

Evaluation Finding Issue 6:

UNDP's environment portfolio in Seychelles provides a highly valued source of external support for partners and focusses on important and challenging issues. Notwithstanding this, the performance of the Seychelles environment portfolio overall has been uneven, and the lack of resources has limited UNDP's engagement and support for policy development outside of the work conducted within projects.

Management Response:

The Country Office agrees with this finding; and would welcome a discussion on the overarching UNDP offer regarding U/MICs and SIDs in the context of the Vulnerability Index; and continued relevance of UNDP in these contexts.

First, the allocation of \$50,000 USD per annum TRAC funding, which provides for both management and oversight costs and support requests from Government of Seychelles, presents a binding constraint of how to scale up engagement with analytical work and upstream policy support. While the CO is aware that Seychelles as an NCC cannot access more TRAC funds; it is a matter of concern that applications for TRAC II and other Innovation funds are also not successful. The net result is a focus on singular downstream project work supported by restrictive vertical funds.

Second, the ICPE makes note that UNDP was not directly involved in the Blue Bonds process which was rolled out with the support of the Commonwealth and World Bank. As indicated in Finding 1; the UNDP was instrumental in supporting the institutional framework on the complementary mechanism resulting in the establishment of SeyCCAT, which provides the seed funding for “proof of concept” projects that may “graduate” to access Blue Bond loans. Furthermore, UNDP engaged in discussions with the Debt for Nature Swap with all stakeholders during the preparation of Protected Area projects.

Third, the design process and architecture of GEF – UNDP projects also tends to forestall opportunities for complementarity and leveraging the portfolio to retain policy and strategy development capacity; and, consistent oversight and management support. Going forward, the CO would like to see more convergence around the CPD pillars to inform the financial and human resources required to better position UNDP in Seychelles.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
6.1 Initiate discussions for UNDP's next CPD cycle	November 2019	UNDP, GoS	The Country office is considering the timing and alignment of the next CPD cycle with Mauritius and considering the current political and economic context	

Evaluation Finding Issue 7:

Given the context and the limitations of the existing GEF funding mechanisms, the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) established by UNDP within the Ministry of Environment and Energy, is a sensible arrangement for absorbing the project management costs of the support UNDP provides through multiple projects to the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC).

Management Response:

The CO agrees in principle with this finding.

The Programme Coordination Unit has been cited as best practice in several independent mid-term and terminal evaluations; and, showcased in Africa for cost efficiencies, capacity building and adaptive management.

The CO does note, however, that in the absence of a complementary and sufficiently resourced UNDP office; there is risk that the work of the PCU is not sufficiently attributed to UNDP support as a contributor; resulting in low visibility due to the limited capacity to demonstrate development impact at portfolio level. This reduces opportunities for the selection of UNDP as a partner of choice; thereby, limiting the sustainability and capacity of both the PCU and the programme office to contribute to the development agenda. For example, notwithstanding the already cited engagements; the PCU sustainability does depend, at least in part, on resource mobilisation linked to UNDP. In the absence of substantive analytical reports, social media footprint and/or policy engagement; the PCU, while saving on project management costs, cannot position UNDP to contribute policy and strategy engagement.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking	
			Status	Comments
7.1 Ensure a continuous portfolio of project to ensure sustainability of the PCU	Continuous	MEECC/PCU	Govt to endorse projects through UNDP and implemented through PCU	Need for discussion on the engagement of the PCU on programme development

Evaluation Finding Issue 8:

Implementation has been made more challenging by unnecessarily complex project designs and insufficient attention to the feasibility of some major components of projects

Management Response:

The CO agrees in principle with this finding.

Amongst the key issues are the process of design, consultation and local capacity, which have contributed to sub-optimal projects. The CO would strongly suggest that a wider conversation is required regarding the technical backstopping efficacy available for Country Offices in the absence of substantive capacity resourced at CO level.

Some key examples include:

- Lack of availability of technical capacity: The indicators under the Adaptation Fund did not adhere to an RBM approach right from design stage; noting also that projects are required to fit the criteria laid out by the donors. A review by the M & E functions of UNDP may have been helpful in this regard to engage with GEF UNDP team to ensure alignment. The absence of this capacity throughout the CO at inception stage, resulted in calls for revision at mid-term.

- **Sub-optimal Project Development timelines:** The lengthy timelines between development and implementation result in uneven engagement by key interlocutors; and, the risk of inconsistent amendments where key changes occur in the counterpart ministries – leading to poor design. For example, the Adaptation Fund project was developed in 2012 and funds only made available in 2014. Similarly, the GEF6 cycle PIF was readied in 2015, while funds for full Project Preparation were only made available in 2018; and the project document is to be approved in late 2019.
- **Insufficient consultation:** Under the GCCA+ project all cost estimates were done by the Ministry of Environment Energy and Climate Change. As a result, the cost-estimates for implementation in La Digue were artificially low having underestimated the cost of transportation of goods by sea. Noting that UNDP was engaged by the donor after negotiations with Government of Seychelles to implement the project; there was also limited to no consultation of local stakeholders at design stage by either the Ministry or by the donor. In this instance, the risk management process and technical backstopping by UNDP may have complemented the CO capacity to collaborate on much needed engagement with both government and the donor on process.
- The clear feedback from national stakeholders, in this regard, is that **Evaluation Finding 8** is of serious concern; and should be raised at Community of Practice events or channeled through partnerships to the attention of donor parties through Country led interventions highlighting the complexities of SIDS.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
8.1 For discussion in next CPD cycle/PIF formulation or PPG phase	June 2020	UNDP, PCU		
8.2 Govt agencies need to pay attention to project design and log frames	Ongoing	UNDP/MEECC		Would add that UNDP will also need to consider the capacity deployed during these processes

Evaluation Finding Issue 9:

For a small sub-office like UNDP's office in Seychelles, ability to access technical backstopping and support from relevant UNDP experts is critical for ensuring high-quality designs, and implementation.

Management Response:

The country office agrees in principle with this finding.

The Country Office would, however, note that this oft cited issue requires a structural reform rather than encouragement for more concerted action within the same problematic framework.

The CO would agree, as cited in an earlier finding, that project implementation is uneven; which can, in part, be attributed to uneven technical backstopping. The CO notes there has been more success in the Biodiversity and International Waters portfolios; where RTA engagement has been regular although with attendant process and design challenges. The CO also acknowledges the high turnover of RTAs from the RSC and challenging distribution of portfolios that may have hampered engagement.

It is for these reasons, that the CO would argue there is need to relook at the core staffing model in the context of SIDs U/MIC countries. The optimal technical support should be in country. There is a considerable and growing environment portfolio in the MCO. The attendant risk of non-delivery on our vertical fund partnerships and access, which serves as the primary basis for our sustainability; calls for investment in a substantive technical backstop dedicated to the MCO – from pooled resources across the programme – as a priority for effective delivery and risk management. The current reliance on occasional missions, detail assignments and ICs as a means of strategic and programmatic response is inadequate; and, contributes to the inconsistencies cited in the report and may speak to an absence of a long terms strategic approach in terms of UNDPs positioning.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
9.1. Technical support from RTAs and communications on-going.			Ongoing	Consider investment in in country support across the portfolio

Evaluation Finding Issue 10:

Given the environmental focus of the current program, the scope promote gender equality in a significant and consistent way is constrained. Reflecting this, in the current programme cycle, 75% of expenditure was reported as making a limited contribution to gender equality (GEN1). The remaining 25% being expenditure without a noticeable contribution to gender equality (GEN0).

Management Response:

The country office agrees with this finding.

Until 2017, GEF did not have a gender reporting requirement. Given that all projects currently being implemented were approved and signed prior to 2017, the scope to report on Gender in environmental projects is limited. However, having taken on board the various recommendations of recent independent mid-term evaluations, a gender assessment of all projects is being conducted and a training for Gender reporting is being

conducted by UNDP through the technical and financial support of the Global ABS project. With the new GEF policy, all project preparation must now include Gender analysis; and submit a Gender Action Plan, as part of the project approval process.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
10.1 Gender Report and Training schedules for all GEF projects	July 2019	UNDP, PCU, GEF	The PCU has recruited a consultant to finalize a gender report and UNDP ABS Global project is supporting a Gender training in the second week of July	
10.2 Improve reporting on Gender Responsiveness and Gender transformation in subsequent years	July 2020			

Evaluation Finding Issue 11:

The Seychelles Country Program Document does not serve as an effective vehicle for promoting accountability to the UNDP Executive Board for results alignment and resources assigned to the programme.

Management Response:

The country office agrees in principle with this finding.

Given the lengthy and consultative/vetting process that results in an approved country programme document; the country office would query whether this observation is best directed solely to the CO. It is clear that the two sovereign governments require to separate country programme documents; notwithstanding that UNDP operates a multi-country office. That said, the constituent parts of a CPD, which include specific RM commitments; core financing; an M & E framework etc.; do not consider the reality that the investment in the sub-office amounts to little more than a project office – and is thus has limited capacity to unable to deploy a full-fledged CPD. Thus, while the CPD design and political process presents the imperative to be ambitious; the reality of the UNDP SIDS offer in U/MIC countries is much more limited; thereby resulting in significant misalignment.

Following this Independent Country Programme Evaluation, and in view of the now approved SIDS offer by UNDP – there will be a need to better articulate what can and should constitute the CPD; and the feasible mechanisms to promote accountability and effective reporting.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
11.1 Improve CPD design and reporting	June 2020	UNDP		

Evaluation Finding Issue 12:

There are also significant weaknesses in results-based management at the project level.

Management Response:

The country office agrees with this finding.

As stated in Management response to Finding #8; UNDP has tended to have limited influence at design stage as projects need to fit in line with donor requirements and templates; resulting in less than optimal design of the M & E frameworks. Nonetheless, greater effort has been made in 2019 to strengthen monitoring and evaluation; documentation; and communication of results and lessons learned. The UNDP Regional Service Centre technical team provided in-depth training on project management requirements and reporting and M&E to project colleagues in April 2019.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
12.1 – Training in RBM undertaken by RSC	April 2019	UNDP/PCU	Completed	
12.1 Dedicated Photo Library to be prepared	July 2019	UNDP	In progress	
12.2 Update the PCU website and UNDP website through support from a Communications Specialist	Dec 2019	PCU	In progress	Detail assignment + PCU comms consultant recruited
12.3 Increase the frequency of social media posts and document lessons learnt	Jun 2020	UNDP	Ongoing	

Evaluation Conclusions Issue 13:

Over the past decade, Seychelles has registered sustained improvements in per capita income and achieved a relatively high level of human development, trends that have limited the scope of UNDP's support

Management Response:

The CO agrees with this conclusion.

Seychelles' high-income status, which obviates access to ODA, presents a significant challenge to continuing development practice. The opportunities to work in Financing for Development through government cost sharing and the private sector will be key to supporting UNDP's evolution alongside Seychelles transitions. The capacity to seize these opportunities will require serious consideration in terms of the human and financial resources made available at a country, sub-regional and global level.

Furthermore, countries such as Seychelles, which have limited capacity in terms of manpower and technical assistance, may face challenges in sustaining growth despite being fully cognizant of the development challenges that lie ahead. The narrative on the vulnerabilities of small island

states – including climate, resilience to shock, and the demographics specific to Seychelles and Mauritius - warrant a revisiting of the formulaic process through which decisions on ODA and UNDP core resources are decided. In the context of the sustainability of the Development Goals 2030, the HDI (and GDP) measures may need to be informed by additional metrics to decide on development support.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
13.1 Support the development of a seminal paper on Seychelles Vulnerabilities which can be used to explain the need for additional support from the donor community.	Jan 2020	UNDP, Foreign Affairs, Economic Planning		
13.2 Support the preparation of the VNR highlighting the inherent vulnerabilities of the country	2021	Government/UNDP		

Evaluation Conclusions Issue 14:

Government partners consulted by the evaluation highlighted the value of the role UNDP has played in smoothing and facilitating access to funding available through global environmental and climate change organisations. The resources UNDP has mobilised through these mechanisms have been important instruments for extending the reach of the Governments own programs, trialling new approaches, and developing the evidence base required to underpin reforms.

Management Response 14.

The country office agrees with this conclusion.

Government values UNDP support on various issues. However, despite the capacity building in country- institutional capacities remain challenged due to high turnover of staff. Emphasis would need to be placed on documentation; evidence-based results and digital archiving to strengthen institutional memory and ensure continuity and progress of results.

Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking Status	Comments
14.1 No actions required				

Evaluation Conclusions Issue 15:

UNDP's contribution to targeted outcomes has been undermined by implementation challenges which have affected four of the five major projects considered by this evaluation

Management Response:

The CO agrees with this conclusion

One of the key challenges of project success has been the reporting, communication of results and impact. As reported above for the EBA project, communications strategy has been prepared, additional staff hired. For UNDP, a detail assignment has been deployed to support the CO communications, going forward, the CO will seek to establish a substantive function. In addition, UNDP has now agreed with Government to ensure that indicators of success are limited to what is within UNDP's scope of influence especially with regards to enacting new legislation.

Evaluation Conclusions Issue 17:

The uneven performance of the program reflects four main factors, including the small island states context, problems with project design, inconsistencies in technical support, and quality of monitoring, evaluation and communications.

- i. The challenges of working effectively in a Small Island State- In particular, the small size of Seychelles bureaucracy means the capacity of key institutions and decision makers is often stretched. Decision makers often have broad mandates and heavy travel schedules, which can slow things down.
- ii. it reflects challenges in establishing designs that provide solid frameworks for implementation
- iii. inconsistencies in the quality of technical backstopping and support from UNDP's regional technical advisors in Addis Ababa
- iv. monitoring and evaluation, documentation of lessons learned, and communications is weak and needs improvement the Country Office needs to strengthen its use of results-based management practices

Management Response:

The CO agrees with these findings, which are elaborated elsewhere

Evaluation Conclusions Issue 18:

Given Seychelles high-income status, but small size and vulnerability as an island nation to climate change, UNDP can play a significant role in contributing knowledge and advisory services in areas where it has a direct role and global expertise

Management Response:

The CO agrees in principle with this conclusion.

As noted in the management responses for findings 1,2,7-9, 11 and 13; while there are opportunities to engage in knowledge and advisory services in Seychelles, the binding constraint remains the available human and financial resources to make the necessary, if initial, investment. The current preoccupation with delivery of downstream projects and hard output activities, has constrained the UNDP presence from engaging in upstream knowledge advisory and policy work. Possible solutions lie, in part, with the reformulation of the CPD in line with the ICPE recommendations to seek a balance between both programming orientations; and for a catalytic investment by UNDP to establish a refreshed SIDs paradigm and our positioning within this context.

Evaluation Recommendations Issue 19:

In developing the new Country Programme Document care should be taken to reflect Seychelles' particular needs and issues as a small island state that has attained high-income status, and UNDP's capacity to provide support. UNDP should focus its limited resources on strengthening the focus of the program on environmental management and climate change, and synergies between its different components.

Management Response:

The CO partially agrees with this recommendation.

While the CO agrees with the focus on environmental management and climate change; the analytics from the IFIs on U/MIC and HIC countries suggest a need to engage with the question of inequality, in line with SDGs 2030 principle to Leave No One Behind. Non-inclusive growth would be a key risk for Seychelles and similarly situated countries. The specificities of the Seychelles, with an ageing population, high dependency on migrant labour and constrained tax base, suggest that support to National Bureau of Statistics, Department of Blue Economy and other key policy institutions on inclusive growth continues to be of import in delivering on the UNDP mandate with perhaps a focus on knowledge and policy advisory work as cited in other segments of this report.

Evaluation Recommendations Issue 20:

The country office should ensure future project designs avoid unnecessary proliferation of project components and counterparts and include only well-reasoned straightforward M&E frameworks and targets. Where designs include plans for complex physical works that have not been subject to detailed feasibility studies, sufficient time should be allocated to complete this work, and flexibility should be provided to accommodate and respond appropriately to the outcomes of this work.

Management Response:

The CO agrees with this finding

Reference is made to previous Findings 8, 11 and 12– where the details of the recommendation are addressed.

Evaluation Recommendations Issue 21:

The country office should improve results-based management by ensuring program level reporting frameworks include objectives, and targets and related indicators only if there is a realistic prospect for UNDP to have a measurable influence over them; building increased M&E and research capacity into individual project designs, or by establishing a shared resource that can provide analytical support across the PCU; developing a shared narrative across the program about the challenges it is helping Seychelles government to address.

Management Response

The CO agrees with this finding, details of which have been elaborated in other parts of this response.

* The implementation status is tracked in the ERC.