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**Executive Summary**

*Project Summary*

The project is funded under the global UNDP-GEF Targeted Portfolio Project for Land Management (SLM) in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The granitic islands of the Seychelles are composed of a core of granitic rock which forms the steep uplands where soils are lateritic and highly leached, with narrow surrounding coastal plains (locally known as “plateaux”) are formed by coral sand – where soils are highly porous and infertile . Both soil types are physically, chemically and biologically poor, with low levels of organic matter (SOM). Over 80% of Seychelles land area is under some form of forest or vegetation cover, though less so on the more urbanized main islands. Land degradation has mainly occurred because of forest fires, clearing of forest for development purposes (agriculture, including plantations, also housing and infrastructure), effects of invasive alien species, unsustainable agriculture, construction practices and landslides or rock falls. On the coralline islands, the SLM issues are different ((*inter alia* porous sandy soils derived from coral, guano mining and often monocultures), but also very important.

“Seychelles is one of the major biodiversity ‘hot spots’ in the world and its most important asset is its rare environmental beauty” (UNDP Country Programme 2007-2010). The project aims to increase capacity in prevention and control of forest fires, rehabilitation of degraded areas, control of invasive alien (IA) creepers, development of forest management plans, promotion of sustainable land management (SLM) / soil conservation in agriculture and to minimise risks of land movements. It also aims to mainstream SLM in relevant policy and regulatory frameworks and to assist in developing a National Action Plan and Integrated Financing Strategy (formerly known as a Medium Term Investment Plan) for SLM.

*Purpose and Objectives of Evaluation*

Mid-Term Evaluations (MTE) are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. This is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The MTE will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

*Audience for the Evaluation*

Project Team (SLM Project Manager, National Project Director, Programme Co-ordinator and Chief Technical Advisor), partners and beneficiaries in Seychelles, Government of Seychelles, UNDP Country Office, UNDP EEG RCU Regional Technical Advisor and the GEF.

*Intended Uses of the Evaluation*

Findings of this review are intended to be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term.

*Key Aspects of the Evaluation Approach and Methods*

Three principle sources of information were used during the evaluation, namely (i) all available documents produced during the first two years of the project; (ii) interviews with the current SLM Project Manager, one previous SLM Project Manager, other GEF Project Managers, UNDP-GEF Seychelles Programme Coordinator and Chief Technical Advisor, National Project Director, UNDP Country Officer, members of the SLM Steering Committee, project partners and beneficiaries; and (iii) field visits.

*Summary of Principle Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.*

Findings

The project is making some progress, in spite of a range of difficulties, many of which are beyond the control of project / wider UNDP. Notably:

* Good progress has been made towards Outcomes 1 and 2.
* Workshops and training sessions have been held as planned.
* Technical studies produced by national consultants.
* The fire risk maps produced.
* The project’s design seems very complex (59 Activities in Outcomes 1-4 of the ProDoc).

Overall, the required quarterly and annual reporting requirements appear to have been fulfilled and the PMs have made appropriate use of these, also the Logframe and PSC in adaptive management.

However, a number of issues are affecting progress towards the project’s goal and objective, including:

* Poor general awareness of SLM / the win-win benefits of SLM.
* Difficulties in project implementation due to the limited number of appropriately qualified, experienced and available national consultants on Seychelles.
* Problems retaining suitably qualified and experienced staff and consultants.
* No progress has yet been made towards Outcomes 3 and 4.
* Site selection of “on the ground” studies has not been participatory.
* The landslide maps for use in the land use planning have not been produced.
* LUP international consultant working to MLUH PS preparing district land use plans – however, work appears to be focusing on wide range of land administration / urban planning issues, not as TORs state focussing on contributing to SLM and BD projects and working under the management of those PMs.
* Communications with partners, beneficiaries and the general public could be improved.
* The project budget is considerably under spent.
* The project does not have an appropriate presence on the internet.

Conclusions

* Urgent need to raise awareness of SLM at all levels (farmers, extensionists, policy makers, local communities and project’s international consultant).
* Project’s major long-term impacts will be through catalysing preparation of the NAP (Outcome 3), the IFS (formerly known as the Medium Term Investment Plan - Outcome 4), contributions to EMPS III and changes in the various laws / Acts and regulations (*inter alia* the Town and Country Planning Act[[1]](#footnote-2) and the Environmental Protection Act).
* Clarification is needed and progress should be expedited towards outcomes 1.4 and 1.6.
* The GEF should avoid over complicated project designs.

Recommendations

* At all levels, there is need to better communicate what SLM is, its multiple win-win benefits and the synergies with BD and CC.
* Work towards Outcomes 3 and 4 should be prioritised using existing guidance (e.g. TerrAfrica CSIF).
* The issues around which projects will contribute to landslide mapping need to be resolved urgently, to enable the LUP international consultant to use these in preparation of the district plans.
* The PM should be more closely involved in the discussions towards changes in the T & C PA, EPA and in the preparation of district land use plans to ensure SLM is not omitted.
* The Forest Fire Contingency Plan, based on using the existing local expertise of the Chief Fire Officer, should be simplified and widely disseminated, if necessary with training by an international fire officer.
* Awareness should be raised among Seychellois that they can relatively easily halt the problems of forest fires with some care and education – as all are lit by people.
* Activities of International Land Use Planning Consultant should be managed by a “matrix” including the SLM and BD PMs (also the PCU), rather than at present where he appears to work only under the direction of the MLUH PS.
* Sites to be used for testing invasive alien creeper removal need to be selected using participatory approaches – involving local communities as they will be responsible to long term maintenance.
* Sites should be developed with farmers to demonstrate the multiple win-win benefits of SLM.
* The PM should propose revisions to resolve issues around Outputs 1.4 (Sustainable production forest management systems are developed) and 1.6 (Capacity for minimising risks of landslides is developed) (links with FAO and WB activites) then take them to the Steering Committee for agreement.
* The project should endeavour to enable the small NGOs to contribute more easily to the project (e.g. GIF, Wildlife Clubs of the Seychelles, SIF).
* The UNDP GEF Seychelles Programme and /or a SLM Project website should be improved.

**Introduction**

This is the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Government of Seychelles – UNDP – GEF Capacity Development for Sustainable Land Management Project (a Medium-Sized Project), which was planned in 2006 – 2007. The Project Document was approved by GEF in 2007. The MTE is required under the terms of the project agreement.

The Mid-Term Evaluation is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The intended audience for this report include the project team (SLM Project Manager, National Project Director, Programme Co-ordinator and Chief Technical Advisor), partners and beneficiaries in Seychelles, Government of Seychelles, UNDP Country Office UNDP EEG Regional Technical Advisor and the GEF.

This report includes a short description of the project, followed by a description of the scope of the evaluation, including its approach and methodology. The main findings and conclusions are presented, followed by recommendations as to how the project should proceed in its final two years in order to maximise the likelihood that the project meets its planned targets. Lessons learned from the project to-date are also summarised – and supporting information provided in the Annexes.

This Portfolio SLM Project was specifically designed for SIDS and being a SIDS with its typical economic, social and environmental vulnerabilities, the experiences in Seychelles are expected to assist in the design of projects for other SIDS.

**Description of the Intervention** (most of following text is directly quoted from the Project Document)

The project is funded under the global UNDP-GEF Targeted Portfolio Project for SLM in LDC and SIDS.

The granitic islands of the Seychelles are composed of a core of granitic rock which forms the steep uplands where the laterite soils are highly leached, with narrow surrounding coastal plains (locally known as “plateaux”) are formed by coral sand – where soils are highly porous and infertile . Both soil types are physically, chemically and biologically poor, with low levels of organic matter (SOM). Over 80% of Seychelles land area is under some form of forest or vegetation cover, though less so on the more urbanized main islands. Land degradation has mainly occurred because of forest fires, clearing of forest for development purposes (agriculture, including plantations; housing; infrastructure), effects of invasive alien species, and unsustainable agriculture and construction practices, and landslides or rock falls. On the coralline islands, the SLM issues are different, but also very important (*inter alia* porous sandy soils derived from coral, guano mining and often monocultures).

“Seychelles is one of the major biodiversity ‘hot spots’ in the world and its most important asset is its rare environmental beauty” (UNDP Country Programme 2007-2010).

Prevention and control of forest fires is taking place, but needs a comprehensive all-encompassing strategy, including models for rehabilitation of degraded areas. Unsustainable harvesting of forest products is on the increase and made worse because of the lack of forest management models. The invasive alien (IA) creepers, which in places are smothering the forest, are reported to be a relatively new phenomenon of which little is known and no control measures have been established. SLM / soil conservation in agriculture is not effectively addressed because of non-conducive lease agreements of state agricultural land, low levels of farmer awareness of SLM, widespread belief that SLM is very costly, non-effective extension work and lack of adequate soil testing facilities. Risks of landslides are not well incorporated in land use planning and construction practices. Seychelles has no National Action Plan or Investment Plan for sustainable land management.

The ‘Capacity Development for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) project, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with a grant of US$475,000, was signed in 2007 between the Government of Seychelles (GOS) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project is part of a global portfolio of SLM projects for Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States to respond to the obligation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. The project was developed to address the particular land degradation issues in Seychelles, with particular emphasis on integrating SLM principles into resource management policies and practices and on capacity development of key partners.

The project aims to increase capacity in prevention and control of forest fires, rehabilitate degraded areas, control IA creepers, develop forest management plans, promote SLM in agriculture and minimise risks of land movements (landslides). It also aims to mainstream SLM in relevant policy and regulatory frameworks and to assist in developing a National Action Plan and an Integrated Financing Strategy (formerly known as a Medium Term Investment Plan) for SLM.

The Project Document explains that there remains a strong policy framework for environmental management in the Seychelles. Environmental concerns are embedded in the Seychelles’ constitution (Article 38). Environmental management in Seychelles is guided by the second Environment Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS II, 2000 - 2010), which has the following goal: “*The promotion, coordination and integration of sustainable development programmes that cut across all sectors of society in the Seychelles”*. It covers ten thematic areas covering all major social and economic sectors, including, with relevance for this document: “*Land Use, Coastal Zones and Urbanization*” and “*Biodiversity, Forestry and Agriculture*”. EMPS II was prepared by World Bank funding and projects identified were expected to be funded by The World Bank (information provided during MTE). These funds were cut and instead only some of the activities prioritised in EMPS II were implemented (with EU, UNDP and other support).

The Department of Environment is currently coordinating the drafting of EMPS III, which is to cover the period 2011 -2020. This is being overseen by a 35 member national steering committee, which includes some civil society stakeholder participation. EMPS III is being prepared with the assistance of 12 consultants, one per thematic sector – many of which involve SLM (see Table 1). The SLM PM has been asked to meet with the relevant consultants on a one-to-one basis to ensure that SLM issues are adequately addressed in the new EMPS.

**Table1: Thematic Sectors in EMPS III (2011 – 2020) and SLM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Thematic Sector** | **Sustainable Land Management** |
| 1 | Society, Population and Health (including Gender) |  |
| 2 | Land Use, Coastal Zones and Urbanisation | Landscape approaches, land use planning, reduction of sedimentation and pollution (excess agrochemicals) of coastal zones from cultivated land and around homes / roads / tourist / industrial developments |
| 3 | Biodiversity, Forestry and Agriculture | Agroforestry, sustainable harvesting, reduction in forest fires, increasing agricultural production and reduction in inter-annual variation in yields |
| 4 | Energy and Transport |  |
| 5 | Fisheries and Marine Resources / Processes | Reduction in inputs of sediment and pollution to coastal zones |
| 6 | Water, Sanitation and Waste | Reduced rates of runoff from increasingly intense rainfall and better regulation of river levels (reducing the incidence of floods and very low river levels) |
| 7 | Tourism and Aesthetics | Landscape protection |
| 8 | Environmental Economics and Mainstream, Sustainable Financing | PES, increasing farm revenues from increasing agricultural production and reduction in inter-annual variation in yields |
| 9 | Regulatory, Policy and Institutional Mechanisms | Vital framework to support SLM |
| 10 | Commerce, Industry and Production | Increasing agricultural production and reduction in inter-annual variation in yields |
| 11 | Climate Change | CC adaptation and mitigation – through C sequestration and improved ecosystem functioning (rainwater infiltration / storage in soils etc) |
| 12 | Education, Awareness and Advocacy | Reduction in incidence of forest fires, care to reduce / clear IAS (creepers) |

The national benefits of the project include contributing to more **sustainable forest and agriculture production**, while at the same time safeguarding against land degradation. These remain relevant, since SLM is still not widely understood nor effectively implemented in Seychelles and land degradation is a visible and increasing threat. The project will thereby contribute to achieving the national development goals in terms of improved ecological and economic underpinning for sustainable development.

The **project’s contribution to agricultural development** in Seychelles is now of much greater relevance to the Seychellois than at the time the Project Document was prepared (2006) - a time when at some levels agriculture was not considered to be highly important (The Seychelles Strategy 2017 (2007) stated that agriculture should “not hinder development” – see full text in Annex 9). The growing appreciation of the importance of agriculture has been catalysed by the combined effects of the 2008 global food crisis, the 2008 – 2009 global economic crisis and national economic reforms and are articulated in the Seychelles Agricultural Development Strategy 2007-2011. In response particularly to the food crisis, the GOS developed a National Food Security Strategy 2008-2011 – which highlights the need to increase national food production, a target to which SLM can contribute.

The global benefits of the project are improved ecosystems integrity, functioning and services. The project was also designed to assist in improved adaptation to climate change, in particular sea level rise. It has recently become more widely recognised that many SLM technologies also contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation, particularly technologies which increase soil organic carbon levels (as results from increased use of *inter alia* compost, green manures, agroforestry, conservation agriculture, sustainable forestry), thereby improving the physical, chemical and biological functioning (ecosystem services) of soils and vegetation.

The project contributes to meeting the objectives of the UNDP Country Programme, as SLM has close synergies to biodiversity protection, climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation. Thus, the SLM project has many synergies with the other on-going GEF projects (Biosecurity, Biodiversity Mainstreaming and the Capacity Development for Improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles).

-----

The Goal of the project is: “***Sustainable land management is practiced and mainstreamed into national developmenti in Seychelles*.**”

The Objective of the project is: “***Capacity enhanced in Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and SLM principles applied in national policies, plans, processes and practices***”.

**Outcome 1**: *Individual and institutional capacity for SLM enhanced* – to be achieved through 7 outputs:

1.1. Capacities for forest fire prevention, detection and suppression are strengthened;

1.2. Cost-effective techniques for the rehabilitation of burned/deforested land are tested and developed;

1.3: Cost-effective techniques/capacities for controlling deforestation by IAS creepers are developed;

1.4: Sustainable production forest management systems are developed;

1.5: Improved capacities for soil conservation in agriculture are developed;

1.6: Capacity for minimizing risks of landslides is developed.

1.7 Capacity on Environmental Economics in SLM developed

**Outcome 2**: *SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development* – to be achieved through 3 outputs:

2.1: Sustainable land management principles integrated in relevant national policies and strategies;

2.2: Legal and regulatory framework concerning SLM reviewed, updated and harmonized;

2.3: Stakeholders are aware of and apply SLM practices.

**Outcome 3**: *National Action Plan (NAP) completed and monitored* – to be achieved through 3 outputs:

3.1: NAP prepared according to UNCCD guidelines;

3.2: NAP disseminated.

3.3. NAP monitored

**Outcome 4**: *Medium Term Investment Plan being financed and implemented* – to be achieved through 3 outputs:

4.1. Medium Term Investment Plan for SLM developed;

4.2. Financing for Medium Term Investment Plan ensured;

4.3. Medium Term Investment Plan implemented and monitored.

**Outcome 5**: *Adaptive Management and Learning in place* – to be achieved through 3 outputs:

5.1. Effective project management in place

5.2. Monitoring and Evaluation work plan implemented

5.3. Lessons learned collected, prepared and disseminated

The evaluation takes place three years after the project was approved, just over half way through this single phase project (the project end date changed from June 2011 to June 2012 during YR 1, as noted in the May 2009 Annual Performance Report[[2]](#footnote-3)) . There have not been any major changes in the project plan and strategy – although there has been considerable delay in the start-up of activities to achieve two of the Outcomes (3 and 4) (see Annex 6) and also delays in various activities which contribute to the Outputs under Outcomes 1 and 2 (see Annex 6 and 7).

The key partners in the project are the Ministry of Home Affairs, Environment and Transport (Department of the Environment and Seychelles National Park Authority), the Ministry of Investment, Natural Resources and Industry (Department of Natural Resources - which encompasses agriculture) and the Ministry of Land Use and Housing. These Ministries differ in name from those outlined in the Project Document as there have been two major institutional changes in the civil service since the preparation of the Project Document, one in late 2008 – then again in June 2010. There has been considerable re-structuring and economic reforms of the public sector of the Government of Seychelles, resulting in a reduction in staff numbers in many Ministries – for this project most notably in the Forestry sector (reportedly depleted of fire fighting expertise), also staff reductions and changes in agriculture with the creation of the Seychelles Agriculture Agency (by Act of Parliament on 6 January 2009) to manage the agricultural sector. This may have some advantages, releasing staff who could then work on the project as national consultants. However, it reduces the capacity of Ministries (fewer staff are available to fulfil statutory obligations etc) to contribute to what is a mainstreaming project and thus places not inconsiderable challenges on the project to maintain links.

Other key partners are the many environmental NGOs which exist in Seychelles (*inter alia* GIF, SIF, TRASS, PCAG).

The total budget for the project, as in the Project Document is presented in Table 2.

### Table 2: Project Outcome Budget (in US$) from Project Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **GEF** | **Co-finance** | | **Total** |
| **GOS Co-finance** | **Other co-finance** |
| 1: Individual and institutional capacity for SLM enhanced | 335,000 | 943,000 | 502,000  (UNDP, FAO, NGOs) | **1,780,000** |
| 2: SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development | 77,500 | 80,000 | 0 | **157,500** |
| 3: National Action Plan completed | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 | **20,000** |
| 4: Medium Term investment Plan being financed and implemented | 15,000 | 30,000 | 0 | **45,000** |
| 5. Adaptive Management and Learning in place | 47,500 | 80,000 |  | **127,500** |
| **TOTAL MSP** | **475,000** | **1,143,000** | **512,000** | **2,130,000** |

Table 3 shows the estimated disbursements of GEF and Co-financing presented in the latest Annual Performance Review (APR) – 2010.

### Table 3: Financial Information: cumulative from project start to 30 June 2010

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Contributor** | **Type of Contributions**  **In-kind/cash-UNDP managed only** | **Amount Carried Over from PDF-A into Project**  **US$** | **Amount Committed in Project Document**  **US$** | **Amount Committed After Project Approval**  **US$** | **Estimated Total Disbursement to**  **30 June 2010**  **US$** | **Expected Total Disbursement by end of project**  **US$** |
| **GEF** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GEF |  | 475,000 | 475,000 | 475,000 | 144,926.78 | 475,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Co-financing /Nature (**Gov, Multilateral, etc.**)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Department of Environment (DOE) | Cash and In Kind | 0 | 700,000 | 1,968,000 | 470,000 | 1,968,000 |
| Department of Natural Resources (DNR) | In Kind | 0 | 333,000 | 1,447,132 | 463,875 | 1,447,132 |
| Ministry of National Development (MLUH) | In Kind | 0 | 218,000 | 238,000 | 128,400 | 20,000 |
| Seychelles National Parks Authority (SNPA) | In Kind | 0 | 32,000 | 32,000 | 18,000 | 32,000 |
| Green Islands Foundation (GIF) | In Kind | 0 | 72,000 | 72,000 | 4,800  Due to a change in the project their contribution will be minimal | 10,000 |
| Nature Protection Trust of Seychelles (NPTS) | In Kind | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 9,515 | 10,000 |
| Plant Conservation Action Group (PCA) | In Kind | 0 | 40,000 | 4,600 | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| Island Conservation Society (ICS) | In Kind | 0 | 45,000 | 47,400 | 47,400 | 47,400 |
| Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) | In Kind | 0 | 235,000 | 355,800 | 265,000 | 355,800 |
| United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) | In Kind (Parallel Funding) | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 15,000  Information still not provided by co-financing agency | 60,000 |

Latest disbursement figures at the time of the MTE (as at 16/09/10) show that the project had disbursed a total of $156,632.91 (33% of the total GEF funds), leaving a balance of $318,367.09 (67%). The co-financing for the project has been verified by the evaluator.

-----

An array of **global and national economic challenges**, also the previously mentioned institutional changes in Seychelles have presented greater challenges to the project’s progress towards achieving its outcomes during the project’s short life-span than could have been anticipated when the project started (see Annex 8).

The project has also faced an array of **implementation constraints**. One of the issues of greatest concern regarding the continuity and successful implementation of the project has been the frequent changes in project and wider UNDP personnel (there have been three Project Managers and one Temporary Project Manager – also three different Programme Coordinators (Jan Rijpma, Brad Auer and Veronique Herminie). This frequent change in personnel has clearly resulted in the loss of some “project memory”. These changes are not conducive to the smooth operation of the project, as new PMs inevitably take some time to become familiar and assume the required leadership role of this “medium-sized” but quite complex project (including, in the Project Document, 59 Activities in Outcomes 1-4).

In addition, the project has faced a range of problems in working with staff from the civil service (downsizing of the DOE and changes in the various departments have impacted on the project) and availability of appropriately skilled national consultants, including the lengthy process to get the civil servants to obtain leave without pay (summarised in Table 4).

### Table 4: Challenges and Difficulties in Project Start-Up and Implementation and Lessons-Learnt (adapted from APR 2010)

| **Challenges** | **Constraints** | **Mitigation Measures** | **Lessons Learnt** | **Required Assistance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative** |  |  |  |  |
| Lengthy approval process between administrative bodies when hiring consultants and approving contracts, which has greatly slowed the initiation of numerous project activities. | Administrative approval for contracts and consulting work is highly complicated in the Seychelles, with the current process requiring involvement / approval of 7 different government agencies[[3]](#footnote-4). In addition, the Government initiated a major restructuring in late 2008, which has resulted in many new rules and requirements, many of which continue to be adjusted. | Procedures have been defined and streamlined in an ‘Aide Memoire’ between UNDP and the Department of Environment. A Chief Technical Adviser post have been added to the unit it should give more time to the Programme Coordinator who is a Seychellois with a good network in government bodies to try to streamline administrative processes. | It is vital from the beginning to streamline any processes and procedures where necessary so as to avoid any delays in the implementation of the project. | UNDP Country Office (Mauritius) and other donors should play a role in pushing government to reduce administrative complexities |
| Delay in contracts completion |  | A penalty of $100 per week or $25 per day overdue has been added to the contracts. | This must be enforced. |  |
| Technical |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of human capacity available to undertake consultancy work. | Seychelles is a very small Island State, which means that the number of persons with technical training and experience in SLM-related issues is quite small, and most of these persons are already engaged in full time employment | Potential candidates are encouraged to submit their application in partnership with others. This relieves the workload and timing required to complete the consultancy. In addition, rather than just advertising consulting work, the project has also tried to develop partnerships with relevant agencies, and has sought out qualified candidates. | In addition to sourcing out potential candidates through advertising, projects in small countries must actively seek out qualified applicants | Effective cooperation from relevant ministries, departments and organizations to provide as much information as possible on the availability of partnerships and/or qualified candidates. EMPS, which is a forum for stakeholder review and oversight of all environment programmes, should be strengthened as often 50% of members do not attend meetings where such matters could be discussed. |
| Other |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of government agencies (DOE, SAA, SNPA, etc) financial and HR capacities to act as viable partners in project implementation | Leads to dependency on consultants.  Government agencies in the Seychelles are struggling to deliver on their main duties so they are not to keen on adding any. | To try to encourage more complementarities and partnership between SLM Project and government agencies |  | UNDP Country Office (Mauritius) and other implementing agencies should play a role in pushing government to give more support to GEF Projects.  The PCU has already started to meet with all its stakeholders on a one to one basis, especially now with new management at the PCU, to explain the PCU role and how all can work together better for implementation of the various projects. |
| UNDP staff turn-over | Loss of continuity and project memory. | Improved record keeping and hand-over period. | Make efforts to retain staff. | GOS support. |

**Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

*Evaluation Scope*

Mid-Term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects) and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

This evaluation studied progress towards all five project outcomes, the four substantive outcomes which contribute to the project goal – also Outcome 5, project management, monitoring and evaluation over the period May 2008 to September 2010. The geographical area of the project focuses on the granitic islands of the Seychelles (Mahé, Praslin and Le Digue), although the international consultant has produced a LUP of the coral atoll Coétivy. [[4]](#footnote-5)

*Evaluation Objectives*

This report is intended to help users to better understand the achievements of the project to date and appreciate the considerable challenges which have faced all those involved in implementing this complex and wide-ranging yet officially “medium-sized” SLM project (Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4 have 35, 8, 7 and 9 activities respectively). The challenges have ranged from the impacts of unprecedented global challenges, with impacts at the national level – also unforeseen discontinuity in the UNDP team in Seychelles.

*Evaluation Question*

Annex 2 provides details of the questions used to interview project partners.

The additional information required for a thorough mid-term evaluation of a project was obtained from the wide range of project reports made available to the evaluator, with confirmation from other sources, including the Project Manager, Programme Coordinator, CO Programme Officer and Chief Technical Advisor.

The information was cross-checked / verified using triangulation.

**Evaluation Approach and Methods**

*Data sources*

Three principle sources of information were used during the evaluation, namely:

1. all available documents produced during the first two years of the project;
2. interviews with the current SLM Project Manager, other GEF Project Managers, UNDP-GEF Seychelles Programme Coordinator and Chief Technical Advisor, National Project Director, UNDP Country Officer, Steering Committee members, project partners and beneficiaries;
3. field visits.

Based on an analysis of the Project Document and particularly the most recently revised Logical Framework (February 2010), these have been selected as the most appropriate to obtain the information required to address the evaluation questions.

*Sampling*

It was not considered appropriate to undertake any formal sample surveys during this evaluation – in part, as the nature of the project activities implemented to-date have not created a large group of beneficiaries –and also as the time-scale of the evaluation did not allow time to plan such surveys.

*Data Collection Procedures and Instruments*

The formal approach used to collect data was an interview protocol (Annex 2), developed from the MTE TORs for use when interviewing project partners. This was used in order to ensure the full range of relevant topics was covered with all the project partners. However, discussions during the interviews were not limited to the 10 questions, as it was believed that it was essential to find out further details on the role of the organisations, recent (post Pro-Doc) changes in the organisation, external factors affecting the organisation etc.

In order to improve the reliability and validity of the evidence, a form of triangulation was carried-out, gathering evidence from project staff and reports, partners and stakeholders to see how their evidence concurred or differed.

*Stakeholder (Partners and Beneficiaries) Engagement*

The evaluator met with as many of the project partners who have been involved to-date in the project activities (inter alia senior officials of the GOS Departments, civil servants at all levels working on the project, active and less active NGO partners mentioned in the Project Document / Inception Report / Annual Project Reports and members of the project Steering Committee). Thus far, the project has not been very active working with beneficiaries (e.g. farmers, land owners), however, the evaluation did include farm visits to review current SLM practices and issues, also a meeting with a private land owner. Without exception, all those met during the evaluation welcomed the opportunity to discuss the project in detail and many devoted considerable time and effort to ensure they offered all the help they could. Unfortunately, I went to a pre-planned meeting at the Seychelles Agriculture and Horticulture Training Centre (SAHTC), but the interviewee did not arrive for the meeting. [A strategy for greater stakeholder participation is required and will be devised by the PM/PCU.]

I followed-up meetings by email wherever possible, to ensure partners had the opportunity to provide any additional material they realised after our meeting may be relevant. I believe that this open-ness and engagement contribute to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.

*Ethical Considerations*

During all meetings between the evaluator and project partners / beneficiaries where the Project Manager, other UNDP staff or project contractors were present (present initially for introductions), interviewees were offered the opportunity to discuss the project in confidence and also given contact details on how to contact the evaluator during her mission, again to provide any further sensitive information.

The Evaluator also contacted as many interviewees as possible by email after meetings, to find out if there were any outstanding issues which they felt unable to discuss in the presence of project staff.

In general, the Evaluator felt it was not inappropriate to meet with partners / beneficiaries with the Project Manager, given that the current PM has only been in post for 4.5 months and would benefit from attending the meetings.

*Background Information on Evaluators*

A single evaluator (Dr Anne C. Woodfine) was contracted to undertake the mid-term evaluation of this medium-sized project.

Dr Woodfine is a tropical natural resources management and sustainable land management specialist with over 25 years experience working sustainable land management / agriculture, natural resources management & livelihood projects mainly in Africa, but also in S. & S. E. Asia and the Caribbean. She has experience preparing projects (including M & E frameworks) for *inter alia* GEF, the LDCF and DFID; and has implemented evaluations for projects in Africa, S. Asia and the Caribbean. Dr Woodfine works closely with FAO, IFAD, UNDP, the World Bank, the EU, TerrAfrica and WOCAT to promote scaling-up of SLM in Africa. She recently wrote the TerrAfrica Resource Guide on using of SLM for climate change adaptation and mitigation, also website materials for both the World Bank and FAO to guide choices of SLMs in different agro-ecosystems. [Also see Annex 10]

*Major Limitations of the Methodology*

Within the constraints of time and money, the evaluator believes that the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions in the TORs and achieved the evaluation purposes.

I ascertained that all those asked to participate in the evaluation agreed to do so.

**Data Analysis**

The major weakness in this evaluation is that it has not been possible to verify progress towards two of the key project targets – increasing the area of agricultural land under SLM and the proportion of productive forest area with tested harvest schemes - as there is no suitable source for the former and the latter is likely not to remain a target for the project (the PM informed the evaluator during the MTE that Outcome 1.4 – sustainable production forest management systems are developed - is to be changed as the funding is insufficient).

Most of the information has been provided via project documents and interviews. Care was taken wherever possible to painstakingly cross-check information from these sources, with the aim of confirming the accuracy of the results.

There are undoubtedly weaknesses in this method of analysis, but given the time-frame of the evaluation, non-availability of up-to-date land cover / land management information and budgetary constraints, this was the only workable methodology.

The project lacks reliable base-line data for the major spatial targets (increasing the area of agricultural land under SLM and the proportion of productive forest area with tested harvest schemes land) and there are no GEF SLM tracking tools. The latest version of the project Logical Framework (February 2010) gives a very different baseline and target for SLM in agricultural areas (the figures in the LogFrames in the ProDoc and Inception Report show the baseline as 0 ha and the target 200 ha; in the Feb 2010 Logframe, this is changed to a baseline of 200 ha and a target of 350 ha). The final evaluation must endeavour to ensure this is accurately measured.

**Findings and Conclusions**

*Findings*

There have been major changes in development conditions affecting Seychelles during the period between the development of the project (2006), project start-up and this evaluation. The changes include the effects of the world food crisis and resulting massive rise in food prices in 2008, also the global and resulting national economic crisis of 2008-2009, (Annex 8 summarizes some of the effects on Seychelles).

The impacts specifically relating to SLM have been considerable, notably; the major change in the exchange rate has altered the profitability of farming enterprises (farmers interviewed during the evaluation recounted total losses of markets for example for small pineapples, massive competition with imports – and huge increases in input costs). The latter should however catalyse increased interest in SLM, once the benefits are more widely understood.

Despite these issues, **progress towards results** of the project has been achieved with the implementation of activities towards Outcomes 1 and 2. However, there has been no progress towards Outcome 3 or 4 – due to problems in transferring funds from the co-financier (the Global Mechanism), which agreed to fund Outcome 3 (which is a pre-requisite to Outcome 4). It is unfortunate that the project could not cover the cost of Outcome 3 in expectation of funding from the GM, given its importance for EMPS III and Outcome 4. During the MTE, UNDP CO indicated that the arrangements were sufficiently well advanced that the PM should begin preparing TORs for a national or international consultant to prepare the NAP.

Concerning Outcomes 1 and 2, project partners report that the project is a highly timely intervention – given the country’s priorities (the new priority of increasing food security, also ensuring the islands retain their “green” credentials), in the context of the current global economic and food security situation. However, with the exception of the DOE staff, other partners are not sufficiently knowledgeable about the full details of the project to appreciate the delay in commencement of work on Outcomes 3 and 4, nor its wider implications (particularly regarding its inclusion in the EMPS III).

Annex 6 details the specific progress towards the project’s outcomes found at the MTE. These include:

* Various workshops and training sessions have been held as planned, although in some cases attendance has been lower than expected by DOE staff, due to their many other commitments.
* The various required technical studies for Outcomes 1 and 2 have been completed by national consultants – but in some cases it is clear that the work should have been more closely supervised / monitored to ensure outputs more closely fit project needs. The TORs were quite adequately drafted, but the consultants did not really address the specifics of their TORs. Continuity of project management (an appropriately qualified and skilled PM and UNDP Technical / Programme staff) will ensure that in future consultants adhere to their TORs.

-----

Project partners, almost without exception, acknowledge that already the project’s activities are making significant contributions to **enhancing individual and institutional capacities for SLM, also systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles into development planning**. They note, for example, that SLM is in government policy, but prior to the project the focus was principally on species conservation rather than habitat conservation. However, there is some disquiet that progress is only “slow and steady”, clearly implying that they had expected the project to have accomplished more in its first two years. Responders almost all stated they expected to see more activities on the ground during the final 2 years of the project – although many of the project’s Outcomes do not involve “on the ground” activities.

The project is particularly focusing on capacity building in SLM, developing national capabilities in forest fire-fighting, improving knowledge to ensure IA creepers can be controlled, ensuring Seychelles benefits from the latest technologies and best practices both from Seychelles and overseas, developing the soil testing capabilities of SAA and improving agricultural extension. Furthermore, the project is raising awareness that SLM is not the domain of a single ministry or department of government – but truly inter-sectoral and involving whole communities and individuals. [The Lead Ministry must continue to play that role also at the policy level, while the project will address the downstream issues and raise awareness with the primary beneficiaries.]

TRASS, DOE and SAA particularly noted that the project had contributed to enhancing individual and institutional capacities for SLM, as it has catalysed much greater discussion on SLM, which they felt as a long term issue had previously been liable to be side-lined. It is reported to already be engaging relevant people (including young people) – although during the evaluation, this seems as yet to be limited and should be scaled-up.

However, two issues particularly arise:

* It is customary practice to involve local communities in on-the-ground demonstrations and trials for SLM – indeed this is particularly important where project intervention will be for less than 2 years. However, selection of sites for the trials of re-planting trees on burnt ground on Praslin – and also removal of creepers on Mahé does not appear to have been participatory, or indeed involve local people (apart from the NGOs). Progress is too far advanced for change now on Praslin, but there is time and it is advisable for sites to be selected / confirmed before work begins clearing creepers on Mahé, in order to ensure sites continue to be cleared beyond the project life-span.
* Following the Forest Fire Risk Assessment study (1.1), an informative report has been produced. This includes maps of fire risk for the main granitic islands. As presented in the report, these have limited value (poor grey scale, over-use of red) but, they are invaluable within the GOS MLUH GIS and should be used in the preparation of the district land use plans.

-----

The project has funded a survey of the **understanding and current use of SLM** with farmers, extension officers and policy makers (Activity 1.5.1). A report on the results was submitted to the PM and MTE by the national consultant during the evaluation. While there are some serious short-comings in the survey methodology (see lessons learnt) – and it is unfortunate that such a survey was not completed as part of the project base-line, then could have been re-surveyed at final evaluation, the implementation of the activity has catalysed SAA staff to think more about training for farmers – recognizing that in the past this has been too academic – the training needs to be more practically oriented, raising the importance of SLM from the “mundane” to the important (including its contribution to CC adaptation). The SAA, Seychelles Farmers’ Association (SeyFA) and Government agricultural policy makers anticipate that raising the profile of SLM and the role of farmers in sustainable land management will gradually also contribute to ensuring that the occupation of farming is no longer considered an occupation of last resort, but vital to the Seychelles economy and environment (Annex 9 demonstrates how agriculture was viewed in Seychelles prior to the global food and economic crises).

The project’s long term LUP international consultant (part-funded by the SLM project, also the GEF Biodiversity Mainstreaming project) is beginning the process of preparing land use plans for some of the districts of Mahé, also for Praslin, having completed a LUP for Coétivy. The evaluator and others have some concern that the LUPs are being prepared before the BD hotspot and landslide risk maps have been completed therefore has focused on urban planning issues[[5]](#footnote-6). Reportedly, DOE already has a list of hotspots at their Conservation unit, which will be incorporated in the draft LUP’s.The MTE discovered a lack of clarity on the landslide mapping, between the World Bank’s Risk and Disaster Management Project (RDM) and the PSC / PCU, which should be resolved expediently to ensure the mapping is completed.

Throughout the LUP consultancy, counterparts in the MLUH are working with the LUP consultant, benefiting from in-service training. The SLM project is also contributing to funding MLUH staff to participate in GIS training (in Kenya).

-----

The **mainstreaming activities** (Outcome 2) are particularly important for **the impact** **and sustainability of the project into the future**, as they focus on revising key policies, regulations and Acts which are fundamental to ensuring land resources are managed sustainably into the future – including aspects of land tenure (lease terms), regulations of fire lighting (all forest fires in Seychelles are reportedly due to human activity – but the current Act reportedly only applies on Praslin), the Town and County Planning Act and the Environmental Protection Act. Inevitably, progress towards these changes takes time and thus-far there have not been any legal changes – but the topics are being discussed in the appropriate forums, which is encouraging. The chance of success in securing these changes would be raised considerably if the PM is able to participate in the meetings on the subject, notably in the T&CPA and EPA – and is kept up-to-date regarding the progress being made by the legal consultants regarding lease terms.

Some of the individual staff of partner organizations working, for example on producing the young trees for the re-planting of burnt sites on Praslin, had no knowledge of the wider project. This seems to be a missed opportunity and efforts should be made to ensure participants at all levels appreciate how their work fits into the wider project. At a higher level, one of the key NGO partners who have recently joined the Steering Committee expressed the feeling the wished to gain a better knowledge of the wider project.

At the LUP stakeholder workshop for Anse Royale on 23 September, attended by about 50 local people, the project’s role in the planning exercise was never mentioned, nor how the LUP intended to ensure BD and LD hotspots were protected. This was a major lost opportunity.

-----

Regarding the **measurement of change and progress towards results** during the first half of the project, the evaluation confirms that 7 reviews / technical reports have been completed (see Annex 5) also a draft report produced on the results of the project’s questionnaire survey.

The project has not begun implementing activities in the field at the test sites for restoration of burnt land and removal of creepers. However, planting material is ready in tree nurseries and plans in place to begin planting trees at the two burnt sites selected on Praslin (unfortunately selection did not use participatory methods) as soon as the rainy season begins (Oct / Nov 2010). Using the results of the project-funded risk assessment of climbing and creeping species[[6]](#footnote-7), it is planned to begin the test clearing of creepers at four sites on Mahé and one on Praslin (Vallée de Mai) during the rainy season as some sites on Mahé involve replanting of natives in place of the removed creepers (Oct – Nov. 2010). These sites must be agreed with local communities using participatory methods – to ensure their follow-up in the long term. Results from these test sites remain highly relevant and are vital for the project’s Outcome 1. Time is now very limited for these tests to provide the required practical information for scaling-up beyond the project’s life-span.

A land use plan has been completed for the atoll of Coétivy, a draft plan has been presented to stakeholders for Anse Royale District (south east Mahé) and plans are at an early stage of development for both districts of Praslin[[7]](#footnote-8). In order to achieve the LogFrame target, these plans need not only to be agreed with stakeholders, but also to be reviewed by Ministries and accepted by Cabinet (including the map, a short report and statistics). It is unfortunate that due to various delays, the maps of landslide risk have not yet been produced – these, together with information from the maps already produced on fire risk need to be included in the final land use plans - adopting a “landscape approach” and reducing the focus on urban areas. [The MTE discovered some lack of clarity as to which project was to fund this landslide mapping, either the World Bank’s DRDM or the GEF SLLM project – I recommend ideally the SLM project should fund with WB co-financing.]

[The international LUP consultant is also reportedly working on a policy paper on industrial estates for the MLUH.]

In 2008 – 2009, the project held an “Environmental Economics Toolkit Training” workshop in November 2008, a “Post-Fire Rehabilitation” workshop in June 2009 and hosted a regional workshop (together with the UNCCD Global Mechanism) on Designing Integrated Financing Strategies (DIFS) for National Action Plans (NAPs) in May 2009, with the participation of three other countries.

In 2009 – 2010, the project held a workshop on Forest Fire Fighting and the Forest Fire Contingency Plan on 30 July 2009. It was attended by 61 high level stakeholders. At the end of 2009, training was carried out on “Ecological & Economical Principles of Cost-effective Strategies for Rehabilitation of Burned/Deforested Areas”. The training course, including field demonstrations and working sessions, was delivered over a period of three days to a mixed group of 20 participants from different organizations and professional backgrounds. A Forest Fire Contingency Plan Validation Workshop was held on 28 May 2010, attended by 20 stakeholders. A Forest Fire Risk Assessment and Creepers Risk Assessment presentation was held on 1 June 2010, attended by 33 high level stakeholders.

The questionnaire survey of the knowledge and use of SLM among farmers, in the extension service and awareness of policy makers (part of 1.5) was not as well focussed as would have been ideal and assumes a level of knowledge of SLM “principles” (this should have been practices or technologies) which may not be present. The report on the results of the questionnaire does not clarify numbers of respondents –and states (regrettably) “Almost all farmers who were interviewed showed no real enthusiasm or necessity to approach or seek for advice from the Extension Service” – which could be misconstrued – as, for example, if farmers are not aware of the win-win benefits of the wide range of SLM technologies (not only composting), they will not appreciate how extensionists can help them.

No UNCCD Committee exists in Seychelles and regrettably in June 2010 the Focal Point left his post – thus Seychelles is currently in the process of finding a replacement Focal Point. DOE should urgently address this in order to ensure successful mainstreaming of SLM.

The EMPS III Steering Committee currently does not closely involve the SLM project – but during the MTE, the DOE EMPS III coordinator agreed that the SLM PM can participate in future meetings, which should ensure that SLM is appropriately addressed, despite the absence of the NAP.

The total lack of progress towards Outcomes 3 and 4 has been beyond the control of the project team – but, now the authorization has been given for the TORs to be prepared for Outcome 3, there are no reasons why this should not be completed within the coming 6 months. It would be appropriate for the project to benefit from lessons learned on continental Africa in developing financing plans for SLM. Thus, they should refer to the TerrAfrica document on preparation of Country Strategic Investment Framework[[8]](#footnote-9) for the preparation of the Seychelles Integrated Financing Strategy (formerly known as the Medium Term Financial Plan).

-----

The **project outcomes and strategy** as outlined in the ProDoc and Inception Report were well targeted to contribute to the achievement of the expected results and in general remain the most effective route towards the project goal and objective.

It is however recommended to include development of on-farm demonstration sites, which have proved effective outside Seychelles (e.g. using the farmer field school approach) in helping farmers appreciate the range of technologies and multiple benefits of SLM.

The project has funded a Review on Institutional Capacity for Forest Fire Fighting (2009) and then held a workshop to present the outcomes to stakeholders. Some interviewees in the MTE feel that the contingency plan is too complex – perhaps no-longer valid, due to changes in the public sector which have changed (and made less clear) the chain of command. Given the impact of forest fires and the fact that most on Seychelles are started by people (either intentionally or accidentally), the topic should be prioritized in the remaining period of the project – developing a less complex plan, perhaps involving bringing in an overseas forest fire-fighting expert (e.g. from Spain) to train the local Chief Fire Officer, his staff and possibly also a team of well-trained reserves in every district of Seychelles. [Linkages to district brigades as well under the DRDM district contingency plans should be established.]

-----

Overall, the latest revision of the **project’s logical framework and indicators** is adequate in responding to the GEF strategic priorities and achieving project objective.

However, there remains uncertainty regarding the target area to be under “improved soil conservation practices” by the end of the project. Not only does this not appear as one of the project objectives, but the baseline and target figures have changed from the ProDoc / Logframe – when they were 0 ha and 200ha respectively to 200ha and 350ha in the February 2010 revision of the Logframe, with no clear explanation[[9]](#footnote-10). After visiting several farms on Mahé on the MTE, the latter baseline is more realistic, as farmers have long been terracing and using compost, without project intervention. Given the small area being farmed, it would be appropriate for the project to collect figures before and after interventions with farmers.

The wording of the target under Outcome 1 for the soil testing laboratory should be re-worded, as this project will not develop the payment-based system *per se*, but assist in equipping the laboratory (both should be done see TOR).

Given the delay in starting work towards Outcome 3, the numerical target for the linked Outcome 4 (80% financing for IFS committed) seems unlikely to be achieved within the lifespan of the project.

-----

Although the project thus-far has had little impact of the ground in Seychelles, the **prospects for the sustainability** of the Outcomes is evaluated to be good, as the project is focusing on mainstreaming SLM into regulations, laws and lease terms for agricultural land, which will set the conditions for long term sustainable land management. This will develop a more conducive environment for SLM – notably for farmers, by increasing the length of leases, they should be more inclined to invest their time, efforts and money into improving their management of the challenging agroecosystems of Seychelles (both the “plateau” and hillside agroecosystems) are characterized by very challenging soils.

The project target regarding restoring the soil testing service is one for which the long term sustainability is less assured. SAA has a project funded by the International Atomic Energy Authority to re-develop an existing building at Grand Anse (on the west coast of Mahé), although it seems GOS are to fund the re-building - the timing for which is uncertain – and the plans are highly ambitious (including several specialist laboratories), although the SAA have only a single member of staff to run the facility. The SLM project is to contribute funds for equipment. Once redeveloped, the lab intends to charge farmers for the soil testing service – but, this is unlikely to cover the true costs.

SAA and the SLM project could consider developing a service using more appropriate technologies, which will be more sustainable, for example providing extension staff with field soil testing kits rather than relying only on lab facilities. (PM comment - both will apply see list of equipment))

-----

Seychelles is a matriarchal society, thus the **gender perspective** is very different from most of continental Africa. [“Women and men in Seychelles enjoy full economic, political and civil rights. Seychelles is among the top countries in the Southern Africa Development Community region to have met targets for female representation at all decision-making levels. There is 35% female representation in parliament, 15% at the ministerial level and 45% at chief executive and middle-management levels. However, the low capacity of institutions with responsibility for gender mainstreaming continues to hamper efforts to achieve gender parity” (UNDP Country Programme 2007-2010).]

Men and women can own / lease land and have equal access to credit. However, during the MTE, clear differences in the importance of including gender considerations in the project were given by men and women informants. The main beneficiary group of the project so-far (interviewed in the questionnaire survey) is farmers (numbering about 540 in Seychelles), who are predominantly men – but comprising ca 10% women. In addition to this total, the project should also take into account the growing number of households involved in small-scale “backyard” production for subsistence and also for sale - and the fact that ca 50% of households in Seychelles are female-headed. The 2002 census showed that 6,900 households (33%) were then involved in small-scale production – and this proportion is expected to increase significantly in the results of the 2010 census. In addition to targeting famers, it will be important to reach these both men- and women-headed households engaging in backyard production with SLM messages.

-----

Considering the **project’s adaptive management framework,** the MTE found that the project’s staff has used the required ***monitoring tools*** (Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, Quarterly Operational Workplans and up-dating of the Overall Workplan and Budget) (see Annex 5). A National MSP Annual Project Review Form was completed as an Annex (III) in the Project Document, which states that the form should be completed annually by each project team by 1st July – but none seem to have been completed since.

The LD Focal Area had no GEF Tracking tool during GEF 3 and GEF 4. Tools have just been introduced for GEF 5 projects and the MTE recommends the project SC should consider adopting the tool for future on-the ground activites (the place of a tool was filled annually as part of the PIR reporting). The structure and completed activities of the project to-date mean that it is not considered relevant to use any tool at this stage.

For the final two years for the project, it is vital that the project involve partners and beneficiaries in monitoring progress, including:

* the test sites to restore the burnt areas on Praslin (the private land owner, also neighboring land owners, NGO and SNPA staff);
* creeper removal on Mahé (local farmers, NGO staff, owners of the woodlands, forestry staff and local residents);
* DOE, MLUH, SAA etc.
* NGOs

Additional tools are required to more rigorously monitor the agriculture land area under SLM before work begins with farmers and as the use of SLM is promoted by the extension service.

Those involved in producing the Project Document / LogFrame (original and as revised at the Inception Report) and project team using APRs, have worked assiduously using the **UNDP-GEF Risk Management System** identifying and trying to mitigate the numerous riskswhich are affecting the success of the project. Notably however, the most recent LogFrame revised in February 2010, only lists the funding risks relating to Outcomes 3 and 4. No risk ratings have been produced.

The challenges of the 2008 food crisis, changes in the global economic situation (which notably reduced tourist income to Seychelles) and devaluation of the local currency (RS) have imposed additional pressure, particularly on the agricultural sector to increase yields of crops in which Seychelles has advantage, to contribute more to food security. This offers the opportunity for the project to emphasize generally with all partners and particularly in awareness raising with farmers that SLM offers a relatively low-cost approach to increasing crop yields and reducing inter-annual yield variations. Challenge also opens the risk that farmers will resort to wide-scale use of inorganic inputs (fertilisers and pesticides) – which the project could work to counter.

In terms of ***work planning****, t*he current PM is clearly making appropriate use of the logical framework as a management tool, particularly in amalgamating Activities into coherent groups for which a national or if necessary an international consultant can be recruited to speed implementation to achieve the project Outcomes. Generally, the latest up-date of the logical framework (February 2010) meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content, although it lacks a full description of the risks of the project (which were outlined in the ProDoc and Inception Report versions). These risks should be reinserted in a revised LogFrame, also including what will replace activities 1.4.1-4.

The current PM reports some delays in starting up activities / contracts; due to delays with the Tender Evaluation Committee. However it is vital that this process is adhered to, to ensure transparency in the awarding of contracts, which is a particularly vital check of openness in the small island context. It is of course appreciated that, for example, the Ministry of Finance have much larger issues to contend with at this time than the awarding of small consultancy contracts. [Post the MTE, I have been advised that “the MOF is no longer involved with the tendering of small consultancies under the GEF projects hence that is not the real reason for delays. The bottlenecks are found mostly at the level of the Department of Administration and DOE processing. PCU should be given greater autonomy for processing of contracts.”].

Over the last year, ***routinely updated work plans*** have been used by the PM and wider programme management. As few earlier plans could be located and the project team has changed, it is impossible to assess whether these were used to best effect at the early stages of project implementation.

The project does make ***use of information technology (IT)***, but could make better use of IT to support implementation, participation and monitoring for example as follows:

PCU needs to set up a proper electronic filing system for the archiving of project workplans (quarterly and APRs), versions of the Overall Workplan and Budget, minutes of Steering Committee meetings etc (with drafts and finally agreed versions well organized). This is important for the audit as well to be able to retrieve the documents.

* Increase the amount of information available on the internet – including improving the PCU website [www.pcusey.sc](http://www.pcusey.sc) to provide partners, the Steering Committee, potential beneficiaries, potential consultants and interested others with a more comprehensive overview of the project, including information on progress (e.g. photographs from the demonstration sites on Praslin, which are not easily accessible) - also access to documents / information about forthcoming events (workshops / training etc).

***Work planning processes are*** ***result-based***, for example methods to be used in the field trials for degraded land restoration and removal of IA creepers are based on the results of the technical studies (Annex 5).

-----

The project has only disbursed some 33% of the total GEF grant, although the rate of spending will inevitably increase as more work begins on the ground and materials (awareness raising, SLM for farmers etc) are produced for publication. No irregularities have been noted in the **financial management of the project** and funds appear generally to be carefully managed.

It would be advisable to make clear on contracts for national consultants which Outcome / Activity this is contributing to – and care should be taken in wording, as review of the contracts issued could be misconstrued to mean that some consultants have had repeat contracts for the same work – yet I am assured these are separate parts of an Activity.

-----

The MTE found that some (but not the majority of) project partners do not feel well informed about changes in the project, implying that adaptive management changes have not been clearly reported by the project management. Steering Committee should devise ways of disseminating information to stakeholders.

**Underlying Factors** which have affected the project include the problems of finding and retaining appropriately qualified and experienced staff has had detrimental impact on the project. Thus far in the project, there have been 3 PMs, one Temporary PM (not all of whom are SLM / LUP experts) and 3 Programme Coordinators.

There have been two major changes in Government institutions, resulting in high rates of movement of staff – and the loss of considerable numbers.

In addition, there have been major changes in development conditions affecting Seychelles during the period between the development of the project (2006), project start-up and this evaluation. The changes include the effects of the world food crisis and resulting massive rise in food prices in 2008, also the global and resulting national economic crisis of 2008-2009, (Annex 8 summarizes some of the effects on Seychelles).

The impacts specifically relating to SLM have been considerable, notably; the major change in the exchange rate has altered the profitability of farming enterprises (farmers interviewed during the evaluation recounted total losses of markets for example for small pineapples, massive competition with imports – and huge increases in input costs). The latter should however catalyse increased interest in SLM, once the benefits are more widely understood.

The project’s management has tried to ensure smooth hand-overs between new PMs, but most of the above is beyond their control.

**-----**

The **assumption was made in the ProDoc** that the impact of climate change (CC) on Seychelles would be due to increasing sea levels. However, nearly 4 years later, there is increasing evidence (mostly by word of mouth) that CC is not only causing rising sea levels and resulting in increased coastal erosion and blocked drains causing flooding, but also increasing rainfall irregularity (rain when “normally” dry – and prolonged drought periods), increasing the intensity of rainfall, increasing temperatures, increasing pest and disease pressures and increasing salt in the air on plateau.

-----

The **UNDP contribution to monitoring and evaluation** of this project to-date can be subdivided as follows:

* ***Field visits*** – thus far, few have been required as the project was contracting national consultants to prepare technical reports. It is vital that the PM regularly and closely monitors activities at the test degraded land restoration sites (brunt areas and IA creepers).
* ***Project Steering Committee*** – the PSC has been Chaired throughout the duration of the project by Mr D. Dogely, the current PS of the Department of the Environment (now part of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Environment and Transport) – providing the vital consistency and leadership. However, due *inter alia* to changes in the civil service and NGOs, there has been a continual change in membership of the PSC over the project period. This is unavoidable – but it is to be hoped that as members are replaced, they fully brief their successor to ensure continuity.

During the MTE, one NGO partner reported that they felt they had not been kept up-to-date with project activities, despite being on the Steering Committee (SC). This is in part due to the fact that NGOs often have to change their representatives on the SC, as they have limited staff resources and many other calls on their time (NGO activities – and other project SCs).

The PM should ensure that, for example, copies of all the reports produced by the project are circulated (by email) to PSC members in addition to them being placed on the PCU website, which should be widely publicised.

* ***PIR preparation and follow-up*** – PIRs have been produced for both years of the project (1 July 2008 – 30 June 2009; 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2010). These serve as a vital resource for the MTE as they provide a comprehensive overview of the project’s achievements and challenges. The challenges for the project are the same in each document. However, proof that there has been some follow-up is indicated as the 2010 document to show that changes are to be made in consultants’ contracts, to better ensure completion.

Of concern is that the final section of the report is identical, namely in answer to the question “What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?” the answer is “Promote awareness of SLM principles and practices from the very first stages and ensure more outreach towards private land owners and manager”. A year has elapsed – the project team could have begun this in the period as it is encompassed in the project’s Outcome 1. This is now imperative – *inter alia* with user friendly guides in Creole and English for plateau and hillside farmers, information being directed via the media to all citizens to raise their consciousness, particularly the growing numbers of backyard farmers.

* ***Project Assurance Role***[[10]](#footnote-11) – the PSC and this MTE provide the required independent and objective quality monitoring to avoid the potential “self-serving bias”, as required under the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide.
* ***Contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance*** (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy and coordination) – the PCU, PM and several of the project consultancies (notably the legal elements) will provide major contributions to the mainstreaming of SLM in national policies, plans and processes. The project is focusing attention on the need to increase the lengths of leases of government land for agriculture to longer than the standard 5 years. Lease term depend on the type and level of activity and also on the site. In the past, leases of over 5 years were only available for investment in buildings, yet these would provide security of tenure and encourage farmers to invest in SLMs which improve the quality and functioning of their soils. In the coming two years, the project should enter dialogues to discourage lighting of fires, which so damage the forests of Seychelles – yet are all caused by humans.

|  |
| --- |
| The project’s **partnership strategy** revolves around the functioning of the Project Steering Committee, within which partners have the opportunity to contribute to the project’s adaptive management framework. This seems to be an area of some difficulty, in part as there has been continual change in membership of the PSC – also as the pool of people available is limited in Seychelles, thus the same people are required to attend very many such meetings, engendering some “committee fatigue”. However, the PSC have a vital role – and the membership bring valuable skills / expertise, thus every effort should be made to ensure participation on the PSC is made as easy as possible – including through use of a PCU website, where copies of documents etc could be lodged.  I found no evidence of partners / stakeholders being involved in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance, nor was the project making use of existing data and statistics.  -----  Within the scope of this medium-sized project, the **opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships** between UNDP and other counterparts have been limited thus-far, however, as the project moves to implement activities on the ground, such partnerships should be developed. Examples include MoUs with community groups working to clear forest of IA creepers – or groups of farmers / perhaps the Seychelles Agriculture and Horticulture Training Centre where demo sites could be developed for the range of SLM technologies (not only terracing and composting – also, for example, low / zero tillage, mulching, inter-cropping, rotations, conservation agriculture, agroforestry).  -----  So-far,there have not been many opportunities for **stakeholder / beneficiary participation** in the project (management / decision-making / activities)**.** To date, this has only involved members of the PSC, national consultants, involved NGOs, at the relatively small validation workshops and during the MTE when the Anse Royale land use plan was presented to local “stakeholders” (the LUP is still on display for the general public). Inevitably this will increase in the second half of the project – indeed this is a necessity, notably to raise awareness of the multiple win-win benefits of SLM. |

*Conclusions*

The project has had to work under very difficult conditions, due to global, national and project issues. Despite this, there has been considerable progress towards several of the targets, but so far none actually reached.

The project has made major advances, for example in knowledge of invasion risk from IA creepers in Seychelles, the review of institutional capacity for forest fire fighting, the forest fire risk assessment, the review of best practices in soil conservation and fertility management and guidelines for best practices for coil conservation and fertility management. These urgently need to be translated into “user friendly” guides / manuals for implementation – using the technical studies and materials which are available on the internet.

Both the project’s annual reports state that, if the project were to begin again, the aspect which would be done differently is: “Promote awareness of Sustainable Land Management principles and practices from the very first stages and ensure more outreach towards general public and developers.” This evaluation totally concurs – at levels from Senior Government officials to farmers, including local communities, school children – and project consultants, communication / information is needed to ensure people fully appreciate what SLM included (and does not include) and the multiple win-win benefits.

Synergies between the on-going GEF projects in Seychelles are not being fully achieved, although the MTE found that the PCU had just instigated that each GEF PM make a presentation on their project to the team – thus in future, with this raised awareness, they should become more synergised .

Project’s major long-term impacts will be through catalysing preparation of the NAP (Outcome 3), the IFS (Outcome 4), contributions to EMPS III and changes in the various laws / Acts and regulations (*inter alia* the Town and Country Planning Act[[11]](#footnote-12) and the Environmental Protection Act.

Clarification is needed and progress should be expedited towards Outputs 1.4 (sustainable production forest management systems are developed) and 1.6 (capacity for minimising landslides is developed).

Outcomes 3 (National Action Plan should be completed and monitored) and 4 (Medium Term Investment Plan being financed and implemented) should be expedited.

The current PM is extremely well qualified for the role and her expertise should be used to maximum benefit for implementation of the project – for example using her LUP expertise to ensure Outputs and Outcomes are achieved.

**Recommendations**

It is vital the project focuses on raising awareness of SLM – some project partners and even recruited consultants do appear cognisant with the concept, range of technologies and win-win benefits. This should be targeted towards project partners, potential beneficiaries (e.g. farmers) and the general public. This concurs with the GEF policy ([www.gef.org/gef](http://www.gef.org/gef) dated 16 September 2010) that “public awareness and environmental education” should be at the “top of the list to address climate change, biodiversity and desertification”.

Discussions and planning for the project with project partners and beneficiaries should make greater reference to the multiple benefits of SLM – particularly the synergies between SLM and both biodiversity protection and climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The Project Manager should be enabled to participate fully in meetings of EMPS III, particularly in the as there is currently no UNCCD Focal Point and in the absence of a Seychelles NAP.

The Project Manager should participate fully in the meetings to discuss revision of the Town and Country Planning Act and the Environmental Planning Act – which should be truly participatory and inter-sectoral, not remaining within a single Ministry.

Seychelles should appoint a UNCCD Focal Point.

The project should ensure that SLM in Seychelles does not remain in a “bubble”, potentially wasting time and funds re-inventing the wheel, but make use of existing SLM knowledge available on the internet (from Africa, also from similar SIDS e.g. the Caribbean, also globally) to help prepare the manual (s) on SLM for farmers (Activity 1.5.5) – including:

* TerrAfrica - <http://ppmtoolkit.undp.org/3b_Project_Roles_Assignment.cfm>
* Benefits of Sustainable Land Management (2009) - UNCCD / WOCAT / FAO / CDE document - http://www.wocat.net/fileadmin/user\_upload/documents/Books/BenefitsofSLM\_2009.pdf
* World Overview of Conservation Technologies and Approaches (WOCAT) – [www.wocat.net](http://www.wocat.net)
* The WOCAT book “Where the Land is Greener”[[12]](#footnote-13)

Work towards Outcomes 3 and 4 should be prioritised using existing guidance (e.g. TerrAfrica CSIF).

The Forest Fire Contingency Plan, based on using the existing local expertise of the Chief Fire Officer, should be simplified and widely disseminated, if necessary with training by an international fire officer.

The PM and Steering Committee should review the ambitious plans and the feasibility of developing a new soil testing laboratory – particularly consider whether the current plan is sustainable in the long-term or whether providing extensionists with appropriate field testing equipment would bring multiple benefits and be more sustainable into the future.

The issues around which projects will contribute funding for the landslide mapping need to be resolved urgently, to enable the LUP international consultant to use these in preparation of the district plans.

While it is recognised that the project aims to mainstream land use planning and thus include planning in non rural areas, the land use planning activities of the international consultant, supported by the project, should focus clearly on LD risk (forest fire risk, for which GIS maps have already been produced by the project, also problems due to IA creepers and landslide risk – see above) and identifying / zoning areas for SLM, rather than the land administration / urban planning focus at Anse Royale. [Also protecting BD hotspots, as part-funded by the BD Mainstreaming GEF project.]

Activities of International Land Use Planning Consultant should be matrix managed by the SLM and BD PMs, in addition to the MLUH PS.

Sites to be used for testing invasive alien creeper removal need to be selected using participatory approaches – involving local communities as they will be responsible to long term maintenance.

Sites should be developed with farmers to demonstrate the multiple win-win benefits of SLM.

The project should endeavour to enable the small NGOs to contribute more easily to the project (e.g. GIF, Wildlife Clubs of the Seychelles, SIF). For example, by planning workshops and meetings further in advance to ensure easier and thus better participation of representatives of small NGOs.

Communications:

* Distribute information more widely by email and on an improved project / programme website for partners, beneficiaries and others.
* Develop tailored manuals for the two agroecosystems of Seychelles (the coastal plains, locally known as “plateau” and the hillsides) – in both English and Creole.

The PM and PSC should consider sending someone to see how SLM is being scaled-up in SSA, then disseminate findings.

**Lessons Learned**

*Invasive Alien Creepers*

The project study on invasion risk from IA creepers provides an in-depth scientific review of the subject. It is a valuable resource in itself and will guide the test clearance plots. However, to be of practical use in the project, this information needs to be condensed into an easily accessible guide for local communities (in English and Creole).

*SLM Questionnaire Survey*

The questionnaire survey was intended to collate information about the knowledge and use of SLM among farmers, in the extension service and awareness of policy makers (part of 1.5). In this one-off survey, a random sample of farmers (variously reported as either 25 or 47 in number), a number of extension officers (number not known) and also of policy makers (again an unknown number) had to complete specifically designed questionnaires (farmers and policy makers interviews, extension staff sent documents to complete) in April / May 2010.

Unfortunately, the questionnaires were not as well focussed as would have been ideal and assumed a level of knowledge of SLM “principles” (this should have been practices or technologies) which may not be present. The questions also referred to more general agricultural / agronomy / harvesting / post-harvest issues.

The draft report on the questionnaire does not clarify numbers of respondents –and states (regrettably) “Almost all farmers who were interviewed showed no real enthusiasm or necessity to approach or seek for advice from the Extension Service” – which could be misconstrued – as, for example, if farmers are not aware of the win-win benefits of the wide range of SLM technologies (not only composting), they will not appreciate how extensionists can help them. Many conclusions did not relate to SLM.

This was a missed opportunity – ideally a well-designed questionnaire survey could have been implemented at baseline to guide activities towards the project Outcomes, then again in final evaluation to quantify the impacts of the project’s awareness raising etc.

*Synergies with on-going projects in other Focal Areas*

UNDP are also managing GEF projects in Seychelles on biodiversity mainstreaming, environmental mainstreaming (CB2) and biosecurity. There are clear synergies with all three projects – not least in awareness raising of environmental issues among Seychellois, also in the proposed revisions to various Acts, regulations and policies to protect the environment of “one of the major biodiversity ‘hot spots’ in the world” (UNDP Country Programme 2007-2010).

The SLM project is welcomed by, notably Seychelles Islands Foundation, whose CEO pointed out that in the past in Seychelles, biodiversity conservation focussed on individual species (e.g. coco de mer and the black parrot) – yet this can only be achieved by implementation of wider habitat conservation (i.e. SLM), which may exist in policies / acts – but these are poorly implemented and regulations often not enforced.

The UNDP project managers are based in a single office – which bodes well for future working.

*Project Staffing*

Seychelles is a very small SIDS, which means that the number of people with technical training and experience in SLM is quite small and most of these people are already engaged in full time employment.

One of the issues of greatest concerns regarding the continuity and successful implementation of the project has been the frequent changes in project and wider personnel (there have been three Project Managers and one Temporary Project Manager – also three different Programme Coordinators). This frequent change in personnel has clearly resulted in the loss of some “project memory”. These changes are not conducive to the smooth operation of the project, as new PMs inevitably take some time to become familiar and assume the required leadership role of this “medium-sized” but quite complex project (including, in the Project Document, 59 Activities in Outcomes 1-4).

GOS and UNDP should consider how they can encourage successful staff to remain in post for the duration of a project – perhaps with some enhancement to the local salary, in acknowledgement that the role is short-term thus cannot be equated with Ministry staff.

*Project Consultants*

As mentioned above concerning project staffing, Seychelles is a very small SIDS, which means that the number of persons with technical training and experience in SLM is quite small and most of these people are already engaged in full time employment, thus there are problems where projects require appropriately skilled national (also even international) consultants.

The UNDP CO has encouraged potential candidates to submit their application in partnership with others, often within an NGO. This relieves the workload and time required to complete the consultancy – although it may raise inter-personal problems. In addition, rather than just advertising consulting work, the project has also tried to develop partnerships with relevant agencies and has sought out qualified candidates.

The CO is also working to develop effective cooperation from relevant ministries, departments and government organizations to provide as much information as possible on the availability of qualified candidates – this is particularly to be lauded, as it ensures that the expertise gained during the project will remain in Seychelles.

The lack of human capacity, which on occasion raises the need to take-on consultants who may not have exactly the appropriate expertise for a piece of work, means that it is incumbent on the PM and PSC to closely supervise and monitor the work of consultants to ensure their activities meet project requirements.

**Annexes**

**Annex 1: Study Terms of Reference**

|  |
| --- |
| *Progress Towards Results* Changes in development conditions. Assess the progress towards the following, with a focus on the perception of change amongst stakeholders:   * cost effective and timely delivery of GEF resources to the target countries * enhancement of individual and institutional capacities for SLM * systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles into development planning   Measurement of change: Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before, during and after (so far) the project intervention. Progress can also be assessed by comparing conditions in the project area prior to the start of the project design process. |
| Project strategy: How and why outcomes and strategies contribute to the achievement of the expected results:   * Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results. * Will the outcomes really meet the project objective and is the strategy currently followed the best approach for achieving the project objective? Consider alternatives. * Assess adequacy of the log frame and indicators in responding to the GEF strategic priorities and achieving project objective   Sustainability: Based on project progress so far, the current prospects for longer-term impacts and using a combination of quantitative and qualitative feedback on project results to date, assess the extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example the prospects for: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of/access to financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities, adequate follow-up support at the regional / sub-regional level, etc. Provide tangible measures that can be undertaken to improve prospects of sustainability.  Gender perspective: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions? Suggest measures to strengthen the project’s gender approach.   *Project’s Adaptive Management Framework  (a) Monitoring Systems* Assess if the monitoring tools currently being used generate adequate information for project evaluation:   * Do they provide the necessary relevant information? * Do they involve key partners? * Are they efficient? * Are additional tools required?   Assess the adequacy/relevance of baseline data. If reconstruction is required this should follow a participatory process.  Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, at least meets GEF minimum requirements.  Apply the GEF Tracking Tool (all elements) and provide a description of comparison with initial application of the tool. If the Tracking Tool has not been previously applied, provide a comparison against the estimated baseline.   *(b) Risk Management*  Validate whether the risks identified in the project document and PIRs are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.  Assess the project’s risk identification and management systems:   * Is the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System appropriately applied? * How can the UNDP-GEF Risk Management System be used to strengthen project management?   *(c) Work Planning* Assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and suggest any changes required   * Ensure the logical framework meets UNDP-GEF requirements in terms of format and content * What impact will the possible retro-fitting of impact indicators have on project management?  - Assess the use of routinely updated work plans.  - Assess the use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities  - Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning.  - Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. Any irregularities must be noted.   *(d) Reporting* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management.  Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.   *Underlying Factors*  Assess the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project’s management strategies for these factors.  Re-test the assumptions made by the project management and identify new assumptions that should be made.  Assess the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project.  *UNDP Contribution*  Assess the role of UNDP against the requirements set out in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. Consider:   * Field visits * Project Executive Committee * Global Advisory Committee (TOR, follow-up and analysis) * PIR preparation and follow-up * GEF guidance * Consider the new UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP User Guide, especially the Project Assurance role, and ensure they are incorporated into the project’s adaptive management framework. * Assess the contribution to the project from UNDP “soft” assistance (i.e. policy advice & dialogue, advocacy, and coordination). Suggest measures to strengthen UNDP’s soft assistance to the project management.   *Partnership Strategy* Assess how partners are involved in the project’s adaptive management framework:   * Involving partners and stakeholders in the selection of indicators and other measures of performance * Using already existing data and statistics * Analysing progress towards results and determining project strategies.   Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships between UNDP and other counterparts, with particular reference to:   * Contracts and/or MoUs with relevant regional institutions * The development of partnerships with any other organizations: * Assess how stakeholders participate in project management and decision-making. Include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project and suggestions for improvement if necessary. * Consider the dissemination of project information to partners and stakeholders and if necessary suggest more appropriate mechanisms |

**Annex 2: Additional Methodology-Related Documents**

**Interview Protocol**

1. How has the project contributed to the enhancement of your individual and / or institutional capacities for SLM?
2. Contributed to systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles into development planning?
3. Based on the project progress so-far and your knowledge of its plans, what are the current prospects for longer-term impacts (post-project)?
4. Please outline the extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions?
5. Do you feel that the project’s “adaptive management framework” adequately involves you monitoring – and receiving the results of project monitoring which you may not be directly involved in implementing?
6. Do you feel that the project team are sharing lessons learned from the project with you / your organisation?
7. Please can you outline from your / your organisation’s perspective, the underlying factors (beyond the project’s immediate control) that are influencing the project’s activities / outcomes and results?
8. Are the assumptions in the project document still valid?
9. Do you feel that you / your organisation have been sufficiently involved in the project’s “adaptive management framework”?
10. Finally, can you suggest any potential future opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships between UNDP and your organisation?

**Annex 3: List of Individuals or Groups Interviewed / Consulted and Affiliations**

Patricia Baquero GOS/UNDP/GEF SLM Project Manager

Mr Didier Dogley PS Department of Environment and National Project Director

Mr Johan Robinson UNDP Chief Technical Advisor

Dr Frauke Fleisher-Dogley Seychelles Islands Foundation

Mr Serge Benstrong Chair - Seychelles Farmers’ Association

Mrs Veronique Herminine UNDP-GEF Seychelles Programme Coordinator

Mrs Begum Nageon Environmental Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS) Coordinator

Mr Roalnd Alcindor UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles CO Programme Officer

Mr Victorin Laboudallon Chairman, Terrestrial Restoration Action Society of Seychelles

Mr Bruno Senterre Project Consultant

Mr Marc Jean-Baptiste Site Manager, Vallée de Mai, Seychelles Islands Foundation

Mr. Sydney (Nurseryman) SNPA tree nursery, NewCome, Praslin

Nurseryman SNPA tree nursery, Fond B’Offay, Praslin

Mr Richelieu Verlaque Private Landowner, Anse Lazio, Praslin

Mr Barry Nourrice Senior Laboratory Technician, Seychelles Agriculture Agency

Mr Antoine-Marie Moustache Chief Executive Officer, Seychelles Agriculture Agency

Mr Wallace Cosgrow Project Consultant and SAA staff member

Mr Julien Low Project Consultant

Mr Dani Payet farmer, Grand Anse, Mahé

Mr. José Pool Farmer Anse Royale

Ms Michelle Etienne Green Island Foundation

Ms Helena Francourt Green Island Foundation

Mrs Mermedah Moustache Agricultural Policy Advisor, Department of Natural Resources

Mrs Danielle Dugasse GOS / UNDP / GEF Bio-security Mainstreaming Project Manager

Mr Francis Coeur de Lion Director, GIS and IT Support Services, Ministry of Land Use and Housing

Mr Florian Rock Project Land Use Planning Consultant (also working for GEF BD Project)

Mr Joseph Rath Capacity Development for Improved National and International Environmental Management in Seychelles Project Manager

Mr Andrew Jean-Louis Former PM, GOS / UNDP / GEF SLM Project

Mrs Noémie Gobine UNDP GEF PCU Finance Manager

Mr Keven Nancy Head of Research, SAA

Mr Denis Matatiken CEO, Seychelles National Park Authority

Mr Flavien Joubert DG Wildlife Enforcement and Permits, Department of the Environment

Mr John Neuvill Technical Manager, World Bank Risk and Disaster Management Project

Mr Terence Vel Coordinator, Wildlife Clubs of Seychelles

Ms Venessa Quatre GOS / UNDP / GEF BD Mainstreaming PM

Ms Iris Carolus Environmental Law National Consultant, GOS / UNDP / GEF SLM + BD Projects

Mr Christian Lionnet PS, Ministry of Land Use and Housing (with Mr Florian Rock)

**Annex 4: Sites Visited**

Praslin

* NewCome and Anse Lazio sites where burnt forests to be replanted in project trials
* Two SNPA tree nurseries
* Vallée de Mai – review of two sites one cleared of creepers, the other still infested

Mahé

* Seychelles Agriculture Agency office, current soils laboratory and building which SAA hope to have renovated to provide modern soil testing facilities for farmers (equipment for laboratory to be funded by GEF SLM project)
* Grand Anse – successful farmer
* Anse Royale – presentation of LUP to stakeholders
* Anse Royale – intensive farmer
* Anse à la Mouche – Agriculture and Horticulture Training Centre (interviewee did not attend as agreed)
* Anse à la Mouche - farmer
* Val D’Endore – visual assessment of current use of SLM

**Annex 5 : List of Supporting Documents Reviewed**

Full Project Document (prepared 2006 - 2007)

Project Inception Report 2008

Overall Workplan and Budget

Jan 2010 up-date

Up-dated Project Logical Framework February 2010

Project Implementation Reports (PIR)

in Project Document (2007)

Annual Performance Reports (APR)

Project Quarterly Progress Reports

Quarterly Operational Workplans

*Project Risk Assessment* Sept 2010

*Technical Reports*

* Review of Institutional Capacity for Forest Fire Fighting (August 2009) – 37pp - Activity 1.1.2
* Invasion Risk from Climbing and Creeping Species in Seychelles (Dec 2009) – 89pp – Activitiy 1.3.1
* Forest Fire Risk Assessment on Seychelles Main Granitic Islands (Dec 2009) – 64pp – Activity 1.1.1
* Review of Best Practices in Soil Conservation and Soil Fertility Management for Farmers in Seychelles (June 2010) 61pp – Activity 1.5.2
* Guidelines for Best Practices in Soil Conservation and Fertility Management for Farmers in Seychelles (undated) 24pp – Activity 1.5.3
* Strengthening and Reorientation of the Agricultural Extension Services to Improve Management and Integrate Sustainable Land Management Principles – Consultants’ Workplan (April 2010)
* Strengthening and Reorientation of the Agricultural Extension Services to Improve Management and Integrate Sustainable Land Management Principles – Consultants’ Progress Report (Sept 2010)

*Other Consultancy TORs, Workplans and Reports*

* Contracts and TORs for most short-term consultancies under the project
* Land Use Planning international consultant’s monthly report (August 2010)
* Draft report on questionnaire survey of use / knowledge of SLM (farmers / extensionists and policy makers) (Sept 2010)

*Other Reports*

MOE&NR / UNDP (2005) National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environment Management Projects – Report on: Strategic Overview of Obligations under the Convention to Combat Desertification

UNDP Country Programme (2007 – 2010)

**Annex 6: Project Targets and Current Status (from LogFrame revised 5 Feb 2010)**

| **Project**  **Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | | | **Current Status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** |  |
| **Goal: Sustainable land management is practiced and mainstreamed into national development in Seychelles** | | | | |
| **Objective of the project:**  Capacity enhanced in Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and SLM principles applied in national policies, plans, processes and practices. | Sustainable forest harvest schemes developed and tested.  [Changed (by PM) to up-dating of the Forest Management Plan.]  Agricultural area under improved soil conservation practices  Land use planning takes account of landslide risks  # of degraded sites that have undergone effective & sustainable rehabilitation trials   * Burned Areas * Areas with Invasive Creepers * Landslide Areas | None of the productive forest area have harvest schemes  200 ha  Risk assessment currently being conducted based on historical data & topography. More expertise required to complete assessment  Past efforts that are largely ineffective or unsustainable  0 sites  ? sites  ? sites | 25% of productive forest area have tested harvest schemes  350 ha  At least 3 Administrative Districts have Land Use Plans that include zoning that takes account of landslide risks  Testing of effective and sustainable demonstrations:  2 sites  2 sites  1 site | No progress  No field implementation begun  Land use plan completed for Coétivy Island.  Draft land use plan for Anse Royale District presented to stakeholder workshop on 23 September 2010  Plans being prepared for both districts on Praslin  2 sites on Praslin ready to be planted at beginning of next rainy season  5 sites to be started on Mahé & Praslin (1) at beginning of next rainy season  ? |
| **Outcome 1:**  Individual and institutional capacity for SLM enhanced | Professionals trained in managing:   * Forest Fire Risk Assessment & Strategic Planning * Up-to-date techniques in control of Invasive Alien Creepers * Up-to-date practices in soil conservation and soil fertility management   Soil testing services operational and sustainable  Comprehensive fire prevention and control strategy, including updated Contingency Plan  Guidelines, Manuals, Protocols outlining Best Practices and toolkits in SLM developed and used  Revamped agricultural extension service, recommending improved soil conservation practices to farmers, sustainable land management practices following participatory extension approaches  An inter-sectoral mechanism for SLM in place and functional | * Estimated trained professionals: * - Forest fires: 0 * - Invasive alien creepers: 0 * - Soil conservation: 0 * Existing soil testing laboratory offer minimal services and has limited funds * Fire Contingency Plan (1997) in place * Outdated National Forest Management Plan/sector study (1993) * No soil conservation guidelines / manuals * Agricultural extension service in place without proper soil conservation recommendations, following top-down extension approach * UNCCD Committee exists, but meets irregularly; EMPS Steering Committee does not specifically address SLM | * Trained professionals: * - Forest fires: 10 * - Invasive alien creepers: 10 * - Soil conservation: 10 * Standard Soil Testing Service operational and financially sustainable, based on payments for services * Revised comprehensive plan implemented * Updated Forest management Plan; (not doing at present, unless we change output 1.4; talk to DOE) * Manuals on soil fertility management and soil conservation * Revamped agricultural extension service is utilising SLM principles * New EMPS 2011-2020 explicitly recognizes SLM issues, and EMPS Steering Committee oversees / coordinates implementation of the National Action Plan for Sustainable Land Management | Forest Fire Contingency Plan validation workshop held May 2010 (20 participants)  Forest Fire Risk Assessment presentation held – June 2010 (33 participants)  Rehabilitation of burned / deforested areas validation workshop held end of 2009 (20 participants)  IA creepers risk assessment presentation held June 2010 (33 participants)  Plans prepared to modernise empty premises for soil testing lab – but no agreement on financing (GOS)  Review of Institutional capacity for forest fire fighting completed (August 2009) – no progress since  No progress – some uncertainty over this activity – SLM project budget insufficient to update plan – possibly FAO financing  Review of best practices and guidelines completed – need to prepare an operational manual (targeted to different types of farmers – “plateau” / hillside farms, crop / livestock, modern / traditional – in English and Creole)  Questionnaire survey of agricultural policy makers, extension staff and sample of farmers completed – report due before end of Evaluation mission  No evidence of active UNCCD committee – no UNDDC Focal Point.  EMPS III in preparation, but without NAP (see Outcome 3) – previously Programme Coordinator attended meetings – following evaluation meeting, PM will attend in future. |
| **Outcome 2:**  SLM mainstreamed into economic and sectoral development | Relevant policies support SLM principles and objectives  Acts & regulations pertaining to SLM updated and harmonized  Lease agreements for state agricultural land improved | There is no specific mention of SLM in the following current policies:   * Forest Management Plan 1993 * Agriculture Policy 2003-13 * EMPS 2000 – 2010 * National Strategy for Plant Conservation * National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan NBSAP (1997)   Following acts + regulations in place:   * Lighting of Fires Act * State Land & Rivers Act * Breadfruit & Other Trees Act   Lease agreements for agricultural land outdated and not conducive for undertaking soil conservation measures by farmers | SLM principles integrated in:   * + New National Forest Policy   + EMPS 2011 - 2020   SLM principles, and relevant components of existing acts, integrated into the following Acts:   * Updated Town & Country Planning Act * Updated Environmental Protection Act * New Biodiversity Act   Updated provisions for lease agreements for agricultural land, providing sufficient incentives for undertaking soil conservation measures | PM to attend EMPS III meetings and contact thematic sector consultants  No other progress evident  3 legal experts recruited for BD + Environ Mainstreaming + SLM projects to work with LUP consultant – no concrete results as yet  LUP consultant has this in TORs – but doubts ability to accomplish, as depends on Attorney General – and lease system seems in disarray, yet SAA and other informants state this is on-going |
| **Outcome 3:**  National Action Plan (NAP) completed | National Action Plan (NAP) completed and supported by an Integrated Financing Strategy  NAP Monitoring mechanism in place | No NAP  No NAP monitoring | NAP prepared, formally approved, and disseminated  NAP reviewed yearly | No activity / progress – to be funded by GM, but problems persist in transferring funds from GM to UNDP  Agreement should be signed very soon as contract has been drafted and signed by PS DOE |
| **Outcome 4:**  Medium Term Investment Plan being financed and implemented | Completed Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) (formerly called MTIP)  Financing for IFS established  IFS monitoring and review system in place | No national financing strategy or program exists for SLM objectives    No financing committed  No MTIP monitoring | Completed and adopted IFS, supporting funding of NAP implementation  80% financing for IFS committed  MTIP yearly reviewed | No activity / progress as considered requiring a NAP. Regional workshop on the preparation of these held in May 2009.    To begin, project should use guidelines from TerrAfrica (CSIF) |
| Outcome 5:  Adaptive Management and Learning in place | Project monitoring and evaluation, technical studies and audits being used to refine project implementation  Lessons learned and best practices disseminated to relevant stakeholders | Nothing  Nothing | Project monitoring and evaluation reports, technical studies and audit reports reviewed in detail by project manager and steering committee and used to revise project strategy and activities  Significant lessons learned and best practices collected and disseminated | Project documents and reports – most available, although not minutes of Steering Committee meetings, nor all quarterly reports  Monitoring reports – some quarterly and annual reports (APRs) see.  Audit documents - ?  Technical documents - 7 seen during MTE  Website – currently in need to improvement |

**Annex 7: Table of Findings[[13]](#footnote-14)**

| **OUTPUT / ACTIVITY** | **Responsible Parties** | **Stakeholders** | **Total**  **Budget**  **(US$)**  **(Yr1-Yr4)** | **TIMELINE**  **Year 1** | | | | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **Status at Mid-Term Evaluation** | **UNDP / GEF Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q**  **1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q**  **4** |  |  |  |  |
| OUTCOME 1: INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR SLM ENHANCED | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| OUTPUT 1.1: Capacities for forest fire prevention, detection and suppression are strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.1.1. Conduct forest fire risk assessments, including drought occurrence, spatial analysis, fuel analysis, identification of priority areas to be protected, etc. | PCU,  DOE, Land Use,  Director of Lands,  DRDM | Local Community  Emergency services (Police, Fire Brigade) | 21400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Risk Assessment Report  (Dec 2009) completed by national consultant (Bruno Senterre) | S |
| 1.1.2. Review institutional capacity for forest fire fighting | PCU, DOE | Local Community  SIF | 10650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Detailed Review of Institutional Capacity for Forest Fire Fighting completed – report completed (Aug 2009) by national consultants (Iris Carlous and Paul Louis Marie) | HS |
| 1.1.3. Develop institutional capacity for forest fire fighting | PCU, DOE | Local Community  SIF | 18250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Linked - see 1.1.5-7 | Delayed MS |
| 1.1.4. Update fire contingency plan | PCU, DOE |  | 3200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Workshop held (national consultant – Michel Vielle) but further meetings required | S |
| 1.1.5. Develop a forest fire prevention and control strategy | PCU, SIF | SIF | 10950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Considered highly important by PM – unable to find suitable national consultant – plan to recruit international consultant. TOR & Recruitment to be in Q 1 of 2011 and implementation  Q 2 of 2011 (end of rainy season) | Delayed MS |
| 1.1.6. Train forest managers (fire brigades/private islands district) on: Forest fire risk assessment, prevention, suppression, and implementation of the fire prevention and control strategy | PCU, PDF, SIF, DOE | Private Islands Districts, Brigades | 14750 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Delayed MS |
| 1.1.7. Strengthen the chain of command | PCU | All relevant stakeholders | 4200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Delayed MS |
| OUTPUT 1.2. Cost-effective techniques for the rehabilitation of burned/deforested land are tested and developed | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.2.1. Research in post-fire rehabilitation of burned / degraded lands, taking into consideration biodiversity restoration, soil and water cycles | PCU, DOE, Private land Owners | Private Land Owners | 16200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed December 2009 (see reports) | HS |
| 1.2.2. Training on ecological & economic principles of cost effective strategies for rehabilitation of burned/deforested areas | PCU, DOE, Private Land  Owners | Private Land Owners | 13350 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Linked to 1.2.1  Completed at the end of 2009 | HS |
| 1.2.3. Develop and test cost effective methods for rehabilitation of burned degraded lands in selected sites on Praslin | PCU, DOE  Private Land  Owners | Private Land Owners | 6000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | About to begin on Praslin by Bruno Senterre, PCAG and TRASS (local NGO)Linked - see 1.2.4-5 | Delayed MS |
| 1.2.4. Develop guidelines for restoration of burned and degraded areas | PCU, DOE, Private Land Owners | Land  Owners | 11750 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | About to start using TRASS (NGO) | n/a |
| 1.2.5. Training on best practices for post-fire rehabilitation of burned / degraded lands | DOE, Private  Land Owners | Land  Owners | 15250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| OUTPUT 1.3: Cost-effective techniques/capacities for controlling deforestation by IAS creepers are developed | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.3.1. Conduct risk assessment of deforestation by invasive creepers, including identification, listing and prioritization of species, vectors, current distribution and spatial risk analysis of future spread. | PCU, DOE |  | 12550 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Risk Assessment Report completed (Dec 2009) – Bruno Senterre | S |
| 1.3.2. Develop and test methods for management of invasive creepers in forests in selected sites | PCU |  | 8000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Contract ready for signature (to be signed beginning of October) and workplan prepared. TRASS should include community participation in site selection and testing. | Delayed MS |
| 1.3.3. Develop manuals / protocols for management of invasive creepers in forests | PCU, DOE |  | 12750 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| 1.3.4. Training in: Suppression and management of invasive alien creepers, and restoration of affected forests. | PCU, DOE |  | 15450 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| OUTPUT 1.4: Sustainable production forest management systems are developed | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.4.1. Develop methods for sustainable harvest schemes in production forest in selected sites | Forestry, Private Land Owners | ENGOs | 8000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | To be replaced by project contributing to the development of an up-dated forestry management plan which DOE hopes to prepared with support an FAO TCP (“whole Output to be reworded” – according to PM) | Delayed  MS |
| 1.4.2. Test methods for sustainable harvest schemes in production forest in selected sites | Forestry, Private Land Owners | ENGOs | 6400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Delayed  MS |
| 1.4.3. Develop sustainable financing systems for model sites | DOE, Economic Planning | Mins of Finance | 6075 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Delayed  MS |
| 1.4.4. Compile best practices and develop a management plan for model sites | DOE, SIF, PDF | NGOS, Private Land Owners | 4100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| 1.4.5. Prepare guidelines for sustainable harvest schemes in production forests | DOE, SIF, PDF |  | 4300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| OUTPUT 1.5: Improved capacities for soil conservation in agriculture are developed | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.5.1 Institutional review of the Agricultural Extension Service (in collaboration with new food security strategy actions) | NR, Farmers, FAO,  Consumers |  | 5625 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Very delayed – in progress – 1st draft almost completed – W Cosgrove. PM should request WC to clarify sample sizes as not clear in draft report. Questionnaires did not focus only on SLM – and resulting report makes various recommendations which are not SLM. | MS |
| 1.5.2 Integrate SLM principles into potential restructuring of the agricultural extension service by GOS | NR, Farmers, FAO,  Consumers |  | 9500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Will follow 1.5.1 | Delayed  MS |
| 1.5.3. Inventory of existing Land Use Plans |  |  | 2100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Linked to 1.6.1 -2, also 2.2.1 – 2 – task of International LUP Florian Rock. | S |
| 1.5.4. Conduct a review of best practices in soil conservation and soil fertility management for farmers. | NR, Farmers, FAO |  | 6825 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Review of best practices completed (Aug 2010) by Mr Moustache / | HS |
| 1.5.5. Develop guidelines / manuals for best practices in soil conservation and soil fertility management for farmers. | NR, Farmers, FAO |  | 11950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Guidelines prepare d (June 2010) by Keven Nancy and Monette Bonne– not yet appropriate for use by farmers - manual proposed under separate contract | S |
| 1.5.6. Assess soil erosion risk for agricultural cultivation, including slope/aspect, past occurrence, land use, cultivation practices, location, priority areas (biodiversity, water catchments, etc.) for integration into land use planning systems and soil conservation recommendations for farmers. | NR,  MND,  DOE | Farmers  FAO  Consumers  MET Office  PUC | 12250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Risk Assessment Report not completed - contract signed with VASCO - due to start 1 April 2010, but still no work plan (subcontractor involved) – PCO wrote to cancel contract on 10/08/10 and to find new consultant | Delayed MS |
| 1.5.7. Train agronomists and extensionists on: Soil conservation, soil fertility management, participatory extension approaches. | NR,  Mins of Education | Farmers | 14550 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Work-plan approved, consultant selected ( same as for the manual) but awaiting DPA approval | Delayed  MS |
| 1.5.8. Strengthen the curriculum of the SAHTC on soil conservation issues, including best practices. | NR,  Mins of Education | Farmers, Bilateral-Multilateral Cooperation | 3500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Planned for YR 3. Unfortunately, MTE mission did not meet with anyone at SAHTC as they were not present at the time scheduled Will start after the production of the manual 1.5.4. | n/a |
| 1.5.9. Develop a “fees for service” standard Soil Testing Service for soil chemical and physical attributes | NR | SBS, Farmers,  Bilateral-Multilateral Cooperation | 17750 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Planned for YR 3 – plan to reword activity as it is SAA which will developed the fees for service aspect Work-plan approved and consultant selected but awaiting for DPA approval | n/a |
| OUTPUT 1.6: Capacity for minimizing risks of landslides is developed | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 1.6.1. Develop a GIS map of the risks of landslides | DRDM,  MND | MET, DRDM,  Env Sector, Agric Sector | 5925 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hopefully to be linked with World Bank disaster risk project – although doubts raised by WB PM regarding whether this will be co-financing – if not, WB will not include. Vital for LUP. | Delayed MS |
| 1.6.2. Include landslide risk zoning based on landslide risk map in District land Use Plans | MND | DRDM, A.G. Office, Commissioner Dev | 5625 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LUP begun early – but not as yet formally including SLM – consultant focussing on urban areas | MS |
| 1.6.3. Sensitise the public of landslide risks | PCU |  | 1100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not started as 1.6.1 not implemented. Now linked to 2.2.2 | n/a |
| 1.6.4. Reinforce best practices and protocols for slope management for architects / constructors | Planning Authority,  EIA Section | Assoc of Architects  SBS | 4400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n/a |
| OUTPUT 1.7 Capacity on Environmental Economics in SLM developed | | | | | | | | | | | | S |
| 1.7.1.Environmental Economics Management training following SLM toolkit developed and conducted | PCU,  Others | ?? | 9225 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Training toolkit developed and conducted - more emphasis needed on economics to address target. | S |
| OUTCOME 2: SLM MAINSTREAMED INTO ECONOMIC AND SECTORAL DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| OUTPUT 2.1: Sustainable Land Management principles integrated in relevant national policies and strategies | | | | | | | | | | | | S |
| Develop a National Forest Policy integrating SLM principles | DOE | Forestry, Timber Merchants, Private Land Owners, NGOs | 16250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Linked with proposed FAO TCP – and 1.4.1 – 5 | Delayed  MS |
| Strengthen & integrate Sustainable Land Management principles when updating Environmental Management Plan Seychelles (EMPS) 2000-2010 | DOE, EMPS SC | EMPS Steering Com., Forestry, Timber Merchants, Private Land Owners, NGOs | 5000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Involves different sectors (see Table 1) but SLM not well integrated. Recently UNDP represented at EMPS III steering committee meetings by Programme Coordinator (?) – in future SLM PM will try to attend to up-date on progress. Unfortunately delays in implementing Outcome 3 mean NAP has not been prepared thus cannot be a direct input to the EMPS III preparations. | S |
| OUTPUT 2.2. Legal and regulatory framework concerning Sustainable Land Management reviewed, updated and harmonized | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 2.2.1. Revise lease system & conditions for state agriculture lands, to take into consideration SLM concerns and create incentives for adhering to best practices | PS/ DNR  MND,  A.G Office | Farmers  MENRT,  Consumers | 7875 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Discussions underway with a lawyer to complete this work – TORs not yet developed. Linked to 1.6.2 | Delayed  MS |
| 2.2.2. Review & update State Land & Rivers Reserves Act, to include SLM concerns | MND,  A.G Office | Internal | 10000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Being “worked on” under wider SLM discussions. Should be task of Florian Rock. | HS |
| 2.2.3. Review & update Lighting of Fires Act, to include SLM concerns | DOE,  A.G Office | Internal | 10000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Being “worked on” under wider SLM discussions | HS |
| 2.2.4. Review & update Breadfruit and Other Trees Act | DOE,  A.G. Office | Internal | 10000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Being “worked on” under wider SLM discussions | HS |
| OUTPUT 2.3. Stakeholders are aware of and apply SLM practices | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| 2.3.1. Develop targeted awareness campaigns for land users (farmers, forest managers, timber merchants, architects, and building contractors) on land degradation and sustainable land management. | DOE, MND,  MENRT,  NGOs | Media, Farmers Assoc, Private Land Owners, Artisans, Herbalists | 14575 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not started yet | Delayed  MS |
| 2.3.2.Sensitization of decision makers of Land Degradation and Sustainable Land Management | Cabinet,  Govt Mins & Depts. | Planning Authority | 3800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Draft TORs prepared – to be advertised, but delayed | n/a |
| OUTCOME 3: NATIONAL ACTION PLAN (NAP) COMPLETED AND MONITORED | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 3.1. Preparation of NAP according to UNCCD guidelines | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| 3.1.1. Develop draft NAP in participatory manner | DOE | Land Users |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun Financial agreement should be signed very soon | Delayed  MS |
| 3.1.2. Finalize NAP, taking into account concerns and feedback of stakeholders | DOE | Land Users |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 3.2. NAP disseminated | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| 3.2.1. NAP adopted by government and stakeholders | DOE | Land Users |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| 3.2.2. NAP published | DOE | Land Users |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| 3.2.3. NAP disseminated | DOE | Land Users |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 3.3. NAP monitored | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| 3.3.1. Develop NAP Monitoring and review mechanism | UNCCD  Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| 3.3.2. Yearly NAP review | UNCCD  Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| OUTCOME 4: MEDIUM TERM INVESTMENT PLAN BEING FINANCED AND IMPLEMENTED | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 4.1. Medium Term Investment Plan for SLM developed | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| Review Medium Term Investment Plans for all different sub-sectors |  |  | 1000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun – but could begin before Outcome 3 | Delayed  MS |
| Develop & enhance draft MTIP in participatory manner for sub-sectors on UNCCD Committee | UNCCD Steering Committee SLM | Land users | 2200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| MTIP adopted by government and stakeholders |  |  | 400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 4.2. Financing for Medium Term Investment Plan ensured | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| Disseminate MTIP to all potential donors / investors |  | MND,  SIB | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Seek and negotiate pledges from potential investors |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Negotiate commitments with investors / donors; |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| OUTPUT 4.3. Medium Term Investment Plan implemented and monitored | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| Devise proper implementation mechanism for MTIP |  | MND,  SIB | 2200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Devise monitoring set-up for MTIP |  |  | 3100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Yearly MTIP review |  |  | 4100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Outcome 5: Adaptive Management & Learning in Place | | | | | | | | | | | | MS |
| OUTPUT 5.1. Effective project management in place | | | | | | | | | | | | HS |
| Project management unit installed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed | HS |
| Project equipment purchased |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed | HS |
| Annual audits undertaken |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed to MTE | HS |
| OUTPUT 5.2. Monitoring and Evaluation work plan implemented | | | | | | | | | | | | S |
| Inception workshop and report delivered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed | HS |
| APR / PIR documents prepared and presented to Steering Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed to MTE | HS |
| Technical reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Completed to MTE | HS |
| Mid-term and final external evaluations held |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | In progress | HS |
| M & E GSU toolkit forms completed and submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Doubts over baseline and target figures | S |
| OUTPUT 5.3. Lessons learned collected, prepared and disseminated | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed  MS |
| Lessons learned collected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Lessons learned prepared |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |
| Lessons learned disseminated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet begun | Delayed  MS |

**Annex 8: Economic, Political and Social Factors in Seychelles[[14]](#footnote-15)**

*Introduction*

The Republic of Seychelles is a remote, small island-state with middle income country characteristics and an estimated population of 86,335 (2008). Per capita income — around US$10,290 (2008) — is among the highest of the Middle Income Countries (MICs). As with other island states, the size of the economy is small (US$833 million gross domestic product (GDP) in 2008) and is predominantly service-based and highly vulnerable to global shocks and climate change due to its isolation and small size. Seychelles comprises 115 tropical islands spread over 1.374 million km2 in the western Indian Ocean, covering 455.3 km2 in land area. Habitation is limited to 10 of the islands and around 90 percent of the population of Seychelles live in the largest island, Mahé (60 percent urbanized), where the capital, Victoria, and the main fishing port are located. The limited land space, capital, and human resources restrict Seychelles’ ability to benefit from economies of scale in production and economic diversification. Seychelles relies on imports for almost all raw materials, products, and specialized services. Fisheries and its processing are important activities, both for industrial and artisanal ends.

*Economy*

Seychelles faces constraints typical of a small island state; including, lack of economic diversification, vulnerability to external shocks, distance from markets, and risks of environmental degradation and weather-related disasters. Seychelles has extensive marine space and accessible coastlines. Tourism is the predominant sector, accounting for 22 percent of GDP, 30 percent of employment and 70 percent of foreign exchange earnings. The fish canning industry, especially tuna processing, contributes 15 percent to GDP, 97 percent of goods exports and employs 17 percent of the workforce.

Real GDP is estimated to have declined by 7.5 percent in 2009.  Macroeconomic imbalances and an unsustainable debt burden, coupled with the external shocks from global commodity prices, led to rapidly depleted stocks of foreign exchange and to missed external debt payments in the middle of 2008. As a result credit ratings agencies downgraded Seychelles, such as Standard and Poor's which downgraded Seychelles to “SD” (Selective Default). This was the catalyst for the reform program and the foreign exchange liberalization.  The global economic recession further adversely affected tourism revenues in the fourth quarter of 2008, and beginning of 2009. Although tourism arrivals began to recover in the second half of 2009, there was an estimated 15 percent fall in tourism revenues for 2009, as a whole, and an overall reduction in GDP growth to -7.5 percent.

Fundamental exchange liberalization was at the heart of the macroeconomic stabilization at the end of 2008. In early November 2008, the government abolished all exchange rate restrictions and adopted a managed market-based float exchange rate regime. Following the float, the rupee depreciated by about 60 percent against the U.S. dollar and has since stabilized at around 14.1 rupees to the US dollar. The liberalization of the exchange regime marked the beginning of an economic reform program.

Prudent monetary policies have contributed to restoring macroeconomic stability and setting the stage for recovery. As a result, month-on-month inflation in 2009 has remained near zero ranging from 1 percent in January to -1.1 percent in October 2009.  Short-term interest rates on government securities declined sharply from about 30 percent to below five percent between January and October 2009. Moreover, the external current account deficit narrowed during the first three quarters of 2009, reflecting lower imports, better than expected service income and higher grants. The decrease in world food and oil prices in 2009, together with a slowdown in tourism has reduced import demand. Gross reserves were estimated at US$153 million by end-2009.

There was a strong fiscal adjustment in 2009, which focused on improving the efficiency of the government and reducing universal subsidies to public enterprises. The government eliminated indirect universal product subsidies and replaced them with a targeted social safety net. It further abolished the fishermen’s fuel subsidy coupons, eliminated electricity rebates for households, raised public bus fares at operating cost recovery levels, and removed the liquefied petroleum gas subsidy by state oil company. All these measures, among others, have led to the reduction of the total government expenditures by 1.5 percent. The government also embarked on downsizing of the civil service. By April 2009, 2,500 staff had left the public service, representing 15 percent of the April 2008 public sector workforce (through early retirement, voluntary departure and a new hiring freeze). This measure is expected to reduce the wage bill from 10.2 percent of GDP to 7.5 percent of GDP from 2007 to 2009.

**Annex 9: Text on Agriculture from Government of Seychelles “Strategy 2017”**

“Seychelles’ agricultural policy is to ensure food security through the most economically effective methods available, given the numerous constraints to intensive agricultural production – such as climate, soil type, and limited available land – present in Seychelles.

The agriculture strategy will focus on subsistence farming as well as on small to medium scale agricultural and livestock production (destined primarily for domestic consumption) in which Seychelles has established comparative advantage. Thus, to ensure national food security and adequate supply for a growing tourism sector, the country will engage in import, a more cost effective option than attempting food self-sufficiency.

This policy would ensure that agriculture does not hinder the development of the identified core socio-economic activities, notably tourism, fisheries, housing and environmental conservation.”[[15]](#footnote-16)

**Annex 10: Short Biography of Evaluator**

Anne C. Woodfine (née Messer) BSc, PhD

A tropical natural resources management and sustainable development specialist with over 25 years experience working with rural people and their environments on sustainable agriculture, natural resources management & livelihood projects mainly in Africa, also S. & S.E.Asia and the Caribbean. Experienced in research, monitoring, implementation and management projects; research; EIAs; policy analyses / reviews; poverty-environment mainstreaming; institutional capacity needs assessments; programme and project preparation (including GEF and LDCF project formulation); design and implementation of M&Es; mapping & field surveys; data verification work; use of appropriate GIS and remote sensing; education / training for counterpart staff, facilitating workshops etc. - working at all levels (household & community to senior & inter-governmental).

Specifically, Dr Woodfine has experience preparing projects (including M & E frameworks) for *inter alia* GEF (mainly the Land Degradation Focal Area, also Climate Change Mitigation, Biodiversity and International Waters), the LDCF (Climate Change Adaptation – including using SLM) and DFID (including coastal zone projects in the Caribbean, Sri Lanka and Sumatra); and evaluating projects in Africa, S Asia and the Caribbean. Dr Woodfine recently wrote the TerrAfrica Resource Guide on the use of SLM technologies for climate change adaptation (in 2008/2009) and website materials for both the World Bank (in 2009) and FAO (in 2010) which guide choices of SLMs in different ecosystems and agro-ecosystems.

1. Reportedly to be re-named the “Land Development Act” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Delays in project initiation, including in recruitment of Project Manager (March 2008). The first vacancy announcement did not produce satisfactory results because of the small size of the market as most of the qualified eligible candidates are already employed by the civil service. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. According to the project’s APR 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Surprisingly, the MTE found no definitive geographical area in the ProDoc and the PCU have questioned this definition, which I understood was correct in the MTE. PCU / PM / SC / GEF need to agree this. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The GOS / UNDP / GEF PCU Chief Technical Advisor noted that “A desktop study has been undertaken on hotspots which will be incorporated into the LUPs under development as well as wetland/marsh mapping, of which the entire wetlands will be safeguarded. Further a large percentage of Coetivy, as well as most remaining areas of forests both upland and coastal, that still remains have been protected in the Anse Royale LUP.” He then stated that “my understanding is that the landslide risk mapping will be done later this year and the results incorporated into the LUPs.” This is dependent on clarifying issues between the PCU and the WB’s DRM project. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Senterre, B. (2009) Invasion Risk from Climbing and Creeping Species in Seychelles. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The LUP consultant has also been working on LUPs for the Waterfront at Victoria – and Ile Aurore [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. TerrAfrica (2009) Country Support Tool for Scaling-up Sustainable Land Management in sub-Saharan Africa. Available from: http://knowledgebase.terrafrica.org/ter-documents/ter-view-doc/0/?uid=44755 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. I have been assured that at project design stage this was not assessed, but required revision of the baseline indicators at project inception. This was approved by the SC. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. **Project Assurance** – this is one of the key roles in the project management structure from UNDP’s perspective. This role must act as an independent and objective quality monitoring agent, avoiding the potential “self-serving bias”.... In cases where UNDP is the implementing partner, this role can be assumed together with other partners to ensure impartiality. In certain technical projects (e.g. GEF, Montreal Protocol, GFATM), technical steering committees can also take on the role of project assurance, in addition to their role as independent bodies for the verification of the products’ or outputs’ quality.

    Source: http://ppmtoolkit.undp.org/3b\_Project\_Roles\_Assignment.cfm [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Reportedly to be re-named the “Land Development Act” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. WOCAT (2007) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. from final version of Inception Report – final column shows status at Mid-Term Evaluation [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Source www.worldbank.org – extract from “Seychelles Country Brief” [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. GOS (2007) Strategy 2017: Creating our nation’s wealth together. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)