

# Final Evaluation of the Governance Capacity Building Programme in Seychelles

## FINAL REPORT

February 2014

**Prepared by** Peter Reed (Senior Expert)

**Implementing Partner:** Public Administration International,  
member of COWI Consortium

PAi

COWI



Funded by the European Union  
Contract Nr 2013/327241

BENEF 2009 - Lot 7 – Governance and  
Home Affairs

**ADDRESS** COWI Belgium SPRL  
Avenue de Tervueren 13-B  
B-1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
**TEL** +32 25 11 23 83  
**FAX** +32 25 11 38 81  
**WEB** [www.cowi.com](http://www.cowi.com)

## **DISCLAIMER**

This report has been prepared with the financial assistance of the European Commission. The evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and implemented by Public Administration International, a member of COWI's Consortium. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission. The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the author.

## REPORT CONTROL PATH

<b>Status</b>	Final
<b>Aid Modality:</b>	Project approach
<b>Project Management:</b>	Single Country National Project managed by the Delegation (devolved with joint management between UNDP and EU)
<b>CRIS Number:</b>	D-021379
<b>Project Title:</b>	Final Evaluation of the Governance Capacity Building Programme in Seychelles
<b>Specific Contract No:</b>	2013/327241/1
<b>Financing Agreement Date:</b>	12/01/10
<b>Domain:</b>	European Development Fund
<b>Country:</b>	Seychelles
<b>Person Responsible at</b>	
<b>Delegation:</b>	Ramduny Arunsingh
<b>Project Authority:</b>	UNDP
<b>Evaluator and Report Author:</b>	Peter Reed
<b>Framework Contractor:</b>	COWI Consortium
<b>Address:</b>	Avenue de Tervuren, 13-B B-1040 BRUSSELS - Belgium
<b>Tel Number:</b>	+32 2 738 71 52
<b>Fax Number:</b>	Fax. : +32 2 742 38 91
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:mtgi@cowi.com">mtgi@cowi.com</a> (Matteo Giarraffa)
<b>Contract Implementing Party:</b>	Public Administration International (PAI)
<b>Address:</b>	56 Russell Square, London, WC1B 4HP United Kingdom
<b>Tel Number:</b>	+44 (0) 20 75803590
<b>Fax Number:</b>	+44 (0) 20 75804746
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:isilay.aktas@public-admin.co.uk">isilay.aktas@public-admin.co.uk</a> (Isilay Aktas)
<b>Start Date (planned):</b>	12/01/10
<b>Start Date (actual):</b>	26/01/11
<b>End Date (planned):</b>	12/07/2013
<b>End Date (actual):</b>	31/12/13
<b>Evaluation Visit Date:</b>	19/11/13 to 06/12/13
<b>Date of the Report:</b>	10/12/13

# CONTENTS

Disclaimer .....	2
Report Control Path .....	3
Financial Data (Euros) .....	5
Evaluation Grading .....	5
Glossary of Acronyms .....	6
<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Introduction .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3. Answered Questions/ Findings .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. Problems and Needs (Relevance and Appropriateness of Design) .....	16
3.2. Achievement of Purpose (Effectiveness) .....	17
3.3. Sound management and value for money (Efficiency) .....	18
3.4. Achievement of wider effects (Impact) .....	22
3.5. Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability) .....	23
3.6. Mutual reinforcement (Coherence) .....	25
3.7. EC Value Added .....	26
<b>4. Visibility .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5. Overall Assessment .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6. Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>28</b>
6.1. Conclusions .....	28
6.2. Recommendations .....	30
6.2.1. Recommendations for the Government of Seychelles .....	30
6.2.2. Recommendations for the EC Delegation .....	30
6.2.3. Recommendations for the UNDP .....	31
6.2.4. Recommendations for Development Partners .....	31
<b>7. Annexes of the report .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Annex 1. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation .....	33
Annex 2. The Evaluator, Mr. Peter Reed (Provided through PAI, UK ) .....	40
Annex 3. Detailed Evaluation Method. ....	41
Annex 4. Logframe .....	49
Annex 5. List of key stakeholders, organisations and persons consulted .....	54
Annex 6. Literature and documents consulted .....	57
Annex 7. Synthesis report on small grants projects .....	60
Annex 8. Project Milestones and Evaluation Work Plan .....	73

## FINANCIAL DATA (EUROS)

Overall Disbursement Summary as @ 5th December 2013						
Activities	A Budget (€)	B Expenditure (€) end of June 2013	C Expenditure July to September	D Total Expenditure as @ 5th December 2013	E Disbursement as % of Total Budget	F Balance of Funds (€)
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	232,500	150,736.75	30,657.80	198,220.73	85%	34,279
SUPPLIES (incl Admin costs)	27,900	18,945.53	4,229.47	23,791.93	85%	4,108
SMALL GRANTS (incl admin costs)	281,600	272,998.29		277,536.75	99%	4,063
<b>TOTAL ACTIVITIES</b>				0.00		0
<b>Sub-total</b>	542,000	442,680.57	34,887.27	499,549.41	92%	42,451
7% of Administrative Costs	37,940	9,019.20	3,246.00	13,803.00	36%	24,137
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>579,940</b>	<b>451,699.77</b>	<b>38,133.27</b>	<b>513,352.41</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>66,588</b>

## EVALUATION GRADING

Relevance and quality of design	B
Efficiency of implementation to date	B
Effectiveness to date	B
Impact prospects	C
Potential sustainability	B

## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

AG	Attorney General
APHI	Association of People with Hearing Impairment
APSHF	Association for the Promotion of Solid Humane Families
CAB	Citizens' Advice Bureau
CEDAW	Convention to Eliminate all forms of Discrimination Against Women
CISAC	Confederation Internationale des Societes d'Auteurs et Compositeurs
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DO	Development Objective (for intended Impact)
DPs	Development Partners
EC	European Commission
EDF	European Development Funding
EQs	Evaluation Questions
ESAMI	Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute (Tanzania)
EQ	Evaluation Question
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation (Mauritius)
FA	Financing Agreement
FWC	Framework Contract
GoS	Government of Seychelles
HR	Human Rights
HQ	Headquarters
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICPA	International Commission for the Prevention of Alcoholism and Drugs
IOs	Immediate Objectives (1-4 in the Logframe)
LF	Logical Framework / Logframe
LUNGOS	Liaison Unit of Non-Governmental Organisations of Seychelles
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MM	Monitoring Mechanism
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoSA	Ministry of Social Affairs
MOVs	Methods of Verification (for achievement of performance indicators)
NAO	National Authorising
NCC	National Council for Children
NCFD	National Council for Disabled Persons

NGOs	Non-Government Organisations
NHRAP	National Human Rights Action Plan
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission (of Seychelles)
NHRDC	National Human Resources Development Council
NSA	Non State Actors
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PAP	Project Action Plan
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PF	Project Fiche
PFM	Public Financial Management
PP	Programme Purpose
PPT	Power Point Presentation
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
RCSS	Red Cross Society of Seychelles
SA	State Actors
SACS	Seychelles Authors & Composers Society
SBM	School of Business Management (formerly the Seychelles Institute of Management)
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SGS	Small Grants Scheme
SHF	Seychelles Heritage Foundation
SMART	Indicators = Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant, Time-bound Objectives = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
SOVs	Sources of Verification (for achievement of indicators)
S4S	Sustainability for Seychelles
SRC	Seychelles Revenue Commission
TA	Technical Assistance
TL	Team Leader
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCRPD	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNISEY	University of Seychelles
UNODC	United Nations Organisation for Drugs and Crime
WCS	Wildlife Clubs of Seychelles
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organisation

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Purpose of the Evaluation

This report presents a final evaluation of the EU's Governance Capacity Building Programme for Seychelles. This requirement (for a final evaluation) was foreseen in the Technical and Administrative Provisions of the programme's Financing Agreement (FA). It is intended to provide decision-makers in Seychelles, the relevant external co-operation services of the European Union (EU) and the wider public with sufficient information to:

- a. make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the programme, paying particular attention to the impact of the programme and its sub-project activities against its objectives;
- b. identify key lessons and propose practical recommendations that shall lead to conclusions based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings.

### Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation's objectives have been:

- a. To assess contribution of the programme to improving the governance capacity of the beneficiaries, particularly in the area of human rights
- b. To assess contribution of the programme in improving the capacity of policy-making bodies, the criminal justice system, security and law enforcement organisations in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work
- c. To assess the effectiveness of grants provided to all the beneficiaries of State and Non State Actors (SAs and NSAs) under the Small Grants Scheme (SGS) and their participation in development policy, notably in the area of governance
- d. To evaluate critically the programme's implementation, including project management issues under the Contribution Agreement with the UNDP
- e. To analyse constraints and bottlenecks related to the programme and sub-projects implementation
- f. To evaluate and analyse the implementation of the revised Logframe (LF)
- g. To analyse and evaluate the Technical Assistance (TA) final reports
- h. To identify key lessons learnt.

For impact, in particular, the evaluator has attempted to assess the prospects for impacts in terms of direct and evident benefits to policy making bodies, criminal justice systems, security and law enforcement organisations in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work, as well as to 13 beneficiaries of Grants which include SAs and NSAs for their ability to network, participate and influence development policy making.

### Key Issues Emerging

There have been essentially three categories of beneficiaries of the programme:

- the organisations that participated (especially NSAs) and whose institutional and organisational capacity and practices the programme or its sub-projects have sought to strengthen;
- the Government of Seychelles (GoS), through the programme's attention to creating or improving legislation, and institutions, and



- the citizens of Seychelles – the public – for whom good governance is a right and a concern, and whose awareness (e.g. of their rights) and ‘voice’, the programme has sought to strengthen.

Seychelles is a conservative small island middle-income State with no strong opposition to the ruling party's Government. There is extra parliamentary opposition to Government but owing to events surrounding the last election led to a situation of there being no strong opposition in the National Assembly. There is therefore a particular responsibility incumbent upon the Government for justice (in its broadest sense of good governance and adherence to international standards for human rights) not only to be done, but to be seen to be done in the interests of accountability. The Government benefits from external financial and technical assistance from development partners (donors such as the EU and UNDP) who have the right, in turn, to expect transparent, efficient and effective use of this support leading to measurable benefits for the benefit of citizens, or the institutions and bodies which serve them. Such benefits can take many forms – from an improved policy framework that is likely to produce worthwhile policy outcomes for voters and tax-payers – to greater awareness among the general public of their civil and human rights and the responsibilities that go with these rights. UNDP has suggested that an assessment of the level of advocacy and quiet diplomacy from all donors is probably called for to determine how soft interventions may be more effective in leveraging the desired results. Using the funds in a transparent way is one form of accountability, but ensuring that the institutions do function and fulfil their respective roles as a result of such support, and subsequently abiding by international norms and practices is a different issue altogether.

## Analysis

**Impact** always takes time to manifest itself and improving governance where it is already not seen to be ‘bad’ (but nevertheless still questionable in some respects in terms of international standards) is an iterative and subtle process that cannot simply be attributable to a single programme. Political will to demonstrate that the Government takes such matters seriously (and understands why it is important to be seen to do so) is perhaps easier to identify and, as a result, achievement of the Programme Logframe's (LF) Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) and evidential Sources of Verification (SOVs) at the impact level can be said to be the weakest aspect of overall performance with the result that impact has been and remains difficult to measure. There has been no broadly undertaken survey of public perceptions on good governance and human rights (including vulnerable groups) since the baseline survey done in 2008 and the need for inclusion of this in the inputs was clearly not foreseen at the time of the project design despite the Logframe reference.

**At Outcome level (for IOs 2 and 3)** - A Draft National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP - June 2013) has been produced through the auspices of the programme in two parts: *Part 1: Background and Situational Analysis*, and *Part 2: The National Action Plan on Human Rights - Priorities, Logframes and Action Plans*. These are excellent and comprehensive pieces of work and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) is to be congratulated on taking the lead for the process of developing the plan with the Seychelles Human Rights Treaty Committee (SHRTC). Preparations for the development of the plan started in October 2012 with the appointment of a Lead Commonwealth Consultant and a National Consultant. A Programme Steering Committee (PSC) with wide representation from different ministries, the judiciary, national councils, commissions and civil society was appointed in December 2012 to provide input into the plan under the guidance of the consultants.

According to the handbooks produced for this process, the development of the plan is as important as the final product itself. Participation, openness and transparency have been hallmarks of the planning process. To quote the words of the Principal Secretary for Foreign Affairs “*Nothing is too sensitive, too emotional, or inappropriate when it comes to human rights issues.*”<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the engagement of the MOFA as an implementing partner for Immediate Objective 2 of the LF has

---

<sup>1</sup> Speech delivered by Principal Secretary MFA at opening of 1<sup>st</sup> Consultative meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2012

facilitated significant progress towards validation and approval of new HR bills by Cabinet and the National Assembly<sup>2</sup>. It should be stated, however, that to date the NHRAP is not yet presented to the Cabinet of Ministers and has not yet even been presented to the National Assembly. In fact UNDP has pointed out that one of the common observations regarding indicators in project documents that they have had from evaluations of other projects is related to this issue of including indicators that may be contingent on approval of legislation by Cabinet or National assembly) because at project level neither the project management nor the implementing partner can have much if any influence on the matter.

Outcome indicators in this respect still remain unachieved (in a final sense) at the time of this evaluation but the process for this is clearly well advanced and there is no reason to believe that the Action Plan will not be adopted formally, or that bills will not be enacted once the Attorney General's (AG's) office has had time to deal with many requirements for alignment with other legislation.

Unfortunately the engagement of the Seychelles National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), which should perhaps have been a key actor, has been less evident throughout. It is understood that the Commissioner is expected to act both as Ombudsman and as HR Commissioner. The Commission appears to lack capacity (with no staff other than two who are actually on the establishment of the Ombudsman's Office) and consequently credibility. This situation is untenable and has been noted as such in various reports including the NHRAP Part 1 mentioned above. The Commission has not been represented regularly at PSC meetings and this has drawn adverse comments from donor representatives. It appears that this situation has been beyond the scope of the programme to influence. UNDP has pointed out that they have raised the issue several times with the Minister of Foreign Affairs but the situation has not changed. Unfortunately, in terms of impact, if this is not addressed it could constitute a major risk for the successful implementation of the NHRAP.

Had the Commission been more active it could perhaps have been the source of data to evidence an *'improved record on human rights by the Seychelles Government'* (as stated in the programme LF) but no such data is available. An interview with the Chair of the NHRC revealed that the Chairperson, whilst unhappy with this situation, appeared resigned to it, and did not see how engagement with the programme would be of benefit to the Commission or to her, or constitute good use of her time. This is somewhat worrying because the implication is that even attention to strengthening the Commission's capacity might not solve the underlying problem of how seriously Government is prepared to consider its role and purpose.

A small perception survey for residents of Bel Ombre District conducted by S4S under its Small Grants Scheme (SGS) project comes closest to providing evidence of public perceptions about governance and it is not convincing. Conversations between the Evaluator and a number of Seychellois all pointed to a continuing perception that there was, as yet, no noticeable improvement in perceived 'good governance' (or for example in the behaviour or attitude of most police), but that there is definitely a growing awareness of rights and growing groundswell of activity on social media to galvanise public opinion around such issues.

LUNGOS is interested to facilitate the creation of a Citizens' Advice Bureau. This should be independent but could possibly receive a grant from GoS or through the new CSR facility. The CAB could provide advice and advocacy on HR and a range of legal issues. It could also provide valuable 'signposting' for members of the public especially in the interim while the NHRC becomes more functional and accessible. Whether LUNGOS is the best body to facilitate this, or is suitably qualified to do so, is another matter. A number of interlocutors (among the SGS grantee NGOs) doubted this.

**At Outcome level (for IO 1)** - Immediate Objective 1 of the Logframe addresses *'Strengthened capacity of the police and prisons service in understanding and adhering to Human Rights principles through support to HR policy development and HR training'*. This component has been largely very successful.

---

<sup>2</sup> The NHRAP and new legislation still awaited endorsement by Cabinet at the time of this report.

In terms strictly of LF achievement, for the police the Sources of Verification (SOVs) stipulated have largely not been provided and thus there is little evidence that the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) at Outcome level have actually been achieved. However, it is clear that at the Output level, achievement is much more evident. With the exception of just one of seven performance indicators at this level (police staff perceptions of the effectiveness of training), the inputs (essentially the introduction of a complete new training curriculum for 3 levels of seniority), and the Output (the Police Academy actually implementing this curriculum), can be seen to have been well implemented.

For the prisons the situation is more impressive. Once again – with a single exception (that of a perception survey of prisoners themselves), the Output indicators have all been well achieved with SOVs as stipulated in the LF. There is no doubt at all that the programme (indirectly) and the prison (directly) have benefitted significantly from the contemporaneous (and highly complementary) UNODC programme to bring the prison infrastructure up to minimum UN standards for the temporary incarceration of Somali pirates on remand pending their trials and transportation to Somaliland.<sup>3</sup> Whilst the UNODC (and its donors) have paid for the actual refurbishment of infrastructure (with some matching funding from the GoS), the Governance Capacity Building Programme has facilitated the production of a new Strategic Plan and a Management & Rehabilitation Plan (2012-2016) that have served as the basic foundation and framework for much of this overall effort. The senior management team of the prisons service has done a first class job of ensuring that these two initiatives have been complementary and they can definitely be seen to have added value to one another. The Assistant Superintendent of Prisons is the first to acknowledge that the piracy – or to be more correct, the GoS decision to offer universal jurisdiction to help the international community deal with this - has been extremely beneficial for the service, and thus partly by default, for the benefit and welfare of Seychelles prisoners. Training curricula provided through the programme have also been well received, and can be seen to be good professional products that are being used. If anything, they remain perhaps too academic in style, (as do those for the Police Academy), and the prisons management stated that there was still a need to ‘translate’ them into more practical lesson manuals for the use of non-trained trainers (for example normal Seychellois prison officers who need to train new contracted Nepali officers) for whom academic qualifications such as a Certificate or Advanced Certificate are perhaps less immediately useful. Having said that, the courses are at the right level for the intended target audience as they were meant for the training of Seychellois prison officers. Standards should not, of course, be lowered to fit in with the perceived competencies of the Nepalese even if they are required to provide additional manpower to the Seychelles prison service. With the localisation policy they are not expected to be in Seychelles permanently and thus aiming for the highest standards and ensuring that Seychellois officers have the best training is something that the Prison Service should adhere to. Management may, however, need further support to render the materials practically useful.

**At Outcome level (for IO4)** - The Small Grants Scheme (SGS) has been a definite success and can be said to represent particularly good value for money in the opinion of the evaluator. A synthesis of summary reports has been provided by UNDP and this was particularly helpful for the evaluation. These can be found for all 13 SG projects at ANNEX 7 to this report. They show that in all cases proposals proved realistic and achievable, that implementing partners have (with help, encouragement and support from the UNDP Programme Management Team) all strengthened their own capacity to manage and report on such project activities, and that the budgets requested and provided were also sufficient to achieve outputs intended. As yet there is no real evidence that *‘policy makers acknowledge the value of inputs from NGOs and request contributions from them’*<sup>4</sup> to the extent that might be desirable, but this OVI was probably worded badly in the first place as it is too

<sup>3</sup> This has been made possible through Seychelles agreeing to provide and apply the statute of ‘universal jurisdiction’ for those accused of piracy and to process their prosecutions through its judicial system. It has received significant donor assistance for all aspects of this including refurbishment of the prison.

<sup>4</sup> One of the Outcome indicators for IO 4 in the Logframe

much of a generalisation. Public awareness of all the issues covered by project inputs has been raised, including the public's awareness that they can actually make a difference and influence policy making.

**At Output level** - It is demonstrable, therefore, that across the board the programme has been successful in achieving the great majority of its planned Outputs. The grantees for the SGS have also been pro-active and successful in many cases in securing publicity to solicit citizens' participation, and for the activities of their projects and achievements.

## **Conclusions**

Overall, and unsurprisingly, the programme has been able to demonstrate success across a whole range of activities, with very clear and comprehensive outputs achievement, some outcome achievement, but with impact being hard to quantify at this stage. Sustainability with respect to some of the interventions is possibly also questionable. Sadly this may be the case for a number of the SGS projects. CSOs and NGOs are frequently dependent on very few permanent and more often voluntary staff who are always busy chasing more funding and managing a range of projects for their sponsors. Once funding runs out for a particular initiative, it is sometimes hard for them to continue to apply resources to it. Where sufficient momentum has been generated to galvanise public participation – e.g. for S4S Bel Ombre based project which now has a popular local Newsletter '*Bel Ombre Buzz*', there can be said to be sufficient 'critical mass' to ensure sustainability. On the other hand, where it might be expected, for example, that the Ministry of Health could pick up on and continue the good work done by volunteers for the Red Cross's blood donors' project, there is no guarantee of this, and the Ministry does not even have the most basic of databases to make effective record or use in future of the newly recruited donors and the project's work.

The establishment of a new CAB would be beneficial and could be one means to ensure the sustainability of some of the programme's outcomes.

Overall the evaluation concludes that Government could be seen to some extent as perhaps missing an opportunity provided by this project to gain political capital out of a clear demonstration of its commitment to human rights in practice as well as on paper. Strategic communications, or public information channels, could have been used – and still could – for Government to claim credit for having secured EU funding for such a programme, and as a result demonstrated its commitment to supporting human rights in all its manifestations.

It is possible that the programme has not had sufficient visibility or publicity to stimulate the Government's interest in this regard and perhaps the EU could have done more – either through diplomatic channels or through insisting the UNDP should pay more attention to this.

## **Lessons Learnt**

For lessons learned, the consultant / evaluator considered in particular:

- policy, organisational and operations lessons
- pre-conditions or pre-requisites normally required for implementation of such programmes
- general development lessons (policy, regulations, instruments, sectoral and national strategies).

From a policy perspective, it is clear that whilst the MOFA has been engaged both for the benefit of the programme and for policy making, adherence to treaties and conventions, legislative amendments and a new NHRAP, this enthusiasm has not really been demonstrable across Government more broadly. Perhaps Ministers could have been involved more directly, and perhaps the UNDP Programme Manager could have been more 'visible' in this respect – both in terms of relationships, communications and awareness raising with senior representatives of GoS, but also with donors. For

their part, UNDP state that they have on every possible occasion raised the matter with the MFA at ministerial level as well as during the presence of the Resident Representative on mission to Seychelles with the particular issue of the non-participation of the NHRC being raised at every opportunity but unfortunately with no result. The UNDP PM has participated in these meetings and when on mission in other activities to this end such as workshops, opening statements and in all but the last of the SC meetings.

Although both the British High Commissioner and the French Ambassador have taken an interest in the programme throughout, and have attended PSC meetings, they have both remarked on the lack of 'visibility' of the Mauritius-based UNDP Programme Manager from the perspective of project activities in general. The PM has stated, however, that he has attended all but one of the SC meetings which he missed as a result of a conflict in scheduling that had been discussed with the Delegation.

From an operational perspective, the UNDP management team based in Victoria has done an excellent job of day-to-day project management, and the capacity building for some of the small NGOs (in the SGS) in terms of learning how to prepare proposals, how to report and account for finances, has been very much a product of their hard work and commitment. It has been much appreciated by implementing partners.

As to pre-conditions or pre-requisites, hindsight is, of course, 20-20. Perhaps the programme design might have taken greater account of the limited absorptive capacity (particularly with regard to human resources) of certain GoS departments (e.g. the Attorney General's (AG's) Office is permanently dealing with a backlog of amendments to legislation). It might also have appreciated that Seychelles is a conservative society which, like many small island cultures, has a tendency to be risk- and confrontation-averse. This may be due to fear (rational or not) of backlash or victimization and loss of jobs (for civil servants), or the prospect of bureaucratic hurdles to starting a business which needs to be licensed. Everyone knows almost everyone, or is related to them, and as a result people are reticent when it comes to being outspoken or critical of Government or governance.

The pre-existence of a fully functioning Human Rights Commission – or possibly the inclusion of a specific set of inputs to strengthen the organisational capacity of such a Commission, could have been a valuable addition to the programme design, as could a greater appreciation of the rapidly developing utility of social media in awareness raising, messaging, and communications generally. Given that it must have been apparent that the Commission was not well capacitated and that there was no professional attention to strategic communications that might help Government to demonstrate its real commitment to such matters, perhaps the project design could have considered the inclusion of inputs to these ends, or the PSC or project management could have attempted to draw greater attention to these issues (which are, however, mentioned in reports, PSC meetings minutes and the NHRAP).

As things stand, and whilst it is clear that the NHRC is in need of capacity building in all respects, it is doubtful whether simply providing funding or technical assistance (TA) for support for plans or training for staff would result in its becoming effective without the genuine commitment of the GoS to welcome and ensure this. The Government needs to make it clear in what direction it wishes to take the NHRC and how its role and powers should be set out in the NHRAP and supporting legislation. Unless this is made clear, the NHRAP may suffer from an inability to function as the anchoring institution that can be the custodian of the Plan.

## **Recommendations**

- The Government should take immediate steps to strengthen the organisational capacity and credibility of the Human Rights Commission, separating its functions from that of the

Ombudsman's Office (or at least establishing separate, specialised units within the same office dealing, respectively, with human rights and with complaints against the administration) and supporting it in particular with its communications and advocacy functions. The GoS must demonstrate its commitment to the spirit and the importance of this if it is to persuade donors like the EU to consider further funding support for this purpose.

- The Government should approve the establishment of a Citizens' Advice Bureau (CAB) using the most appropriate institutional status to allow such a body to be essentially independent whilst receiving some financial support from Government for its overheads. LUNGOS is researching the operations of similar bodies internationally.
- The Cabinet and AG's Office (and Parliament) should take all possible steps to speed up the validation, endorsement and enactment of the new HR legislation, treaties, conventions and the NHRAP.
- Further attention should be given (and if necessary funds sought) to make the training curricula for both police and prisons more practical; breaking the accredited qualification courses down further into 'lesson plans and manuals' for officers that have not necessarily been trained as trainers. Such trainers should, however, be given 'Methods of Instruction' courses and care should be taken not to dilute the standard of the qualifications.
- Perception surveys should be commissioned (ideally by Government contracting an independent contractor), and if necessary with further donor funding (or possibly a contract variation allowing use of remaining unspent programme funds for this). These should address in particular the SOV for the Programme's DO to provide '*a broadly undertaken survey on public perceptions of Good Governance and substantial Human Rights including vulnerable groups (using the 2008 survey as a baseline)*'. A further survey of public perceptions of police behaviour and the extent of trust in their knowledge and application of HR principles (i.e. whether or not there is evidence of the new training having the desired effect) would also be beneficial.
- Development Partners should continue to support Seychelles but should perhaps propose that future assistance might be contingent on results achieved to some extent. This is always something of a 'chicken and egg' situation, but GoS must play its part in convincing donors that it is serious about ensuring that the results of the programme will be sustainable and that it does want to see the planned impact achieved.
- The EU Delegation should consider what other forms of leverage it might apply (e.g. perhaps through diplomatic channels in addition to the possibility of future funding) to influence the GoS that it really is in its interests to take the overall HR agenda more seriously and demonstrate this – for example - through the establishment of a more functional NHRC.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation has been conducted in adherence to the standard evaluation methodology based on the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria. It has been guided by the European Commission's (EC's) good practice on conducting an evaluation provided for in Directorate Generals' (DGs') Evaluating EU activities practical guide, to provide the underpinning methodology for this final evaluation<sup>5</sup> as suggested by the Terms of Reference (ToRs). The overall methodological guidance is available on the web site of the Evaluation Unit. The approach also takes into account UNDP's guidelines for terminal evaluation of supported projects.

The evaluation provides objective, balanced and substantiated findings, and conclusions, and also suggests corresponding horizontal and targeted recommendations to the EC (and the GoS) for future consideration – including, as appropriate, recommendations for the roles of actors other than the EC. The recommendations are made with a view to their being seen as operational and realistic; providing clear, feasible, and relevant input for decision-making. The evaluation will help develop lessons learnt and identify good practice, as well as identify weaknesses and obstacles to the desirable

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm)

sustainability of achievement of the stated programme objectives which, at the impact level, is an ongoing process.

As noted in the ToR, the evaluation and the methodological approach takes into consideration the fact that the revised LF was approved by the GoS following the recommendations of a Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) mission that was undertaken in September 2011 at the initiative of the Delegation of the European Union for Seychelles. Another ROM mission was conducted in 2012 to evaluate the results of the project at that time. The evaluation has also been guided by the findings and recommendations presented in the European Court of Auditors special report<sup>6</sup> on the overall “Aid Programme”, issued in 2012 and by the findings of the external evaluation of the “Aid Programme” that was completed earlier in 2013.

In developing the specific contextual approach the evaluator has also been guided by consultations with the person responsible at the EC Delegation in Mauritius, (the Evaluation Manager) Mr. Arunsingh Ramduny, as to the goals of the evaluation and the approach to be adopted.

The ToRs establish a recommended process for the evaluation consisting of a desk phase, a field phase, and a synthesis phase. The ToRs are attached to this report at Annex 1. They mandate clear objectives for the evaluation as follows:

‘The final evaluation, which was foreseen in the Technical and Administrative Provisions of the project’s Financing Agreement, will provide the decision-makers in Seychelles, the relevant external co-operation services of the European Union and the wider public with sufficient information to:

- a. make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the programme, paying particular attention to the impact of the project actions against its objectives;
- b. identify key lessons and propose practical recommendations that shall lead to conclusions based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings’.

### 3. ANSWERED QUESTIONS/ FINDINGS

The evaluation was conducted with adherence to the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria in order to address the five principal evaluation criteria as follows:

- **Relevance** concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with the policies, priorities and needs of the intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to strategic plans and priorities, and the extent to which the intervention was able to adapt to emerging needs.
- **Efficiency** measures the extent to which activities have been delivered adequately and how, economically, resources or inputs are converted into intended results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.
- **Effectiveness** is a measure of the extent to which the initiative’s intended results and overall specific objectives have been achieved, or the extent to which progress toward the results and outcomes has been achieved via demonstrated engagement of stakeholders in the development and the take-up of the initial results of the initiative.
- **Impact** measures the immediate and also the medium- to longer-term changes in political, social, economic, and human development and peoples’ well-being that are brought about by the contribution of development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- **Sustainability** measures the extent to which the benefits of the programme can be expected to continue after the external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the capacity to maintain, manage and guarantee the development results in the future.

---

<sup>6</sup> European Court of Auditors: Special Report No. 6//2012, adopted on 6 March 2012.

The ToRs also suggest the use of further evaluation criteria/issues, namely those of Visibility, Coherence and Value Added.

On the basis of the assessment linked to these eight evaluation criteria (i.e. specific objective 1 of the evaluation), appropriate conclusions have been drawn as to the lessons learnt and corresponding and operational recommendations have been provided (i.e. specific objective 2 of the evaluation).

The Table at ANNEX 3 summarises all of the evaluation questions (EQs) and how they were used to assess the programme,

### **3.1.PROBLEMS AND NEEDS (RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS OF DESIGN)**

**Relevance** qualifies the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention (programme and projects) are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and EC policies.

The analysis of relevance focused on the following questions in relation to the design of the project:

- the extent to which the programme has been consistent with, and supportive of, the policy and programme framework within which the project is placed, in particular the EC's Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme, and the Government of Seychelles' (GoS) development policy and sector policies;
- the quality of the analyses of lessons learnt from past experience, and of sustainability issues;
- the programme's coherence with current/on-going initiatives;
- the quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement;
- the extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and social needs with clarity and internal consistency of the stated objectives;
- the extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed;
- the extent to which objectives have been updated in order to adapt to changes in the context;
- the degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances;
- the quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis and analysis of vulnerable groups) and of institutional capacity issues;
- the extent of stakeholder participation in the design and in the management/implementation of the project, and the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
- the quality of the analysis of strategic options, of the justification of the recommended implementation strategy, and of management and coordination arrangements;
- the realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative resources);
- the analysis of assumptions and risks;
- the appropriateness of the recommended monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

The Governance Capacity Building Programme is supportive of the 2008-2013 EC-Government of Seychelles (GoS) Development Support Strategy reflected in the 2008 Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programme. In following on from the governance-related capacity building efforts commenced under EDF9, the project addresses further needs of the target groups that include both SA and NSA, respectively. The judiciary, police and prisons departments are keen to promote good governance practices within their services and adherence to Human Rights (HR) issues through improving professionalism. This involves strategic planning and infrastructural refurbishment (prisons services), staff training (prisons and police services), and specific support initiatives with respect to new legislation and conventions (judiciary).



Furthermore, a range of activities funded through a Small Grants Scheme (SGS) encourages the involvement of NSA and a few SA in initiatives targeting the building of governance capacity amongst the general public and increasing awareness about HR. The project design is supported by key stakeholders, including the Government (Ministry for Foreign Affairs as the NAO), judiciary, police and prison services (under Ministry for Home Affairs), and NSA. Cross-cutting issues concerning environment, gender, governance and coordination of NSA are mainstreamed in the project design, and are reflected in the wide range of proposals submitted under the SGS.

The original LF included in the Financing Agreement (FA) was previously reported to be of very poor quality, and although that included in the Contribution Agreement with UNDP was somewhat better, it was (according to the Monitoring Mission) still far from being a useful tool to guide project management and monitoring – particularly for the higher levels of intended outcomes and impact. A workshop facilitated by an expert in project and LF design provided the opportunity to introduce the Project Cycle Management (PCM) approach as a project design as well as a management and monitoring tool for implementing partners. Risks and assumptions were considered to be holding true at the time of the previous monitoring mission with the report for this stating that: *‘GoS is committed to improve governance of its own institutions, and through dialogue with the NSA sector; it also has established a Human Rights Commission’*. However, it is this commitment and evidence of it in practice that is perhaps one of the areas that is most difficult to confirm with any certainty at the time of final evaluation. The delay in project start-up was precisely due to the fact that UNDP and the EU in Mauritius spent time towards the end of 2010 to improve the LF. In future such programmes should have a LF that is adequate from the outset, and that can be evaluated at the end with proper indicators

In summary the programme interventions are considered to have been highly relevant to the problems and needs they were designed to address. Some aspects of design (and as a result some indicators) could with hindsight have been more appropriate given the level of sophistication and the absorptive capacity (particularly human resources capacity) of the beneficiaries. For example, interviewees report that:

- Training curricula and materials are somewhat ‘academic’ and need further ‘distillation’ into practical lesson manuals to be even more useful, and able to be used by non-professional trainers (e.g. prison officers);
- Whilst implementing partners (e.g. CSOs implementing SGs) submitted highly relevant proposals and achieved equally relevant outputs, insufficient understanding of the Seychelles *‘realpolitik’* or political economy resulted in expectations concerning ‘ownership’ by Government and thus sustainability at the outcomes and impact level to be perhaps optimistic. Time will tell.

### **3.2.ACHIEVEMENT OF PURPOSE (EFFECTIVENESS)**

The effectiveness criterion concerns how far the programme’s results were attained, and the sub-project’s specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved (in the case of higher level impact).

The analysis of Effectiveness therefore focused on such issues as:

- whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including both women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
- whether intended beneficiaries participated to the extent expected in the intervention;
- in institutional reform components, whether behavioural patterns have changed in the beneficiary organisations or groups at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements (e.g. in

communications, productivity, awareness of human and other rights, ability to generate actions which lead to economic and social development, and adherence to international (e.g. UN) standards;

- if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commissions, etc.;
- whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate, and which accompanying measures have been taken by the partner authorities;
- ways in which unintended results may have affected the benefits received positively or negatively, and if so whether this could have been foreseen and managed;
- whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation.

Project activities commenced a year later than planned and no results had been achieved at the time of previous monitoring missions. Since then, and with the added benefit of an extension, significant results have been achieved – particularly at the Output level. Indeed it can be stated that overall the two-fold Development Objective (DO) – sometimes called the Project Purpose has been achieved. The SGS component has been particularly worthwhile and has undoubtedly led to increased NSA participation in governance issues, as well as improved governance within some SA. There has been no need to adapt to changing conditions (other than turnover of staff in some organisations), nor have there been any unforeseen negative or adverse effects on target groups.

One possibly fortuitous and highly positive effect has been the added value generated by funding through the UNODC's activities. While this was primarily designed to ensure that judicial processes and prison accommodation and facilities were up to minimum UN standards for the temporary incarceration of Somali pirates, it has significantly improved the infrastructure for the benefit of Seychelles prisoners and corrections staff. The Governance Capacity Building Programme was able to facilitate production of a 2012-2016 Medium Term Strategic Plan and a Management and Rehabilitation Plan (2012-2016) for the Seychelles Prison Service (Ministry of Home Affairs and Transport) that provided the basis and framework for much of this activity. This synergy clearly produced a very beneficial and effective 'win-win' situation for all stakeholders, and was particularly well exploited by the senior management team of the prison.

The balance of responsibilities for the programme's visibility and success between the EU Delegation and the UNDP Victoria office could perhaps have been more evident. The regular attendance by the EU Programme Officer at PSC meetings has been useful and appreciated as such. Apart from this personal engagement, together with the regular attendance at PSC meetings of the two Member States' Ambassadors from UK and France, the visibility of the EU as the funding partner has not been as evident as it could have been.

The PSC has been reasonably effective in terms of its requiring regular reports from UNDP, and also playing its part in overseeing contracting processes. It has applied due diligence in these respects but could perhaps have done more to 'steer' the programme more strategically so that impact achievement and sustainability might have been less uncertain. The closing ceremony for the programme will, no doubt, receive publicity and provide a photo opportunity on the day that it happens but there is a danger that this will soon be yesterday's news.

### **3.3.SOUND MANAGEMENT AND VALUE FOR MONEY (EFFICIENCY)**

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (most obviously and immediately at the outputs level), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison has been made against what was planned.

The assessment of Efficiency therefore focused on such issues as:

- The quality of day-to-day management, for example in:
  - a. operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs) and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
  - b. management of personnel, information, property, etc.,
  - c. whether management of risk has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;
  - d. relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
  - e. the quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including beneficiaries/target groups);
  - f. respect for deadlines;
- The extent to which the costs of the programme and sub-projects have been justified by the benefits (whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches), taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions;
- Partner country contributions from local institutions and Government (e.g. offices, experts, reports, tax exemption, as set out in the Logframe resource schedule), target beneficiaries and other local parties: whether such resources have been provided as planned;
- Commission HQ/Delegation inputs (e.g. procurement, training, contracting, either direct or via consultants/bureaux): have they been provided as planned?
- Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?
- Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
- Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities so far?

Following the signing of the FA in January 2010, it took another year for the signing of the CA between EU and UNDP (the reasons for which are unclear), and a further 2 months to contract the Programme Manager and Assistant Programme Manager. Despite the slow start, and with the benefit of an extension, at the time of the final evaluation all activities were on schedule and effectively concluded. Project management has evidently been efficient and has progressed well with timely implementation of the project. As a result all of the planned activities and inputs have been delivered on time, with the 6-month extension ensuring the satisfactory completion of the SGS projects and the training of judiciary, police and prisons, and enabling adequate backstopping. Monitoring Missions were deemed to have been helpful, particularly in respect to pointing out the inadequacies of the original LF and the need for its revision.

Management and coordination of the project has been generally good, and implementation and procurement procedures generally follow those of UNDP and are cost-effective and transparent. PSC approval was required prior to contracting of consultancy services and the SGS projects, whilst GoS (MoFA) has been the overall contracting authority in line with an agreement with UNDP. Consultancy services and inputs were scheduled using a 3-monthly work programme, and regularly

monitored by the two project staff, under supervision of the Mauritius-based UNDP Programme Manager who visits frequently. It has been helpful that the Deputy Programme Manager has extensive experience with EU and UNDP administrative and procurement procedures from the EDF9-funded governance project. UNDP has indicated that there has been a tendency for responses to reporting and to receipt of payment due from the Delegation to be slow (particularly slow disbursement of the second instalment according to UNDP). However, any funds disbursement does, of course, require proper financial reporting. According to the Delegation, the process of agreeing the detail for financial reporting took some considerable time on the part of UNDP. In any event, there should always be a balance of 30% of funds available and once 70% of funds have been used UNDP should make a request for replenishment as per the regulations. This is to facilitate payments due prior to replenishment. Furthermore, the lead consultant for the NHRAP was financed by the Commonwealth Secretariat through funds earmarked under the project and therefore, according to the Delegation, there should not have been any financial strain on project management. UNDP management contests this and feels that the overall funds for the whole project were not sufficient and that some activities that could have been desirable (such as surveys) could not have been undertaken in any case. UNDP states that funds had to be re-allocated from the SGS to the TA component from the start to be able to complete some activities. In the opinion of the evaluator, if a balance of unused funds remains at the end of the project, the issue of better cash-flow should have been dealt with through its being addressed more effectively – either at PSG meetings, or through the PM's being based in Mauritius with ready access to the Delegation at all times.

It does not appear that the LF has been used sufficiently as a management tool - although project management understands what the project aims to achieve. This has resulted in attention to realistic OVIs and MoVs being less assiduous – particularly at the Impact and Outcome levels than it could have been. For example:

- Three of the four Impact indicators for the high level Development Objective of the programme cannot be demonstrably seen to have been achieved because no survey, as predicated as the primary Source of Verification (SOV) for this, has yet been conducted;
- SOVs for Outcome indicators in respect of Immediate Objective 1 are also not in evidence as far as the police are concerned. The prisons component has been able to demonstrate evidence of indicators achievement to a much greater extent.

The sequencing of the Outputs and their quality has been good, and rigorous attention to this by programme management staff (e.g. chasing SG implementing partners for regular reports), has contributed to achieving the intended results. The PSC has fulfilled its responsibility in evaluating tenders for consultancy contracts and SGS project proposals. UNDP procedures were followed in this process. Activities have been coordinated with due attention to similar interventions from Government and other donors (e.g. UNODC as reported above). Communication between the various stakeholders, UNDP, partner country actors, and EC Delegation appears to have been satisfactory.

The SGS was designed in line with UNDP procedures and templates, and is appropriate, and sound. The call for proposals coincided with a 2-day seminar in which the SGS and proposal formulation were introduced to interested NSA and SA. The Monitoring Mission considered that it was unfortunate that the usefulness of LF design did not receive sufficient attention during that seminar, stating that *'As such, an opportunity to introduce this concept to NSA/SA organisations to help improve management of their projects has been missed'*. 24 proposals were received and assessed by the PSC, which resulted in the shortlisting of 14 organisations (11 NSA and 3 SA) that were invited to submit a full proposal. By the 11 August deadline 14 proposals had been received. These were reviewed by project management in consideration of the available budget and 13 were selected. The duration of projects has ranged from 8-16 months, which has proven adequate to achieve the individual targets set by each. Two projects (managed by NCC and the National Council for the Disabled) applied for additional funding which was granted as the overall budget was sufficient to allow this.

The projects varied considerably in their focus, and included strengthening public participation in environmental decision-making; promotion of disabled people's rights; development of procedures and practices to reduce corruption in the revenue service; promoting women's rights under CEDAW; improving availability of and access to blood at the hospital services through recruitment of blood donors; anti-drug abuse awareness and empowerment issues; promotion and awareness of copyright and intellectual property issues; and strengthening of the umbrella NGO association LUNGOS to help it build its organisational capacity to serve as a 'platform' for CSOs.

These activities represent a good spread and balance that has clearly boosted public awareness and participation in matters of governance. An overall implementation timeline for the SGS proposals was prepared by project management. A Final Synthesis Report for all the SGS Projects can be found at ANNEX 7 to this report. Some small projects showed great ingenuity to publicise their cause; for example, the Red Cross's use of a bus advertising for the recruitment of blood donors that toured Mahe Island. Following up the logic of this perhaps with a mobile blood donor unit might be a creative idea. The Gender Secretariat reported some concern that they felt there was a danger of unreasonable delays or even the 'dumbing down' of legislation which could be taken to be indicative of a lack of political will to push for enactment of new legislation or to confront entrenched resistance in the police or the Ministry for Home Affairs. Overall, however, there is little doubt that the discipline of having to produce a proposal, followed by guiding documents and regular reports has all led to capacity building for CSOs and an increased likelihood of sustainability for a number of the SG projects that they have managed.

Following an invitation to tender that yielded 4 responses, a local management institute (The School of Business Management at the University of Seychelles – previously the Seychelles Institute of Management) was contracted to develop a Strategic Plan for the Prison Services, which will form the basis for further development of the service, including the development of a training programme curriculum to Certificate and Advanced Certificate level. In addition, two consultancies were contracted to report on the status and progress of the implementation of HR Treaties and Conventions, together with preparation of a Draft National Human Rights Action Plan. Whilst a thorough, professional job appears to have been done in the drafting of these documents (in other words Output achievement has been good), it has become apparent that 'ownership' of this initiative by Government has lacked conviction to date. Outcome achievement is delayed (the Action Plan has been a long time in process of endorsement by the AG and Cabinet), and Impact is therefore questionable. This is evidenced by the following observations:

- The National Human Rights Commission is still in effect 'virtual' at this time. The Commissioner 'wears two hats' as she is also expected to fulfil the role of Ombudsman. This state of affairs was criticised as being sub-optimal if not untenable in previous reports, and also in the preparatory assessment documents for the Human Rights Action Plan, but no action has been taken by Government to date;
- Furthermore the Commissioner has not attended, nor has she sent representatives to, most PSC meetings to demonstrate that Government is aware and supportive of the programme's interventions to help strengthen human rights in Seychelles. This is unfortunate given the centrality of HR considerations to the programme's design and objectives.

Funds expended at the time of this evaluation (46 months after FA signing on 12/01/10) total Euros 513,352 (89 % of total budget available). The implementation of SGS-financed projects has shown particularly good (i.e. as budgeted) disbursement. The main reason for the overall under-spend by the programme appears essentially to be the result of UNDP management preferring to contract local national TA wherever possible. The budget was earmarked to have a blend of both external and local consultants. The process to secure external consultants can always be properly planned in advance without difficulties in sourcing so the preference for locals seems to have been well intentioned in terms of an attempt to ensure 'value for money' (perhaps 3 local consultant days for the price of 1

international expert). UNDP has stated that *'use of local consultant actually greatly helped the project in 2 significant ways. Firstly it helped to build local capacity and also to use existing local capacity. Secondly and as it is less costly, this has enabled the project to address all activities, whereas had it relied solely on international consultants, the funds would not have been sufficient. Hiring local consultants did not cause delays but actually helped to speed up implementation'*.

However, whilst in some cases sufficient local expertise (and particularly knowledge of the local context) does exist, contracting international experts who have knowledge of international best practice, and who are not afraid to argue potentially politically sensitive issues with Government at a senior level, can have advantages. They can be sometimes be useful to convince Ministers of shortcomings of governance (in the context of international best practices) that really should be addressed if donors are in turn to be convinced of the Government's seriousness (e.g. about having a fully functioning and competent Human Rights Commission and Action Plan).

### **3.4.ACHIEVEMENT OF WIDER EFFECTS (IMPACT)**

The term impact denotes the relationship between the programme's specific and overall objectives. At Impact level the final or ex-post evaluation has therefore made an analysis of the following aspects:

- The extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the programme's planned overall Development Objective of *'Strengthened governance capacity of non-state and state organizations to influence policies on Governance and Human (including gender) Rights; and strengthened capacity of the Criminal Justice System (Attorney General's Office, police and prison service) in respecting human rights principles and practices formally and substantially'*.
- whether the effects of the programme:
  - a) have been facilitated/constrained by external factors;
  - b) have produced any unintended or unexpected impacts, and if so how have these affected the overall impact;
  - c) have been facilitated/constrained by project/programme management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders;
  - d) have contributed to economic and social development;
  - e) have contributed to poverty reduction;
  - f) have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.

A positive impact of the programme is undoubted in general terms of its having been 'worthwhile' and 'good value for money'. In more specific technical terms – and applying the official (Logframe) interpretation of the word 'Impact', it must be said that 'the jury is still out'. Impact in this sense is a longer term concept, and it is not uncommon for higher level intended impact not to be apparent for some years, especially if political will, culture change, and behavioural change are required to evidence this. If political will (for example) is not certain but is assumed, then a statement to this effect should have been included in the Risks and Assumptions column of the Logframe. If uncertainty over this was deemed to be of significant concern, then such a risk should have been specifically addressed with activities – for example, a communications strategy, or even more pro-active liaison by the Programme Manager with Government (and possibly with the support of donors and diplomats who can engage Ministers directly).

The Prisons Service is keenly interested in the development and implementation of their Strategic Plan, and the Police Service will benefit from the development of training packages for both recruits and for middle-ranking and senior officers' development.

At this stage and at the Final evaluation, there are definite foreseeable positive outcomes (both direct and indirect) of the more substantial institutional capacity building (e.g. for police and prisons). Furthermore, the funding of several environment and gender-relevant small projects under the SGS is likely to lead to a wider positive impact outside the governance and HR area, not least because some of these have been implemented by SAs. SGS support for the development of a strategic plan for the NGO umbrella organisation, LUNGOS, has certainly strengthened its overall governance and management, which will have an added value effect in improving the governance and management of its 71 members. LUNGOS management is very grateful for, and encouraged by, the potential increase in scope of operations that this support has helped to engender. Overall, promoting good governance will see long term benefits as people become more aware of citizens' rights, enhancing their motivation to complain, or make their feelings known when these rights are not fully respected.

### **3.5.LIKELY CONTINUATION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS (SUSTAINABILITY)**

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes (and indeed impact) of the programme and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends; or to whether or not directly funded support interventions (such as: policy dialogue and coordination) are seen to continue to benefit citizens of Seychelles. Sustainability could be seen as the primary desirable impact result in this sense.

The final evaluation has accordingly made an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on the basis of the following issues:

- the ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and have continued to remain in agreement;
- policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions: e.g. how far donor policy and national policy are coherent and harmonised; the potential effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the project positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organisations.
- institutional capacity, e.g. of the Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating or significantly strengthening a new institution (e.g. the Human Rights Commission), how far good relations with existing institutions have been established; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); and finally, whether counterparts have been properly prepared (by and through TA where this was provided) for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
- the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose, particularly with reference to the likely effect of phasing out projects;
- socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the programme is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities;
- financial sustainability, e.g. whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remain so after funding will end; whether enough funds are available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs), and continued to do so after funding will end; and economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated;
- technical (technology) issues, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii)

alternative technologies are being considered, where possible; and (iii) the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance;

- wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, environmental impact and good governance; were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project.
- whether there is a high level of project ownership by the target groups (prison and police services, judiciary, NSA and SA);
- whether beneficiaries and implementing partners will continue to make use of the relevant results. Applicants for SGs were required to indicate the sustainability of project outcomes and deliverables.

Sustainability prospects are generally good but perhaps not as certain as might be hoped. The project is, for the most part, well embedded in local structures as it aims at building capacity of local institutions both at the governmental as well as non-state levels. At the governmental level, the MoFA's role as the principal interlocutor with donors such as the EC, its chairing of the PSC, and its role in working together with the consultants on reporting on Seychelles adherence to Conventions, assessing the statutes of the existing laws on HR, and drafting amendments to these, together with the new NHRAP, has ensured its institutional engagement and support which has been admirable.

The Police Academy has already integrated the newly developed curriculum into its courses at Certificate, Advanced Certificate and diploma levels in order to ensure institutional continuity and high involvement of target groups (for all levels of seniority and rank) in the future.

For results supporting the AG, the NHRC, and the development of the NHRAP, the existence of an economic phase-out strategy (of programme funds) is not particularly significant, but lack of serious engagement by the Commission (given that HR considerations were paramount in the rationale for the programme) certainly is a cause for concern. The results should by this time be evidently embedded within the existing institutional structures and they are not. The understanding is that the HR Commission is both organisationally and technically weak in terms of its structure, staffing and capacity to function effectively. Furthermore it has not been represented effectively or even attended PSC meetings. Donors have a right to be concerned about this and expressed their concern at the final PSC meeting. It could be said that Government is missing an opportunity here to claim the credit for having secured funding from development partners (donors such as the EC), having officially sponsored the programme through the MoFA's engagement, being seen to advocate the strengthening of HR in all its manifestations (as the Minister for Foreign Affairs did), and being associated with a successful programme as a result. Securing publicity at the grass roots level (e.g. by CSOs for their SGS projects) has been admirable. The Government could do well to emulate this at the level of strategic communications. Seychelles Government support is however evident through MoFA being one of the implementing partners in the project and is also an active member of the PSC.

The chances seem high that public and private sector policy support will very likely continue to be provided, as the focus of the project is in line with government strategy and long term development plans in these relevant areas. As far as the private sector is concerned, the new Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policy and legislation that proposes to take a levy from the turnover of all businesses is controversial and as yet still not fully transparent in its intended operation. If it is implemented as planned, some of the NGOs and CSOs may be able to obtain follow-on funds to continue good work that they have started through the SGS initiatives, and some have already applied for or received their certificates of eligibility for such assistance. Furthermore, the SGS projects were identified and principally designed by the beneficiaries and it is therefore very likely that the knowledge gained (even in such fields as proposal writing and project cycle management) will continue to be of benefit to them and thus to their clients. NGOs under SGP and state bodies such as the Gender Secretariat and the National Council for Children (NCC) will continue to exist without the EU funds as they are running numerous projects. It seems likely that the experience of participation in the programme has enhanced their professionalism and organisational capacity.



LUNGOS would like to facilitate the establishment of a CAB. The creation of such a body would be an excellent idea but a number of interviewees among the NGOs / CSOs felt that LUNGOS might not necessarily be the best or most capable organisation to do this. A CAB might have some form of agency or council status (as GoS deems appropriate) but should be essentially independent. It could be staffed by volunteers (as in the UK) who have professional social services knowledge or legal skills, and it could offer valuable signposting, advice and advocacy on HR issues – especially while the capacity of the NHRC and Ombudsman's Offices is being strengthened

The Prisons Service has indicated their commitment to implement the Strategic Plan, which they are certainly doing. The implementation of the Strategic Plan for prisons has no economic phase-out strategy, however, and this should be developed as a priority. It will provide guidance for the development of the Service for the next 5 years, and identify areas where further support is needed, and it has already provided a useful framework and timeline for the infrastructural refurbishments provided by UNODC. The commitment of the Police Service has earlier been demonstrated in their implementation of outcomes of the EDF9 funded project, which included the development of their Strategic Plan and the development and certification of a training course for certificate level; the development of advanced training courses to diploma level and for cadets will further support their initiative to enhance professionalism. The understanding is that, amongst other intentions, officers who have been trained through these courses will gradually replace the Special Constables who will be phased out. The latter have, in effect, operated in a 'community policing' role, but in future trained officers who do not necessarily aspire to rapid or higher promotion will take over this role in the community.

### **3.6.MUTUAL REINFORCEMENT (COHERENCE)**

Coherence refers to the extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission to achieve its development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other Community policies. It also refers to the desirability of, and extent to which they complement the country's policies and other donors' interventions.

Considering other related activities undertaken by Government or other donors, at the same level or at a higher level, the issues considered and assessed have been:

- The likeliness that results and impacts will mutually reinforce one another;
- The likeliness that results and impacts will duplicate or conflict with one another.

In terms of connection to higher level policies, coherence refers to the extent to which the programme and its sub-projects (i.e. its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc.):

- is likely to contribute to or possibly duplicate or contradict other EC policies, and
- is in line with evolving strategies of the EC and its partners.

In these respects, reference has already been made to the useful complementarity and synergy of UNODC's activities for refurbishments to the prison. The World Bank has also supported the GoS over the last several years with technical assistance for public financial management (PFM) – initially to address fiscal discipline and more recently to introduce Programme Performance Based Budgeting (PPBB) in pilot Departments. It has also supported technical assistance for critical aspects of the public administration reforms (PAR) with an 18 month project based in the Department of Public Administration (DPA). This has addressed the introduction of Results Oriented Management (ROM), strengthened human resources management systems, strengthened internal audit, and provided advice to assess the social impact of economic and fiscal austerity measures. This last intervention does have some synergies with the social sector components of the EU programme and none of the other initiatives are in any way contradictory or anything other than complementary.

### **3.7. EC VALUE ADDED**

This consideration concerns any connection that the programme has to the interventions of Member States and the extent (if any) to which the project/programme (its objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc.)

- is complementary to the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area;
- is co-ordinated with the intervention of EU Member States in the region/country/area;
- is creating actual synergy (or duplication) with the intervention of EU Member States;
- involves concerted efforts by EU Member States and the EC to optimise synergies and avoid duplication.

As the major donors for both the UNODC activities at the prison which have already been mentioned, and the broader activities under the RAPPICC programme (and the wider international maritime security sector initiatives in the Indian Ocean such as EU NavFor and EU CAP NESTOR) – for which the principal GoS institutional partner is the Ministry of Home Affairs) - are principally the same (notably the British and French Governments), regular high level contact and liaison is maintained through diplomatic channels and there is no cause for concern that there is any danger of duplication of effort or conflict of interests.

UNDP acts as the managing partner for a number of other EU programme initiatives – particularly in the environment and energy sectors, and once again (together with the EC Delegation in Mauritius) is in a position to ensure that there is no duplication or conflict.

Overall, there is no doubt that the EU has added value through this programme which has been complementary to other efforts funded by member states (e.g. in the maritime security sector). The EU could perhaps have done more, however, to promote and require greater visibility for its funding and the potential benefits of this (through its own diplomatic channels and from UNDP as managing partner).

## **4. VISIBILITY**

The evaluation has made an assessment of the project's strategy and activities in the field of visibility, information and communication, the results obtained and the impact achieved. More could possibly have been done in respect of public relations and communications. UNDP could, for example, have made greater use of the media or social media in particular – or encouraged the GoS to do this (and to take political credit for it), not simply for publicity of grass-roots level activities and SGS projects, but at the higher strategic level of human rights awareness including the rights of women, children and vulnerable groups as matters of policy and law. Obviously care has to be taken concerning how social media is used, as one of the most active groups on the social media network is very critical of the government. UNDP must maintain its neutrality and to get engaged on the social media networks over which it would have little or no control could be dangerous. Nor can UNDP be expected to have to vet what is posted and discussed through the auspices of a project that bears its sponsorship. Nevertheless, it is apparent that if civil society is increasingly turning to such media for open discourse on such matters, both Government and its supporting projects should find ways to engage for promotional purposes as opposed to argument, as opposed to being excluded from the dialogue, or being left behind the trend.

Many of the NGOS / CSOs that have managed the SGS projects have done a good job of promoting and publicising their efforts and in some cases (as in the example of S4S's *Bel Ombre Buzz* newsletter) this is ongoing, and at the time of writing, the Department of Social Affairs has managed to secure headline publicity in the Seychelles Nation newspaper (Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> December) for a workshop where *'Religious leaders team up to tackle gender violence'* as part of a well- publicised 16 day campaign.

Interviews with the Chief Secretary of the Public Service and other senior civil servants showed that they were not well informed about the objectives and activities of the programme. Had they been better informed they could have appealed for some of the programme budget to be applied to the sort of public perception survey that was envisaged at the highest level of the LF and for which the Department of Public Administration (DPA) has been trying to find funds to mobilise for the last two years. Greater visibility could in this sense have engendered greater coherence and added value.

The question is how could this aspect have perhaps been improved? Strict guidelines exist concerning the ways in which a managing partner (in this case UNDP) is supposed to ensure the visibility of EU funding.<sup>7</sup> There is actually a legal obligation to ensure this but also useful guidelines for 'Building a Communication and Visibility Plan' to maximise the impact of joint communications efforts. More attention could have been paid to this.

## 5. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overall the programme has been successful; impressive in parts and good value for money. The closer one gets to the 'grass roots' (e.g. when looking at the activities and achievements of the SGS projects), the more impressive it appears, and the better the obvious value for money evidenced. The enthusiasm shown by many participants at this level, together with the hard work of the UNDP management team to orchestrate and oversee much of this activity has probably generated both greater awareness and a momentum for change with regard to citizens' understanding of rights and social responsibilities.

At the institutional level, both police and prisons services have undoubtedly benefitted from improved training curricula, plans and the timely coincidence of complementary activities from other donors' programmes. Local sources of the requisite expertise such as the School of Business Management at the University of Seychelles have played an important role in this and have benefitted themselves as a result. The impact of improved training curricula will, of course, take time to be felt, and a public perception survey (as predicated in the Logframe as an important potential SOV for impact achievement) should eventually be conducted to ascertain whether people feel that the police (for example) are seen to behave with more sensitivity to HR and with less of the 'arrogance' that interviewees have described heretofore. The Commander of the Police Academy acknowledged that relations with the public were generally 'OK' but recognised that there was room for improvement. It could be interesting now for the police to solicit the public's reaction to the enactment of the new Public Order Act (Dec 2013) which gives more powers to the police.

The prison currently lacks a suitable training room which is a work in progress. Consequently the new curriculum is not yet actually being implemented. However, the prisons senior management stated that working with UNISEY had been rewarding. This had been publicised and had provided an opportunity for the prisons service to reconnect with the community.

As far as new conventions, treaties, acts and the new NHRAP are concerned, the sooner these can be validated, endorsed by Cabinet, passed by the National Assembly (or whatever level of action is still required to finalise and legalise them), the better it will be – both from the perspective of programme Outcomes being seen to be actually achieved, but also for the benefit of all Seychellois citizens. Endorsing all such institutional mechanisms can only add to Government credibility and help to convince donors (including those for this EU Governance Programme) that the GoS is genuinely serious about strengthening the governance capacity of all State and Non State institutions, and promoting proper attention to human rights considerations wherever possible.

---

<sup>7</sup> See:

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/procedures/financing/international\\_organisations/other\\_documents\\_related\\_united\\_nations/document/joint\\_visibility\\_guidelines.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/procedures/financing/international_organisations/other_documents_related_united_nations/document/joint_visibility_guidelines.pdf)

The Small Grants Scheme has made a particularly positive contribution to the programme. The Ministry of Social Affairs has been an important SA beneficiary. Their SG project has enabled them to work with consultants to improve legislation and consult stakeholders such as the National Child Protection Commission. They now have a final report and a draft bill. The Ministry is passing this to the AG's Office but the National Assembly also has to debate it and meanwhile experts have to determine that it is completely congruent with other legislation and the penal code such as the Law for Minors and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Gender Secretariat feels that the Domestic Violence Bill is very important and responds to the Convention on Violence Against Women. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has also been both beneficiary and implementing partner for the programme and the principal architect of the new National HR Action Plan. The Ministry feels that there is significant national interest in this which is genuinely cross-departmental and is optimistic for the future in this regard. MOFA did report that the input from the Commonwealth consultant for the HR Action Plan had been in their words 'underwhelming'. In any event the Ministry reported that capacity assessment and development would definitely be required for implementation by democratic institutions such as the NHRC<sup>8</sup> to be able to make good use of new legislation and plans.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **6.1. CONCLUSIONS**

- The evaluation questions, as summarised in the Executive Summary, and as set out in full at ANNEX 3 of this report, have provided enough evidence to conclude that the programme has been largely successful and deserving of an overall rating of B.
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency have all been good. The programme has been highly relevant in terms of its appropriateness to the current needs of the Government and people of Seychelles. It has been largely effective in that the great majority of outputs (as set out in the LF) have been achieved through efficient programme and project cycle management by the UNDP Victoria office team.
- Impact (i.e. likely achievement of wider effects) and Sustainability (i.e. the likelihood that results that have been achieved will continue to be apparent – or give rise to further positive effects, are at this stage more difficult to confirm with certainty. In the personal opinion of the Evaluator, the chances are good that this will be the case in both contexts. Government (particularly through the MOFA and the SAs that have been directly involved in programme implementation) has been sufficiently engaged to make it likely that 'governance' in its widest sense, can only benefit as a result of the programme's interventions. Furthermore, although outputs achievement in itself does not guarantee that achievement of the desired higher level outcomes (e.g. new policies and acts actually being implemented) will necessarily follow (as the logic model might imply), there has been such a significant degree of outputs achievement across the board of the programme's activities, that it does seem likely that enough momentum has been established for this to be the case.
- The evident lack of capacity and consequent lack of credibility of the National Human Rights Commission is a matter of grave concern (with the reported concern of donor country diplomats clearly evidencing this). This situation requires the immediate attention of the GoS as the existence of such a body would be a clear signal that the Government takes the whole HR agenda seriously. Failure to address this can only have an unfortunate and unnecessarily adverse effect on donor perceptions about this seriousness. The establishment of a CAB could prove to be

---

<sup>8</sup> The multi-donor Democratic Institutions Project (DIP) in Ethiopia would serve as a good model for such assistance that donors might consider.

a useful 'stop-gap' in terms of service provision for advice and advocacy, and could help to ensure the sustainability of a number of the programme's outcomes.

- The programme could have been more visible, and could both have benefitted from better publicity and more attention to communications in itself. It is likely that it could also have increased the chances of sustainability and impact by so doing, or by helping the GoS to do this and to appreciate the potential political benefits of so doing. There are strict guidelines concerning the ways in which the managing partner (in this case UNDP) is required to ensure the visibility of EU funding for programmes like this (see footnote 7 above). More awareness of this (by UNDP and also across Government as opposed simply to the MOFA) could help to generate a sense of responsibility for engagement to be effective and sustainable on the part of SAs in particular.
- Although some of the added value provided by the programme has been almost coincidental, in that concurrence of timing has led to synergies and complementarity (e.g. with UNODC operations), the result has nevertheless been very positive. The programme has clearly been coherent with other initiatives and has not conflicted with or duplicated the efforts of any others.
- The programme has been generally well managed by UNDP, particularly in so far as it has consisted of many disparate elements that must have taken a lot of coordination and attention to detail. Some criticism has been levelled at the low visibility – particularly of the Programme Manager who has the difficult task of managing the programme from a distance as he is based in Mauritius. UNDP does not feel that this is an issue. It is also open to question whether contracting of more international TA (particularly perhaps senior consultants who might have enough credibility to influence the GoS at senior or Ministerial level, as well as bringing experience of international best practices) might have added even more value, in addition to the possibility of their transferring valuable knowledge and skills to local national consultants.
- It was pointed out by UNDP that the EU Delegation programme management have never actually requested nor visited the PMU during any missions and that the only times the PMU have met with the EU PM has been during the SC meetings.
- Despite Seychelles being a middle income country and a tourist destination that many who have never been there probably perceive as a 'paradise in the sun', it does have many problems ranging from its well-documented struggle to get fiscal discipline under control (which the Ministry of Finance has done admirably), to a range of social ills that, if anything, are becoming more apparent and more of a concern. The causes of criminality – such as drug abuse, unemployment, cyber-crime and trafficking are issues of very real concern. As a result the sheer number of prosecutions is on the rise, and with it the prisons population (as reported with concern by the prison service management). This may be unsustainable.
- Furthermore, there is significant discontent, now beginning to manifest itself through social media and growing public confidence in people's right to a 'voice to be heard' (one of the objectives of this programme). This discontent ranges across a number of issues with one of the most prominent being the very obvious foreign direct investment (principally from Russia and the Gulf States) in large and some would say obtrusive hotel and resort developments on some of the islands' best beaches. Inward investment must be seen as desirable and will no doubt contribute positively to the economy in a number of ways. But when citizens, who for generations have enjoyed a cultural tradition of free access to these same beaches for barbeques with their families where they enjoy their music and their heritage, can no longer do this because the beaches are fenced off, they feel that their rights (civil and cultural) have been infringed. There is further significant discontent among those who have lived or retired for years near these same beaches, and who now find their view or even their light obliterated by a huge concrete hotel. People feel powerless in the face of these developments and this groundswell of discontent translates into a very real lack of confidence in 'good governance' which appears more evident to anyone who

actually converses with local people than the opposite perception which was the aim of this programme.

## **6.2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **6.2.1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF SEYCHELLES**

- The Government should take immediate steps to strengthen the organisational capacity and credibility of the Human Rights Commission, separating its functions from that of the Ombudsman's Office and supporting it in particular with its communications and advocacy functions.
- The Government should support and approve the establishment of a Citizens' Advice Bureau that among other services could provide free signposting, advice and advocacy on HR issues. It could publish a range of leaflets to promote further awareness in this regard.
- The Cabinet and AG's Office (and Parliament) should take all possible steps to speed up the validation, endorsement and enactment of the new HR legislation, treaties, conventions and the NHRAP.
- Further attention should be given (and if necessary funds sought) to make the training curricula for both police and prisons more practical; breaking the accredited qualification courses down further into 'lesson plans and manuals' for officers that have not necessarily been trained as trainers. Such trainers should, however, be given 'Methods of Instruction' courses.
- Perception surveys should be commissioned (ideally by Government contracting an independent contractor), and if necessary with further donor funding (or possibly a contract variation allowing use of remaining unspent programme funds for this). These should address in particular the SOV for the Programme's DO to provide '*a broadly undertaken survey on public perceptions of Good Governance and substantial Human Rights including vulnerable groups (using the 2008 survey as a baseline)*'. A further survey of public perceptions of police behaviour and the extent of trust in their knowledge and application of HR principles (i.e. whether or not there is evidence of the new training having the desired effect) would also be beneficial.

### **6.2.2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EC DELEGATION**

- Despite the conclusion of the programme, consideration should be given (if regulations permit or flexibility could be granted) to use some of the unexpended portion of the programme budget for contracting of '*a broadly undertaken survey on public perceptions on Good Governance and substantial Human Rights including vulnerable groups, with the Rosalie 2008 perception survey as a baseline*' (in line with the SOV for the Impact level Development Objective of the programme as expressed in the Logframe).
- Failing the possibility of such a variation or reallocation of programme funds, the Delegation could usefully consider future support for such potentially valuable and relevant follow-on activities as:
  - Support for the organizational and institutional capacity building of the NHRC (provided that genuine support for and commitment to the principles of this is demonstrated by GoS);
  - Training for the staff of Commission and the Ombudsman's Office (provided that GoS demonstrates its political will to give such bodies the 'teeth' they need to do their jobs);
  - Support for a strategic communications strategy to help GoS publicise its support for and activities in the arena of HR – and perhaps the positive benefits of inward investment in tourism development;

- Pragmatic support for simplification of the accredited training curricula for the police and prisons to create practical manuals for lesson plans to be delivered by non-professional trainers;
  - Possible support for the establishment of a CAB.
- In addition to considerations of future funding, the EU should consider how best to maximize the potential value that this could have through a combination of more effective diplomatic pressure and greater attention to public information to increase the visibility of its support when provided.

### **6.2.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE UNDP**

If there is a reasonable hope or prospect of future development assistance for Seychelles continuing to be implemented with UNDP as the implementing partner or 'managing agent', UNDP should consider whether it is good enough, or to put it another way – whether they can completely justify - having a senior manager who needs to act in the role of Programme Manager for such partnership projects, who is not based full time in Seychelles. (As stated previously UNDP themselves dispute that this is an issue of concern). The UNDP local office staff have done a first class job of PCM for this programme but they could not have been expected to tackle some of the more sensitive political issues arising, or to be the most appropriate interlocutors for such development partners as EU member states' Ambassadors on the one hand, or Government Ministers on the other. The present situation puts UNDP staff at all levels at something of a disadvantage.

### **6.2.4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS**

- DPs should continue to exert diplomatic pressure on the GoS, not only to fulfil obligations to treaties and conventions, and to pass the new Act and implement the new NHRAP, but also to espouse these concerns with more evident enthusiasm and commitment.
- Where possible, they should draw the attention of their own governments to some of the concerns expressed in this report in order that donor agencies should not desert Seychelles at this critical juncture in its economic and social development; but rather continue to encourage and support the GoS in the work that still needs to be done to ensure real sustainability of the benefits of this programme.
- Although 'conditionality' for development assistance is now considered by many to be unhelpful, 'payment on results' with some part of assistance being contingent on evident progress, or possibly on matched funding that shows seriousness of intent, could be considered as a modality.

## **7. ANNEXES OF THE REPORT**

The report includes the following annexes:

1. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation.
2. The name of the evaluator and their company with synopsis pen picture CV.
3. Details of the evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Details of tools and analyses.
4. Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/revised).
5. List of key stakeholders: persons and organisations consulted.
6. Literature and documentation consulted.
7. Synthesis Report of Small Grants Projects.
8. Programme Milestones and Evaluation Schedule.





## **ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION**

**Request 2013/327241/1**

### **SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Final Evaluation of the Governance Capacity Building Programme in Seychelles**

**FWC BENEFICIARIES 2009 - LOT 7: Governance and Home Affairs  
EuropeAid/127054/C/SER/multi**

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

The Governance Capacity Building Programme, financed under the 10<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF), supports the efforts of State and Non State Actors to continue improving and strengthening governance capacity in Seychelles society, with particular emphasis on the area of human (including gender) rights. The project is being implemented under a Contribution Agreement with the UNDP as the implementing agency following its own procedures which started in December 2010 and will be terminated on 31 December 2013 following the approval of a rider to the FA for an extension of the programme by 6 months. All recruitments for the programme are undertaken in accordance with UNDP policy and procedures. The logframe of the Financing Agreement was reviewed by an independent expert following consultations with all the stakeholders in February 2012. The revised logframe was approved by the Government of Seychelles following the recommendations of a Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) mission that was undertaken in September 2011 at the initiative of the Delegation of the European Union for Seychelles. Another ROM mission was conducted in 2012 to evaluate the results of the project. All the relevant reports and documents will be made available to the selected firm.

As a follow-up from the governance-related capacity building efforts initiated under the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF, the project comprises two components namely (a) a capacity building programme to continue strengthening the capacity of the policy-making bodies, the criminal justice system (CJS), security and law enforcement organisations in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work and (b) a Small Grants Scheme (SGS) to provide access to funds for non-state and state organisations so that they can be further strengthened and do awareness-raising in the areas of good governance.

As a result the project addresses further needs of the target groups that include strengthening the capacity of the policy-making bodies, in particular the Attorney General's Office, the criminal justice system (CJS), security and law enforcement organisations (Police and Prisons Department) in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work.

This involves strategic planning (Prisons services), staff training (Prisons and Police services), and specific support initiatives to the (Attorney General's office). Furthermore, a range of activities funded through a Small Grant Scheme (SGS) that were allocated to thirteen non-state and state organizations encourages the involvement of NSAs and a few state actors in initiatives targeting the building of governance capacity amongst the general public and increasing awareness on Human Rights. The project design is supported by key stakeholders, including the government (Ministry for Foreign Affairs as the NAO), Attorney General's office, police and prison services, and NSA.

A Steering Committee (SC) oversees the overall guidance and technical orientation of the programme and monitors progress of the project components with the role of reporting and trouble shooting. The SC composition comprises a member of the National Assembly, the National Authorising Officer (NAO) or his representative, representatives of the CJS and law enforcement organisations, representatives of the NSAs, UNDP and EC. Additional resource persons are invited to attend the SC, subject to prior agreement of the EC and NAO.

The SC also has the mandate to set up a sub-committee for management of the Small Grants Programme. The sub-committee has the duty to screen, reject or approve small grants projects for financing, as well as observing progress, and commenting on the management of the grants by the various applicants.

## 2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

The final evaluation, which has been foreseen in the Technical and Administrative Provisions of the project's Financing Agreement, will provide the decision-makers in Seychelles the relevant external co-operation services of the European Union and the wider public with sufficient information to:

- c. make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the programme, paying particularly attention to the impact of the project actions against its objectives;
- d. identify key lessons and to propose practical recommendations that shall lead to **conclusions** based on objective, credible, reliable and valid findings.

Expected results are:

- a) To assess contribution of the programme to improving the governance capacity of the beneficiaries, particularly in the area of human rights;
- b) To assess contribution of the programme in improving the capacity of policy-making bodies, the criminal justice system, security and law enforcement organisations in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work
- c) To assess the effectiveness of grants provided to all the beneficiaries of State and Non State Actors under the Small Grants Scheme and their participation in development policy, notably in the area of governance.
- d) To critically evaluate the project implementation, including project management issues under the Contribution Agreement with the UNDP.
- e) To analyse constraints and bottlenecks related to the project implementation;
- f) To evaluate and analyse the implementation of the revised logframe;
- g) To analyse and evaluate the Technical Assistance final reports;
- h) To identify key lessons learnt.

## 3. ISSUES TO BE STUDIED

The evaluation study responds to the requirements of the last phase of the project cycle. The consultants shall verify, analyse and assess in detail the issues outlined in Annexe 2 "Layout, structure of the Final Report". The list of issues is not intended to be exhaustive. More specifically the objective of this evaluation shall assess to what extent the EU assistance has been **relevant, coherent, effective, efficient and sustainable in providing the expected impacts** along with the **EC added value of interventions**. It should also assess the **coherence** with the Governments' priorities and activities.

The evaluation should support policy decision-making and project management purposes. The main users of the evaluation will be the EU Delegations, DEVCO. Other EC services may also benefit from the results of this evaluation. The evaluation should also generate results of interest to a broader audience, including governments of partner countries, Member States, Non State Actors (mainly private sector and its organisations) and others. The consultant is requested to verify, analyse and assess the integration and impact of cross cutting issues in the project.

For impact, in particular, the consultants will assess the prospects for impacts in terms of direct benefits to policy making bodies, criminal justice systems, security and law enforcement organisations in respecting and adhering to human rights practices and principles in their work, as well as to 13 beneficiaries of Grants which include State and Non State Actors for their ability to network, participate and influence development policy making. The success of the project implementation and its positive impact can be demonstrated by identifying success stories.

For lessons learned, the consultant will review in particular: (a) policy, organizational and operations lessons, (b) pre-conditions that would be required for implementation of such programmes, (c) General development lessons (policy, regulations, instruments, sectoral and national strategies)

In particular, the evaluators will assess:

- i. whether the strategies, activities and management of the project achieved the expected

results;

- ii. The problems met during the implementation and lessons learned;
- iii. The suitability of the budgetary and human resources deployed in terms of the project's objective;
- iv. The cooperation of the different stakeholders and States involved in the project, the level of ownership of the project by the beneficiary countries and the level of their involvement;
- v. The impact of the project at national level.

The evaluation should:

- assess whether the project's inputs have contributed to the cost-efficient achievement of its expected results as reminded under effectiveness above.
- generally assess whether or not the implementation of the project has provided 'value-for-money' and whether and how results could have been achieved more cost-effectively.
- provide a detailed description of the obstacles encountered for implementation.

The consultant is required to use his/her professional judgement and experience to review all relevant factors and to bring these to the attention of the European Commission and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

#### 4. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The overall methodology guidance is available on the web site of the Evaluation Unit under the following address: [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm)

---

##### - EVALUATION METHODS

The good evaluation of a project or a policy needs on the one hand thorough application of methodology up to the highest professional standards and is on the other hand a creative thought exercise: what do we really want to know and how to find out.

- EVALUATION GUIDES: for the geographical and thematic evaluations, for evaluation managers or evaluators and for project and programme evaluations, including checklists
- METHODOLOGICAL BASES: subject, timing, utilisation, roles, method
- TOOLS: to structure an evaluation, to collect and analyse data, to assist the formulation of judgements
- IMPACT DIAGRAMS/INDICATORS: a set of intervention logics, outlining key chains of results and a menu of example indicators for some key EC intervention sectors
- OVERALL ASSESSMENT: the development of these documents has been accompanied by a group of international evaluation experts. Please read their assessment
- DOCUMENTS

## **4.1 MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation is managed by the EU Delegation in Mauritius under the coordination of Mr Arun Ramduny, Project Manager of Seychelles at the EU Delegation.

As regards Steering of the evaluation exercise, it will be undertaken under the coordination of a Reference group comprising namely reference group comprising Cecile Tassin-Pelzer, Head of Section Seychelles at the EU Delegation, Mr Arun Ramduny, Project Manager at the EU Delegation, Mrs Jeanette D'Offay, Deputy National Authorising Officer and Chairperson of the Steering Committee at the Seychelles Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Gayethri Pillay, Second Secretary, Treaties Section, Protocol, Treaties and Consular Affairs Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Steve Lalande, CEO of Lungos in Seychelles (umbrella organisation of Non-State Actors) .

The reference group member's main functions are:

- To aggregate and summarise the views of the members of the Steering Committee and to act as an interface between the consultants and the services, thereby supplementing bilateral contacts.
- To ensure that the evaluator has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the project/programme.
- To validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluator.
- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.

For detailed information on the role of the reference group see the following link: [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/methods/mth\\_stg\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/methods/mth_stg_en.htm)

## **4.2 THE EVALUATION APPROACH / PROCESS**

The evaluation approach should be developed and implemented as presented below (for further details consult the evaluation methodology website above mentioned). Once the evaluator has been contractually engaged, the evaluation process will be carried out through three phases: a Desk Phase, a Field Phase and a Synthesis Phase, as described below:

### **4.2.1 Desk Phase**

In the Desk Phase the relevant programming documents should be reviewed, as well as documents shaping the wider strategy/policy framework. The evaluator will then analyse the initial and revised logical frameworks as set for the programme cycle. The relevant programming documents should also be reviewed, as well as documents shaping the wider strategy/policy framework. On the basis of the information collected the evaluator should:

- Review systematically the relevant available documents including logical framework;
- Propose the work plan for the field phase.
- Present an indicative methodology to the overall assessment of the programme.
- Liaise with the EU Delegation for Seychelles based in Mauritius, Seychelles Ministry of Foreign Affairs, project management unit and key partners and all beneficiaries in Seychelles.

### **4.2.2 Field phase**

The evaluator should:

- Submit its detailed work plan with an indicative list of people to be interviewed. This plan has to be applied in a way that is flexible enough to accommodate for any last-minute difficulties in the field. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as

creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these should be immediately discussed with the Reference group.

- Meet the members of the Steering Committee for the programme in the first days of the field phase and be in attendance of the final Steering Committee meeting of the programme tentatively scheduled at the beginning of November 2013.
- Ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of, the different stakeholders; working closely with the relevant government authorities, agencies, Non State Actors and the EU Member States in particular the France and UK during their entire assignment. Use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information and will harmonise data from different sources to allow ready interpretation.
- Summarise its field works at the end of the field phase, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present its preliminary findings to the Reference Group.

#### 4.2.3 Synthesis phase

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report. The consultant will make sure that:

- The assessment is objective and balanced, affirmations accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, the expert will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place, in order to avoid misleading readers and causing unnecessary irritation or offence.

If the evaluator considers the draft report of sufficient quality, he/she will circulate it for comments to the reference group members. On the basis of comments expressed by the reference group members, the evaluator has to amend and revise the draft report. Comments requesting methodological quality improvements should be taken into account, except where there is a demonstrated impossibility, in which case full justification should be provided by the evaluator. Comments on the substance of the report may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluator is to motivate and explain the reasons in writing.

#### 4.2.4 Quality of the Final Evaluation Report

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager (in the delegation) using a quality assessment grid (see annexe IV). The explanation on how to fill this grid is available on the following link:

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/egeval/guidelines/gba\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/egeval/guidelines/gba_en.htm)

### 5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The reports must match quality standards. The consultant will submit the following reports in English:

1. Draft **Final report** using the structure set out in Annex 2 and taking due account of comments received from the reference group members. Besides answering the evaluation questions, the draft final report should also synthesise all findings and conclusions into an overall assessment of the project/programme. The report should be presented within 10 days from the receipt of the reference group's comments.
2. **Final report** with the same specifications as mentioned under 1 above, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report, to be presented within 5 days of the receipt of these comments.

Distribution of the report in both electronic version as well as in hard copies will be as follows:

- Beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs): (5) copies
- EU Delegation for Seychelles based in Mauritius (2) copies

## **6. EXPERTS PROFILE**

The evaluation will be composed of one Senior expert with the following profile and qualifications:

### Minimum Criteria:

- The expert should have a University degree in Social Sciences, or similar discipline of relevance to the assignment. A Masters degree would constitute an advantage.
- Solid and diversified experience in the specific field of expertise needed, including experience in evaluation of projects
- At least ten years experience working in the area of governance, human rights and civil society development
- Full working knowledge of English and French and excellent report writing and communications in both languages
- Fully conversant with the principles and working methods of project cycle management and EC aid delivery methods;

### Evaluation criteria:

The expert should have

- Minimum of 10 years of specific expertise in the field of governance and human rights
- Wide experience in Capacity Building on Methodology of Human Rights Programmes for Human Rights stakeholders.
- At least 10 years proven professional work experience in Human Rights monitoring, evaluations, impact/outcome assessment
- Experience of human rights issues to both state and non-state actors (covering institutional capacity assessment and capacity development planning) is essential
- Experience in undertaking EU evaluation exercise is an asset.
- Experience in Small island states is an asset.

## **7. WORKPLAN and TIMETABLE**

The duration of the assignment is 23 days over 90 man days. The tentative start date is at the end of October /beginning of November 2013. The EU Delegation for Seychelles is based in Mauritius and will facilitate availability of contact details in Seychelles to plan the field phase. Specific meetings through telephone and mails will be facilitated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the UNDP liaison office in Seychelles. A debriefing is proposed to be undertaken at the EU Delegation for Seychelles based in Mauritius.

The detailed inputs of the Senior expert are reflected in the following table:

	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Man Days</b>
--	---------------	-----------------	-----------------

Desk Phase	End of October 2013		2
Proposed Field mission in Seychelles and half-day debriefing in Mauritius	End of Oct/ beginning of November 2013 17/11 to 2/12?	Seychelles + Mauritius	16
Draft final/Final report			2
3 days travel (EU-Seychelles; Sey-Mauritius; Mauritius-EU)			3
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>23</b>

## 9. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

- Administrative information is available and can be provided on request.

## **ANNEX 2. THE EVALUATOR, MR. PETER REED (PROVIDED THROUGH PAI, UK)**

Peter Reed is an internationally experienced strategy, organisational development, and security sector development consultant, specialising in high level policy advice, policy and strategy development, strategic planning, organisational and institutional capacity assessment, leadership and senior management development and training. He has significant experience of the project leadership and direction of high value transformational change programmes in the UK and 40 transitional developing countries, principally in the fields of governance, public and civil service reform, and assessment of systemic, institutional and organisational capacity – particularly in complex, fragile or post-conflict environments. He specialises in programme evaluations and project output to purpose reviews which he has conducted for HMG's DFID, the World Bank, the EC, Swedish SIDA, UNDP and UNRWA.

Mr. Reed is the author of 'Extraordinary Leadership – Creating Strategies for Change' first published by Kogan Page in 2001, now in 4 editions and 4 languages. He co-authored a new edition of John Adair's classic text 'Not Bosses but Leaders' re-published by Kogan Page in translation in 5 languages. He co-authored a UN publication: 'Building the Policy Making Capacity of States in Transition' and has contributed two chapters on balanced scorecard applications for the American Encyclopaedia of Public Administration and Policy. In addition he has helped to develop MBA programmes for universities in the UK, Hungary and Russia, and innovative curricula – particularly senior management and leadership competency materials for Institutes of Public Administration around the world.

He has advised NATO Allied Command Transformation and its partners on strategy mapping for a Comprehensive Approach to civil-military cooperation for the transition to development in stabilisation operations, and is a member of the US Army Asymmetric Operations Working Group (Special Operations Command, Africa), advising on stabilisation, countering violent extremism, radicalisation and counter-piracy in the Horn of Africa and Indian Ocean region.

In summary, Mr. Reed offers:

- A track record as team-leader of complex programme reviews and evaluations (esp. major institutional and multi-donor evaluations), e.g. Review of Uganda's National Development Plan; Review of UNRWA's management of the US\$1Bn programme for the 4.6 million Palestinian Refugees throughout the Near East; Review of UNDP's management of the US\$800M Global Fund's programmes in DRC);
- A track record and established profile as a respected senior generalist in public and civil service reform in 40 countries; Specialist in fragile States stabilisation/governance; Recently a Strategic Advisor to the Office of the President of the Transitional Federal Government of Somalia provided through AMISOM. Recently Team Leader for the World Bank Project, advising the Vice President and Cabinet of the Government of Seychelles on strengthening critical aspects of the Public Administration Reform.
- Deployable Civilian Expert for UK Government's Civilian Stabilisation Group with current SC (UK, EU and NATO Secret) Security Clearance.
- A track record as a good facilitator and presenter (experienced trainer able to present and work in several languages); Keynote speaker at international *fora* and published author. Excellent report writing skills;
- A track record in joint donor / multi-stakeholder exercises; practical knowledge of aid effectiveness architecture – Recently facilitated creation of the National Security Stabilisation Plan for Somalia for international community engagement. Also facilitated establishment of the National Security Council architecture in Mogadishu. He designed the Multi Donor Trust Fund's Medium Term Reforms Framework in Southern Sudan and the governance architecture and critical support requirements for the Public Administration Reforms in Seychelles in 2011-12.



### ANNEX 3. DETAILED EVALUATION METHOD

The project/programme has been judged more from the angle of the beneficiaries' perceptions of benefits received than from the managers' perspective of outputs delivered or results achieved. Consequently, interviews have focused on outsiders (beneficiaries and other affected groups beyond beneficiaries) as much as insiders (managers, partners, field level operators).

A key methodological issue is whether observed or reported change can be partially or entirely attributed to the project / programme, or how far the project/programme has contributed to such change. The evaluation has attempted to identify attribution / contribution problems where relevant and these have been noted in the conclusions.

All conclusions are based on facts and evidence through clear chains of reasoning and transparent value judgements. Each value judgement has been made as explicit as possible (see Table below) regarding:

- the aspect of the project/programme being judged (its design, and implementation procedure, management practices, etc.)
- the evaluation criteria used (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, coherence, EC value added, visibility etc.).

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
<b>Relevance</b>		
(1) How effectively have the priorities/needs of the beneficiaries been translated into the programming of EDF assistance through this Governance Capacity Building Programme?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project preparation is subject to the efficient involvement of key SA and NSA partners, stakeholders and target beneficiaries</li> <li>• Project documents contain appropriate references to beneficiary policies/strategies, reform timelines and budgets</li> <li>• Project preparation/design ensures consistency of activities and outputs with the immediate objectives, the impacts and effects, considering realistic implementation timeframes and the absorption capacity of the stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numbers of SA and NSA partners, stakeholders etc. involved in project preparation/consultations</li> <li>• Number of references to beneficiary policies</li> <li>• Internal quality reports to ensure projects focused in terms of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and post-project planning</li> <li>• Logframe objectives and indicators of achievement for support by the programme components are relevant in the Seychelles and regional context.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>		
(2) To what extent were the costs of assistance justified by the benefits generated?	<p>Judgement will be based on whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project costs can be justified in terms of the project benefits generated (i.e. cost-effectiveness), in comparison to similar projects or alternative approaches</li> <li>• Similar results could have been achieved at a lower cost and within the same amount of time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial data linked to the planned and actual annual financing (e.g. per SG sub-project), provided in regard to key sub-categories of events (i.e. expenditure)</li> <li>• Operational data linked to the planned and actual achievement of goals / benefits</li> </ul>
(3) How efficiently have the	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely delivery of planned outputs</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
priorities/needs of the identified stakeholders and beneficiary groups been adequately delivered, and converted into the appropriate results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project activities have transformed the resources available (time, funding, staff, etc.) into achieved results as planned</li> <li>• Project management (budget, staff, information, activities, logistics, flexibility, risks, absorption capacity, commitment, etc.) has been adequate in fulfilling the project objectives</li> <li>• Beneficiaries and stakeholders have contributed to activity preparation/implementation in a timely manner, supporting the definition of appropriate solutions to deliver the results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal quality reports ensure progress and quality control of project outputs' delivery, plus future planning for coherence with other GoS and donor policies, programmes and initiatives.</li> <li>• The involvement of the beneficiaries and the stakeholders to enable the beneficiaries to guide technical design of implementation and develop ownership of the outputs delivered</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
(4) How far has the EU assistance been able to support reforms in the sectors concerned and induced both a sustainable behavioural change and a development of administrative capacities in the beneficiary stakeholders' organisations at various levels?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planned benefits have been delivered <u>and</u> received, taking into account the perception of key beneficiaries and stakeholders, as well as of the evaluation expert and the EC</li> <li>• Responsibilities amongst the target beneficiaries and various stakeholders have been distributed in a balanced manner, and partners have appropriately contributed to project preparation/implementation in a result-oriented manner</li> <li>• Appropriate actions have been conducted to ensure project results have been used/utilised and/or their potential benefits have been obtained so as to achieve the project purpose</li> <li>• Behavioural patterns of the beneficiary "bodies" and stakeholders have changed at various levels as a result of the support, including revised processes and arrangements</li> <li>• The synergy created by the results achieved through in relation to the other EU funded projects as well as the projects of other donor institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal texts and related administrative reforms etc. in the process of adoption or adopted</li> <li>• Assessment of key actors as to the progress of processes and of the quality of outputs and of final texts adopted</li> <li>• The degree of involvement of the stakeholders/beneficiaries in the development of reforms in respect to drafting, validation and enactment of new legislation, treaty or UN standards adherence, conventions etc.</li> <li>• The actions undertaken by the UNDP in management of the programme.</li> <li>• Internal reports relating to the take-up of system and procedural reforms supporting planning for new ways of working, behavioural, cultural and institutional change.</li> <li>• The extent to which the legal texts and their adoption are synchronised with the outcomes of other donor and/or EU funded</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
		projects
(5) To what extent have the programme and project managers managed to adapt the project in case of unforeseen external or internal factors and still achieve the key objectives and how well was the project supported by key stakeholders?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation constraints exist to the achievement/non-achievement of the stated project objectives</li> <li>• Adequate risk assessment and risk management systems are in place, and partners react responsively and flexibly to external or internal factors adversely affecting project results</li> <li>• The indicators of achievement of the project purpose are appropriately defined and as necessary refined by managers</li> <li>• Senior management of beneficiaries and stakeholders are engaged in project progress monitoring and provide ownership of the results (e.g. through engagement in the Steering Committee).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data linked to the reasons for, frequency of, and time-delays created by constraints</li> <li>• Internal reports relating to risk assessment/management</li> <li>• The responsiveness and flexibility of managers to external or internal factors to ensure the achievement of the planned results</li> <li>• Frequency of reporting to and engagement of senior management in project delivery</li> </ul>
<b>Impact</b>		
(6) To what extent are the conditions for impact in place and the financial assistance effective in achieving the desired results, and what possibly hampered its achievement?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project results have been or are likely to be achieved as planned and there is a demonstrated contribution in terms of the achievement of the overall objectives</li> <li>• The benefits of the project have been received and absorbed by the target beneficiaries and mechanisms are in place to ensure roll-out to the larger population in the target groups</li> <li>• Civil society organisations are involved as stakeholders</li> <li>• Management systems are in place in order to respond to unplanned impacts and constraints affecting overall impact</li> <li>• The synergy created by the impacts arising through programme support in relation to the other EU funded projects as well as the projects of other donor institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which project outputs and results have contributed to the overall objectives</li> <li>• The availability and the adequacy of the absorption capacity of the beneficiaries</li> <li>• The existence of project follow-up planning</li> <li>• Internal reports relating to the roll-out of reforms, and take-up by target groups</li> <li>• Capacity of programme and sub-project beneficiaries to establish new “bodies”, e.g. volunteer groups, CSOs, clubs etc.</li> <li>• The degree of civil society / CSOs involvement</li> <li>• Internal reports relating to risks, post-project, and corresponding adaptations required</li> </ul>
(7) To what extent will the EU assistance be likely to have an overall positive effect	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced social and economic development, convergence, and bi-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced bi-communal cooperation, and other social and economic factors promoted on the basis awareness raising, training,</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
on the social, cultural and economic development of Seychelles?	communal dialogue have / are likely to result from the enhanced capacity and work of programme beneficiaries in terms of awareness of human and other rights considerations.	<p>adoption of conventions, communications civil and rights protection measures etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced capacity of police and corrections services to operate in line with EU and UN standards, and of citizens to benefit from the mutual recognition of rights and conventions.</li> </ul>
(8) To what extent has the programme positively affected the capacity competence and expertise of the stakeholders	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The awareness of and understanding of senior interlocutors on the TCc-side of the Community legal order, range of tools and managerial techniques, and the interaction between Community law and that in the Member States is enhanced</li> <li>Beneficiaries' and stakeholders' awareness / understanding of the associated reform processes necessary for full enactment of legislation and the NHRAP.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development by the programme of 'horizontal' and sectoral capacity and skills to facilitate the monitoring of progress in rights and responsibilities of both citizens and security services.</li> <li>Number of Ministers and senior civil servants supporting the objectives of the programme and the NHRAP.</li> <li>Sector evidence for positive indications of achievement in this respect.</li> <li>Evidence of positive changes of the expertise and competence of the beneficiaries to comply with and manage EU and UN standards and requirements</li> </ul>
(9) To what extent are the outcomes of the EU assistance supported and implemented by the beneficiaries mentioned in Article 1 of the Aid regulation?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results and immediate outcomes of the assistance are formally adopted reforms enacted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal texts adopted to align with Treaties, Conventions and international standards and procedures.</li> <li>New organisations (such as CSOs, functioning Commissions, inspectors, complaints commissions etc.) are formed for this purpose</li> <li>Updating of the legal texts are in progress</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>		
(10) To what extent are the outcomes of EU assistance likely to continue producing	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ownership of the project objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of a sector approach, appropriate strategies, regulations, and action plans to promote the</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
<p>sustainable effects after the end of EU funding?</p> <p>(a) To what extent are programme and project outcomes consistent with the sector approach by the main stakeholders?</p> <p>(b) To what extent are the beneficiaries' systems as well as available finance stable and adequate?</p>	<p>and achievements is ensured by the direct beneficiaries in a sustainable manner, e.g. medium-term strategies, manuals of internal procedures, human resource management processes/development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity newly acquired through projects is sustainable in terms of the embedding of results and effects within the beneficiaries' structures and capacity demonstrated by beneficiaries to continue operating, managing, developing and fostering the flow of the project benefits.</li> </ul> <p>(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy support and responsibility of the project beneficiaries are sustainable in terms of the continued commitment of senior interlocutors on the TCc-side to the processes of alignment with the <i>acquis</i> and capacity development/reform</li> <li>Project achievements are well perceived by senior interlocutors in terms of added value and are well accepted</li> </ul> <p>(c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of associated project achievements and positive results/outcomes/impacts activities is ensured from a financial/economic perspective after external funding ends</li> <li>A medium-term funding strategy is in place or under way to continue the project achievements, at affordable costs</li> </ul>	<p>continued implementation of supported measures and the reform process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of human resources to adopt the legal texts prepared and to update them</li> <li>Availability of financial resources to develop the structures the sustain the legal requirements and the UN standards</li> <li>Awareness raised regarding the benefit of the human rights legislation and NHRAP.</li> <li>Support of the final (end-user) beneficiaries</li> <li>Contribution of the academicians and civil society to the awareness raising and advocacy process</li> <li>Support of other actors to the reform process such as UN, WB, WHO, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>Visibility</b>		
<p>(11) To what extent has the EU assistance contributed to enhanced visibility of EU funding and support in Seychelles?</p>	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visibility and promotional activities are undertaken by the beneficiaries and partners linked to the programme, and the extent that the type and frequency of such activities achieve out-reach to a range of audiences/groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data on visibility events, frequency, content, attendance, plus of visibility materials delivered</li> <li>Occurrence of events and availability of the materials widespread, not just on Mahe but also other Seychelles islands.</li> </ul>
<p>(12) Coordination,</p>	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other actors' awareness on EU Governance Programme</li> </ul>



Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
coherence and complementarity: to which extent has the EU assistance been consistent with the support provided by other actors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EC suitably coordinates and shares information with other actors as to its and other actors' actions undertaken to build synergy</li> <li>The beneficiaries and the EC suitably share information as to support actions provided by other actors</li> </ul>	<p>actions and associated EU assistance through UNDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated joint or complementary activities.</li> <li>Communication on potential areas of coordination / avoidance of duplication</li> </ul>
<b>Lessons learnt and recommendations to an extent relevant and applicable</b>		
(13) To what extent were the EC's chosen implementation modalities relevant and efficient?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to the programming and the delivery of support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses such as in the identification of the real needs, design of the ToRs, SGs projects and the management structures including adequate monitoring mechanisms</li> </ul>
(14) To what extent was the support provided by the EC coherent in terms of linkages to and for other "Aid Programme" interventions?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to the coordination of and the development of synergy between support provided via the programme and the other "Aid Programme" interventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the synergies with the sector projects under the EDF Aid Programme</li> <li>Coherent ToRs with the objectives of other reform and development projects in Seychelles.</li> </ul>
(15) Were beneficiaries' existing capacity, policies and strategies taken into account and was the proposed approach adequately tailored to the local context?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to ensuring regular dialogue with programme partners, throughout the project cycle, as to the development and the update of beneficiaries' capacities, policies, plans, timelines, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the efficiency and effectiveness of dialogue</li> <li>Frequency of the stakeholders' consultations including Working Groups regarding legal texts and preparations for new Acts etc.</li> </ul>
(16) Were the activities undertaken by the UNODC as well as by other actors or donors adequately taken into account in order to ensure complementary and coherence of the programme?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to ensuring regular dialogue with the UNODC, other actors or donors, throughout the project cycle, as to the goals and operation of related actions undertaken by these partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the communication and coordination with the UNODC considering their non-membership of the UN Country Team for Seychelles.</li> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the communication and coordination with the other actors such as CSOs, Chambers of Commerce and Industry, "universities", etc.</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the communication and coordination with other donors such as the UN etc.</li> </ul>
(17) To what extent has the UNODC's engagement with programme partners and beneficiaries (particularly the Prisons and Judiciary Services) supported activities undertaken by the EU programme and been conducive to its effective implementation?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to the UNODC's operations and its engagement with partners during the project life-cycle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the methods/mechanisms to facilitate the coordination of activities, secure feedback from the programme beneficiaries, the incorporation of the responses to the design and identification of the gaps, facilitation of the raising awareness of programme beneficiaries and stakeholders etc.</li> </ul>
(18) Were the risks, assumptions, and conditions adequately assessed and taken into account in the design and implementation of the Governance Capacity Building Programme assistance?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses are evident regarding the processes and operations linked to risk assessment / risk management systems utilised during the project life-cycle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the identification of the risks and assumption during the design and programming phase</li> <li>Strengths/weaknesses in respect of the preparation of risk mitigation plans, the implementation of risk mitigation and plans during the implementation of the programme.</li> </ul>
(19) What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the assistance?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross-cutting issues and lessons linked to processes and operations linked to the implementation of project actions can be identified, plus the identification of good practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good practices related to development of legal texts</li> <li>Good practices related to the management of such programmes through a partnership arrangement with UNDP.</li> </ul>
(20) Could financial assistance have been better coordinated/aligned with reforms to improve effectiveness, impact, and sustainability?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross-cutting issues and lessons linked to the coordination and alignment of EU support with beneficiaries' reforms can be identified, plus the identification of good practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The legislative and judicial reform processes, the absorption capacity of programme beneficiary institutions / organisations.</li> <li>Availability of good practices to multiply</li> </ul>
(21) What type of assistance and reforms achieved the most sustainable results,	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the extent that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross-cutting issues and lessons linked to the promotion of sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ownership of the programme and sub-projects to sustain the results</li> </ul>

Evaluation Question	Judgement Criteria (Indicative)	Indicators (Indicative)
and what were the reasons for that?	results and the sustainability of impact can be identified, plus the identification of good practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of adequate human resources and other resources to ensure absorption capacity</li> <li>• Availability of good practices to multiply</li> </ul>
(22) What are the main lessons to be drawn in terms of implementation modalities and institutional setting that could be taken into account in the future implementation of the assistance programme?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of main lessons (conclusions) arising from the other EQs as to the strengths and weaknesses of the present processes supporting project implementation</li> <li>• Provision of operational recommendations to the EC derived from the conclusions; as suitable the recommendations shall also specifying the role of actors other than the EC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learnt throughout the project life-cycle.</li> <li>• Realistic, practical and coherent recommendations derived to contribute to future programming of assistance by the EC considering all of the stakeholders/actors</li> </ul>
(24) With regard to the future design and implementation of possible EU funded assistance, which are the most suitable progress indicators and implementation methodologies that might justify or inform such interventions?	<p>Judgement will be based in regard to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of main lessons (conclusions) arising from the other EQs as to the strengths and weaknesses of processes for the definition of progress indicators and the development of implementation methodologies, within the context of convergence and the framework of reunification of the island</li> <li>• Provision of operational recommendations to the EC derived from the conclusions; as suitable the recommendations shall also specifying the role of actors other than the EC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learnt throughout the project life-cycle.</li> <li>• Realistic, practical and coherent recommendations derived to contribute to future programming of assistance by the EC considering all of the stakeholders/actors</li> </ul>

Table 1: Evaluation Questions, Judgement Criteria and Indicators



## ANNEX 4. LOGFRAME

### Revised Logframe

Objective	Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Development Objective</b> Strengthened governance capacity of non-state and state organizations to influence policies on Governance and Human (including gender) Rights; and strengthened capacity of the Criminal Justice System (Attorney General's Office, police and prison service) in respecting human rights principles and practices formally and substantially.	<b>Impact Indicator</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The level of confidence of citizens in Good Governance and respect for Human Rights by the Seychelles Government</li> <li>- The level of confidence of citizens that Non-State and State Actors have the capacity to influence policies on Governance and Human (including gender) Rights,</li> <li>- Improved record on Human Rights by the Seychelles Government</li> <li>- Positive trend in UN Treaty Recommendations on Seychelles and Recommendations addressed and responded to.</li> </ul>	<b>Sources of Verification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A broadly undertaken survey on public perceptions on Good Governance and substantial Human Rights including vulnerable groups, with the Rosalie 2008 perception survey as a baseline</li> <li>- International and national Human Rights reports..</li> </ul>	Impact cannot be exclusively attributed to one project. It may be assumed that changes are partly attributable to the SGCB programme. Attribution to be established in Impact Assessment.
<b>Immediate Objective 1</b> Strengthened capacity of the police and prison service in understanding and adhering to Human Rights principles through support to HR policy development and HR training.	<b>Outcome Indicator</b> <p>Prison service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prison Service implementing a Strategic Plan with a Human Rights approach to Prison management which meets UN minimum standards</li> <li>- Prison service integrating Human Rights in training for all prison staff</li> <li>- Awareness of prison staff of the HR dimensions of their work as evidenced in their professional practice,</li> <li>- The performance appraisal system based on minimum international standards</li> <li>- Prisoners are informed of and exercise their rights,</li> <li>- A complaint mechanism is in place; number and % of complaints addressed.</li> </ul> <p>Police</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- % of police officers aware of Human Rights as</li> </ul>	<b>Sources of Verification</b> <p>Prison service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Plan for Prison Service</li> <li>- Discussions with prison staff,</li> <li>- Documentation on the job appraisal system, and job appraisals</li> <li>- Prison reports; training reports,</li> <li>- Perception survey of prisoners, disaggregated for women, youth, vulnerable groups.</li> </ul> <p>Police</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Performance appraisals reflecting adherence to Human Rights principles,</li> </ul>	Prison management having the capacity and resources, and providing the opportunities to integrate HRBA in prison service.  Police management having the capacities and resources, and providing the opportunities to integrate HRBA in the police force.

	<p>evidenced in their professional practice,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a systematic monitoring mechanism on Human Rights practices in police work established through the Internal Affairs, with feedback to SPA</li> <li>- A complaint mechanism on Human Rights violations in police work is in place; number and % of complaints addressed</li> <li>- Number and severity of complaints on HR violations,</li> <li>- Extent of Civil Society awareness of HR dimensions of police work</li> <li>- Level of trust by the public, as evidenced in areas/ levels of collaboration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception surveys of civil society, disaggregated for vulnerable groups, including those most frequently experiencing search and detention</li> <li>- Community Policing Unit records</li> <li>- Media reports</li> <li>- NGO reports.</li> </ul>	
<b>Output</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	
1.1: Seychelles Prison Service develops and implements a gender sensitive Strategic Plan with a Human Rights approach to Prison management and rehabilitation, including training, which meets Standard Minimum Rules, and involves stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A Human Rights based Strategic Plan and development plan for Prison Management and Rehabilitation validated and implemented,</li> <li>- The Strategic Plan complies with Standard Minimum Rules</li> <li>- The plan covers the perspective of duty bearers and rights holders and vulnerable groups</li> <li>- The plan has been developed in collaboration with stakeholders in the criminal justice system and CSOs,</li> <li>- A realistic mechanism is in place on consulting prisoners</li> <li>- Training curriculum developed in cooperation with prison service, and the course integrated in overall prison training plan</li> <li>- The course addresses Standard Minimum Rules and a Human Rights Based Approach</li> <li>- Number and % of staff having received HR training.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic Plan</li> <li>- Development plan with budget, time line, human/other resources, responsibilities</li> <li>- Performance appraisal mechanism</li> <li>- Interviews with staff, management</li> <li>- Prison service reports including training reports,</li> <li>- Job appraisals,</li> <li>- Perceptions srveys or Focus Group Discussion with prisoners</li> <li>- Discussions with key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	Prison management commitment and resources
1.2: The Police Academy implements a diploma training curriculum including Human Rights principles and a Human Rights Based approach to policing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A systematic and comprehensive Training Plan and Curriculum with Work Based Experience finalized,</li> <li>- The course has been developed in cooperation with police officers</li> </ul>	<p>Training course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training reports, training certificates</li> <li>- Report of the police</li> </ul>	Police management commitment and resources

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The course has been integrated in the overall training plan of the police</li> <li>- The quality of the curriculum in how it integrates HR principles and a Human Rights Based approach, with special attention for perceived key issues pertaining to Seychelles police force</li> <li>- 100 % of new recruits trained,</li> <li>- 15% of existing officers trained by the end of 2012,</li> <li>- Perception of the police staff on the effectiveness and impact of the training, specifically in to what extent it contributes to a professional Human Rights based approach to policing.</li> </ul>	<p>management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception surveys of police officers on effectiveness &amp; impact of the training as regards a professional Human Rights based approach to policing.</li> <li>- Feedback from trainees on the effectiveness of the training as a tool towards a professional human rights based attitude to police work.</li> </ul>	
<b>Immediate Objective 2</b> Compliance of national Human Rights legislation with international treaty obligations; and adherence to reporting obligations on the Human Rights treaties to which the Republic of Seychelles is a signatory, in particular on ICCPR and ICESCR.	<b>Outcome Indicator</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Validation and approval of reviewed Human Rights bills by National Assembly</li> <li>- Reports submitted to UN Human Rights Committee.</li> </ul>	<b>Sources of Verification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bills</li> <li>- UNHRC reports and recommendations.</li> </ul>	Government leadership.
<b>Output</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	
2.1: State party reports on Human Rights Treaties and their implementation, with recommendations, and validated by stakeholders; in particular on ICCPR and ICESCR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reports on ICCPR, ICESCR validated</li> <li>- The extent to which the report addresses recommendations by stakeholders and HR Committee</li> <li>- Perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of the report and the validation process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report on ICCPR, ICESCR,</li> <li>- Validation reports on ICCPR, ICESCR by MFA,</li> <li>- List of stakeholders involved</li> <li>- Stakeholder interviews</li> <li>- Media reports.</li> </ul>	Stakeholders' participation; availability of data.
2.2: Support Attorney General's Office to review national Human Rights legislation in line with international treaty obligations and recommendations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of laws as recommended by UN, EU and rights holders</li> <li>- Laws drafted in collaboration with AG's Office</li> <li>- Key stakeholders consulted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bills drafted and presented at National Assembly</li> <li>- Laws reviewed</li> <li>- Media reports</li> <li>- Stakeholder interviews.</li> </ul>	Direction and procedures by AGs Office established.
<b>Immediate Objective 3</b> A National Human Rights Action Plan is developed involving duty bearers	<b>Outcome Indicator</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Human Rights Action Plan adopted by</li> </ul>	<b>Sources of Verification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NHRAP</li> </ul>	Ownership of duty bearers, rights holders;

and rights holders and approved by the Government.	<p>government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The NHRAP is perceived by citizens as a substantial contribution to Human Rights</li> <li>- The extent to which the NHRAP functions as a tool for the advancement of HR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception survey,</li> <li>- National and international Human Rights reports</li> <li>- CSO Action plans and reports</li> <li>- Duty bearer plans and reports.</li> </ul>	monitoring mechanisms established
<b>Output</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	
3.1: A gender-sensitive National Human Rights Action Plan developed with an M&E mechanism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A NHRAP, validated and submitted for approval to the Government</li> <li>- The NHRAP includes details on budget, human resources, responsibilities, time frame</li> <li>- It has a duty bearer and rights holder perspective</li> <li>- The plan includes an M&amp;E Framework</li> <li>- Key stakeholders (including gender secretariat) consulted</li> <li>- Innovative tools used for consultations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NHRAP with implementation framework including budget, human resources, responsibilities, time frame</li> <li>- Interviews with stakeholders</li> <li>- Press statements, Media reports</li> <li>- Websites.</li> </ul>	Established responsibility of specific Ministry for leadership; a co-ordination mechanism established.
<p><b>Immediate Objective 4</b></p> <p>Strengthened ability of Non State Actors - and some State Actors to network, forge partnerships and influence policies on Good Governance and Human Rights.</p>	<p><b>Outcome Indicator</b></p> <p>Empowerment of NSAs as evidenced a.o. in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and % of NSAs of SGP beneficiaries showing increased involvement in and ownership of Human Rights in Seychelles</li> <li>- Number and % of NAs/SAs having increased confidence that they have the ability to influence policies on Good Governance and Human Rights.</li> <li>- Civil Society Organisations articulating their position on Good Governance and Human Rights</li> </ul> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy makers acknowledging the value of inputs from NGOs and requesting contributions from them</li> <li>- Public awareness that CSOs have the ability to influence policies</li> <li>- Examples of policies strengthened by inputs from Non-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sources of Verification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- discussions with policy makers</li> <li>- discussions with NSAs and SAs</li> <li>- NGO-reports, interviews</li> <li>- Media and other channels / articulating a vision on civil society participation</li> <li>- Evaluation of usefulness of the training in how it contributes to the empowerment of the CSOs</li> <li>- triangulation of means and sources of verification</li> <li>- Perception surveys.</li> </ul>	Mutual encouragement and support amongst NGOs.

	State-Actors and State Actors.		
<b>Output</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>	
4.1: Capacity building on Good Governance, including on concepts and best practices of Human Rights and Gender Mainstreaming, for Non-State Actors and State actors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training modules on Good Governance, including on concepts and best practices of Human Rights and Gender Mainstreaming</li> <li>- Number of people trained</li> <li>- Training perceived to have integrated Human Rights and Gender Mainstreaming, as reported by trainees</li> <li>- Training perceived as a capacity building tool as reported by trainees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training modules</li> <li>- Evaluation forms, anonymous, specifying usefulness for their own work</li> <li>- Training reports, manuals</li> <li>- Discussion with key CSO representatives.</li> </ul>	Trainees represent governance and management levels.
4.2: Establish mechanisms for greater participation of civil society in policy, decision-making and legislative processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effectiveness of current MoU assessed,</li> <li>- Action plan on participation of civil society</li> <li>- Number and Effectiveness of NGO-partnerships as evidenced by joint actions in the field of GG and HR</li> <li>- Effectiveness of mechanisms for collaboration between State and CSOs, as evidenced by the implementation of decisions taken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment Report on current MoU</li> <li>- MoUs on collaboration between State and CSOs,</li> <li>- Action plan</li> <li>- Interviews with Civil Society stakeholders.</li> </ul>	CSO capacity to plan and implement; Government and NSAs willing to co-operate.
4.3: Technical and organizational support provided for Non-State Actors and some State Actors, to participate in SGP Call for Proposals; the Small Grants Programme launched; Best Practices and Lessons Learnt by SGP beneficiaries shared and disseminated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical support to all potential SGP beneficiaries on proposal writing and budgeting provided</li> <li>- Visibility of the SGP as evidenced in media reports</li> <li>- The number of qualified proposals from State and Non State Actors approved and funded</li> <li>- Reporting on Best Practices and Lessons Learnt</li> <li>- Best Practices and Lessons Learnt shared amongst CSOs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Reports</li> <li>- SGP project documents narrative and financial reports, mid-term review, evaluation</li> <li>- Media reports on SGP</li> <li>- Media attention on Best Practices and Lessons Learnt.</li> </ul>	State and Non-State Actors involved in GG and HR realizing Best Practices and documenting Lessons Learnt.

## ANNEX 5. LIST OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS, ORGANISATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED (PER PROGRAMME OUTPUT)

		Status Meeting
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Mrs. Jeanette D'Offay, National Project Director, <a href="mailto:jdoffay@mfa.gov.sc">jdoffay@mfa.gov.sc</a> Alternate: Mr. Phillippe Michaud <a href="mailto:pmichaud@mfa.gov.sc">pmichaud@mfa.gov.sc</a> Secretary: Ms. Lorna Low-Hong, <a href="mailto:llowhong@mfa.gov.sc">llowhong@mfa.gov.sc</a>	Overseas
<b>Project Management</b>	Mrs. Barbara Carolus-Andre, Programme Manager, <a href="mailto:bcarolus@gmail.com">bcarolus@gmail.com</a> Ms. Fabrina Molle, Programme Assistant, <a href="mailto:fabrina.molle@gmail.com">fabrina.molle@gmail.com</a>	Confirmed
<b>Output</b>	<b>Stakeholders &amp; Consultants</b>	
<b>1.1:</b> <b>A gender sensitive Human Rights based Strategic Plan (including implementation plan) for prison management (including training) and rehabilitation is implemented.</b>	<b>Prison Services</b> Mr. Maxime Tirant, <a href="mailto:prisonservices@seychelles.net">prisonservices@seychelles.net</a> Mr. Will Thurbin, <a href="mailto:will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk">will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk</a> Mr. Sam Dodin, <a href="mailto:archange1986@hotmail.com">archange1986@hotmail.com</a>  <b>Consultant</b> Seychelles Institute of Management Mrs. Shella Mohideen, <a href="mailto:shellamohideen@sim.sc">shellamohideen@sim.sc</a> Mr. Denis <a href="mailto:denis@sim.sc">denis@sim.sc</a>	Confirmed
<b>1.2: The Police Academy develops a Diploma training Curriculum including Human Rights principles and a Human Rights Based approach.</b>	<b>Prison Services</b> Mr. Maxime Tirant, Superintendent, <a href="mailto:prisonservices@seychelles.net">prisonservices@seychelles.net</a> Mr. Will Thurbin, Asst. Superintendent, <a href="mailto:will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk">will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk</a> Mr. Sam Dodin, <a href="mailto:archange1986@hotmail.com">archange1986@hotmail.com</a>  <b>Seychelles Police</b> Mr. Francois Fremiot, Commander, Police Academy, <a href="mailto:ilea74.34@gmail.com">ilea74.34@gmail.com</a> / <a href="mailto:spa@seychelles.net">spa@seychelles.net</a>  <b>Consultant</b> Ms. Fiona Ernesta, <a href="mailto:f_ernesta@yahoo.co.uk">f_ernesta@yahoo.co.uk</a> Mr. Danic Ostiguy, <a href="mailto:dostiguy@cmaisonneuve.qc.ca">dostiguy@cmaisonneuve.qc.ca</a>	Confirmed  Confirmed
<b>2.1: A baseline overview of Human Rights Treaties and their implementation with recommendations. Consultations, public dissemination, and public debate about the HR Treaty report</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Ms. Gayethri Pillay, <a href="mailto:gpillay@mfa.gov.sc">gpillay@mfa.gov.sc</a> Mrs. Sandra Michel, <a href="mailto:smichel@mfa.gov.sc">smichel@mfa.gov.sc</a>  <b>Consultants</b> Mr. Benjamin Vel, <a href="mailto:bennyvel40@yahoo.co.uk">bennyvel40@yahoo.co.uk</a> - ICCPR and CMW Treaty Report Mrs. Fiona Robinson, <a href="mailto:fionarobinson@seychelles.net">fionarobinson@seychelles.net</a> – ICESCR Treaty Report	Confirmed  HR Treaty Validation Workshop to

	<p>Mrs. Ellen Carolus, <a href="mailto:ellencaro@hotmail.com">ellencaro@hotmail.com</a> – CAT Treaty Report  Gayethri Pillay, <a href="mailto:gpillay@mfa.gov.sc">gpillay@mfa.gov.sc</a> – CERD Treaty Report  Mrs. Iris Carolus, <a href="mailto:carolusiris@yahoo.co.uk">carolusiris@yahoo.co.uk</a> – Treaty Mechanism</p>	attend opening session
<p><b>2.2: Support Attorney General's Office to review national HR legislation in line with international treaty obligations, based on recommendations from rights holders/civil society/UN</b></p>	<p><b>Attorney General Office</b>  Mr. Ronny Govinden, <a href="mailto:agoffice@seychelles.sc">agoffice@seychelles.sc</a>  Mr. Vipin Benjamin, <a href="mailto:bvipin@gov.sc">bvipin@gov.sc</a></p> <p><b>Ministry of Social Affairs</b>  Marie-Josée Bonne - <a href="mailto:mjbonne@gov.sc">mjbonne@gov.sc</a> and Ms. Michelle Marguerite - <a href="mailto:mmarguerite@gov.sc">mmarguerite@gov.sc</a></p> <p><b>Consultants</b>  Mrs. Ellen Carolus, <a href="mailto:ellencaro@hotmail.com">ellencaro@hotmail.com</a> – Gender law Review  - Ms. Samantha Aglae, <a href="mailto:saglae@hotmail.com">saglae@hotmail.com</a> – Children Law Review</p>	<p>Will meet Mr. Vipin during Steering Committee Meeting</p> <p>Confirmed</p>
<p><b>3.1: Develop a gender-sensitive National Human Rights Action Plan with an appropriate M&amp;E mechanism for implementation //</b></p>	<p>Ministry of Foreign Affairs  Ms. Gayethri Pillay, <a href="mailto:gpillay@mfa.gov.sc">gpillay@mfa.gov.sc</a>  Mrs. Sandra Michel, <a href="mailto:smichel@mfa.gov.sc">smichel@mfa.gov.sc</a></p> <p><b>Consultants – Seychelles National Human Rights Action Plan</b>  Mr. Emile Short – Lead Consultant Commonwealth - <a href="mailto:kwameshort@hotmail.com">kwameshort@hotmail.com</a>  Mrs. Mahrokh Pardiwalla – National Consultant - <a href="mailto:mpardiwalla@seychelles.net">mpardiwalla@seychelles.net</a></p>	Confirmed
<p><b>4.1: Establish mechanisms for greater participation of civil society in policy, decision-making and legislative processes.</b></p>	<p><b>LUNGOS</b>  Mr. Steve Lalande, Chief Executive Officer, <a href="mailto:ceo@lungos.sc">ceo@lungos.sc</a>  Mr. Michel Pierre, Project Manager, <a href="mailto:projects@lungos.sc">projects@lungos.sc</a></p> <p><b>Consultant- Seychelles Institute of Management</b>  Mrs. Shella Mohideen, <a href="mailto:shellamohideen@sim.sc">shellamohideen@sim.sc</a>  Mr. Paul – <a href="mailto:paul@sim.sc">paul@sim.sc</a></p>	Confirmed

## 10 EDF GRANTEES CONTACTS – Output 4.2

Contact Person	Post Title	Grantee	Status Meeting	Email Address
Ms. Ruby Pardiwalla	Director	National Council for Children (NCC)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:rubyp@seychelles.sc">rubyp@seychelles.sc</a> / <a href="mailto:ncc@seychelles.sc">ncc@seychelles.sc</a>
Mrs. Anita Gardner	Chairperson	Association of People with Hearing Impairment (APHI)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:lizyepoutande@yahoo.com.au">lizyepoutande@yahoo.com.au</a>
Mrs. Edwina Adrienne	Founder President	Association for the Promotion of Solid Humane Families (APSHF)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:apshf@seychelles.net">apshf@seychelles.net</a>
Mrs. Michelle Martin	Chairperson	Sustainability for Seychelles (S4S)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:martinzanlwi@gmail.com">martinzanlwi@gmail.com</a> /
Mrs. Colette Servina	Secretary General	Red Cross Society of Seychelles (RCSS)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:servinac@ymail.com">servinac@ymail.com</a> / <a href="mailto:hqredcross@ymail.com">hqredcross@ymail.com</a>
Mrs. Marie-Josée Bonne	Special Advisor, Ministry of Social Development & Culture	National Gender Secretariat	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:mjbonne@gov.sc">mjbonne@gov.sc</a>
Mrs. Sharon Orphee	Project Manager	Seychelles Revenue Commission (SRC)	Not able to be confirmed	<a href="mailto:sharon.orphee@src.gov.sc">sharon.orphee@src.gov.sc</a>
Mrs. Sarah Sabadin	Chairperson	International Commission for the Prevention of Alcoholism and Drugs Seychelles (ICPA)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:icpaseychelles@gmail.com">icpaseychelles@gmail.com</a> / <a href="mailto:sarahsabadin@hotmail.com">sarahsabadin@hotmail.com</a>
Mr. Maxwell Julie	Project Manager	Seychelles Heritage Foundation (SHF)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:pm@shf.sc">pm@shf.sc</a>
Mrs. Patricia Rene	Chairperson	National Council for Disabled Persons (NCFD)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:Patricia.Rene@health.gov.sc">Patricia.Rene@health.gov.sc</a>
Mrs. Sybil Labrosse	Manager	Seychelles Authors Composers Society (SACS)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:sacs@seychelles.net">sacs@seychelles.net</a>
Mr. Terrence Vel	Coordinator	Wildlife Clubs of Seychelles (WCS)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:wildlifeclubsofseychelles@gmail.com">wildlifeclubsofseychelles@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Steve Lalande	Chief Executive Officer	Liaison Unit for Non-Governmental Organisations Seychelles (LUNGOS)	Confirmed	<a href="mailto:ceo@lungos.sc">ceo@lungos.sc</a> / <a href="mailto:projects@lungos.sc">projects@lungos.sc</a>



## ANNEX 6. LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Document
<p>10<sup>th</sup> EDF Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance Documents</li> <li>• Letters</li> <li>• Revised Logframe</li> <li>• Minutes</li> <li>• Notes of Consultative Meetings</li> <li>• Project Evaluation Reports</li> <li>• Project Workplans</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meetings</li> <li>• Publicity releases</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prison Service Strategic Plan</li> <li>• Contract with SBM (SIM)</li> <li>• Prison Service Development Plan</li> <li>• Strategic Plan – Management &amp; Refurbishment</li> <li>• ToR for Development of Strategic Plan</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Report Course Development</li> <li>• Compilation of Materials Required</li> <li>• Consultants Contract for Course Development</li> <li>• Course Handbook Police Diploma Course</li> <li>• Course Handbook Prison Certificate</li> <li>• Presentation to Prison</li> <li>• Raining Proposal – Certificate Course</li> <li>• Unit Framework Police Certificate Course</li> <li>• Unit framework Police Diploma Course</li> <li>• Unit Framework Prison Course</li> <li>• Unit Standards Police Certificate Course</li> <li>• Unit Standards Police Diploma Course</li> <li>• Unit Standards Prison Course</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Against Torture (CAT) Documents</li> <li>• Convention Against All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) Documents</li> <li>• Convention on Rights of Migrant Workers and their Families (CMW) Documents</li> <li>• HR Identity Data Treaty</li> <li>• International Covenant on Civil &amp; Political Rights (ICCPR) Documents</li> </ul>

Document
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) Documents</li> <li>• Treaty Reporting Committee Documents</li> <li>• Adverts for Consultancies</li> <li>• CEDAW Concluding Observations</li> <li>• ICESCR Draft Report</li> <li>• Selection Report for Consultancies</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 2.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children's Law Documents</li> <li>• Domestic Violence Bill (GBV) Documents</li> <li>• Evaluation Grid for Legal Review – CEDAW</li> <li>• ToR for Legal Consultancy on HR Legislation</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 3.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead Consultant CV</li> <li>• Consultant's Contract for NHRAP</li> <li>• NHRAP Part I</li> <li>• NHRAP Part II</li> <li>• ToR for Lead Consultant</li> <li>• ToR for National Consultant</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper on good Governance Training for Civil Society Organisations</li> <li>• LUNGOS Form on Good Governance</li> <li>• MoU between SBM (SIM) and LUNGOS</li> <li>• ToR for Governance Curriculum Development</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various LUNGOS Papers (on establishment of CAB etc)</li> <li>• Final Action Plan for NSA Participation</li> <li>• Project Proposal – CSOs Operational Plan</li> <li>• ToR for CSOs Operational Plan</li> </ul>
<p>Logframe Output 4.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance SGP Proposal Documents</li> <li>• MOA Small Grants Agreements for all 13 SGS Grantees</li> <li>• SG Application Concept Notes</li> <li>• Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meetings Minutes</li> <li>• Final Evaluation Report of SGS</li> <li>• Grantees Contacts List</li> <li>• Synopsis of Project Proposals</li> <li>• Adverts, Press Releases etc.</li> </ul>
<p>Evaluation Methodological Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Europaed Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Brochure</li> </ul>

Document
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria List</li> <li>• Review / Evaluation Guide from EC</li> <li>• ROM Handbook 2011</li> <li>• UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP Suggested Evaluation Report Structure</li> <li>• UNDP Terminal Evaluations Guide</li> </ul>
<p>Programme Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10<sup>th</sup> EDF Milestones</li> <li>• Copy of Summary of Expenditure</li> <li>• Financing Agreement for Programme</li> <li>• Logframe for Programme</li> <li>• Signed Contribution Agreement</li> <li>• SGS Final Report</li> </ul>
<p>Programme Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annex 1 Report Community Survey Bel Ombre District (from S4S SG Project)</li> <li>• Annex 2 Bel Ombre Community Survey</li> <li>• Final Report 10<sup>th</sup> EDF SGS</li> <li>• Programme ROM Reports 1 and 2</li> <li>• Steering Committee Meetings Minutes and Reports</li> </ul>

<b>10 EDF SGP STATUS REPORT AUGUST 2013</b>
<b>NAME OF ORGANISATION:</b> 1_ National Council for Disabled <b>PROJECT TITLE:</b> Project to advocate for and formulate policies and laws on accessibility to public places for persons with disabilities. <b>Total Grant:</b> SCR400,000.00
<p><b>Objective 1:</b> Develop minimum standards and guidelines for the accessibility of facilities and services open or provided to the public</p> <p><b>Objective 2:</b> Educate key stakeholders on accessibility issues</p> <p><b>Objective 3:</b> Lobby for and develop a national policy on accessibility to public places for disabled persons</p> <p><b>Objective 4:</b> Advocate for and propose legislative provisions on accessibility to public places persons with disability</p> <p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility will be stipulated in Town and Country Act. Following Seychelles Bureau Standards adoption of ISO21542:2011 and BS 8300:2009 as National Standards for Seychelles. Produce document entitled 'Barrier free Seychelles' enhancing accessibility for people with disabilities.</li> <li>• Translation into Creole of UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Special sensitization activities conducted with children; resulting in interpretation of the rights through drawings. Drawings were used for exhibition and calendar 2013, produced. The drawing will also be used for the production of child friendly version of the convention. IEC Materials featuring UNCRPD developed.</li> <li>• Development of a National Policy document on accessibility and other aspects of the UN Convention of the Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD). Policy will guide development of National Action Plan for the disabled.</li> <li>• New policy for Town and Country Act. Lobbying for accessibility to public places. Contribution towards to the other policy formulation and other legal framework such as employment, health.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term Impact:</b> Through lobbying and advocacy the National Council is now being consulted in Key Policy Formulation to ensure the persons with disabilities are not left out. It has paved the way for more development towards exercising the rights of persons with disabilities.</p> <p><b>Reach intended beneficiaries:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants from various workshops including persons with disabilities through sensitisation, active participation, validation, establish partnership, increased consultation</li> <li>• Children through active participation, sensitization,</li> <li>• Visitors through exhibition</li> <li>• SBS, Planning Authorities</li> <li>• Wider public through media coverage,</li> <li>• Long Term Benefits for accessibility - Expectant mothers, children, elderly, parents with children, persons with disabilities, injured persons.</li> </ul> <p><b>Finance:</b> adhered to project workplan and budget. Additional fund of US\$1,300.00 received for activity with Children on interpretation of the UNCRPD.</p> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <p>Active involvement of the persons with disabilities, 'moving around is in itself an issue'.</p> <p>Need to work in partnership with all sectors and not left to the National Council for disabled.</p>

<p><b>NAME OF ORGANISATION: 2_Association of People with Hearing Impairment</b></p> <p><b>PROJECT TITLE: Training of Hearing persons as sign language interpreters and Deaf people mediators.</b></p> <p><b>Total Grant: SCR275,000.00</b></p>
<p><b>Objective 1: To train hearing people first to become fluent in Seychelles sign language to be able to follow interpreter program</b></p> <p><b>Objective 2: To train deaf trainers as mediators in human rights issues, social and general issues.</b></p> <p><b>Objective 3: To promote sign language interpreter and Deaf mediator services to service providers, the Deaf community and the general public.</b></p> <p><b>Objective 4: Advocate for and propose legislative provisions on accessibility to public places persons with disability</b></p> <p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducted sign language trainings. Certification of 4 hearing persons as interpreters and 2 deaf persons as mediators, training conducted by Mrs. Monique Gendrot - Paris Institute for the deaf.</li> <li>• Conduct Human rights trainings regarding issues of deaf people under the UN Convention for Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD).</li> <li>• Design and disseminated leaflets to advertise the interpreter services and promotion on APHI website. Interpreter Services are available for tribunals, courts, police and social services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained persons are available to serve the community and service providers.</li> <li>• Major barrier has been lifted in the communication between deaf and hearing.</li> <li>• Create opportunity for further communication initiatives for the benefit of the deaf (media, news on national tv).</li> </ul> <p><b>Reach intended beneficiaries:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 hearing interpreters and 2 deaf mediators – able to master sign language</li> <li>• Deaf people and families</li> <li>• Service providers from police, courts, tribunals and social services.</li> <li>• Participants who attended sign language trainings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Finance:</b> Initial delays in project expenditure due to lack of experience in project management. Very efficient and effective spending of project fund contributed to accomplishment of all project objectives.</p> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maintain capacities of interpreters and mediators who have to continue meeting on a weekly basis.</li> <li>• Accreditation and recognition of interpreters and mediators in the Seychelles society.</li> <li>• Service providers being aware and using the interpreter services for the benefit of the deaf (to consider in budgeting).</li> </ul>
<p><b>NAME OF ORGANISATION: 3_Association for the Promotion of Solid Humane Families</b></p> <p><b>PROJECT TITLE: Advocate Review and Modernisation of existing family laws and regulations to ensure respect of family rights.</b></p> <p><b>Total Grant: SCR170,000.00</b></p>

<p>Objective 1: Establish the issues and areas of concern through stakeholders' consultation</p> <p>Objective 2: Establish weaknesses in laws, regulations and preparation of couples for their future roles</p> <p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations to identify and establish issues and areas of concern related to family law</li> <li>• Consultant report making recommendation for review of family law</li> <li>• Production and dissemination of leaflets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased awareness of stakeholders on family law and its weaknesses</li> <li>• Participation of stakeholders in contributing for amendments law (attorney general's office,</li> </ul> <p><b>Reach intended beneficiaries:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seychellois families' rights will be better protected.</li> <li>• Men and women will have equal protection.</li> <li>• Government and other stakeholders will have a clearer view of the situation and action to be taken on family law.</li> </ul> <p><b>Finance:</b> All expenses are according to the project activities and budget.</p> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial stage of the project there was an issue with commitment of consultant.</li> </ul>
<p><b>NAME OF ORGANISATION: 4_Sustainability for Seychelles</b></p> <p><b>PROJECT TITLE: Engaging Bel-Ombre citizens in decision making and sustainable development in their community</b></p> <p><b>Total Grant: SCR400,000.00</b></p>
<p>Objective 1: Establish the issues and areas of concern through stakeholders' consultation</p> <p>Objective 2: Empower people of Bel-Ombre to become more involved in environmental decision-making</p> <p>Objective 3: Establish a core group to take the lead on behalf of the community</p> <p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey conducted and identified environmental and social concerns and level of involvement in the governance issues in the district. Survey results disseminated in workshop and newsletter to the Bel-Ombre population.</li> <li>• Developed a kind of 'formula' for helping communities to get organized and start participating more actively in decision making. Increased participation and dialogue of Bel-Ombre community in public meetings organized by the district administration discussing different issues.</li> <li>• Setting up Community Based Organisation, now registered as a legal association 'Bel-Ombre Action Team'. Assist Bel-Ombre Fishermen Association to be better established and known.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term Impact:</b> As registered association able to secure funds for future community activities. Solidarity between associations and community groups in Bel-Ombre e.g. Bel-Ombre Fishermen Association and BOAT. Other district administrators recognized the importance of civil society organizations and are approaching to ask for assistance in getting their Community Based organizations off the ground. Materials gathered for compilation of a Community based</p>

handbook.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Members of the Bel-Ombre Action Team, Bel-Ombre Fishermen Association,
- Community members in general through meetings and activities organized for the community.
- Increased visibility of Local Businesses/Service within the Community
- Professional development as an Association of Sustainability for Seychelles

**Finance:** adhered to project workplan and budget. Well-organized financial monitoring and reporting.

**Challenges:**

- Scheduling and getting community to participate in meetings
- Getting people to contribute to Newsletter
- Participation of BOAT members in community based activities.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 5\_ Red Cross Society of Seychelles (RCSS)**

**PROJECT TITLE: Promoting Health of the Vulnerable through timely access to safe blood**

**Total Grant: SCR200,000.00**

Objective 1: Establish MoU for partnership and procedures in Blood Donation Management with the Ministry of Health to contribute an effective collaboration of the RCSS and the Blood Transfusion Unit.

Objective 2: Establish a pool of trained Blood Donor Recruiters in donor education, motivation, recruitment, selection and retention of eligible blood donors.

Objective 3: Increase number of blood donors through awareness raising and Management of Blood Donors

**Project Outputs:**

- Meeting held with Minister from the Ministry of Health to finalise MOU for partnership with RCSS for blood donor recruitment. Further discussion required for effective partnership.
- Training Manual Programme in Blood Donor Recruitment was developed and implemented. 30 personnel recruited from various organization and workplaces as Blood Donor Recruiters. Action Plan drawn up by the participants for implementation at community level.
- Awareness campaign was carried out and materials designed and disseminated, including advert on public bus. Recruitment drive for blood donors conducted during the National Day Celebration..

**Long Term Impact:**

- Improved skills of donor recruiters from the Community.
- Sustained visibility of need to donate blood.
- Rapid response at community level for blood donation.
- Improved management and retention of blood donors.
- Established role of the RCSS in blood donor recruitment and management.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Community/individual requiring blood
- Ministry of Health, National Blood Bank
- Blood donor recruiters – capacity built.
- Blood donors – improved management

**Finance:** Delays initial project activities had an impact on the consecutive activities and budget. Awaiting final financial report, deadline first week of September.

**Challenges:** Initial efforts for partnership were delayed due to change at Management level at the Ministry of Health.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 6\_Gender Secretariat**

**PROJECT TITLE: Sensitisation and Training of the Judiciary, Parliamentarians and other Law Enforcement Officials for effective implementation of CEDAW and other gender-related human rights treaties.**

**Total Grant: SCR365,336.00**

Objective 1: Raise awareness of the judiciary, legal profession and other law enforcement agencies on human rights standards contained in CEDAW and the SADC Gender and Development Protocol.

Objective 2: Develop skills of parliamentarians, party members, legal profession and other law enforcement agencies to implement provision contained in CEDAW and the SADC Gender and Development Protocol.

Objective 3: Develop skills of the national gender machinery and women's groups to use online tools including social networking and mobile tools (blogging, facebook, twitter) for advocacy and campaigning on gender equality and empowerment of women.

Objective 4: Develop resources for sensitisation and training

**Project Outputs:**

- Gender sensitization sessions for judiciary and law enforcement agents.
- Gender and Law Manual produced and distributed.
- CEDAW mock session with Social affairs department conducted by Office of High Commission for Human Rights(OHCHR) and CEDAW Committee member.

**Long Term Impact:**

- Compliance to CEDAW at law enforcement and judiciary levels.
- Increased awareness of gender based issues

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Judges, magistrates and parliamentarians, tribunal members, police officers,
- National Gender Management Team, Gender Based Violence Working group, activists gender based violence

**Finance:** Initial delays in project expenditure. New proposal submitted for sensitization activity.

**Challenges:**



- Slow implementation of project due to difficulty of scheduling session with judiciary and parliamentarian.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 7\_Seychelles Revenue Commission**

**PROJECT TITLE: Promotion of Integrity in Seychelles Revenue Commission (SRC)**

**Total Grant: SCR450,000.00**

Objective 1: To influence and increase awareness on good governance and integrity amongst SRC Stakeholders

Objective 2: To develop mechanism for staff and stakeholders to address issues related to integrity

**Project Outputs:**

- Presentations conducted and attended by all staff on basic understandings of ethics. Workshop on integrity, good governance and anti-corruption for representatives of all divisions within SRC. Integrity included as a topic in SRC induction programme. 3 weeks training on integrity attended by 3 members of staff at the ESAMI Headquarters in Tanzania. Poster competition to promote integrity and anti-corruption by SRC Staff members. Winning poster used as awareness materials mugs, key rings, calendar 2013, poster to disseminate about anti-corruption and integrity.
- Integrity self assessment conducted facilitated by integrity expert from World Custom Organisation.
- Research on benefits introducing whistle blowing policy conducted.
- Internal and external Assessment on the level of corruption and areas most vulnerable to corruption in SRC. Integrity has been integrated as one SRC Core Values in its Strategic Plan. SRC Code of conduct developed.

**Long Term Impact:** Stage has been set for sound integrity policies in SRC. Improvement in the SRC Staff conduct has they are now better informed of the effects of corruption. Implementation of the Integrity Action Plan developed by the World Custom Organisation and to be used as basis for all integrity related strategies.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- SRC Staff and Management
- Customers (10,000 registered businesses ) and stakeholders

**Finance:** Initial delays in project expenditure.

**Challenges:**

- Project Implementation – unavailability of members to implement the project because of workload, resignation of staff who were on the project committee.
- Difficulty to carry out activities requiring input from other parties such as laws to protect whistle blowers.
- E-Learning course not available online due to poor internet connectivity and access.
- Training module on integrity not developed due to lack of expertise and unavailability of staff.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 8\_ICPA Seychelles**

**PROJECT TITLE: Gender base Violence, Substance abuse and human right**

**Total Grant: SCR200,000.00**

**Objective 1: Carry out district studies to ascertain trends on Domestic Violence.**

**Objective 2: Carry out training of trainers under the ENDITNOW training Programme**

**Objective 3: Develop a Risk Indicator Framework for ICPA on drug related violence as an operational tool for effective partnership with other service providers**

**Objective 4: Develop guidelines to establish partnerships with Youth Organizations and schools.**

**Project Outputs:**

- Survey conducted on trends of domestic violence in districts; 4 x districts on Mahe and 1 x on Praslin.
- Training of participants on Gender Based Violence under the ENDITNOW Training Programme.
- Sensitisation of youth in schools on Gender Based Violence.

**Long Term Impact:**

- ICPA has a better understanding of the community through its survey conducted allowing to reach out to those in need.
- Established relationship with Ministry of Education for future works with schools.
- Lesson learnt under this project for future programming.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- ICPA develop capacity to reach out to communities and for project implementation.
- Communities/districts participating in survey
- Participants of workshop.

**Finance:** Initial delays in project expenditure. Budget reviewed to reflect a more realistic implementation of activities. Awaiting final financial report, deadline first week of September.

**Challenges:**

- Sensitive project and data collectors were not always welcome by the community.
- Project had to be reviewed (activities and budget), to take into account realities on the ground in particular cost of survey and timeframe.
- Low level of commitment by ICPA volunteers at the start of the project (implementation).

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 9\_Seychelles Heritage Foundation.**

**PROJECT TITLE: Promoting Appreciation and Recognition of Cultural Diversity.**

**Total Grant: SCR150,000.00**

Objective 1: to have a pool of well trained heritage club coordinators

Objective 2: to increase school children and youth awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity relevant to good governance.

Objective 3: to help children and youth explore new ways to preserve, conserve and promote our natural and cultural features.

**Project Outputs:**

- Recruitment and training of 30 heritage clubs coordinators for schools.
- Production of heritage club manual for use by the heritage clubs in schools.

- Launch of the Heritage Clubs at La Plaine ste Andre.

**Long Term Impact:**

- Establishment of Seychelles Heritage foundation award to motivate schools.
- The document produced will guide the school in future activities.
- Increased appreciation of national heritage by school children.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Club coordinators – learn how to run a club and appreciate national heritage
- School club members and their respective school population
- Seychelles Heritage Foundation – able to reach out to the school community.

**Finance:** awaiting final financial report, deadline first week of September.

**Challenges:** Motivation of heritage club coordinators in schools

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 10\_National Council for Children**

**PROJECT TITLE: Making the CRC Real.**

**Total Grant: SCR300,000.00**

Objective 1: To design and disseminate user friendly IEC Material on the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC)

Objective 2: To raise awareness of gaps identified in the Convention of the Rights of the Child through 14 workshops for children, parents and activist partners

Objective 3: To build capacity of the children's Coalition for online activism (facebook, twitter, blogging) in respect of children's rights.

Objective 4. To lobby Government.

**Project Outputs:**

- Production and dissemination of concluding observation of the CRC through print media, radio, tv, articles and leaflets and online information. Creole translation of the concluding observations.
- Awareness raising for professionals working with children carried out.
- Online activism training conducted. Took charge of website and face book page.
- Presentation of the Concluding observations to the Members of the National Assembly by special rapporteur to the Seychelles and the Chairperson of the CRC Committee. Meeting with Ministers for Education, Health and Social Services and other top level officials.

**Long Term Impact:**

- Recommendation for data collection, child sensitive budgets, school drop outs, adolescent reproductive health, persons with disabilities, obesity in young children, violence against children, juvenile, delinquency.
- Recommendation on how to ensure Seychelles compliance with CRC Standards.
- The National Assembly has formed a Committee to discuss Children legislations.

- Government ratifying optional protocols.
- Improvement observed in the orphanages' management

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Partners from various organizations and agencies e.g. social workers, education, judges, lawyers, policy makers working with children.
- All Head teachers from both Primary and Secondary schools, School Counselors, Deputy Heads for Pastoral, teachers, Peer Educators, Secondary students
- District Administrators, Members of the National Assembly through sensitization campaigns
- Social networkers through online activism
- Media personnel training.
- Non-Governmental Organisations
- The public in general from awareness campaigns of the Convention of the Rights Child through TV spots

**Finance:** adhered to project workplan and budget. Additional fund of US\$3000.00 for extension activities.

**Challenges:**

Resistance to the Convention of the Rights of the Child by adults due to lack of information on their Human Rights.

Need for a common vision/training of all partners working with children.

Release for attendance of workshop was met with some resistance.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 11\_Seychelles Authors Composers Society (SACS)PROJECT**

**TITLE: Promoting and protecting cultural and intellectual property rights through enforcement of the legal copyright framework**

**Total Grant: SCR335,000.00**

**Objective 1:** Promote awareness of citizens on protection of intellectual property rights

**Objective 2 :** Obtain formal recognition of management standards and be part of World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) and 'Confederation Internationale des Societes d'Auteurs et Compositeurs' (CISAC)

**Project Outputs:**

- Production of educational video used for awareness via media and sessions in secondary schools on Mahe, Praslin and La Digue.
- Production and dissemination of posters, leaflets, bookmarks and video to schools, national library and general public.
- Education sessions on protection of intellectual property rights for law enforce, artists, copy right users (Mahe, Praslin, La Digue).
- Existing Copyright Acts reviewed reflecting SACS as the licensing body nationally for musical Works.
- Copyright Manual for copyrights beneficiaries produced.
- Established World intellectual property database and completed entries of all SACS members and their repertoire.
- Clause in SACS constitution is amended to reflect CISAC criteria.

<p><b>Long Term Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System established for collecting or artists rights and protection of intellectual property rights.</li> <li>• Increased compliance to buying original works by the public.</li> <li>• Some music users complying with legal requirements.</li> <li>• Artists realises the importance of registration with the SACS.</li> <li>• Artist recognises the importance and benefits of creating original works.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reach intended beneficiaries:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Music users/businesses - respect for intellectual property.</li> <li>• School children, general public – understanding what is intellectual property and importance of fight against piracy.</li> <li>• Artists – understand reasons why they should not infringe other creators’ rights. Learn about creating songs and music.</li> <li>• SACS – established collecting mechanism/equipment and guidelines produced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Finance:</b> adhered to project workplan and budget.</p> <p><b>Challenges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional responsibilities towards project implementation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>NAME OF ORGANISATION: 12_WILDLIFE CLUBS OF SEYCHELLES</b></p> <p><b>PROJECT TITLE: RAISE YOUR VOICE! <i>Empowering youth to participate in sustainable development decision-making.</i></b></p> <p><b>Total Grant: SCR400,000.00</b></p>
<p>Objective 1 - Increase youth awareness of environmental laws and policies and their right to participate in their development.</p> <p>Objective 2 - Enable young people to practice raising their voice</p> <p>Objective 3 – Establish a recognized environmental youth forum</p> <p>Objective 4 – Empower environmental youth forum members to participate in community and national environmental decision-making</p> <p>Objective 5 – Build WCS capacity to support the development of the youth environmental forum and its continuation beyond the life of this project</p> <p><b>Project Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey amongst youth highlighting environmental concerns and barriers to participation in decision-making conducted.</li> <li>• Production and dissemination of illustrated Environmental law, rights and responsibilities booklet. Distributed to schools and communities. Production of Wildlife Clubs Magazine 2012, focusing on impact of youth voice.</li> <li>• Setting up and promotion of new youth forum ‘EKO Youth Seychelles’ registered under national associations act. Participated in national and international environmental events year 2012 by EKO Youth Seychelles.</li> <li>• Community based projects focusing on climate change at club levels in schools through mini-grants.</li> <li>• Capacity building of members of the EKO Youth Seychelles, in communication, diplomacy, video making, production of magazine, performance</li> </ul>

management and reporting.

- Participation and dialogue with Policy Makers as part of 'Raise your voice' campaigns by the EKO Youth Seychelles.
- Environmental and Education Centre with the collaboration of the University of Seychelles

**Long Term Impact:**

- As registered association able to secure funds for future activities.
- Wildlife Clubs will be able to expand and replicate project activities
- Environmental and Education Centre at the University of Seychelles
- Use of environmental law publication by teachers, students and the community.
- Empowered youth groups for continued participation in sustainable development and decision making on environmental issues.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- Wildlife Club members and teachers
- EKO Youth Seychelles
- Public and Community
- Youth in Seychelles
- Department of Environment – have an established link to youth for consultation on policy or other decision making.

**Finance:** adhered to project workplan and budget.

**Challenges:**

- Getting committed youth to join the forum and take leadership roles (run their own programme)
- Difficulty in scheduling activities
- EKO Youth Seychelles is new and not yet taken seriously by decision makers and the community.

**NAME OF ORGANISATION: 13\_LUNGOS**

**PROJECT TITLE:** Transforming LUNGOS into the national platform for a stronger civil society. LUNGOS transformed into a stronger National Platform for Civil Society;

**Total Grant: SCR496,000.00**

Objective 1: Review the operational framework and governance structures in view of transforming LUNGOS into a National Platform

Objective 2 : Strengthen the National Platform and thematic Commissions for more effective coordination, engagement and programme impacts at national and international level

Objective 3: Formulate and enforce operational guidelines promoting good governance

Objective 4: Strengthen capacity of Secretariat and Thematic Commissions for effective engagement

**Project Outputs:**

- Statutory document reviewed and a new name was proposed and approved for the new the platform.
- A new membership and accreditation standard developed which contains a list of criteria that will facilitate the process of becoming a member of the platform.
- Code of ethics and conduct developed.
- Five standard operating procedures have been developed in accordance with ISO certification.
- Strategic plan for next five year developed, it also incorporates a thematic commission plan and communication plan.
- A capacity development plan developed guiding the secretariat on several operational aspects.

**Long Term Impact:**

- Guidance for Platform for the next five years.

**Reach intended beneficiaries:**

- 80 Civil Society Organization members of LUNGOS - participated actively in the workshops, meetings and consultations.
- Partners and stake holders - exposed with first hand information about the operation and function of a national platform.
- Public at large through different media presentations - opportunity to reflect on citizen's engagement in national development through.

**Finance:** awaiting final financial report, deadline first week of September.

**Challenges:**

- Difficulty in obtaining release for NGOs to participate in planned workshops which had to be postponed on few occasions. To remedy this situation we tried as much as possible to organize activities on week-ends.
- The nature of the project required both sectoral and national consultations, conflict resolution processes leading to consensus building and articulating agreements.
- Requested for 2 months extension.

## ANNEX 7. SYNTHESIS REPORT ON SMALL GRANTS PROJECTS

*Final Report 10EDF SGP 30<sup>th</sup> August 2013*

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Total Fund Received SCR</u>	<u>Status</u>
Association of People with Hearing Impairment (APHI)	275,000.00	Completed
National Gender Secretariat	365,336.00	Completed
International Commission for the Prevention of Alcoholism and Drugs Seychelles (ICPA)	200,000.00	Completed
Association for the Promotion of Solid Humane Families (APSHF)	170,000.00	Completed
Sustainability for Seychelles (S4S)	400,000.00	Completed
Seychelles Revenue Commission (SRC)	450,000.00	Completed
National Council for Disabled Persons (NCFD)	400,000.00	Completed
National Council for Children (NCC)	300,000.00	Completed
Seychelles Heritage Foundation (SHF)	150,000.00	Completed
Seychelles Authors Composers Society (SACS)	335,000.00	Completed
Red Cross Society of Seychelles (RCSS)	200,000.00	Completed
Wildlife Clubs of Seychelles (WCS)	400,000.00	Completed
Liaison Unit for Non-Governmental Organisations Seychelles (LUNGOS)	496,000.00	Completed
<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	<u>4,141,336.00</u>	



## ANNEX 8. PROJECT MILESTONES AND EVALUATION WORK PLAN

The ToR establishes a clear framework for implementation of the evaluation based on three distinctive phases: (1) Desk Phase; (2) Field Phase; (3) Synthesis Phase / Reporting and Presentation Phase. The ToR establishes a clear timeframe and key project milestones for implementation of the project: the specific evaluation contract entered into force on 11/11/2013 and delivery is assumed to be completed within 4 weeks, i.e. by 11/12/2013. The evaluation will be conducted via a mission by the evaluator to Seychelles, plus work from home-base. The original intention was for the evaluator to discuss his findings in a briefing session at the EC Delegation in Mauritius but it was agreed that this could be done by means of a teleconference.

The ToR provides for 23 working-days for the Senior Expert. The evaluator was supported throughout the contract with backstopping support from Public Administration International (PAI), the Contract Implementing Party, for which Isilay Aktas is the Project Manager. In addition to supporting the evaluator, she also ensures liaison with the EC, internal coordination of the FWC Consortium support and quality control.

The key project milestones are presented in Table 3 and the project Work Plan in Table 4 below.

Milestone	Date
The European Union and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs signed the <b>Financing Agreement</b>	December 2009
The European Union and the UNDP signed the <b>Contribution Agreement</b>	December 2010
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UNDP signed the <b>Project Document</b>	January 2011
<b>10EDF Programme Project Team</b> for the Management Unit Appointed	April 2011
<b>First Steering Committee Meeting</b>	May 2011
<b>10EDF Programme</b> Officially Launched	May 2011
<b>Launch for Call for Proposal</b> of the 10EDF Small Grants Programme	June 2011
2 Day Writing Workshop for potential applicants of the 10EDF Small Grants Programme	June 2011
<b>Meeting of Technical Review Committee</b> of the 10EDF Small Grants Programme – reviewing of concept notes	July 2011
<b>Confirmation</b> to successful Applicants under the 10EDF Small Grants Programme to develop Full Proposal	August 2011
<b>ROM 1: EU Evaluation</b>	August 2011
<b>Recruitment of Consultants to deliver</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SIM, Good Governance Modules for Civil Society</li> <li>- Human Rights Treaty Reports ICCPR and ICESCR (Contracts Ending November 2011)</li> <li>- SIM, Prison Strategic Plan and Management and Rehabilitation Plan ending November 2011)</li> <li>- Prison and Police Course (Contract ending July 2012)</li> </ul>	August 2011
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Consultative Meeting</b> with Stakeholders for Development of Good Governance Course for Civil Society (SIM)	August 2011
<b>Approval of Full Proposals</b> under the 10EDF Small Grants Programme	September 2011
<b>Signing Ceremony</b> UNDP and Grantees 10EDF Small Grants Programme (18 Months Implementation timelines)	October 2011
<b>Validation Workshop</b> Seychelles Prison Strategic Plan (followed by finalised version of	December 2011

Strategic Plan Jan 2012, end of Consultancy)	
<b>10EDF Programme Second Steering</b> Committee Meeting	Jan 2012
<b>10EDF Programme Logframe Review Consultancy EU</b>	Feb 2012
<b>Development of Prison Service</b> Management and Rehabilitation Plan (SIM)	Feb 2012
<b>Validation Workshop</b> of ICCPR HR Treaty followed by Finalisation of Report by Consultant – end of Consultancy.	Feb 2012
<b>Launch of Good Governance Course for Civil Society</b> <b>SIM and LUNGOS signed</b> agreement for implementation of Course <b>Implementation of Module 1:</b> Course Civil Society	April 2012
<b>Validation Workshop</b> of ICESCR HR Treaty followed by Finalisation of Report by Consultant - end of Consultancy (July 2012).	April 2012
<b>ROM 2: EU Evaluation</b>	April 2012
<b>Implementation of Module 2:</b> Course Civil Society	May 2012
<b>UNDP Submit to EU Annual Report Programme ending Apr 2011 - Mar 2012 with expenses for 2<sup>nd</sup> Disbursement</b>	July 2012
<b>Launch Ceremony</b> Prison Service Strategic Plan	July 2012
<b>Presentation of Police and Prison Courses</b> by Consultants to Minister Morgan and all stakeholders concerned at the Ministry of Home Affairs and Transport	July 2012
<b>Implementation of Module 3:</b> Course Civil Society	July 2012
<b>Partnership Workshop</b> for Prison Service for implementation of Rehabilitation and Management Plan	August 2012
<b>10EDF Programme Third Steering</b> Committee Meeting	August 2012
<b>Implementation of Module 4:</b> Course Civil Society	August 2012
<b>Final Disbursement of</b> Grants most Grantees under the 10EDF Small Grants Programme	Aug – Sep 2012
<b>Appointment Consultant</b> National Human Rights Plan (Consultancy ends Mar 2013)	September 2012
<b>Request UNDP following 3<sup>rd</sup> Steering for Project Extension</b> 6 Months project submitted to Ministry of Foreign Affairs	November 2012
<b>Request Ministry of Foreign Affairs</b> to EU Delegation for Programme Extension of 6 months project – July to December 2013	November 2012
<b>Consultations</b> Working Group and Stakeholders (NHRAP)	December 2012
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting</b>	January 2013
<b>EU Respond</b> to Project Extension 6 months July - December 2013	January 2013
<b>Validation Workshop of</b> National Human Rights Action Plan	Mar 2013
<b>Extension of</b> Contract NHRAP to Develop Action Plan and Logframe	Mar 2013 – June 2013
<b>Law Review Consultancies Appointments</b> Children and Gender Laws	Mar 2013 – June 2013
<b>EU Regional Disbursed 2<sup>nd</sup> Instalment</b> Programme Fund to UNDP	Mar 2013
<b>Final Disbursement of</b> Grants remaining Grantees under the 10EDF Small Grants Programme	Apr 2013 – May 2013
<b>HR Treaty Reports Consultancies Appointments</b>	May 2013 – October

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CAT</li> <li>- CERD</li> <li>- CMW</li> </ul>	2013
<b>UNDP Submit 2<sup>ND</sup> Annual Report Apr 2012 – Mar 2011 expenditure for Final Disbursement of fund</b>	
<b>Law Validation Workshop:</b> Gender Law (finalisation of consultancy upon validation)	July 2013
<b>Law Validation Workshop:</b> Children Law (finalisation of Consultancy upon validation)	August 2013
<b>End of 10EDF Small Grants Programme:</b> Final Reports	September 2013
<b>EU FINAL Evaluation Mission</b>	November 2013
<b>EU Regional Office Final Disbursement</b> of Programme Fund to UNDP	November 2013
<b>10EDF Programme Final Steering Committee Meeting</b>	November 2013
<b>Validation Workshop HR Treaties</b> (finalisation of Consultancy upon validation)	December 2013
<b>Closing Ceremony 10EDF Programme</b>	December 2013
<b>Final Report End Project</b>	December 2013

Table 2: Overview of Key Milestones in Programme Implementation

## EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND WORK-PLAN

Schedule of Final Evaluation Mission

10 EDF Seychelles/Governance Capacity Building Programme

Mr. Peter Reed

19<sup>th</sup> November – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2013

Mobile: 2736390

Dates	Details
DAY 1 Tues 19 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<b>Arrival - Overnight Flight No. EK705 – 0705hrs</b> Logistics and desk research
DAY 2 Wed 20 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<b>0930hrs – 1200hrs - 10EDF Project Team</b> Logistics, discuss programme and documents for review. - Ms. Fabrina Molle, 10EDF Programme Assistant <a href="mailto:fabrina.molle@gmail.com">fabrina.molle@gmail.com</a> , Tel : 4 225914  <b>Venue :UNDP Office, Les Palmes, Floor 2 - CONFIRMED</b>
DAY 3 Thurs 21 <sup>ST</sup> Nov 2013	<b>1030hrs – 1200hrs - Seychelles Police Academy, SPA (CONFIRMED)</b> Mr. Francois Freminot, Commander, Police Academy, <a href="mailto:ilea74.34@gmail.com">ilea74.34@gmail.com</a> / <a href="mailto:spa@seychelles.net">spa@seychelles.net</a>  <b>Venue: Seychelles Police Academy, Pte Larue – CONFIRMED Tel: 4 389050</b>  <b>1330hrs Prison Service</b> Mr. Maxime Tirant, Superintendent, <a href="mailto:prisonservices@seychelles.net">prisonservices@seychelles.net</a> Mr. Will Thurbin, Asst. Superintendent, <a href="mailto:will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk">will.thurbin@hotmail.co.uk</a> Mr. Sam Dodin, <a href="mailto:archange1986@hotmail.com">archange1986@hotmail.com</a>

	<b>Venue: Montagne Posee, Prison Service, Tel: 4 381 600 – CONFIRMED</b>
DAY 4 Fri 22 <sup>nd</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>0915hrs – 1050hrs - 10EDF Project Team and UNDP</b></p> <p>Ms. Preethi Nair-Sushil, UNDP Programme Officer <a href="mailto:preethi.sushil@undp.org">preethi.sushil@undp.org</a></p> <p>Mrs. Barbara Carolus-Andre, 10EDF Programme Manager, <a href="mailto:bcarolus@gmail.com">bcarolus@gmail.com</a></p> <p>Ms. Fabrina Molle, 10EDF Programme Assistant <a href="mailto:fabrina.molle@gmail.com">fabrina.molle@gmail.com</a> , Tel : 4 225914</p> <p><b>Venue :UNDP Office, Les Palmes, Floor 2 - CONFIRMED</b></p> <p><b>1100hrs – 1200hrs - Ministry of Social Affairs - National Gender Secretariat</b>, Mrs. Linda William, <a href="mailto:lwilliam@gov.sc">lwilliam@gov.sc</a></p> <p>Mrs. Michelle Marguerite, <a href="mailto:mmarguerite@gov.sc">mmarguerite@gov.sc</a> , Mrs. Marie-Josée Bonne, <a href="mailto:mjbonne@gov.sc">mjbonne@gov.sc</a></p> <p><b>Venue: 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Unity house, Block C, Tel: 4 281 500 - CONFIRMED</b></p> <p><b>1330hrs – 1500hrs Ministry of Foreign Affairs</b></p> <p>Mrs. Sandra Michel, <a href="mailto:smichel@mfa.gov.sc">smichel@mfa.gov.sc</a></p> <p>Ms. Gayethri Pillay, Second Secretary, Treaties and Consular Affairs Section, <a href="mailto:gpillay@mfa.gov.sc">gpillay@mfa.gov.sc</a></p> <p><b>Venue : Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mont Fleuri, Tel : 4 283 500 – CONFIRMED</b></p>
<b>Weekend</b>	
DAY 5 Mon 25 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>1100hrs – 1200hrs - UNODC Mr. Shanaka Jayasekara</b> Tel: 2525175, EX Coast Guard, SIBA – CONFIRMED</p> <p><b>1300hrs – Meeting with Mr. Arun Ramduny, EU Programme Manager – Beau-Vallon Bay Hotel – CONFIRMED</b></p>
DAY 6 Tue 26 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>0900hrs – 1030hrs - National Council Children – SGP Grantee, Ms. Ruby Pardiwalla</b> – tel: 4283900 , <a href="mailto:ncc@seychelles.sc">ncc@seychelles.sc</a> / <a href="mailto:ruby@seychelles.sc">ruby@seychelles.sc</a> – Children's House, Bel-Eau – CONFIRMED.</p>
DAY 7 Wed 27 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>0915hrs – 1015hrs British High Commission and French Ambassador</b> Mrs Lindsay Skoll and Madame Genvieve Iancu – OLIAJI Building, Victoria, British High Commission Office - <b>CONFIRMED</b></p> <p><b>1300hrs – 1400hrs – UNDP Teleconference Programme Manager</b>, Mr. Roland Alcindor <a href="mailto:roland.alcindor@undp.org">roland.alcindor@undp.org</a> and Programme Officer, Preethi Sushil, <a href="mailto:preethi.nair@undp.org">preethi.nair@undp.org</a> – 4225914 - <b>Venue: UNDP Office – CONFIRMED</b></p>
DAY 8 Thurs 28 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>1300hrs – 1415hrs – Red Cross Society of Seychelles – Mrs. Colette Servina – Providence Industrial Estate - CONFIRMED</b></p> <p><b>1430hrs – 1600hrs - Liaison Unit Non-Governmental Organisations Seychelles (LUNGOS)</b></p> <p>Mr. Steve Lalande, Chief Executive Officer, <a href="mailto:ceo@lungos.sc">ceo@lungos.sc</a></p> <p>Mrs. Eline Moses, Information &amp; Research Officer, <a href="mailto:info@lungos.sc">info@lungos.sc</a></p> <p>Mr. Michel Pierre, Project Manager, <a href="mailto:projects@lungos.sc">projects@lungos.sc</a></p> <p><b>Venue: LUNGOS Office, Orion Mall, Floor 2, Victoria Tel: 4 325552 - CONFIRMED</b></p>
DAY 9 Frid 29 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	<p><b>0900hrs – 1200hrs – 10EDF Final Steering Committee Meeting</b></p> <p><b>Venue :Room 2, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mont Fleuri, Tel : 4 283 500 –</b></p>

	<p>CONFIRMED</p> <p><b>1500hrs – 1600hrs Gender Secretariat - SGP Grantee – Mr. Terrence Brutus and Mrs. Marie-Josée Bonne, <a href="mailto:mjbonne@gov.sc">mjbonne@gov.sc</a> / <a href="mailto:tbrutus@gov.sc">tbrutus@gov.sc</a> – 4281500 – Unity House, Block C, Floor 2 – CONFIRMED</b></p>
<b>Weekend</b> (spent drafting report)	
<p>DAY 10</p> <p>Mon 2<sup>nd</sup> Dec 2013</p>	<p><b>0830hrs – 1000hrs – Sustainability for Seychelles, SGP Grantee, Mrs. Michelle Martine, <a href="mailto:martinzanlwi@gmail.com">martinzanlwi@gmail.com</a> – Tel: 2519135 – Arpent Vert Office, Mont Fleuri – CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p>DAY 11</p> <p>Tue 3<sup>rd</sup> Dec 2013</p>	<p><b>Report drafting</b> (to address request from Arun Ramduny for early sight of a draft by Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> of possible)</p>
<p>DAY 12</p> <p>Wed 4<sup>th</sup> Dec 2013</p>	<p><b>0930hrs - The Seychelles Human Rights Commission, Mrs. Dora Zatte, The commissioner, <a href="mailto:seynhrc@gmail.com">seynhrc@gmail.com</a> - Tel: 4225417 – Aarti Chambers, Mont Fleuri – CONFIRMED</b></p> <p><b>1200hrs – The Chief Secretary of the Public Service, Mrs Jesse Esparon, <a href="mailto:jesparon@dpa.gov.sc">jesparon@dpa.gov.sc</a> DPA, National House, and Director of Performance Management, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation for DPA, Mr Gerard Albert, <a href="mailto:pma@dpa.gov.sc">pma@dpa.gov.sc</a></b></p> <p><b>1330hrs – The British High Commissioner, Mrs Lindsay Skoll, <a href="mailto:Lindsay.skoll@fco.gov.uk">Lindsay.skoll@fco.gov.uk</a> and BHC Regional Communications Officer, Matthew Harper, <a href="mailto:matthew.harper@fco.gov.k">matthew.harper@fco.gov.k</a></b></p> <p>Pm. Writing up meeting notes. UNDP Office</p>
<p>DAY 13</p> <p>Thur 5<sup>th</sup> Dec 2013</p>	<p><b>1030hrs - Wrap up Session - 10EDF Project Team and UNDP</b></p> <p>Ms. Preethi Nair-Sushil, UNDP Programme Officer <a href="mailto:preethi.sushil@undp.org">preethi.sushil@undp.org</a></p> <p>Mrs. Barbara Carolus-Andre, 10EDF Programme Manager, <a href="mailto:bcarolus@gmail.com">bcarolus@gmail.com</a></p> <p>Ms. Fabrina Molle, 10EDF Programme Assistant <a href="mailto:fabrina.molle@gmail.com">fabrina.molle@gmail.com</a> , Tel : 4 225914</p> <p><i>Venue: UNDP Office, Les Palmes, Floor 2 - EXACT TIME TO BE CONFIRMED</i></p> <p>Pm – Drafting report for EC Del.</p>
<p>DAY 14</p> <p>Fri 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2013</p>	<p><b>Departure Flight No: EK 706 at 08.35.</b></p>

Other contacts for whom consultant may consider to organise meetings: **Attorney General Office**, The Attorney Mr. Ronny Govinden, [agoffice@seychelles.sc](mailto:agoffice@seychelles.sc) , Representatiave Mr. Vipin Benjamin, [bvipin@gov.sc](mailto:bvipin@gov.sc) , Office 4 383 000/Mob: 2 795.