1. **Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Proposals for Future Directions**

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

***Design***

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

***Implementation***

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

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

***M&E***

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

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

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

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

***Best:***

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

***Worst:***

* Record keeping (saving, archiving, handing on project files) within PCU;
* M&E – scorecard never used at baseline, nor MTE / MTR etc. – meaningless now to do at TE;
* Hand-over between PMs;
* Poor support to PMs by PCU (CTAs and PCs) and wider UNDP staff;
* Lack of an active Steering Committee and National Project Director;
* Unfortunate situation regarding SEO IC, which could have been avoided by earlier prompt action of previous PM and also PCU

**Recommendations: On future project management**

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

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

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

**Proposals: For future directions underlining main objectives**

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

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