

Mid -Term Evaluation Management Response:

PIMS 3925 Strengthening Seychelles' Protected Area System through NGO Management Modalities

Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) held in October-November 2013

Final report accepted by the UNDP Resident Representative on Jan 2014, but slight amendments made to the final report post factum (May 2014), as there were gross errors in the co-financing calculations

Management Response finalised in Jul 2014 / Updated Oct 2014 [updated are highlighted]

Atlas Award and Project ID under 00060844 / 00076774, Budget department Seychelles

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening Seychelles' Protected Area System Through NGO Management			
ProDoc Signature:	28 March 2011	Original Planned Closing Date (Operational):	31 March 2015	Revised Closing Date: (see end note)
GEF Project ID:	3925	Finance	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at mid-term (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP PIMS:	4190 Seychelles PA System	GEF financing \$2.100 (FSP) + \$0.830 (PPG):	\$2.93	\$0.83
Country:	Seychelles	IA/EA own:	\$0.015	\$0.015
Region:	Africa	Government:	\$1.500	\$0.680
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other (NGOs and private sector):	\$1.780	\$2.877
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD1/SO1	Total co-financing:	\$3.295	\$3.572
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Energy	Total Project Cost:	\$6.225	\$4.401

KEY ISSUES

Key issues (concerning the Evaluation)	General Management Response
<p>Relevance (Satisfactory) The MTE has evaluated the project as relevant to the current Seychelles context and has a satisfactory rating based on assessment of design and current country context. The logical framework, components, activities, human resource strategy and budgets to achieve the development objective were evaluated as <u>appropriate, viable and responsive</u> to the contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings. However, the</p>	<p>Management takes note of the suggested revisions to the logframe including introducing a new indicator and targets. Adding a new outcome to the logframe (as suggested at one point in the MTE) requires GEF approval. However, other ways of incorporating the needs for knowledge management actions within the existing component was discussed at a Steering Committee meeting on 4th December 2013 (see</p>

Key issues (concerning the Evaluation)	General Management Response
<p>MTE indicated a <u>need for stronger linkages</u> between the expected project development outcome, its strategies and the log frame indicators. While the overall project outcome revolves around strengthening partnership and enhancing cooperation, process-related indicators are absent, particularly those related to knowledge sharing and learning. The project logframe was regarded as having too many indicators, although the MTE then proceeded to suggest additional ones. Some <u>indicators were found to be reliant upon Government approval processes</u> outside of the ability of the project to influence, and attention was needed to adjust these. A key criticism was the <u>lack of a knowledge management and learning element</u>, which the reviewer would have liked to have seen as a new (third) outcome.</p> <p>Efficiency (Marginally Satisfactory)</p> <p>The evaluator points out that the project was intended to be efficient and cost-effective by capitalizing on the comparative benefits of several implementing partners and ensuring synergies across the biodiversity portfolio. The project was expected to demonstrate co-implementation to be an efficient project modality. However, two issues were raised: firstly <u>the project steering committee did not function adequately</u> as a decision making body, being bogged down in (often acrimonious) discussion over financing issues, secondly, these same <u>financial planning and management issues</u> (primarily delays in disbursements) were constraining the ability of PCU and the partners to deliver project outcomes.</p> <p>Effectiveness (Marginally Satisfactory)</p> <p>The evaluator noted that the ENGO sector is highly capable and delivering good work, including demonstration of co-implementation approaches for PAs with Government and private sector partners, but the <u>project modality and implementation was found to be problematic</u> and relationships between NGOs on the one hand, and Government and PCU on the other hand, were often strained. ENGOS found it difficult to accept and comply with the complex procedures for reporting and disbursement of funds, in particular. The evaluator noted, nonetheless, that the <u>project has been effective to the extent it is beginning to show results</u> within the enabling environment for longer term management and services of an expanded PA system – despite the difficulties in implementation modality that constrain potential effectiveness.</p> <p>Sustainability (Marginally Likely)</p>	<p>mgmt response to recommendation 2, below).</p> <p>Management notes in particular the suggestion to re-phrase indicators and targets that are reliant on external Government approval processes that cannot be influenced by the project. It is logical that these targets be revised to something that is achievable by the NGOs in terms of contributing to the legislative process for gazetting new areas – ensuring all the appropriate documentation is available, etc.</p> <p>Management notes the need to enhance knowledge management and learning and is introducing activities to achieve this within the 2014 annual work plan. Management also intends to allocate funds for development and printing of knowledge products in the final months of the project in 2015. Management does not consider it necessary to add a new outcome to the logframe.</p> <p>Management takes note of the point made by the evaluator concerning the steering committee and will ensure that actual review and decision-making processes are higher up the agenda of further meetings – lengthening the duration of the meetings if necessary. Another possibility is to organize operational meetings separate from the SC meetings, which discuss only substantive matters, networking, knowledge management, etc.</p> <p>Management notes the points made concerning financial processes, but is not in a position to change UNDP-GEF rules in regard to processes for disbursements.</p> <p>Management has taken note of the issues raised concerning deteriorating relationships between partners. Management concurs that this is a very serious issue, and will endeavor to address this through the remainder of the project by paying all possible attention to speeding up disbursements and supporting partners with financial processes as needed. Management notes, however, that this is a two-way process and partners must also keep to the deadlines and follow the processes agreed upon. Management has raised the issue with Government departments that have previously tended to hold up financial approval processes and obtained strengthened commitments on processing time of documentation (documented in a revised Aide Memoire between Government and UNDP).</p>

Key issues (concerning the Evaluation)	General Management Response
<p>On financial sustainability, the evaluator noted that targets for the relevant indicator (the financial scorecard) had been <u>surpassed by mid-term</u> (satisfactory).</p> <p>On socio-political sustainability, the evaluator noted that the discourse between ENGOs and Government, while not without its issues, is <u>healthy</u>. The evaluator considered that the innovations tested on co-implementation approaches were framed within an institutional framework and systems that reduced the risks associated with individual egos, properly considered the laws, policies and financial capability for the PA system to function effectively, and drew upon the knowledge and capabilities of NGOs (satisfactory).</p> <p>On sustainability of the Institutional framework and governance, the evaluator noted the intent of the project to bring partners together to work collaboratively on PA management initiatives, including garnering the evidence needed for protected area expansion and for mapping of new PA boundaries, but noted <u>failings in the dissemination of information</u> between Government and partners that could <u>compromise the uptake of successful innovations</u> (marginally satisfactory).</p> <p>On environmental sustainability, the evaluator considered that the project objectives towards ensuring environmental sustainability (including small islands management and development) as a core outcome were not being met at mid-term, and that the project emphasis was more towards individual biodiversity conservation initiatives (marginally satisfactory).</p> <p>Lessons learned: The evaluator noted that the project is unique and commendable as a showcase of co-management of PAs in Seychelles and could be a global good practice. 12 lessons learned were documented that would assist in the documentation of good practice. Seven of these refer to the need to establish effective and transparent budgetary processes and build trust between partners – to avoid co-implementation becoming counter-productive. Two others refer to the need for effective knowledge management and sharing to ensure successful innovations and individual site level leads to strengthening of the system as a whole.</p> <p>Recommendations: A total of 20 recommendations were made by the evaluator, of which key ones are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes should be made to the logframe to make targets for new PA establishment achievable through project interventions (rather than reliant on external Government processes), and to introduce a new indicator concerning results around knowledge management, collaboration and partnerships. 	<p>Management has taken steps to begin developing a communications strategy (for all projects in the biodiversity portfolio) and to allocate funds within the project 2014 annual work plan to support documentation and dissemination of information. Management also expects that the SC will take a stronger role in this through the remainder of the project.</p> <p>Management has taken note of this issue, which to a large extent needs to be addressed in a holistic approach by the PCU in ensuring project outputs are linked with wider environmental and sustainable development initiatives such as the implementation of the Seychelles Sustainable Development Strategy (expected to start up in 2014) and NBSAP (also expected to start implementation in 2014). Project outputs, to be documented as noted above, will be important reference material for these implementation processes.</p> <p>Management takes note of the evaluators opinion that the lessons learned should be disseminated so as to assist in development of best practice. Management proposes that this be addressed through specific project documentation developed during the last months of the project in 2015.</p> <p>Management addresses the specific recommendations in the Recommendations section, following.</p>

Key issues (concerning the Evaluation)	General Management Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project builds on the capacity assessment exercise and plans for capacity strengthening activities to ensure actual strengthening of implementation approaches.• A strategy should be developed for continuous PA policy advocacy and communications.• Rationalization is needed of the environmental management system (database) housed at DOE to develop links to other data and monitoring activities in ongoing biodiversity projects (e.g. through a clearing house mechanism).	

Elements evaluated		Rating
Monitoring and Evaluation	Overall	Satisfactory
	M&E Plan Design	Satisfactory
	M&E Implementation	Satisfactory
IA and EA Execution	Overall	Moderately Satisfactory
	Quality of UNDP implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
	Quality of Execution – Executing Agency	Moderately Satisfactory
Achievement of Outcomes	Overall	Moderately Satisfactory
	Relevance	Satisfactory
	Effectiveness	Moderately Satisfactory
	Efficiency	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall assessment of the prospects for sustainability		Moderately Likely
	Financial resources	Moderately Satisfactory
	Socio-political	Moderately Satisfactory
	Institutional framework and governance	Moderately Satisfactory
	Environmental	Moderately Satisfactory

RECOMMENDATIONS

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
<i>Design/Formulation</i>						
1. SC develop post MTE implementation strategies around Output 1.2 and Output 1.3 with a focus on mitigating the risks related to the assumptions connected with slow policy and legislation or implementation not going through.	<p>The PA Policy was approved by Cabinet of Ministers in December 2013.</p> <p>A strategy cannot be developed for activities out of the remit of the project (i.e. Government approval of the legislation based on the approved policy). NGO partners are, seeking means of implementing (e.g. TPAs) under existing legislation (i.e. not waiting for the lengthy process of new legislation to be approved through the AGs Office).</p>	<p>Support to the legislative processes that can be provided by the project (i.e. support in drafting) is developed during the 2014 AWP.</p> <p>There are no specific project targets/indicators related to the approval of the legislation, but NGO targets for gazetting of PAa (endorsement by Government) are to be softened to targets that can be met by project interventions (as opposed to relying on Government actions) (see recommendation 2).</p>	<p>PA Policy approved in December 2013</p> <p>TWG re-started in December 2013 on approval of policy</p> <p>Discussion with Government and implementing partners on establishment of TPAs) commencing December 2013</p>	<p>Government</p> <p>PM</p> <p>NGO partners</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>MCSS is proceeding based on the existing legislation. The legislative review is ongoing with a draft prepared and to be presented to the TWG at end of Oct. for comments.</p>	<p>SC notes that there is no need for project to develop a strategy as this is reflected in the annual work planning.</p>
2. SC review and approve new Log Frame (Annex 4 – suggested log frame changes) which includes a new indicator concerning results <i>around knowledge management, collaboration and partnerships</i> . Review design structure (<i>learning and KM strategy</i>); SC must agree to shift results language for IPs specific activities in component two as	Revised logframe as recommended by MTE has been reviewed by SC.	The SC meeting held on 4 th December proposes the changes indicated in revised logframe attached to this mgmt response. The SC did not agree to the proposed reduction in the target for indicator 3 to a level	December 2014	SC	Done	SC felt that introducing a new indicator on knowledge management was unnecessary: the point has been made and the need for better

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
"a contribution to".		below the baseline (which made no sense) or to the introduction of a new indicator on knowledge management.				dissemination of results and knowledge products is incorporated within work plans.
3. PCU develop PA project knowledge management; a) Undertake scoping and development of project KM strategy. b) Develop a temporary knowledge database to store project-related knowledge products and information - accessible to different PA stakeholder groups. c) IPs and PCU prioritize documentation and distillation of PA knowledge products at PCU and IP levels for policy and partnership learning purposes. d) Institute a KM program at PCU to support project KM implementation approach and visibility of the IP partner activities and results from project to date. e) PCU develop strategy for hosting international learning seminar on PA co-management in year four.	PCU is in process of developing a communications strategy across the projects portfolio. PA project outputs will be integrated within this wider approach (a, b, c, d) SC agreed to establish a Blog for sharing of results among partners on a day-to-day basis (addresses a MTE point of	a) PCU communications officer and PM will address strategy and establishment of Blog b) PCU will collate and store documents and reports on the open access PCU website (this process is on-going). A link will be made from the clearing house mechanism to be developed at DOE (under NBSAP project) to the PCU website to heighten accessibility of the data. c) The preparation of knowledge products will be budgeted for in 2014 and 2015. d) As per point a) e) SC felt that this is a very expensive activity and remaining funds should be allocated for more practical actions.	January 2014 December 2014 EOP January 2014	PCU SC NGOs, PCU PCU	The PCU website is currently being updated to include detailed repositories of knowledge from all projects. This should be completed by the end of 2014. NGOs are being encouraged to begin preparing reports and publications concerning work under their components.	The development of KM within the programmes is organic (e.g. the KBA database, the PCU's website and the finance work under BIOFIN, plus other related initiatives). We therefore question the value added of a Strategy for KM. We do see the need to improve data management and storage and to improve the communication aspect. This is being acted upon by the PCU.
<i>Implementation approach, stakeholder participation and financial planning</i>						
4. PM and SC revisit the Steering Committee TOR to enable more regular	This was discussed with the SC on 4 th	No action was deemed to be necessary. The SC	December 2013	SC	Done	SC Chairman noted in the SC Meeting

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
meetings for enhanced substantive and operational oversight by all partners. SC (intent and process and the timing). Review TOR and participation list and augment this in order to promote more inclusive decision-making and technical knowledge sharing on results and implementation.	December 2013	would ensure that time is allocated within the SC meetings for more substantive discussion. This commenced with the meeting on 4 th December, almost all of which meeting was concerned with technical matters (there was very little discussion on the financial issues that have plagued previous SC meetings, as these issues have been largely dealt with over the last months).				of 4 th December that the point made by MTE has been largely addressed and the meeting was thus able to focus almost entirely on its decision-making role.
5. PC negotiate and formalize the new PM arrangement as soon as possible.	Under negotiation	A new contract format has been prepared combining the PM and Technical Officer role. A financial Assistant has been hired (part time) to handle financial aspects of project implementation.	December 2013 October 2013	PCU	Done and signed. Done	
6. PM restart and reinvigorate the technical work group TWG for legal review.	To be initiated as soon as possible (PA policy was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers in early December 2013) and provides the essential strategic direction for the legislation	The TWG is established, but its membership will be reviewed and enhanced as several people are no longer in their former posts. The PM will discuss with the AGs office concerning how to proceed with drafting the legislation (given the huge backlog of work at the AGs office). The project will recruit legal drafting experts to assist if so	December 2013 or January 2014	PM, TWG	Done	

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
		agreed: this is budgeted in the 2014 work plan.				
7. PM work with CB consultant on Output 1.4 project capacity strengthening activities to ensure that activities are based on MTE and on strengthening implementation approach, i.e. targeted trainings on economic valuation, conflict resolution, negotiations and collaborative governance approaches; one priority CB activity must be to support SNPA assess/ ascertain protocols for PA co-management, including NGOs and GOS	Captured in the 2014 AWP	On completion of the capacity assessment (delayed until March 2014) the directions for specific CB interventions will be determined. Funds will be budgeted in generic terms within the 2014 AWP to ensure resources are available for follow-up.	March 2014 December 2013	PM, PCU	Delayed by other commitments of the consultant: now due end 2014. Funds are being allocated or priority capacity building as needs emerge.	The capacity analysis will determine what the actual training needs are: this is pre-empted in the recommendation, but PM will make sure that these potential training areas are considered during the assessment.
8. PM and PC develop a schedule (and share with IPs for approval and preparations) for monitoring site visits through end of project.	Needs for more specific site monitoring have been noted and conferred to partners.	A site visit was made to Cousin Island (NS) during the MTE and will be followed up. Other site visits will be organized with the IPs during the first quarter of 2014.	From January 2014	PM, PC	Final transplants are due in Q4 2014. With the onset of the calmer NW monsoon final monitoring can be done.	
9. PCU develop a strategy for continuous PA policy advocacy and communications; work through the PCU. Communications Officer in raising visibility of PA results through an integrated PCU communications strategy.	See point 3.					
10. PM facilitates and encourages synergies; cooperation and knowledge sharing among IPs through TWG and other modalities, such as the <i>capacity strengthening and knowledge management</i> activities (see related point 3).	See point 3					

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
11. PCU commission advocacy report on the comparative investment case for models of island co-management, including <i>inputs on the tensions of enforcement and co management protection strategies, and highlighting synergies</i> to other sectors, i.e. tourism, health, education, development.	As part of the process of gazetting private islands as PAs, the island owners will be developing investment models, which will differ between the islands.	The documentation of different investment models cannot take place until after the island owners have completed the process of gazetting the new PAs, and this may not happen within the lifetime of the current project. If it looks likely to happen by EOP, then a study may be budgeted during 2015, if the required information is made generally available by Government and the island owners.	EOP	SC, PCU	This will likely be deferred to the in-coming PA Finance project which has a focus on this issue.	It is certainly useful and constructive to document how private sector and conservation interests can work together (although there is already a lot of literature on this). The need for a specific study related to this projects interventions will be reviewed towards EOP.
12. SC in consultation with UNDP and UNDP GEF RTA decide on and implement viable options for <i>the serious</i> disbursement issue affecting implementation by December 2013: (1) hire a short term contractor to support, mediate and provide learning and guidance to all IPs on financial procedures through scoping of problem, training and creating templates and calendar; (2) augment PCU capacity for PA financial support to focus entirely on PA project bottlenecks in disbursements and to work closely with implementing partner to help get reports in on time with 80% delivery (done Oct 1, 2013, during MTE); (3) separate project into five GEF awards with immediate effect so that the new separate but linked projects can begin in January 2014.	Action already taken at the time of the MTE	This was discussed in depth prior to the MTE and during the MTE duration. The suggested option 2) was adopted and a part-time financial assistant hired to support PCU in financial aspects of the PA project from October 2013. This will continue for the remainder of the project lifetime.	October 2013	PCU	Done	Bringing the new financial assistant on board has had an immediate impact in rationalizing the financial processes, including providing continual support to NGOs in their accounting. Disbursements to NGOs are made rapidly on receipt of documentation from them. However, delays in processing paperwork within Ministry of Finance in particular remain problematic.
<i>Results</i>						
13. SC vet project softened targets (refer to	See point 2.					

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
proposed new MTE log frame Annex 4) and remove those targets that are out of IP partners control and are the responsibility of Government) so project can continue and complete within the original time frame.						
14. RTA and UNDP prioritize action /solution (see point 13) around financial disbursement issues;	See point 12 (redundant)					
15. PM revitalize the TWG to actively work on PA legislation;	See point 6.					
16. PM prioritize scoping work on PA EMIS system development linked to other data and monitoring activities in ongoing biodiversity projects, e.g. clearing house, GIS and/or mapping work, etc.;	SC and PCU appreciates this is an issue and is will support DOE to coordinate data collection and storage activities undertaken by all projects within the portfolio.	A workshop on the modalities for the national database and clearing house mechanism is to be held in January 2014 (under the NBSAP project)	January 2014	PCU	Pending	This is distinct from the internal knowledge management issues discussed under recommendation 3, although the umbrella data sharing and access system for both is the CHM.
17. PCU commission work with GIF to develop case studies on the cost benefits and private public - stewardship approach to PA management, especially in the case of Denis and North Island.	See point 11.					
18. PCU provide training for IPs on how to undertake cost benefit analysis of project activities, including on how to conduct a valuation analysis of co-management island models. Document case studies constituting a biodiversity valuation and make case why PA and instituting a stewardship approach is cost effective on a variety of different small islands (linked to point 20).	Cost-benefit analysis is very complicated and a speciality area – this is not a feasible recommendation. Valuation could be done – economic or financial – but not within the project timeframe	No action related to the proposal for cost-benefit analysis or valuation study. The capacity assessment being done during Q1 2014 may make some further comments on this issue, but is likely to focus more on practical training.			No action planned	This suggestion was specifically reviewed by a professional economist working with Nature Seychelles and the comments presented here are a professional opinion.
19. SC convene meeting to immediately vet MTE recommendations and reschedule	MTE recommendations	SC meeting on 4 th December reviewed and	December 2014	SC	Done	

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

Key Recommendations	Response	Key actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status	Comments
resources based on key asks - see annex 4 of MTE report. The exercise will focus reorienting resources to the completion of the important technical work of IPs and the documentation of experiences as a focus of the last three months, i.e. reef restoration scientific project coordinator to undertake the extra documentation work on viability of reefs for ecosystem management; fisheries monitoring which was found to be a longer than budgeted for activity.	were considered by SC members at the SC meeting on 4 th December and comments incorporated within this mgmt response. NGOs have considered the points discussed during the MTE in formulating their 2014 work plans.	discussed both the recommendations and the extent to which NGOs have taken these up into their work plans Additional resources are to be allocated for documentation of results at end of project.	Late 2014	NGOs, PCU	The project will organise a final 'symposium' for all project associates to present their work	
20. IPs document and share information on alternative land and water resource uses, livelihoods and inclusion of user groups in changing practices: social norms and practices (turtles), support of change of destructive traditional practices (Killing turtles for meat or harvesting of coco de mer) and support of PA agenda setting (these activities need to be costed, re-budgeted and rationalized by the SC if viable) (see related point on KM above).	NGOs will be requested to undertake results documentation, for which additional resources will be provided in 2015	Additional resources will be allocated for documentation of results at end of project.	EOP	NGOs, PCU	Pending These activities are budgeted under each NGO allocation. Some publications are being prepared already but not yet shared with PCU.	Documentation is to be collated and made available after finalizing project activities, but further inputs (e.g. staff time) into this documentation will need additional resources. This will be clarified in 2014 in planning for the use of the remaining project budget in the 2015 work plan.
Sustainability						
See comments under issues.						
Need for project extension						
A revised closing date of 29 th March 2015 is quoted in the MTE, This date was adjusted by MTE (without explanation) to 30 th June 2015. Given that Component 1 activities will be completed in 2014 and NGOs also expect to complete all or most activities in 2014, the mgmt suggestion would be to remain with the 29 th March closure, with documentation of knowledge products in late 2014 and January 2015, and the TE scheduled for February 2015. <i>The budget remaining as of the end of Q3 2014 is \$231,929 (programmed for 2014) plus \$146,704 (remaining for 2015).</i>						

Approved by Mr Simon Springett, UNDP Resident Representative

Signature

Date

REVISED PROJECT LOGFRAME (INCORPORATES SUGGESTIONS BY MTE, VETTED BY SCM OF 4th DECEMBER 2013)

[Changed in values and at the word level for indicators are marked in red and notes added]

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective Demonstrate effective models for protected area management by non-governmental organizations in Seychelles, and enable their inclusion into a strengthened national protected area system	1. Capacity development indicator score for protected area system:	33%	42%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government, private sector and NGOs commit to constructive engagement in the development of protected area partnerships The government allocates adequate resources (staff and budget) to fulfil its oversight function for the protected area system Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing conflicts and misunderstandings between public institutions, private sector partners, NGOs and resource users Protracted legislative reform, regulatory amendments and PA proclamation processes Poor resilience of marine and terrestrial ecosystems to the effects of climate change Increasing incidents of piracy
	Systemic	35%	40%		
	Institutional	35%	42%		
	2. METT scores:	Baseline METT	Minimum Target METT	METT applied at Mid-Term and Final Evaluation	
	[1] Cousin Island Special Reserve	[1] Cousin Island Special Reserve: 76 / 102 = 75%	[1] Cousin Island Special Reserve: 80%		
	[2] Aldabra Special Reserve	[2] Aldabra Atoll Special Reserve: 60 / 102 = 59%	[2] Aldabra Atoll Special Reserve: 66%		
	[3] North Island	[3] North Island: 43 / 102 = 42%	[3] North Island: 60%		
	[4] Denis Island	[4] Denis Island: 67 / 102 = 66%	[4] Denis Island: 78%		
NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #2: The original numbers from PRODOC were respectively 78%, 62%, 42% and 66%. Yet these numbers contained calculation mistakes, as the scoring was done in MS Word. In the 2013 PIR, the figures for the baseline were corrected. No changes were made to target percentages however. In 2013 the METTs were applied in connection with the MTR and the scores endorsed by it.					
	3. Coverage (ha) of formal protected area system	Gazetted by 2010, as per best available knowledge, but subject to adjustments in light the on-going gazettment review study from 2014:	[3a] at least 37,500ha [3b] Approx. 21,121 ha	Protected Area Information Management System	
	[3a] Marine	[3a] Marine: 34,847 ha			
	[3b] Terrestrial	[3b] Terrestrial: 20,921 ha Total: 55,769 ha			
NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #3: The original numbers from PRODOC were respectively 29,836 ha and 24,978 ha for marine and terrestrial. In connection with the preparation of a PIF in 2013 on PA finance and of the PA Policy, a quick (back-of-the envelope) review of gazettal status across the PA/MPA system for Seychelles was carried out. Based on dates of proclamation, we had revised the baseline in the 2013 PIR to reflect what we assumed were the correct surface areas. The reference is Table 3 in the Annex to the PIF to PIMS 4656 Seychelles Sustainable PA Finance, which can be accessed through the following link: http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=5485					

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<p>We gathered the following through the mentioned baseline reconstruction exercise from 2013:</p> <p>Prior to 2010:</p> <p>24 sites marine: 29,827 ha terrestrial: 19,048 ha Total: 48,875 ha</p> <p>Added in 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - expansion of the marine area of Aldabra: adding 5,020 ha (and reaching a total of 28,120 ha of marine area for the Aldabra site, a figure that was already embedded in the baseline METT of this project for "Aldabra Special Reserve", though the baseline METT had been prepared in 2009) - terrestrial area of Silhouette: 1,860 ha - terrestrial area of the new Recif Island Special Reserve: 13ha <p>After 2010:</p> <p>25 sites marine: 34,847 ha terrestrial: 20,921 ha Total: 55,769 ha</p> <p>The 'After 2010' values should constitute the interim reconstructed baseline for this indicator. This had been proposed in the 2013 PIR, finalised in October that year.</p> <p>Else, the MTR had suggested around mid-2013 to reduce EOP target for Terrestrial PAs to 23,000 ha. This was rejected by the Steering Committee (SC), because it appeared to be below the baseline suggested in the PRODOC. However, there are other aspects to this.</p> <p>Revisions to baseline and targets for this indicator may need reconsideration by the SP in light of <u>three important facts</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is very little room for further expanding the terrestrial PA estate in Seychelles, given the limited land area of the country. 2. The only prospects in the near future of achieving an effective expansion of the <u>terrestrial</u> PA estate in Seychelles are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The gazettal of 100% of Denis Island and of and North Island as private PAs under the new law, or of parts of their land surface, which have respectively 201 ha and 143 ha. Given the standing collaboration with the management of these islands with the project, such achievements can be considered well within its scope. b. The addition of the terrestrial part of the Curieuse Island National Park to the PA estate, complementing an already proclaimed marine area. This could potentially add 152 ha to the terrestrial PA estate and can be said to be 'influenced' by the policy / legislation processes set in motion by the project (namely under output 1.3). Yet, it is not directly foreseen in its programme of work. c. If 100% (or close to 100%) of the areas for Denis, North and Curieuse islands are gazetted, these three sites would add approximately 490 ha to the terrestrial PA estate. If we consider only the two first ones, it would be approximately 350 ha. Although the private owners of Denis and North have expressed an interest in undergoing the gazettal process under the new legislation, the actual area that will be proposed is not yet clear. We should be conservative in our assumptions. d. The addition of new sites in Outer Islands can potentially bring a considerable marine area under protection and a terrestrial one of approximately 1,922 ha (with emphasis on the approximation). These new gazettlements can also be said to be 'influenced' by new PA legislation, though the decision to move with it was separate from the policy process. Most importantly, these processes can remain pending for a few years still, and are definitely outside the scope of the project. 3. In early 2014, the project has been co-supporting a consultancy of carrying out a "deep" revision of gazettlements in Seychelles. By this, we mean that the consultant has worked for several weeks with government, pulling out old legislation archives and attached maps, to determine what was effectively gazetted as PA and what was not. The matter is delicate and the results of the study are still being analysed. <p>In light of the above points, we note:</p>				

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With a total land surface of 459 sq km (or 45,900 ha), of which some 20,000 ha were already gazetted by 2010, any additional 50 ha of terrestrial PAs would matter for Seychelles. So numbers should be analysed and proposed carefully. ▪ The greatest prospect of expanding the terrestrial PA estate is clearly outside of the scope of this project. ▪ It would unrealistic to add 1,900 ha to the terrestrial target for this indicator. ▪ The conclusions of the gazettment review study will likely show that any previous assumptions on baseline and targets could have been off by quite a few hectares and they should be revised again. This is especially true for the terrestrial sites, where small numbers matter. A caveat on these considerations an uncertainties should be added to the indicator revision. <p>Therefore, we propose (1) to adopt the baseline of “by 2010”, as proposed in the 2013 PIR for both terrestrial and marine areas within the formal protected area system; and (2) to change only the target for terrestrial to +200 ha from the baseline, given uncertainties presented above.</p> <p>This analysis is from Oct 2014 and went beyond MTR proposals.</p>				
	4. Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	16%	21%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	
Outcome 1 Strengthened management framework for protected areas in Seychelles	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1.1 National priorities for the expansion of marine and terrestrial protected areas are defined</p> <p>1.2 National policy directions are updated and modernised to direct a partnership approach to the expansion, planning and management of the PA system</p> <p>1.3 New protected area legislation is drafted and adopted to effect the national policy directions</p> <p>1.4 The capacity of PA institutions to establish and administer partnerships is strengthened</p> <p>1.5 An electronic information management system is developed for protected areas</p>				
	5. Number of terrestrial areas of high biodiversity outside of existing PAs that are identified as priority areas for PA expansion in the PA expansion plan	0 or 0% (of 36 the areas in total)	More than 50% of identified Areas of High Biodiversity	National Policy Directions for Protected Areas Protected Area Information Management System	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The government, private sector and NGOs commit to constructive engagement in the development of protected area partnerships – There is an adequate data baseline to determine priority areas for PA expansion – Policy, legislative and regulatory reforms are supported and adopted by Government, and adequately provide for the establishment of protected areas under private ownership and cooperative management – The government allocates adequate resources (staff and budget) to fulfil its oversight function for the protected area system – Prospective data suppliers make critical data available
	<p>NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #5:</p> <p>The original formulation of this indicator in the PRODOC was “Number of terrestrial Key Biodiversity Area (see Gerlach, 2008) that are identified as priority areas for PA expansion in the PA expansion plan”.</p> <p>The changed wording from KBAs had been inserted at inception workshop to read ‘Areas of High Biodiversity outside existing PAs’. This was introduced in the 2012 PIR (the first for the project) and with the agreement of the SC.</p> <p>Yet, we note that KBA is a more common term internationally and now also adopted in the new GEF6 Strategy as an indicator or relevance for the Biodiversity focal area. These terms could be interchangeable, but the semantic difference still needs to be appreciated. For now we keep the formulation at inception. Also we need to analyse the impact of more recent studies to all this.</p> <p>Further to these considerations, there were changes to the target value for indicator #5, which was 30 (absolute number) at the PRODOC. The increased target for areas of high biodiversity to be identified as priority areas from 30 to a percentage of “More than 50% of identified Areas of High Biodiversity”, given that these areas were still being identified and the absolute number uncertain. The proposed change had been accepted by the SC and endorsed by the MTR. The progress on this element will be engineered through the consultancy on priorities for PA expansion - activity 1.1.</p> <p>At the same time, in the 2014 PIR, the project reports the following, which will require a more careful consideration of concepts and targets:</p> <p>“The three KBAs identified by the Biodiversity Mainstreaming project have been included in the revision of the Morne Seychellois National Park Boundary which has now been gazetted, plus D’Arros island which was identified as a KBA by Gerlach. The KBA data from all previous studies, and the accompanying KBA database, is being used by the PA project in the spatial planning exercise to identify priority areas for PA expansion. A modelling software (Marxan) which layers all the existing biodiversity data and other key data layers to identify priority areas for expansion is being used. This</p>				

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	activity is on-going but will have identified the key areas for expansion, and is expected to meet the project target, by September 2014.”				for incorporation into the PAIMS
	6. Contribution to number of IBAs designated as PAs/ number of IBAs identified as priority area for PA expansion (of a total of 20 marine and terrestrial IBAs) in the PA expansion plan	[6a] 11 IBAs designated as PAs [6b] 0 IBAs identified as priority areas for PA expansion	[6a] 13 IBAs designated as PAs [6b] 6 IBAs identified as priority areas for PA expansion	National Policy Directions for Protected Areas Protected Area Information Management System	Risks: – Ongoing conflicts and misunderstandings between public institutions, private sector partners, NGOs and resource users – Protracted legislative reform, regulatory amendments and PA proclamation processes
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #6: Numbering of sub-indicators added for the sake of clarity in the 2012 PIR. No change in values or essence. The softening of the formulation of the indicator from ‘Number of IBAs...’ to ‘Contribution to the number of IBAs...’ had been agreed by SC. This keeps the target to something that is achievable by the project rather than reliant on Government processes outside the mandate of the project to influence.				
	7. Year of formal adoption of the most recently adopted Conservation Policy	1971	2012 [no effectual change from PRODOC target value]	Annual Report of DOE	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #7: In the 2013 PIR, the project had proposed to change the target to 2013, as it had not been met. The MTR did not take note of this. Such change is in fact futile, as what matters is the importance and scope of the policy development process. The project reports extensively on this. We retreat and add back the original target of 2012 (as per PRODOC).				
	8. Partnership approach to protected area establishment and management adequately provided for in legislation	No	Yes	Independent legal review report	
	9. Increase in funding support to the protected area system: [9a] State grant allocation (US\$/annum) [9b] Donor funding support (US\$/annum)	[9a] US\$20,000 [9b] US\$100,000	[9a] US\$50,000 [9b] US\$200,000	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard Annual financial reports of DOE and SNPA	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #9: Numbering of sub-indicators added for the sake of clarity in the 2014 PIR. No change in values or essence.				
	10. Number of public and NGO PA staff completing specialised training and/ or skills development in: [10a] Cooperative management [10b] Data management	[10a] 0 individuals [10b] 0 individuals	[10a] more than 15 individuals [10b] more than 10 individuals	Project training reports Annual reports of DOE, SNPA and SFA Annual reports of implementing partners (SIF/ NS/ MCSS & GIF)	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #10: Numbering of sub-indicators and words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability. No change in values or essence.				

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions	
	11. Level of involvement of affected NGOs, resource users, CBOs and private landowners in decision-making in planning and management of the protected area system	Less than 10% [baseline defined in 2012]	More than 80%	Independent cooperative governance reviews undertaken as part of preparation of the inception report, as well as the mid-term and the final evaluation reports		
NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #10: Numbering of sub-indicators and words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability. Baseline defined in 2012. No change in the target value.						
Outcome 2 Expanded and strengthened management of protected areas in Seychelles	Outputs: 2.1 The efficacy of active coral reef restoration techniques are tested in Cousin Island Special Reserve 2.2 An approach to the formal protection of critical habitats of whale sharks and turtles is tested 2.3 The offshore boundary of the Aldabra Special Reserve is expanded, and its management strengthened 2.4 The privately owned islands of North and Denis are established and managed as formal protected areas, under different governance regimes 2.5 The design and functioning of Cousin Island Special Reserve is improved to meet both conservation and fisheries management objectives					
	12. Number of nursery-reared coral stock produced for transplantation	0	At least 35,000 nubbins	Project reports	Assumptions: – NGOs and private landowners actively involve affected stakeholders in PA establishment and expansion processes – Coral nursery sites remain unaffected by bleaching-induced coral mortality events – The government supports the testing of the feasibility of establishing temporal protected areas – Private island landowners ‘ring-fence’ a % of income from nature-based tourism enterprises for protected area management – Artisanal fisherman, tour operators and recreational users engage constructively in PA establishment and expansion processes Risks: – Ongoing conflicts and misunderstandings between public institutions, private sector partners, NGOs and resource users – Protracted legislative	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #12: Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability. No change in the target value.					
	13. Extent of actively restored coral reef ecosystems (ha)	0	Larger than 1ha	Project reports		
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #13: Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability. No change in the target value.					
	14. Contribution the establishment (i.e. formalisation) and effective operationalization (i.e. testing) of temporal PAs, expressed as the number of established and operational for the following species:			Protected Area Information Management System		
	[14a] Whale sharks	[14a] 0	[14a] 1			
	[14b] Turtles	[14b] 0	[14b] 1			
NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #14: Original formulation was “Number of temporal PAs established and operational” MTR had recommended the softening of the formulation of this indicator, as the responsible party (Marine Conservation Society – MSC) would only contribute to the establishment of these temporal PAs. However, MTR may have missed that the operationalization would still be under MSC’s remit and a key expected outcome from their activities under the project. We do recognise though that, given the time frames, the effectiveness of these temporal sites can only be initially tested, not necessarily confirmed. Numbering of sub-indicators added for the sake of clarity in the 2014 PIR.						
15. Contribution to the number of TPC’s being regularly monitored in Aldabra Special Reserve	0	At least 5	Annual Review - Aldabra SR Management Plan			

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #15: MTR suggested indicator change to 'Contribution to the number'. Management agrees. Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability. No change in the target value.				reform, regulatory amendments and PA proclamation processes – Poor resilience of marine and terrestrial ecosystems to the effects of climate change – Increasing incidents of piracy
	16. 'Financing gap' for Aldabra Special Reserve	~US\$300,000 (2009/10)	Less than US\$200,000	SIF Annual Financial Report	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #16: Numbering of sub-indicators added for the sake of clarity in the 2014 PIR. No change in values or essence. A side note on this is: The MTR commented on this issue, querying whether this target is actually achieved (as per the last PIR). However, the MTR consultant agreed with the comment that 'If cross-subsidization from WHS Vallé de Mai is considered, SIF is generally breaking even under a basic management scenario for the two PAs it manages within its sub-system. It actually verified a surplus in 2012.' – from the 2013 PIR.				
	17. Contribution to the number of formal PAs under private ownership	3	More than 5	Protected Area Information Management System (register of protected areas)	
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #17: MTR suggested indicator change to 'Contribution to the number', rather than just 'number'. Contribution in this case is to be interpreted as supporting the process to the level of PA nomination files. No changes in values. Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability.				
	18. Extent (ha) of Denis and North Islands with restored and maintained native habitats:	[18a] Denis 50ha (of 143ha) [18b] North 37ha (of 201ha)	[18a] Denis 60 ha [18b] North 60 ha	Project reports Annual reports of Denis Island Development Pty Ltd and the Wilderness Safari Trust	
	[18a] Denis [18b] North				
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #18: Wording of indicator includes now maintenance of restored areas. Baseline for sub-indicator 18a was adjusted in the inception report with the agreement of the RTA. It was 64 ha in the PRODOC. The new number is more accurate. Targets adjusted in the inception report with the agreement of the RTA. They were 80 ha for both 18a and 18b in the PRODOC. These changes reflects more achievable targets. MTR endorsed these changes. Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability.				
	19. Proportion of the habitats of key functional fish groups around Cousin Island under a conservation management regime:			Project reports Annual report of NS Annual report of SFA	
	[19a] Home ranges [19b] Spawning sites	[19a] Less than 1% (estimate) [19b] Less than 5% (estimate)	[19a] More than 20% [19b] Less than 50%		
	NOTE ON LOGFRAME REVISION, Indicator #19: MTR had suggested the indicator to become 'contribution to the'. Management does not agree. Here is why. The MTR had visited Cousin with PC and suggested that that rescheduling budget and an extension was needed for fish monitoring project until end of project; and that this would ensure quality in the exercise and give important time to monitor the results. Management agree with it. However, "contribution to" with respect to expected results here are not in any way outside the remit of the responsible party, namely Nature Seychelles (NS). They are the managers of Cousin Island and can control every aspect of its management (barred force majeure or other pervasive external disturbance). NS should have all the means and tools necessary, including the funding, to be able to produce and demonstrate the desired conservation				

Summary of Key Actions

Tracking

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	outcome reflected in this indicator. It does not make sense here to soften the indicator by adding the word "contribution". Management rejected the change in the indicator. Words rather than signs were added in the 2014 PIR for the sake of clarity and PIR readability.				

NOTE

A MTE suggestion for a new indicator 'Basic PA knowledge management system' is rejected by SC. The knowledge management activities suggested by MTE are, however, being integrated into overall project and partner work plans. No changes were made so far.