



# **United Nations Environment Programme**

**Terminal Evaluation of UNEP/DGEF project GF/6030-04-11 (4792)  
Addressing Land Based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO- LaB)**

**Evaluation Office**

**Sarah Humphrey**

**November 2010**

# Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	iii
<b>1 Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Introduction and Background.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Overview of Project .....	4
2.1.1 Project Partners .....	4
2.1.2 Budget.....	5
2.1.3 Project Status.....	5
2.2 The Evaluation .....	5
<b>3 Scope, Objective and Methods.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Scope of the Terminal Evaluation .....	6
3.2 Approach and Methodology .....	6
<b>4 Project Performance and Impact.....</b>	<b>7</b>
A. Attainment of objectives and planned results .....	7
B. Sustainability .....	10
C. Catalytic role and replication .....	12
D. Country ownership / drivenness.....	13
E. Stakeholder participation / public awareness.....	13
F. Achievement of outputs and activities.....	17
G. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems .....	23
H. Preparation and readiness .....	25
I. Implementation approach.....	26
J. Financial planning .....	28
K. UNEP and UNOPS supervision and backstopping.....	30
<b>5 Conclusions and Rating .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>6 Lessons (to be) Learned .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>7 Recommendations.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>8 List of Annexes .....</b>	<b>39</b>
Annex 1. List of interviewees .....	40
Annex 2. Evaluation timeline .....	43
Annex 3. The Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	44
Annex 4. List of documents reviewed or consulted .....	54
Annex 5. Performance Matrix .....	56
Annex 6. Review of Outcomes to Impacts.....	63
Annex 7. Summary of Progress on Planned Activities .....	66
Annex 8. Sustainability, Innovation and Replication in the Demonstration Projects .....	69
Annex 9. Summary co-finance, expenditure by activity and budget variance .....	72
Annex 10. The Evaluator .....	76

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ASCLME	Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems
CHM	Clearinghouse Mechanism
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South Africa
DEWA	Division of Early Warning and Assessment (UNEP)
DEPI	Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (UNEP)
DGEF	Division of Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP)
EAF/RCU	Eastern African Regional Coordination Unit for the Nairobi Convention
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FARI	Forum of Heads of Academic and Research Institutions
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPA	Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (UNEP)
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICARM	Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IW	International Waters
LBA	Land Based Activities (of marine and coastal degradation)
LBSA	Land-based Sources and Activities (of marine and coastal degradation)
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MESL	Marine Environmental Studies Laboratory (IAEA)
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MWW	Municipal Wastewater
NCC	National Coordination Committee
NCS	Nairobi Convention Secretariat
NFP	National Focal Point
NFPI	National Focal Point Institution
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPA	National Programme of Action
OP	Operational Programme (of the GEF)
OVI	Objectively verifiable indicator
PADH	Physical alteration and destruction of habitats
PDF B	Project Development Facility – category B (GEF)
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit (WIO-LaB)
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit (Nairobi Convention)
ReCoMaP	Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Coastal Zones of the Countries of the Indian Ocean (of the IOC)
RoTI	Review of outcomes to impact
SAIEA	Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SIDS	Small island Developing State
SMART	Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound
STAC	Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
SWIOFP	South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WIO	Western Indian Ocean
WIO-C	Consortium for Conservation of the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean
WIO-LaB	Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean
WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Sciences Association
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

# 1 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Project Details

Project Title: Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-LaB)  
Project Number: GF/6030-04-11  
Duration: 1 January 2005 to 30 June 2010  
Geographical Scope: Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, and Tanzania  
Implementing agency: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Executing Agencies: Nairobi Convention Secretariat and UNOPS

## 1.2 Introduction

1. The WIO-LaB Project brought together two initiatives developed respectively in response to a call from the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention in March 1997 and as a follow-up to the 2002 World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the related Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, which called for “advanced implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)”. The WIO-LaB Project was designed to serve as a demonstration project for the GPA.
2. The **long-term development objective** of the project was to contribute to the environmentally sustainable management and development of the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) region by reducing land-based activities that harm rivers, estuaries and coastal waters and their biological resources.
3. The independent Terminal Evaluation for the project was undertaken between 23 May and 15 August 2010 on behalf of UNEP. This report provides an introduction and overview of the project, describes the evaluation methodology and scope and sums up the main findings of the evaluation. The report concludes with lessons and recommendations.

## 1.3 Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

4. During its five and half years of activity, the WIO-Lab project supported a wide range of activities towards achieving its long term development objective, to contribute to the environmentally sustainable management and development of the WIO region by reducing land-based activities that harm rivers, estuaries and coastal waters and their biological resources. It combined foundational activities focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity development with demonstration activities focusing on capacity development and technical and managerial innovation. It also helped to introduce a new strategic approach at national level in the form of National Programmes of Action (NPAs).
5. The project was strongly embedded in the political and institutional framework of the Nairobi Convention and helped to reinforce the profile of the Convention in the WIO Region.
6. Key outputs of the project are the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), the *Strategic Action Programme for Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities* and the *Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities* that was finalised in Mombasa in December 2009. The Protocol was formally adopted in April 2010 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries. Together these outputs provide the rationale and justification for mainstreaming of activities into government functions and for further project-based investment.

7. The WIO-LaB project was implemented through a highly participatory process with strong engagement and reinforcement of networks amongst governments and governmental organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and research and academic institutions. Demonstration and small grants projects provided for engagement of a wider set of stakeholders including the private sector.
8. The project was well managed with effective governance, backstopping, reporting and monitoring and evaluation processes and evidence of adaptive management. However significant delays were experienced during implementation, contributing to the need for two no-cost extensions to this ambitious project. Constraints to implementation included the limited technical, financial and/or administrative capacity within the National Focal Point Institutions (NFPIs).
9. The achievement of longer term impacts may be affected by financial constraints and related shortfalls in institutional capacity and investment at the national level. It remains uncertain whether the breadth of ownership required to secure the momentum of initiatives to ameliorate Land-based Sources and Activities (of marine and coastal degradation) (LBSA) will be achieved in all participating countries in a context of competing priorities for government attention and funding.
10. The overall rating for this project based on the evaluation findings is **Satisfactory**.

#### 1.4 Recommendations

11. The following recommendations address continuation of key ongoing WIO-LaB activities; continuation of the coordination and networking bodies and functions established or supported through WIO-LaB, and assimilation of learning at national and regional level to guide future implementation of the Nairobi Convention and Protocol. The following recommendations may lead to proposals that would need to be approved as part of the Nairobi Convention workplan.
12. **Recommendation 1.** The GEF Secretariat should consider supporting a follow on project to WIO-LaB focused on implementation of the SAP and mainstreaming of LBSA activities at the national level. Ideally this project would be implemented within the framework of the Nairobi Convention Programme of Work with day to day management ensured through a dedicated project team working closely with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat (NCS). (Deadline: May 2011)
13. **Recommendation 2.** The NCS, UNEP Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA), national focal points and lead collaborating agencies should assess the ongoing support needs for maintenance of the Clearinghouse Mechanism and together develop a firm proposal regarding its continuation, including by investigating to what extent this can be integrated into the regular work programme and budget of the of the Convention and of the collaborating agencies. (Deadline: June 2011)
14. **Recommendation 3.** The NCS, national focal points and relevant research institutions and laboratories should assess the ongoing support needs for maintenance of the national hotspot monitoring programme and the NCS and NFPs should develop a firm proposal addressing appropriate arrangements for its continuation. (Deadline: June 2011)
15. **Recommendation 4.** The NCS should lead a process involving national focal points and relevant stakeholders (such as the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association, WIOMSA) to review the status and future utility of the Task Forces and other coordination bodies established and supported by the WIO-LaB project and undertake appropriate courses of action to sustain, devolve or disband them, including with reference to future implementation of the SAP. (Deadline: June 2011)

16. **Recommendation 5.** The NCS should organised a follow up meeting to the regional stocktaking meeting and to this evaluation to reflect on experience at the national level and identify lessons at national and regional level that could inform the design and implementation for future regional initiatives and projects in support of the Nairobi Convention and LBSA Protocol. (Deadline: June 2011)

## 2 Introduction and Background

### 2.1 Overview of Project

17. The WIO-LaB Project brought together two initiatives developed respectively in response to a call from the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention in March 1997 and as a follow-up to the 2002 World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the related Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, which called for “advanced implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)”. The WIO-LaB Project was designed to serve as a demonstration project for the GPA.
18. The **long-term development objective** of the project, *Addressing land-based activities in the Western Indian Ocean* (WIO-LaB), is to contribute to the environmentally sustainable management and development of the WIO region by reducing land-based activities that harm rivers, estuaries and coastal waters and their biological resources.
19. The main **objectives** set out in the project document were to:
  - Reduce stress to the ecosystem by improving water and sediment quality;
  - Strengthen regional legal basis for preventing land-based sources of pollution, including through the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from land-based activities; and
  - Develop regional capacity and strengthen institutions for sustainable, less polluting development, including the implementation of the Nairobi Convention and its action plan as approved by participating countries.
20. The first of these objectives was revised during the first year of the project, as documented in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of June 2005, to read, ‘Improved information base and demonstrated guidelines and strategies for the reduction of stress to the ecosystem by improved water and sediment quality.’
21. **Outcomes** were not described in the project document but two outcomes were introduced in the M&E Plan.
  - A WIO region which is better equipped to ensure sustainable management of its marine and coastal environment by managing the impacts of Land Based Activities (LBAs) in terms of:
    - Commonly agreed and applied strategies and standards;
    - A well-designed and applied regional legal framework;
    - Adequate institutional capacity;
    - An adequate level of stakeholder involvement and awareness.
  - Actual reduction of stress from LBAs on the coastal and marine environment.

#### 2.1.1 Project Partners

22. The WIO-LaB Project was implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and executed by the UNOPS and the UNEP/Nairobi Convention Secretariat (NCS) within the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI).
23. The main financial partners were the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Government of Norway, contributing US\$ 4,511,140 and US\$ 3,395,650 respectively. Participating Countries were Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa and Tanzania. Although not officially part of the project, Somalia and France (La Réunion) participated in a number of key components, notably in the development of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBSA Protocol).

24. Project activities in the participating countries were coordinated by the host institutions of the National Focal Points (NFPs) for the Nairobi Convention.

### 2.1.2 Budget

25. The Project Document identified GEF financing for the Full Project of US\$ 4,186,140, with anticipated co-financing as follows:

UNEP (in kind)	US\$ 375,000
Governments (in cash & kind)	US\$ 3,131,675
Norway (in cash)	US\$ 3,395,650
Total co-financing	US\$ 6,902,325
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>US\$ 11,088,465</b>

26. The regional government contributions specified in the letters of co-financing annexed to the project proposal amounted to \$1,395,000. As will be seen later, the actual co-financing and leveraged funds received by the close of the project greatly exceeded the amount stated in the project document.

### 2.1.3 Project Status

27. While the project officially commenced in June 2004, activities did not get 'off the ground' until the beginning of 2005. The first meeting of the project Steering Committee was held in April 2005.
28. The project was intended to be implemented over a 4-year period but extended to five and a half years on the basis of two no-cost extensions, firstly to 31 December 2009 and secondly to 30 June 2010. The project closed on 30 June 2010.

## 2.2 The Evaluation

29. The evaluation took place between 24 May and 15 August 2010. The list of persons interviewed during the course of evaluation is provided in [Annex 1](#) and the itinerary and evaluation timeline is provided in [Annex 2](#).
30. Further details on the methodology and key questions are provided in [Section 2](#) and [Annex 3](#) (Evaluation Terms of Reference).



### **3 Scope, Objective and Methods**

#### **3.1 Scope of the Terminal Evaluation**

31. The purpose of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation provides an assessment of project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation focuses on the progress the project has made towards the achievement of its objectives.
32. [Annex 3](#) includes a more specific list of review criteria used for this evaluation.

#### **3.2 Approach and Methodology**

33. The findings of the evaluation were based on the following:
  - A desk review of project documents including but not limited to ([Annex 4](#)):
    - a. The project documents and monitoring and evaluation reports including progress and financial reports to UNEP, GEF annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports (up to 2009) and Report on the Mid-Term Review of the Project and relevant correspondence.
    - b. Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
    - c. Technical reports and outputs (including TDA & Strategic Action Programme (SAP), proposals and reports of the demonstration projects)
    - d. Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners including reports of training courses and technical meetings.
    - e. Relevant material published on the project web-site: [www.wiolab.org](http://www.wiolab.org)
  - Interviews with project management including the Project Manager and other staff of the Project Management Unit, UNOPS, and the UNEP GPA Coordination Office.
  - Interview with the UNEP / Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF) Project Task Manager.
  - Interviews with national focal points and/or other stakeholders in all participating countries (Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, and Tanzania).
  - Field visits to the nine demonstration projects and to two of the small grants projects (Kenya and Comoros) with emphasis on actual implementation of activities and realised outcomes.
  - Interviews and telephone interviews with other stakeholders involved with the project, including in the participating countries, NGOs, international bodies and representatives of donor agencies. An overview of stakeholders met during the evaluation is presented in [Annex 1](#).

## 4 Project Performance and Impact

### A. Attainment of objectives and planned results

#### *Effectiveness*

34. A project Performance Rubric to be used as an evaluation tool in the Terminal Evaluation was developed as part of the Mid-Term Review. The matrix with ratings and brief comments justifying each rating is attached as [Annex 5](#).
35. The more strategic issue of overall likelihood of impact achievement is discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs. The related 'Review of Outcomes to Impacts' (ROtI) method was used to establish the overall rating effectiveness rating provided in the conclusion.

#### *Identification of Impacts*

36. The intended impacts of the project can be identified based on project outcome 2 and the associated objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) in the project M&E framework (listed below). The first of these is the highest order outcome that in turn would lead to the global environmental benefit of improved ecosystem health. The second is an intermediate impact. The third and fourth impacts represent behavioural changes that would contribute to reduced pollution levels or directly to a reduction of stress to the ecosystem.
- Reduction of stress on coastal and marine ecosystems.
  - Reduction in levels of pollution in water and sediment;
  - Reduction in the amount of pollutants discharged to the coastal and marine environment;
  - Reduction in physical alteration and destruction of habitats related to land based activities (LBAs).

#### *Review of Project's Logical framework and outcomes to impacts pathways*

37. The original logical framework set out a simple but limited theory of change for the WIO-LaB project comprising a potentially synergistic package of 31 foundational and demonstration activities intended to catalyse longer term change. It included a list of 11 outputs. The outcomes defined in the WIO-LaB project M&E framework ([Box 1](#)) supplemented the rather weak project purpose that was set out in the original logical framework and strengthen the intervention logic. The M&E framework itself defines 23 outputs including establishment of the Project Management Unit (PMU).

#### **Box 1: WIO-LaB outcomes as defined in the January 2006 M&E matrix**

**Outcome 1:** A WIO region which is better equipped to ensure sustainable management of its marine and coastal environment by managing the impacts of LBAs in terms of:

- Commonly agreed and applied strategies and standards;
- A well-designed and applied regional legal framework;
- Adequate institutional capacity;
- An adequate level of stakeholder involvement and awareness.

**Outcome 2:** Actual reduction of stress from LBAs on the coastal and marine environment.

38. Outcome1 emphasises the foundational nature of the project and sums up the rationale for the various project strategies that are implicit in the objectives. Outcome 2 is more fundamental in nature and better describes the intended project impact. The WIO-LaB demonstration projects were designed both to achieve such impact at a local scale and to catalyse scaling-up to magnify the impact. The different elements of outcome 1 correspond well to GEF strategic

outcomes but are not very specific and are not measurable, with qualitative descriptors such as 'adequate' or 'well-designed'.

39. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to revise the original logical framework. However [Figure 1 in Annex 6](#) presents a generalised theory of change for the project with 'strategies' derived from the project objectives. The outcomes (based on the original outcome 1) have been modified to describe outcomes that may be reasonably expected to be achieved as a result of the project without a requirement for significant further investment. The need for further investment is treated as an assumption that needs to be met if the project outcomes are to lead to the desired intermediate states and impact.

#### *Overall likelihood of impact achievement*

40. Figure 2 in Annex 6 shows the results of the Review of Outcomes to Impact (RotI). The overall likelihood of impact achievement is rated as moderately likely. This rating is based on the following observations:
- The outcomes are foundational in nature and are designed to feed into a continuing process. There is a generalised allocation of responsibilities in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and Protocol on land based sources and activities (LBSA) (Rating B).
  - Measures designed to move toward intermediate states have started in a number of countries. However the assumption of adequate political and financial report, which in turn underpins institutional capacity, highlights a risk (Rating C).
  - The '+' rating on impacts reflects local delivery by demonstration projects. This was not taken into account in assigning the overall score since the systematic changes required for this impact to occur at scale have yet to be realised.

#### **Relevance**

41. Project implementation was based on the project document developed with reference to the GEF Programming Framework OP 10 (Contaminant based). The project conformed to the GEF objectives and priorities in two Operational Programmes (OPs) linked to the International Waters (IW) portfolio, namely 'OP 10: Contaminant based', that set out to demonstrate ways of overcoming barriers to the adoption of best practices that limits contamination of the International Waters environment, including with reference to land based activities, and 'OP 9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area', that focuses on integrated approaches to the use of better land and water resource management practices on an area-wide basis.
42. The project as implemented has remained relevant to these programme objectives and specifically has demonstrated strategies for addressing land-based activities that degrade marine waters at local to regional scales in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO). In addition to its demonstration role, the project has established the basis for further management of land based activities in the WIO region through development of the SAP and delivery of relevant policy in the LBSA Protocol to the Nairobi Convention. The catalytic nature of the project activities (See [Section C](#)) can be expected to contribute to a significant longer term contribution to the aims of the GEF International Waters portfolio.

#### **Efficiency**

##### *Cost-effectiveness*

43. The cost effectiveness of the WIO-LaB project has been enhanced by its building on existing knowledge and experience. Specifically the project built on and benefitted from the knowledge compiled and experience gained through the Africa Process and through UNEP GPA activities that had previously been developed in the WIO region in response to WSSD. In addition, implementation approaches including the structure of national and regional Task Forces and Working Groups were based on the success of similar approaches in other IW projects, such as the South China Seas Project.

44. The WIO-LaB project was designed to serve as a GPA demonstration project. Though it is difficult to make a direct comparison with other regions, costs are comparable to or lower than other GEF IW regional marine pollution projects such as those implemented in the East Asian Seas and South China Sea.
45. The relatively high transaction costs associated with the regional approach (notably in meeting costs) were offset by the advantages of WIO-LaB project being embedded in a regional policy process, by the desirability of a common approach, and by opportunities for sharing of expertise amongst countries.
46. At the administrative and governance level there were cost savings associated with the early strategic decision to merge the complementary GEF and Norway initiatives that were at the origin of this project. The two funding streams were managed by a single PMU and overseen by a single governance structure leading to economies of scope and scale, reduced transaction costs and streamlined administration. This source of efficiency was replicated at the national level and individual institutional level.
47. The project period was extended from four years to five and a half years on the basis of two no-cost extensions approved by the Steering Committee. This reflects the slow start of the project and also the significant extra funding raised during the course of the project that enabled additional activities to be undertaken. The consequent increase in PMU staff costs was met through earlier savings in staff time, notably in support to experts in the GPA coordination unit. Expenditure on personnel amounted to 18.4% of the combined GEF and Norway funding compared to 17.6% in the original 'core' budget ([Annex 7](#)).

#### *Cash and In Kind Cofinance*

48. The value of co-finance and leveraged contributions is summarized in [Annex 7](#). The total cash and in kind contributions to the project by countries and project partners amounted to US\$ 12,183,408, nearly double the target of US\$ 6,902,325 mentioned in the project document. With GEF project funding this brought the total budget for the implementation phase to US\$16,364,548.

#### *Incorporation of scientific and technical information and knowledge*

49. Incorporation of scientific and technical information and knowledge was central to the WIO-LaB project. The project was able to mobilise expertise available in scientific and technical institutions within all eight participating countries as well as internationally including through ongoing collaboration with the GPA. Notable international collaborations included the involvement of the International Atomic Energy Agency's *Marine Environmental Studies Laboratory* (IAEA-MESL) in assessing national capabilities for marine pollution monitoring and subsequent follow up training and support adapted to different institutions' needs. The project also mobilised international technical support from a private sector association, the *European Council for Vinyl Manufacturers*, as well as from international non-governmental organisations, such as the network of water supply companies and water boards in the Netherlands (*Aqua-4-All*), and universities in Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK.
50. Scientists and experts from regional universities and research institutions as well as government agencies were closely involved project activities including through involvement in regional and national task forces and working groups, preparation of the TDA and SAP and advisory roles to the demonstration projects. The project collaborated closely with WIOMSA, the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association, and facilitated creation of FARI, the Forum of Heads of Academic and Research Institutions in the WIO region. Regional centres of excellence such as the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in South Africa, the Constructed Wetlands group at the University of Dar es Salaam, the Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment (SAIEA) and the University of Eduardo Mondlane were engaged in compilation of regional assessments, formulation of guidelines, and provision of technical support to demonstration projects.

## **B. Sustainability**

51. While the project brief included only a limited discussion of sustainability and risk, the question of sustainability has taken on more prominence during implementation of the project. Ongoing concerns highlighted in the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) are economic constraints on national action and limited technical and managerial capacity at the country level. The project sustainability strategy developed in 2005 identified actions to be taken respectively by the project and by national governments to underpin sustainability of each of the project outputs and results. It identified strategies to address five 'pillars of sustainability' (legal, economic, governance, science and information and capacity development) to be addressed directly by the project.
52. The Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) analysis, as well as the project sustainability strategy, highlights the how the foundational and demonstration activities provide building blocks to secure longer term outcomes and impacts. The main vehicle for follow up of the project is the SAP, which itself identifies risks to implementation in the areas of cooperation and coordination, political will, capacity, financial resources and awareness.
53. Sustainability of the individual demonstration projects is considered in part F.

### ***Financial resources***

54. Comprehensively addressing land-based activities and sources affecting the marine environment in the WIO region is a major undertaking requiring substantial investment in infrastructure and in education and awareness programmes, and in this context the role of the WIO-LaB project was intended to be catalytic. The outcomes and eventual impact of the WIO-LaB project are highly dependent on continued financial investment and the SAP Implementation Plan acknowledges the need to mobilise resources at national, regional and international levels. The preamble to the decisions of the Sixth Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention further noted the increased workload associated with implementation of the SAP and the LBSA Protocol and consequent need for increased human and financial resources.
55. A full investigation of changes in national investment and investment planning was beyond the scope of this review but there is clear evidence of investment or mainstreaming of LBSA related actions at the country level. For example, in South Africa the national plan of action (NPA) on land based sources is being 'rolled out' at provincial level with West Cape Province already developing its own plan of action. Individual institutions have also engaged in or are championing follow through of specific project activities including ongoing monitoring at hotspots in Madagascar and Mauritius.
56. Nevertheless, project funding will remain important. At the regional and international levels several island states see scope to build on WIO-LaB activities through the forthcoming GEF project, "Implementing Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS". In the wider region there is strong interest in the development of a dedicated regional project to catalyse implementation of the SAP ('WIO-LaB 2'). At the national level, activities outlined in the Tanzanian NPA, which was the first to be completed, have been funded through the EU 'PUMPSEA' project on use of mangroves to remediate domestic sewage in peri-urban areas. The recently approved World Bank *Kenya Coastal Development Project* is expected to contribute to implementation of the national integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) strategy and related LBSA activities. There is a broad portfolio of ongoing work related to physical alteration and destruction of habitats (PADH), notably with the support of NGOs.
57. From the perspective of cost-cutting, the WIO-LaB project was able to demonstrate cost effective solutions to wastewater management that are suitable for replication and scaling up in the region, notably in the area of constructed wetlands.

## ***Socio-political***

58. Project implementation in some of the WIO countries was delayed by political change or unrest at national or local levels and affected to a lesser extent by organisation restructuring. This type of change or uncertainty may continue to disrupt the work of agencies or organisations involved in LBSA-related actions and consequently delay onward progress, but is not considered to represent a substantial threat to long-term project impacts at the regional scale.
59. The ownership of national focal point institutions involved in project implementation and their ability to champion LBSA issues is evident in the endorsement of the SAP and adoption of the LBSA Protocol (See *below*). Wider stakeholder engagement with LBSA issues was secured through the national coordination mechanisms and, where applicable, through processes to develop national plans of action (NPAs). In several cases the development of NPAs was integrated into broader-based environmental management or ICZM initiatives that had a higher profile and political support than LBSA alone may have been able to garner. Related national initiatives developed during the project period include Kenya's *Shoreline Management Plan* and Mauritius' updating of the national sewage master plan.
60. Nevertheless it remains uncertain whether the breadth of ownership required to secure the momentum of LBSA will be achieved in all participating countries in a context of competing priorities for government attention and funding (See also, *Stakeholder participation*, below). Similarly, the onus will be on the participating countries to maintain the profile of LBSA work within the work programme of the Convention where LBSA is just one element of the broad range of environmental protection and management issues falling within the remit of the Convention.
61. The training course on mainstreaming '*Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Environmental Management Issues in the National Planning and Budgetary Processes*' organised in collaboration with UNEP/GPA and attended by senior government officials from ministries and agencies responsible for planning, finance and environment was a response to concerns in this area.

## ***Institutional framework and governance***

62. The institutional framework and governance mechanisms established or employed by the project at regional and national level are favourable in terms of allowing for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained.
63. The WIO-LaB project was implemented under the umbrella of the Nairobi Convention and was a vehicle for delivery of part of the Convention's Programme of Work agreed by its Conference of Parties. This ensured the project was strongly embedded in the political and institutional framework of the Convention. The Nairobi Convention framework allowed the project to engage with France (La Réunion) and Somalia who took part as observers in later Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings. Somalia's regular participation from 2007 was welcomed in PSC meeting decisions as part of a wider concerted effort to assist Somalia to participate more actively in Nairobi Convention Activities.
64. The project itself helped to raise the profile of the Convention within the WIO region, including within the parent ministries of the national focal point institutions (NFPs) and amongst other ministries and agencies as well as with regional bodies such as the Indian Ocean Commission. The recent increase in member contributions to the Convention has been attributed to this visibility and associated recognition of the practical value and relevance of the Convention process.
65. A key result of the project and mechanism for follow up at the regional level is the *Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities* adopted in April 2010 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries to the Nairobi Convention, and signed by eight countries including six of the eight WIO-LaB

project partners. The Protocol includes provision *‘to develop and adopt procedures and mechanism to assess and promote compliance with and enforcement of this protocol.’*

66. National plans of action (NPAs) were prepared by Tanzania, South Africa, Seychelles, Kenya, Comoros and Madagascar either as stand-alone plans (Tanzania and South Africa) or integrated into wider coastal zone or environmental management strategies. Plans have been initiated in Mauritius and Mozambique.
67. There remain strong differences amongst the WIO countries in terms of capacity and technical know-how to implement measures foreseen by the LBSA Protocol, and the need for increased human resources was recognised when the Protocol was adopted. There is further potential to build on expertise-sharing initiated through the project which established and reinforced networks, identified centres of excellence and regional activity centres to support project activities at the regional level, and encouraged collaboration at laboratory level.

## **Environmental**

68. The project itself set out to address LBSA that represent threats to the health of marine and coastal ecosystems in the WIO region and has helped to establish and reinforce processes to prevent and control such threats. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidelines developed through the project have been used in a number of countries to reinforce their existing EIA practices.

## **C. Catalytic role and replication**

69. The WIO-LaB project combined foundational activities focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity development with demonstration activities focusing on capacity development, and technical and managerial innovation. It also helped to introduce a new strategic approach at national level in the form of NPAs.
70. The project highlighted the economic rationale for taking preventative action to limit negative impacts of LBSA on the marine and coastal environment. At the same time the project piloted a range of cost-effective solutions for reducing or preventing impacts through the demonstration projects.
71. The project largely worked within existing institutional structures of the Nairobi Convention and national inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms associated with ICZM or environmental management. At regional level it helped reinforce the institutional framework for implementation of the Nairobi Convention by providing a forum for practical engagement of the Convention's National Focal Points (NFPs) who also served as focal points for the project. At the national level the project breathed new life into inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms including where necessary through provision of financial support for operating costs.
72. The project contributed substantially to policy development at regional level through the LBSA Protocol and at national level through development of NPAs. It strengthened the building blocks for policy implementation including through by building capacity of institutions and individuals.
73. Follow-on funding by government and donors is discussed under financial sustainability. The adoption of the LBSA Protocol, endorsement of the SAP and development of NPAs have established a justification and rationale for mainstreaming of activities into government functions and for further project based investment.
74. The NFPs served as individual champions for the project and their ability to convene other actors and coordinate activities was central to progress at the national level. Further champions included senior staff in the national focal point institutions (NFPs) and project coordinators in the NFPs or partner organizations. A number of NFPs and other champions were reassigned during the course of the project, sometimes moving to strategic roles. In some

cases this was associated with loss of continuity and institutional memory particularly where the WIO-LaB project as a whole, or a demonstration project, had been strongly identified with an individual.

### *Replication*

75. Both foundational and demonstration aspects of the project are suitable for replication in other areas where a regional approach to LBSA is desirable. Replication of the individual demonstration projects and the potential for scaling up in the WIO region is considered in Part F.
76. The project has made some efforts to document its lessons and share experiences through IW:LEARN including through preparation of four 'International Waters Experience Notes'. The WIO-LaB Project Manager and other participants from the region have taken part in learning events and conferences organized by IW:LEARN and UNEP/GPA. Both these bodies and the networks established through the course of the project offer a medium for ongoing sharing of experience.

## **D. Country ownership / drivenness**

77. The project was developed in response to a call from of the Eastern African governments during the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention in March 1997. It specifically addressed priorities presented in the Work Programme for the Nairobi Convention, approved by the Contracting Parties in the Conference of the Parties held in Maputo, Mozambique, 5-7 December 2001.
78. The project was also a direct follow-on to the 2002 World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the related Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, which called for "advanced implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)" (Paragraph 32).
79. The project document was developed through a participatory process including development of a draft SAP. It built on the GEF-supported African Process for the Development and Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa, itself established to build on a long-running regional coastal management policy initiative, as well as ongoing GPA initiatives in the WIO region.
80. The growing level of country ownership during implementation is evidenced by the value of leveraged funds that led to a fourfold increase in the country cofinance achieved relative to the total amount specified in letters of endorsement, and by a significant increase in payments of national financial contributions to the Nairobi Convention Trust Fund. Trust fund contributions in 2010 stood at just over USD 200,000 as of March 26, compared to USD 113,000 for the reporting period 2004/05. While there were differences in the extent to which countries engaged with the project these appear to be more a reflection of capacity or perceived relevance of individual activities or project approaches (such as task forces) than of ownership.

## **E. Stakeholder participation / public awareness**

81. The WIO-LaB project document suggested that 25% of project funding would be dedicated to stakeholder engagement. Stakeholder engagement was distinguished as one of the 11 project components or groups of activities, bringing together three activities under Objective 3 (Activity 20. *Develop Regional/ National /Public-Private Partnerships on LB activities and sources*; Activity 21. *Identify, strengthen, and involve stakeholders in LBS issues in the Region; and Activity 22. Implement small-grants programme*). These are discussed further in Section F.



82. At the same time, stakeholder engagement was a cross-cutting project implementation approach running through all activities of the project. The resulting high level of stakeholder engagement was central to the effective delivery of the project. The following paragraphs highlight efforts undertaken through the project to engage a full range of stakeholders at the regional, national and local levels.

#### *Identification and Engagement of Stakeholders*

83. A comprehensive 'Stakeholder engagement plan' for the project was completed in January 2006. The plan sets out the rationale for stakeholder involvement and identifies different types of stakeholder (national government and governmental organizations, local government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community based organizations (CBOs), informational sector, private sector, local communities, marginal groups, regional and international partners) and a framework for their level of involvement at the local, national and regional levels for each of the 11 project components.
84. The main part of the plan identifies stakeholder institutions by project component, largely through liaison with the NFPs who were requested to nominate appropriate institutions and experts to be members of the various regional task forces and working groups established under the auspices of the project. Two groups of stakeholders for each of technical components 1-5 are identified, respectively *members of the regional working group or task force* (1. Water and Sediment quality, 2. Municipal Wastewater (MWW), 3. Physical Alteration & Destruction of Habitats (PADH), 4. Legal and Technical Review, and, 5. EIA) and *other stakeholders* whose engagement is linked to individual actions. Members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) as well as other stakeholders are identified under component 8 (Regional Coordination). For the remaining components, stakeholders are identified with methods for engagement linked to individual actions.
85. The plan concludes with National Stakeholder Involvement Plans, listing members of the National Coordination Committee (NCC) and five thematic task forces to be established at national level (Water and Sediment Quality, MWW, PADH, EIA, Legal and Technical) for six countries. Seychelles identified a distinct Water and Sediment Quality Task Force with other technical groups' membership the same as the NCC, while South Africa identified members of the Water and Sediment Quality Task Force with all other groups' membership to be confirmed.

#### *Regional Level Engagement*

86. At the regional level, the stakeholder engagement plan was largely implemented as anticipated. The project Steering Committee held its inaugural meeting in April 2004 and its seventh and final meeting in December 2009. The Steering Committee served as a governance and oversight body for the project and comprised the National Focal Points (NFPs), the executing and implementing agencies (Nairobi Convention Secretariat, UNOPS, UNEP/DGEF and UNEP/GPA), selected regional NGOs (WIOMSA, IUCN and WWF), and related International Waters projects (UNDP/GEF ASCLME project and WB/GEF South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) project).
87. Five regional task forces or working groups were established and provided guidance on related thematic component activities from 2005 onwards. Each group convened on a number of occasions and took a lead in compiling regional status reports. Individual members provided for liaison with the related national task forces. Regional Activity Centres were nominated and contracted to support the work of selected Task Forces.
88. Additional processes bringing together stakeholders at regional level during the course of the project included the SAP Drafting Team, the transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) Task Team, and, Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee. Two regional multi-stakeholder forums were convened during development of the SAP.

89. The project facilitated creation of FARI as a mechanism for coordination of research activities and for quality assurance of scientific work in the region. A sub-committee of FARI, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC), served as a review mechanism for technical outputs of the project, such as the TDA. The Forum is expected to continue under the auspices of WIOMSA and the Nairobi Convention. In addition informal 'international waters forums' were organised linked to the WIOMSA scientific symposia.
90. The project also supported strengthening of the newly established Consortium for Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the WIO (WIO-C), which is a partnership of regional and international NGOs operating in the WIO region and anchored in the Nairobi Convention. This enhanced appreciation of important role being played by NGOs in addressing land-based activities, particularly PADH, and more broadly in contributing to the implementation of the Nairobi Convention.
91. Although relatively costly to organise in terms of direct costs (airfares and accommodation) and demands placed on the PMU support staff and host institutions, meetings associated with regional level stakeholder engagement proved vital as a driving force for project activities at the national and regional level, for building regional cohesion, generating consensus on common methodologies, and ultimately, in paving the way for adoption of the SAP and LBSA Protocol.
92. One concern from the point of view of implementation of the SAP is that there was little comprehensive engagement of sectoral agencies other than environment agencies that characterise the NFPIs. Relatively few representatives of sectoral agencies responsible for agriculture, water resources /water supply and sanitation, standards, or infrastructure took part in regional level discussions and cross-sectoral engagement instead relied on national level processes. Similarly there was limited engagement of the extensive NGO community involved in water supply and sanitation.
93. Some stakeholders considered that the regional processes overemphasised involvement of experts based in research institutions and universities at the cost of involvement of managers and technical staff based in line agencies, thus favouring scientific and technical rigour over agency buy-in and experience. However, others welcomed the opportunity to strengthen links between research and policy and noted that many research institutions are themselves governmental organisations.

### *National Level Engagement*

94. Stakeholder engagement at the national level was the responsibility of NFPIs. National Coordination Committees (NCCs) – or inter-ministerial steering groups – were largely built on existing national coordination mechanisms such as the Nairobi Convention Steering Committee in Mauritius, the Committee overseeing the Environment Management Plan in Seychelles, the national sustainable development committees in Comoros and Mozambique, and national ICZM committees in Kenya, Tanzania, and Madagascar. One drawback in using existing structures from the perspective of stakeholder engagement was that membership was largely predefined and predominantly, if not entirely, comprised of government and governmental organisations. There was some variation in the extent to which NCCs represented the full range of sectoral interests relevant to LBSA.
95. NFPIs took a flexible approach to establishment of task forces, variously reflecting availability of alternative mechanisms, perceived administrative burden or need for formal mechanisms. For example, the NCC took the lead on most thematic activities in Seychelles and Mauritius where establishing a full set of task forces was seen as placing an unnecessary burden on relatively small government structures. Similarly, South Africa chose not to establish national task forces but instead to work with existing mechanisms including 'clusters' bringing together department heads in national and provincial governments (which had the added benefit of early engagement of provinces in LBSA issues).

### *Local Level Engagement*

96. With an explicit aim of the demonstration projects being to develop innovative managerial approaches to addressing impacts of land based activities, the nine demonstration projects and six small grants projects served as a vehicle for engagement of a wider range of stakeholders. Each of the demonstration projects prepared its own broad-based stakeholder engagement plan and most established appropriate governance structures such as a project steering group. In general, participation tended to decline as the projects progressed to a core group of stakeholders with a specific implementation role in or strong interest in the outcome of the project.
97. Private sector involvement in the WIO-LaB project, whether as a generator of land based sources of marine pollution or as a provider of solutions, was limited. However, the private sector was involved in a number of demonstration projects, notably in the constructed wetland projects in Mombasa and Pemba, where Dutch NGO *Agua4All* facilitated donations and assistance from ECVI, a trade association for European PVC plastic producers. In Mauritius private landowners are involved in the steering committee for the Black River Gorges project, and have provided seeds and contributed to pest control while in the small grant project NGO *Forever Blue* has strongly engaged tourism operators as well as private sponsors in its activities. A second small grant project in on coral diseases in Seychelles also enjoyed logistic support from the tourism sector. The erosion control project in Tanzania aimed to promote wider use of vetiver in erosion and runoff control through the private sector.

### *Effectiveness of Collaboration*

98. The immediate effectiveness of collaboration amongst project partners and institutions is evident in the products of the different task forces and working groups, and ultimately in the adoption of the SAP and LBSA Protocol.

### *Public Awareness Activities*

99. The project placed greater emphasis on stakeholder involvement than public participation and awareness and awareness raising materials reflect a focus on engaged stakeholders, practitioners, researchers and educators, or an informed public rather than the general public or media. These include:
- Outreach products and promotional materials including leaflets, brochures, posters and a seven issues of the project newsletter (*'Insight'*, in English and French) that were widely disseminated through actors engaged in the project;
  - A regularly updated project website that will remain accessible over the coming years;
  - Four 'International Waters Experience Notes' drawing together lessons from the project and posted on the IW Learn Website;
  - An educational film and intended for the general public, *'Rivers of Life, Oceans of Plenty'* produced together with the ASCLME project;
  - The clearing house mechanism providing online access to a wide range of data and information on the coastal and marine environment of the WIO region.
100. WIO-LaB's demonstration and small grants programme (SGP) projects provided a vehicle for wider stakeholder engagement and many were directly involved in awareness raising activities.
- The projects provided a focus for engaging decision makers, politicians and press and TV media including through events such as world environment day celebrations. In some cases the high visibility of the demonstration project bordered on being counterproductive in skewing the perception of the overall project but in most cases the opportunity for project actors and NFPIs to showcase project interventions has helped to profile the wider range of issues associated with LBSA.
  - Community-based projects such as those in Mozambique, Madagascar and Comoros and the SGP project in Kenya worked with a wide range of stakeholders to generate awareness and action on issues related to PADH or waste management while contributing to improved livelihoods, amenities or sanitation;

- Many of the infrastructure oriented projects are only now being completed and several projects delayed awareness-related activities until they could demonstrate tangible results. Earlier implementation of the projects could have enhanced their visibility as well as potential to share lessons and encourage replication during the lifetime of the WIO-LaB project.
101. Specific environmental education activities were contracted through NGOs based on a wider call for proposals facilitated through WIO-C. The principal outputs were an updated schoolteachers' guide to environmental education that is being finalised and pilot environment education activities undertaken in Mozambique and Kenya.
  102. A first draft of a communications strategy was produced in 2009 in response to a recommendation of the mid-term review (MTR). The strategy was directed more broadly at the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and included guidance for rolling out messages related to management of LBSA and lessons from WIO-LaB.

## **F. Achievement of outputs and activities**

103. The overall WIO-LaB programme of work was well-designed with a set of complementary and often interdependent activities. [Annex 8](#) summarises the status of the 24 major activities that were scheduled in the project workplan as well as one unscheduled activity. It includes a summary of key results or deliverables for each of the activities. The findings in this table are derived from project reports including annual and half-year reports and Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) as well as from discussions with project stakeholders.
104. The implementation of project activities was organised by thematic 'work packages' that typically incorporated activities from two or more project objectives. The more technical work packages were guided by thematic task forces or working groups which in many countries were echoed at the national level thus broadening the consultative processes. The following paragraphs consider the achievement of outputs and activities by component or work package with reference to the activity number in [Annex 8](#). It has not been possible review the many technical outputs or all of the workshop reports of the project in view of time limitations.

### *Project components*

#### *1. Water and sediment quality*

105. Water and sediment quality was one of the largest work packages encompassing an interrelated set of activities (1 to 6) under objective 1 of the project. The work was coordinated and implemented through a regional working group with representatives from designated lead institutions and NFPIs in all eight countries and with technical assistance from the IAEA MESL and CSIR. The work under these activities resulted in a large number of outputs including a regional synthesis report on the status of marine pollution in the WIO, guidelines for the establishment of environmental quality objective and targets, and agreement on a long term monitoring protocol that countries have undertaken to domesticate as one of their responsibilities under the LBSA Protocol.
106. A strategic decision was taken at an early stage to have the monitoring work envisaged under this component undertaken by national institutions rather than by the MESL as envisaged in the project proposal. The logistical costs of monitoring from a central facility in countries with extended coastlines and provision of equipment and supplies on the basis of individual laboratory assessments led to a substantial increase in expenditure in this activity. This was justified as a deliberate investment in building regional capacity through experience. The project and MESL had to tune their support to be relevant and useful in all participating countries in a context of wide variation in laboratory capabilities and individual skills. It accomplished this to a large degree by running training sessions tailored to individual needs and by encouraging collaboration amongst countries.

107. All eight countries undertook to develop monitoring reports based on identified hotspots. There were some shortcomings, notably in Mozambique which was unable to complete the monitoring programme and South Africa that used secondary data. Comoros was unable to undertake some analyses in its national laboratory but received support from Madagascar. Comoros and Madagascar, who did not participate in the African Process, undertook an additional activity to identify hotspots based on the African Process methodology. Laboratories in several countries are committed to continue this work though some expressed concern over longer term costs.
108. MESL facilitated two sets of laboratory proficiency testing based on provision of standard testing samples. This effort was appreciated and several laboratory interviewees noted that they intended to continue to participate with this MESL programme and to proceed to seek higher level certification for their laboratories. Some interviewees commented on the lengthy period to receive results of the proficiency tests.

## *II. Municipal wastewater management (MWW)*

109. This component was represented by activity 8 that had two parts, namely a review of the applicability of the GPA guidelines on applicability on municipal wastewater management and implementation of MWW demonstration projects that are discussed below.
110. Work under this component was coordinated through a regional Task Force on MWW Management with participation from all eight countries. The review of GPA guidelines was undertaken in a comprehensive manner through national and regional assessments of the existing status of MWW Management in relation to the principles in the GPA Guidelines. These assessments serve as a useful baseline and basis for identification and prioritisation of interventions related to policy, infrastructure and practice.

## *III. Physical Alteration and Destruction of Habitats (PADH)*

111. The main activity under this heading was implementation of PADH demonstration projects. This was identified in the project proposal as a discrete activity (ii), but was in practice merged with activity 7 (see *demonstration projects* below).
112. Work under this component was coordinated through a regional Task Force on PADH with participation from all eight countries. The task force reviewed the status of PADH in the region building on an earlier UNEP/GPA and WIOMSA study (published in 2004) and PADH is addressed in detail in the TDA. 'Protecting, restoring and managing coastal habitats' is one of four strategic components in the SAP.

## *IV. Strengthening regional legal frameworks*

113. This component encompassed three activities under objective 3 of the project: 9, to review gaps in national legislation; 10, to review the status of ratification of conventions, and 13, to develop and adopt a protocol to the Nairobi Convention. The work was coordinated through the Legal Review Task Force, comprising government representatives from all participating eight participating countries and France as well as academic legal experts.
114. Participating countries undertook reviews of their national legislative and regulatory frameworks and assessed the status of ratification of conventions. Both documents have proven useful as reference materials at the national level.
115. A major activity of the Task Force was to prepare and negotiate the text of the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities that was finalised in Mombasa in December 2009, and to negotiate updating of the Nairobi Convention. This process took longer than originally anticipated with extended discussions in Cape Town in late-2008 and Mombasa in mid-2009. Nevertheless, participants appreciated the highly consultative nature of the process on

development of the Protocol and associated training sessions and have indicated that this should be seen as a model for further development of the Convention.

116. The formal adoption of the protocol and revised Convention in April 2010 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries is an important landmark in the history of the Convention and highlights the complementarity of the WIO-LaB project and Convention process. The Protocol itself was signed by eight parties to the Convention with follow up underway in the remaining two countries.

#### *V. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)*

117. Regional EIA guidelines (Activity 11) were compiled by the Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment (SAIEA) based on extensive regional consultation and with support and input from the Regional Task Force on Environmental Assessment that brought together representatives from institutions in all eight countries. The guidelines are clear, comprehensive and have been published in English and French. A secondary activity was a regional assessment of policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks related to EIA.
118. While all of the WIO countries had EIA processes in place, the Guidelines are expected to inform further development of these processes and have already been used by Kenya in updating their national guidelines. Importantly in this respect, the guidelines introduce strategic environmental assessment that is not yet widely practiced in the WIO region.

#### *VI. National Programmes of Action (NPA)*

119. Two countries developed stand-alone national plans of action on LBSA, namely Tanzania, which had started the process prior to WIO-LaB and South Africa that developed its plan largely outside the framework of WIO-LaB (and without financial support) but which drew on expertise and activities of from South African institutions closely involved with the WIO-LaB project. Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, and Seychelles integrated the NPA process with their wider ICZM or environmental planning processes and there is a clear identification of LBSA activities within these planning frameworks; an approach that is compatible with the GPA and anticipated in the Washington Declaration. The work in Madagascar and Comoros benefitted from the additional support of the Indian Ocean Commission's 'ReCoMaP' project. In addition all eight countries developed a 'National Framework for SAP Implementation' that identifies the roles of different national institutions in SAP implementation.
120. Work on national plans of action (sometimes referred to in project reporting as 'national action plans') under the WIO-LaB project was slow to get started and it was suggested this was due to misunderstanding of the nature of an NPA. Some NFPs reportedly expressed discomfort with the term 'national plan' that seemed to go beyond the mandate of the NFPIs or profile of LBSA issues. The pragmatic decision to integrate LBSA actions into wider ICZM and environmental planning, in line with the GPA's pragmatic approach, resolved this concern.

#### *VII. Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management (ICARM)*

121. The original ICARM activity (14) envisaged engagement with the Incomati tripartite committee involving Swaziland, South Africa and Mozambique and concerned with management of the transboundary basin and was more akin to a demonstration project than a strategic consideration of ICARM as a tool for addressing LBSA. The activity was reoriented following failure to engage the committee in practical activities and instead an environmental profile of the Mozambican part of the basin was developed by an interdisciplinary team.
122. The project separately supported an assessment of hydrological and land use characteristics affecting river-coast interactions in the West Indian Ocean region that was incorporated into the TDA. Management of river flows was identified as one of four strategic components in the SAP.

## VIII. Regional coordination

123. The regional coordination component included establishment and running of the PMU (activity 16) as well as the more outward looking activities 15, to establish an IW coordination mechanism; 17, to support the Regional Coordination Unit and strengthen the NCS as a Regional Seas Coordination Unit; and 24, to develop an East-African node of the GPA Clearing House Mechanism. The substantial budget associated with this component (26.1% of the operating budget) largely reflects the PMU running costs.
124. The project undertook a number of activities towards establishment of the regional international waters coordination mechanism (Activity 15) including participation of representatives of other WIO IW projects on its steering group and organisation of events such as the October 2009 WIO International Waters Forum during the Global GEF International Waters Conference held in Cairns, Australia, in October 2009 and an IW session at WIOMSA symposiums. The PMU worked very closely with the Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems (ASCLME) Project and the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) and co-organised a joint Steering Committee meeting in March 2009 (Seychelles) and regional Stocktaking meeting in March 2010, during the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention. The project also collaborated effectively with the IOC's ReCoMaP project that involves five of the same countries.
125. There were no direct efforts to support the Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) of the Nairobi Conventions (Activity 17). Direct efforts to increase capacity of the NCS, as envisaged in the project document, included support to an additional staff member from 2008. In addition there were cost-savings associated with joint meetings with the NCS. The project has helped strengthen the Convention indirectly by raising its profile in participating countries and amongst other organisations. (See also *Sustainability* above).
126. The development of the Nairobi Convention Clearinghouse Mechanism (CHM) (Activity 24) benefitted from cofinancing from the Belgian government and from the technical support of UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment that installed equipment and software and provided dedicated in country training and ongoing support to each of the national institutions identified to host a national node of the CHM. The CHM has been launched at the regional level and national launches are being rolled out during 2010. A considerable volume of metadata has already been onto the national nodes and it is anticipated that the launches will further profile the facility. The CHM is intended to be maintained by through the Nairobi Convention work programme and is supported at country level. However there are concerns about sustainability as equipment has a limited lifespan and at least one host institution expressed concern about personnel costs.

## IX. Training and education

127. This component covered activities 18, to determine and satisfy training needs, and 19, to develop educational programmes on LBSA. A training needs assessment was published in 2007. The project meantime placed considerable emphasis on training at the national and regional level with some 15 short courses organised in total in partnership with UNEP/GPA, MESL and UNESCO IOC amongst others. The identification of courses was linked to needs identified through other project activities. It was not possible within available project resources to comprehensively address the more systematic needs identified in the assessment.
128. The training courses were appreciated by participants and positive feedback in course evaluations indicates that they met a real need and in most cases targeted appropriate participants. Efforts were made to meet individual needs during the courses. However training in more advanced monitoring techniques did not always reflect available facilities or logistic realities of operating in the WIO countries. The stakeholders met during the course of the evaluation found training beneficial but emphasised that some areas could have been treated in greater depth, notably as regards treaty negotiation skills where just one session was organised.

129. An education needs assessment was undertaken in 2007. LBSA-related education activities were undertaken by regional NGOs based on a limited call for proposals through WIO-C (See *public awareness activities* above). Informal environmental education activities were carried out as part of several demonstration and small grants programme (SGP) projects. As above it was not possible to meet the more systematic needs identified in the assessment.

#### *X. Stakeholder involvement*

130. Stakeholder involvement as a cross-cutting project approach has been discussed in section E and received significant attention. The three specific activities under this component (20, to develop private public partnerships; 21, to identify and strengthen stakeholder participation; and 22, to implement a small grants programme) were more limited in scope with the main outputs being the stakeholder engagement plan discussed above and the small grants projects. Public-private sector collaboration was established in some of the demonstration and small grants projects.
131. Small grants were provided to six projects in five countries, serving as cofinancing and leverage for UNDP small grants and other funding support to community level projects in Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, and Mauritius, and as sole support to two smaller field-study projects in Seychelles (which at the time was not participating in the UNDP small grants programme). The relatively small amounts of funding (US\$ 7,500 to US\$ 29,000) have been cost-effective and produced tangible and quality results. The larger projects have served to engage communities and other stakeholders in a range of activities including building of a research and educational centre and developing a coastal plan serving 12 villages in Comoros, mangrove restoration and construction of sanitation facilities in Kenya, mangrove restoration in Madagascar, and marine environmental education in Mauritius. The smaller projects in Seychelles produced management relevant research reports.
132. Based on a recommendation of the MTR, the PMU transferred the administration of the small grant programme to the UNDP small grants programme but maintained its own system of applications and approvals. Working with this framework proved less straightforward than anticipated. The applications process was closed in August 2008 and the budget line for this activity was not fully allocated.

#### *XI. Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Programme (SAP)*

133. The *Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme for Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities* are major outputs of the project (Activity 23). Published in 2009, the 350 page TDA is the culmination of over three years work undertaken by the national and regional working groups and task forces and by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee established to guide TDA development under the auspices of FARI. The TDA covers the eight project countries as well as Somalia and was developed through a participatory process involving over 500 experts and stakeholders in governmental and non-governmental organisations. The TDA formed the basis for formulation of the SAP.
134. The SAP built on the TDA process and on the inputs provided through *two regional stakeholder workshops in November 2009 and June 2009*. Published in 2009, the SAP document provides an overview of the TDA and sets out a strategic action programme based around four components (coastal habitats, water quality, river flows and governance and awareness). It includes an implementation plan and a series of detailed annexes including a prioritisation of SAP targets and country by country framework for national SAP implementation. The SAP was adopted by the Sixth Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention in April 2006. The high quality of the TDA and SAP is reflected in their being used as examples of best practice within the UNEP/GEF IW portfolio and being recommended as good portfolio-wide examples GEF Secretariat.



### *Other Activities*

135. Eight national assessments of marine litter and a regional synthesis were taken undertaken as an additional project activity (lj). Results of the assessments were incorporated into the TDA and litter is identified as a priority substance in the LBSA protocol. Three of the demonstration projects addressed solid waste disposal issues designed to reduce marine litter from land-based sources in municipal and coastal village settings.

### *Demonstration projects*

136. Nine demonstration projects were implemented in seven of the participating countries (Activity 7). These together address a range of LBSA issues with a focus on municipal waste water treatment and PADH. Sub-contracts for the demonstration projects amounted to US\$ 1,237,479 (based on budget revision 4 of December 2009), 46% more than had originally been envisaged, and representing just over 16% of the project core (GEF and Norway) funding. In addition, most of the country co-finance contributions and a substantial part of partner contributions were tied to the demonstration projects.
137. The demonstration projects in Tanzania were pre-identified and fast-tracked based on preparatory GPA activities. The remaining shortlisted projects were subject to a rigorous multi-stage selection process including a funded 'final design' phase. Some projects struggled to complete this process in the face of uncertain funding and were provided with technical assistance to meet the stringent selection requirements. While on the plus side this process served as a feasibility study for each project, there were repercussions on the overall timing of the WIO-LaB project and several projects were forced to seek additional funding or cut back activities as a result of the falling dollar value during the preparation phase.
138. Each of the demonstration projects will be subject to its own terminal evaluation and an overview of the projects has been compiled as a complementary activity to this evaluation. The focus of this evaluation has therefore been on the demonstration value of the projects, and specifically their sustainability, innovation and replication or replicability. [Annex 8](#) lists the ten approved projects with comments on each of these aspects. A few more general remarks follow.
139. The demonstration projects were intended to demonstrate innovative technical or managerial solutions to LBA and each one of them has shown value in this area regardless of the extent to which it was able to meet its specific objectives. Amongst the technical innovations are habitat restoration techniques tested in the ecologically sensitive coastal hinterland in southern Madagascar and Black River Gorges National Park in Mauritius, and a vetiver-based containment of the dump site in Dar es Salaam. Management innovations relate to the engagement of stakeholders including NGOs, community based organisations, universities, and the private sector. For example, the community based project in Itsamia on Mohéli brought a proactive habitat restoration dimension to community ecotourism.
140. Similarly, all of the projects have elements that are suitable for replication and scaling up. Amongst these, constructed wetlands stand out as a low cost and flexible system for water treatment that has proven applicable in relatively controlled and high density institutional settings such as the prison in Shimo La Tewa, Mombasa, in established urban settings such as the town of Chake Chake on Pemba Island, and in a small scale housing development in Seychelles where other treatment systems have failed as a result of geological characteristics. The Port Louis Waste management system developed in accordance with ISO 14001 has set a new standard for ports management in Mauritius that could be widely replicated in the region.
141. Many of the projects proved a focus for high profile events and visibility actions that has boosted their potential for replication. For example, the demonstration project around Lumbo was the first well-publicised attempt to plant mangroves in Mozambique and the approach is now being widely replicated in other parts of the country.

142. The project generated some lessons relating to the importance of stakeholder engagement in securing sustainability. For example, two years was not long enough to establish sustainability in community based projects while in the infrastructure projects roles and responsibilities for operations and maintenance often needed to be redefined and were often subject to ongoing negotiation. A tenth project was abandoned after the preparation phase following a breakdown in relationships amongst the project partners.

#### *General remarks*

143. The activities and outputs of the project were complementary and often synergistic. Most can be regarded as both relevant and necessary for project outcomes with just one activity (ICARM) standing out as somewhat redundant in the original project design. Despite this, management of river flows was identified as one of four strategic components in the SAP and the ICARM approach can be expected to play a prominent role in SAP implementation especially in the mainland countries.
144. As discussed in Section A, the majority of activities and associated outputs were oriented towards achievement of outcome 1 and their outputs together establish a foundation for longer term achievement of this outcome and ultimately of outcome 2. Project activities were not alone sufficient to achieve outcome 1, particularly as regards application of the legal framework and achieving 'adequate' institutional capacity and stakeholder involvement. The demonstration projects have contributed, and will continue to contribute, directly to outcome 2 at the local scale but activities of the project alone were not alone sufficient to achieve the outcome 2 at large scales. The slightly modified outcomes in the RoTI analysis reflect a more realistic set of outcomes.
145. Implementation of many activities took longer than expected, and this is reflected in substantial under-expenditure of annual budgets during the first years of the project (35% in 2005, 48.6% in 2006, 42.5% in 2007). NFPs reported that delays were largely attributable to limited institutional capacity or disruption of work at the national level. Delays in preparation of the demonstration projects accounted for a substantial amount of the under-expenditure from 2006. In addition the sequential nature of many activities and reliance on delivery by all countries to complete some outputs (such as regional assessments that in turn fed into the TDA and SAP) meant the progress in some components was constrained by the weakest link. By 30 December 2008 the project expenditure had reached 73% of the available budget.
146. A number of outstanding activities were handed over to the NCS at the close of the project, including supervision of the ongoing demonstration and small grants projects, demonstration project evaluations, and activities being undertaken by partners such as development of a teachers' guide. Outstanding issues related to project governance arrangements and the monitoring programme are raised in recommendations.

### **G. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems**

#### *M&E Design*

147. A project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan was developed in June 2005. The Plan set out arrangements for monitoring of the implementation of project activities and evaluation of the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of activities. It defined roles and responsibilities for monitoring amongst the project partners (UNEP/DGEF, WIO-LaB PMU, UNOPS, Nairobi Convention Secretariat, UNEP/GPA, Project Steering Committee and Governments). The arrangements reflect the dual reporting and accountability for the GEF and Norway funded components of the project.
148. The M&E plan includes a revised project Logical Framework Matrix with specific, measurable and time-bound 'objectively verifiable indicators' (OVIs) at objective level. It details 23 project outputs or deliverables with a timeline for each based on the project workplan. At the same time it acknowledges that the workplan may be subject to change during the course of the project.

149. Baseline information provided in the project document was limited to a global figure on 'associated financing'. The revised logical framework matrix includes a baseline in terms of current status for each of the OVIs. In addition, revised objective 1 placed emphasis on developing an improved information base that serves as a baseline for project Outcome 2 (reduction of stress from LBAs on the coastal and marine environment). The results are detailed in project outputs including the various thematic reports and in the TDA. In addition national 'State of the Coast' reports were produced during the project period as a wider Nairobi Convention activity. The project also placed considerable emphasis on building water quality monitoring capability providing skills training, equipment, supplies and standards at the national level.
150. A performance rubric defining a ratings scale (or series of performance indicators) for each of the OVIs was developed as part of the project Mid-Term Review (MTR), to be used as a tool for the Terminal Evaluation. The performance indicators were subsequently adopted with certain revisions as set out in the management response to the MTR and approved by the Project Steering Committee. The performance indicators address both outputs and outcome 1, are relevant and are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) at objective level (with time-bound generally referring to the project duration). The management response reflected the fact that some of the indicators proposed went beyond measures anticipated in the original project proposal.

#### *M&E Implementation*

151. Project reporting was conducted in a thorough and timely manner according to the M&E Plan, including half-yearly progress reports, annual project reports quarterly expenditure reports and annual co-financing reports. Progress reporting was based on the project logical framework. The Project Mid-Term Review was conducted in April 2007 and its findings, together with the management response, were considered by the Tripartite Review Meeting of November 2007, held in conjunction with the 4<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting. An advanced draft of the project Terminal Report due by 30 September 2010 was made available to the evaluator during the Terminal Evaluation.
152. Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports were completed on an annual basis. While the mid-term review reported that earlier PIRs were incomplete, the reports examined from 2007 onwards were thorough and provided a candid and fair account of project progress with justified ratings. Specific actions were identified, implemented and tracked for any areas where progress was considered less than satisfactory during the reporting year. The PIRs include a frank assessment of risks that could affect achievement of the project objectives, building on the original assessment of risk in the project document, and plans to mitigate these risks.
153. Mid-term reviews were undertaken by the WIO-LaB PMU technical staff for six of the nine demonstration projects during the period March 2008 to December 2009. The reviews are detailed, informative, timely with respect to the progress of the individual projects, and provided a useful basis for discussion amongst project stakeholders. Three mid-term reviews were omitted in view of the advanced stage or straightforward nature of the projects concerned. Terminal evaluations of all the demonstration projects by independent evaluators were undertaken or initiated in May to June 2009 but were not available during the course of this evaluation.
154. The Project Steering Committee used the annual reports to inform its discussions on and approval of annual workplans and budgets developed by the PMU in response to changing needs with clear evidence of an adaptive management approach. In addition the PMU developed a considered response to the recommendations arising from the MTR and this is reflected in number of revisions to the project workplan and implementation approach that were approved by the PSC and are discussed elsewhere in this report. Separate annual UNEP-Norway Review Meetings were held together with the UNEP Division of Policy Implementation (UNEP/DEPI) and UNEP/GPA.

155. There were some delays in technical and financial reporting by the NFPIs or demonstration projects. These were sometimes a result of external factors such as political upheaval but largely a result of limited organisational capacity.

#### *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities*

156. Expenditure on M&E exceeded the modest budget allocation (of under 0.005% of the total project budget covering the final evaluation and tripartite review) by more than twofold. With this adjustment, the global funding level available for M&E can be considered sufficient in view of the nature of the project and the fact that M&E costs were also built into relevant activities.
157. The final contractual payments for the demonstration projects were in part contingent on receipt of their terminal evaluations. For some partners this proved challenging in terms of cash flow, either because they lacked sufficient reserve funds to pay for the evaluation or because their internal accounting systems did not allow for funds to be advanced from other budget lines. Allocated funding proved insufficient in just one of the projects.

### **H. Preparation and readiness**

158. The WIO-LaB project document built on both the African Process and UNEP/GPA engagement with a number of participating countries. The project document together with a preliminary TDA and SAP was facilitated through a GEF Project Development Facility Block-B (PDF-B) grant. A detailed Plan of Implementation was developed in April 2004 and incorporated the results of a regional meeting on 'Addressing Land-based Activities in the West Indian Ocean' organised in December 2003. The project document does not expressly refer to experience gained in other regions but instead situates the project in well-grounded regional and international policy processes and decisions including the WWSD Plan of Action. It reflects the experience of its extended development phase.
159. Building on the Plan of Implementation, the project document included a detailed and logical description of project objectives and components with identification of relevant lead agencies and stakeholders. However its description of delivery of work through '*a series of national consultants and national organization including education, research, governmental, NGO and so on*' was rather vague and the Project Steering Committee and PMU needed to define delivery mechanisms and clarify expectations during the inception phase particularly with respect to responsibilities at the national level. While project activities were largely implemented as planned, delays in project implementation and ultimately the need for project extensions can be traced to a failure in the project document to adequately consider and address capacity limitations in key institutions.
160. The Plan of Implementation stated that the NCS and UNOPS would jointly implement the project under the overall supervision of the UNEP-GPA Coordination Office. With reference to the two principal sources of project funding (GEF and Norway), the project document stated that UNOPS and the NCS would jointly execute the project under the overall supervision of the UNEP/GEF and UNEP/GPA Coordination Office. It anticipated establishment of a small project office within that Nairobi Convention Secretariat in Nairobi, comprising three staff to manage the day-to-day running of the project and with additional support provided by consultants (through the NCS) and by GPA. The project document stated that the project would cover related personnel costs staff in UNOPS, the 'project office' (subsequently called the PMU), and the GPA Coordination Office. The budget included personnel costs for staffing the project management office as well as GPA coordination and specialist staff. Provision for UNOPS administrative support was covered by an overhead in line with the prevailing UNEP-UNOPS MOU.
161. The partnership arrangement and related budget allocations were appropriate at the time the project document was completed, though the project document lacked details on roles and responsibilities related to management of the separate funding streams and dual reporting by the project office to UNOPS and the NCS (instead referring confusingly to a gradual handover of responsibility from UNOPS to NCS). In practice there was an ongoing need to renegotiate roles

and responsibilities as a result variously of a decision not to have UNOPS administer the Norwegian project funding, the relocation and restructuring of the GPA, and a change in UNEP DGEF fiduciary standards related to supervision of projects. It also became necessary to draw a clear distinction between core business of the Nairobi Convention and project activities.

## **I. Implementation approach**

### *Implementation mechanisms*

162. The project document outlined a three-tiered institutional structure with governance, coordination and implementation roles but did not define institutional arrangements in detail. The actual implementation structure built on that described in the project document and overlaid this a structure of task forces and working groups that had been effective in coordination and driving implementation as well as engaging stakeholders in a similar project in the South China seas.
163. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) served as the overall governance body for the project. It comprised the National Focal Points (NFPs), the executing and implementing agencies (Nairobi Convention Secretariat, UNOPS, UNEP/DGEF and UNEP/GPA), selected regional NGOs (WIOMSA, IUCN and WWF), and related International Waters projects (UNDP/GEF ASCLME project and WB/GEF SWIOFP project). Representatives of France and Somalia were invited as observers.
164. Within the PSC the group of NFPs formed the overall coordination body for policy aspects of the project, reflecting their parallel role as focal points for the Nairobi Convention and the strong synergy between the project and Convention processes. The group or their delegates met regularly in the context of the project steering committee meetings, multi-stakeholder events, and at policy oriented meetings of the Legal Review Task Force. At a practical level this created a need to distinguish between project-related activities and the core business of the Convention in order to clarify funding expectations. Policy coordination at national level was through the inter-ministerial national coordination committees.
165. Technical coordination at the regional level was assured through establishment of task forces or working groups. While working groups were established as short term structures it was anticipated that the four regional task forces (municipal wastewater management (MWW), physical alteration and destruction of habitats (PADH), legal review and EIA) will be maintained under the Nairobi Convention. The task force and working group structure was echoed at the national level in most countries. Where NFPs preferred other structures the terms of reference for the NCCs were adjusted to reflect their additional tasks.
166. Implementation at the national level took place under the oversight of the NFPIs based on an agreed terms of reference. Specific activities at the national level including the demonstration projects were variously contracted through the NFPIs or directly through national organisations – both governmental and non-governmental. A number of NFPIs expressed a concern that this made this difficult for them to retain a strategic overview of the project activities in their country and to leverage these to full advantage (as visible actions of the project). Decisions regarding contracting were based on the level of technical and administrative support available to NFPs to manage the projects. In addition where focal points operated at a more political level, there was a perceived need to separate technical-level interventions from political-level decision making.
167. Implementation at the regional level was overseen by the PMU. The PMU favoured subcontracting to regional institutions over individuals in order to broaden ownership of the project activities and provide for continuation after the project closed. Identified centres of excellence were contracted to undertake tasks of a regional nature and to provide technical advice to the demonstration projects. Tasks were also assigned to WIOMSA and to the two newly established networks, FARI and WIO-C.

### *Project management and supervision*

168. Terms of reference for the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Project Management Unit (PMU) were adopted as amended by the first meeting of the Committee in April 2005.
169. The PSC served as the overall governance body for the WIO-LaB project and conducted its business through correspondence and (mainly) through regular meetings from inaugural meeting in April 2004 to its seventh and final meeting in December 2009. The regular business of the PSC was to review and assess the progress of the Programme and its projects and to discuss any constraints; to monitor and review co-financing; to review and approve the work plan; and, to comment on and (going beyond its terms of reference) approve the project budgets. The PSC also provided detailed feedback on outputs including the TDA and SAP and on policy development. The decisions and recommendations of each meeting were recorded and included as a distinct Annex or preamble to the meeting reports.
170. The meeting reports, decisions and recommendations of the PSC suggest that it was an effective mechanism for tracking progress of the project at all levels, encouraging commitment, and guiding delivery by the participating countries and PMU. It provided sound and timely advice on project outputs and on policy processes related to the Nairobi Convention and considered feedback on adaptive management measures proposed through the mid-term review and associated management response.
171. A small PMU was established with the Project Manager employed by UNOPS. Day to day management through the PMU was well-organised and national focal points reported that the project management was responsive, supportive, and flexible. Preparation of documentation such as workplans and quarterly, bi-annual and annual reports was timely. Meetings were well prepared and documentation and reports were distributed in an efficient manner. The PMU workload was considerable and the small permanent team of three persons was at times put under considerable pressure to meet its own exacting standards. That it was able to do this is to the credit of the team and its effective backstopping. (*See also sections on M&E and financial planning*).

### *Constraints*

172. A significant constraint to project implementation that was repeatedly raised in project reporting and PSC meetings has been the limited technical, financial and/or administrative capacity within the NFPIs. Many NFPIs volunteered that there were delays on their side in reporting or providing inputs to key outputs. The differences between the countries of the region in terms of institutional and socio-economic settings are reflected differences in institutional capabilities and in the level of support provided to NFPIs. While some NFPIs were able to dedicate personnel to the project, a number of NFPIs took on project coordination on top of their regular workloads and with very limited support. Although not envisaged in the project budget, limited support was provided to NFPIs in the later stages of the project facilitate their coordination tasks following a recommendation from the MTR and request at the 2007 PSC meeting.
173. The WIO-LaB project was implemented in a multi-lingual region with English being the main operating language of the project. While the PMU was able to operate in both English and French and simultaneous English-French interpretation was provided at more formal meetings, many of the technical and training events were conducted in English. This constrained participation from francophone and lusophone countries in terms of selection of participants and in some cases in terms of the level of participation. In addition the project had only a limited budget for translation of project documentation and technical reports reducing their immediate and future accessibility to working group members and to experts in francophone and lusophone countries. Extra funding was allocated to translation but this covered only selected documents.
174. The extended selection process for the demonstration projects was unpopular and some project proponents required external support to prepare a proposal that met the stringent criteria for approval. In retrospect, earlier implementation of the projects combined with ongoing technical supervision may have been valuable in allowing for lessons from the projects to be

taken on board during the lifetime of the WIO-LaB project. The delays had unforeseeable financial impacts in view of the decline in value of the US dollar against local currencies.

## **J. Financial planning**

175. The PMU developed a detailed activity-based annual budget reflecting the annual workplan and within the framework of the overall project budget. Workplans and associated annual budgets were approved by the Project Steering Committee. Expenditure was reported on through quarterly and annual expenditure reports. The PMU liaised closely with UNOPS and UNEP DEPI to maintain an overview of the status of project funding. There were four formal budget revisions, each approved by the executing agencies and Norway, the Project Steering Committee and the implementing agency. There was no specific project audit. Evidence and feedback suggest that the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
176. The GEF and Norway funds were associated with separate accounting, supervision and reporting systems run respectively through UNOPS and UNEP DEPI. There have been periodic reconciliations of financial records in view of the different systems used by UNOPS and UNEP, and no major discrepancies have emerged.
177. The separate financial reporting required on GEF and Norwegian funding placed an administrative burden on the PMU. At the same time, as noted above, there were significant savings in administrative costs associated with economies of scale and scope compared to running two separate projects. Recipients were not negatively affected by the parallel reporting systems except indirectly where this was associated with delays in approvals or disbursements (*see below*).
178. Approvals, disbursement and procurement through UNOPS were responsive and timely. UNEP DEPI approvals and decision making were somewhat slower and spanned several layers of authority. This did lead to delays in activities in the final stages of the project, notably regarding approvals of additional financing and transfer of funds to the demonstration projects.
179. Funding delays were also experienced as a result of banking procedures, notably in Comoros. Several NFPs noted that the UNDP Atlas system was an expedient means to transfer funds in a timely manner (for example, to enable advance payments associated with organisation and hosting of a regional event). Two organisations reported difficulty with cash flow towards the end of projects since a percentage of funding is withheld pending the terminal report. In the case of the governmental organisation this was a result of strict project-based accounting that prohibited movement of funds between project accounts; in the case of the NGO (*Grupo de Trabalho Ambiental*) this was exacerbated by uncertainty over a possible renewal of the project that prevented their submitting a final report.
180. The original budget and end of project variances anticipated as of 30 December 2009 and reflecting expenditure of over 90% of available GEF and Norway funding are shown in [Annex 9, Table 3](#).
181. Significant variances (taken to be over 50% on budget lines of over US\$ 50,000) include:
  - A 64% saving on equipment and premises, including a 98% saving on premises. These savings are not considered to have affected project performance.
  - A 54% saving on subcontracts with cooperating agencies, notably with the IAEA and GEF IW Projects coordination. This reflects the decision to contract the monitoring work to national institutions.
  - A 53% saving on consultants costs within the personnel component. This reflects the preference to contract out to institutions (e.g. academic and research institutions, WIOMSA, etc.) rather than individuals, in order to build capacity and ownership.
  - An increase of 157% in reporting costs due to the substantial number of technical reports published by the project and to translation of selected reports.



- In addition project personnel costs were saved in the earlier stages of the project but ultimately balanced out as a result of no-cost project extensions.
182. At the activity level major variances on individual budget lines compared to the original budget include unplanned expenditure on national level coordination and TDA/SAP development, a 46% increase in expenditure on the demonstration projects, a 72% saving on the ICARM component, and a more than tenfold increase in expenditure on monitoring water and sediment quality. Part of the latter increase was covered by reallocation of funds originally allocated under sub-contracts to IAEA. Delays between pre-selection and launch of the demonstration projects (after further development of proposals) meant project activities were affected both by inflation and the falling dollar value. The project was able to supplement funding in a few cases. In others partners stepped in with additional cofinance or projects were advised to scale back activities accordingly.
183. [Annex 9 Table 2](#) provides a more integrated view of available resources per component or work package based on the budget associated with the seventh revision of the workplan. Figures include anticipated direct expenditure on that module (travel, meetings, consultant, publications and so on). PMU costs are allocated to regional coordination. Table 1 below summarises the allocation of budget by component.

**Table 1. Budget allocation by thematic component (%)**

Water and sediment quality	9.5%
MWW	19.5%
PADH	12.0%
Legal	4.0%
EIA	2.1%
NPA	6.7%
ICARM	2.4%
Regional coordination	26.1%
Training and education	6.5%
Stakeholder involvement	6.8%
TDA and SAP	4.5%

*Source: Workplan Revision 7*

184. The total cash (grants) and in kind contributions to the project by countries and project partners amounted to US\$ 12,183,408, nearly double the target of US\$ 6,902,325 mentioned in the project brief. ([Annex 9, Table 1](#)). Cash contributions are fully documented. Documentation of in-kind contributions includes estimates provided by relevant partners and statements from participating countries.
185. Country contributions amounted to an estimated US\$ 5,587,149 compared to the original target of US\$ 3,131,675. The major project co-financer was the Government of Norway with total co-financing amounting to US\$ 3,608,339 that was directly managed by the PMU. Other important contributions (over US\$ 100,000) include:
- Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA): US\$ 593,000 for the organization of a regional training course in Good Governance in Marine Management.
  - The Belgium Government: US\$ 172,000 for the development of the regional Clearinghouse Mechanism.
  - The Netherlands NGO Aqua-4-All: US\$ 257,020 for demonstration projects in Mombasa and Pemba.
  - The European Council for Vinyl Manufacturers: US\$ 157,500 for the demonstration project in Pemba.



- The Indian Ocean Commission (IOC): US\$ 143,000 through cooperation on Coastal Zone Management Planning.
- IOC-UNESCO: US\$ 112,000 related to the joint organization of a series of leadership training workshops for high-level Government officials.

## **K. UNEP and UNOPS supervision and backstopping**

186. The WIO-LaB Project was implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and executed by UNOPS and the UNEP/Nairobi Convention Secretariat (NCS) within the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI). The PMU was hosted by the NCS while the Project Manager was employed through UNOPS. At the start of the project, the Project Manager had three reporting lines, through UNOPS, UNEP DGEF, and UNEP DEPI.
187. The role of DGEF changed during the course of the project in line with the GEF fiduciary standards that led to introduction of an institutional separation between UNEP GEF's implementing functions and the executing service offered by other UNEP Divisions. The Project Manager's reporting line was subsequently through UNEP DEPI together with UNOPS.
188. The DGEF task manager changed twice during the course of the project and it has not therefore been possible to look in any detail at the inception phase. Nevertheless this phase appears to have been well supported with staff recruited, a fully functional office place, and M&E system in place and project governance structures established and operational.
189. The DGEF Task manager provided for oversight and accountability as well as problem solving or trouble shooting. The DGEF Task Manager or a senior programme officer participated actively in key WIO-LaB management meetings including steering committee meetings, the Tripartite Review, annual review meetings with Norway, and multi-stakeholder events. In addition to formal reporting, regular informal meetings were held with the Project Manager and with the senior line manager in UNEP DEPI's Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch.
190. Annual project implementation reviews (PIRs) completed by DGEF accurately reflect project performance and are candid. The reports include in depth discussion of risks and an explicit discussion of adaptive management measures. The steadily improving progress ratings reflect the project's gaining momentum in its later years. DGEF maintained a strategic perspective on programme outcomes emphasising the foundational nature of activities (Outcome 1) and demonstration value (Outcome 2).
191. UNEP DEPI took responsibility for management of the Norwegian part of the project's core funding. Day to day management issues as well as financial approvals within UNEP were handled or channelled through the Nairobi Convention Secretariat, reporting in turn through DEPI's Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch. While approvals processes were lengthier than those of UNOPS, engagement of the Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch provided for quality assurance during the course of the project.
192. UNEP/NCS's hosting of the project facilitated strong synergies between the project and the Convention with the project being integrated into the work programme of the Convention. From the perspective of accountability it was sometimes necessary for managers to step back and clarify the extent to which the project could support the Convention's regular programme of work particularly where there was a shared policy interest in a particular activity such as a meeting.
193. UNEP GPA, situated within UNEP DEPI, provided ongoing and consistent technical backstopping to the project as anticipated in the project document, despite relocation and substantial changes in its staffing in the early stages of the project. A senior GPA Programme Officer participated actively in key WIO-LaB management and technical meetings as well as in specific project activities such as the co-organised '*Mainstreaming*' workshop.
194. UNOPS took responsibility for management of the GEF part of the project's core funding and administrative staff worked closely with the Project Manager throughout the course of the

project. While UNOPS financial approval processes were streamlined compared to those UNEP, UNOPS did not provide for technical supervision or backstopping of the Project Manager. This arrangement worked quite satisfactorily in the case of WIO-LaB in view of the strong project team and wider support within the UNEP.

## 5 Conclusions and Rating

195. The WIO-LaB project concluded on 30 June 2010. During the five and half years that it was active, the project has supported a wide range of foundational and demonstration activities towards achieving its long term development objective, to contribute to the environmentally sustainable management and development of the WIO region by reducing land-based activities that harm rivers, estuaries and coastal waters and their biological resources.
196. The overall rating for this project based on the evaluation findings is **Satisfactory**. The ratings in the following table reflect consideration of the full set of issues affecting or characterising project performance and impact that are discussed in Part 3. Summary comments highlight aspects of the assessment that best illustrate the rationale for the rating given.

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		S
A. 1. Effectiveness - overall likelihood of impact achievement (ROtl rating)	According to the RoTI, the overall likelihood of impact achievement is rated as 'moderately likely'. The satisfactory score in this section reflects the strong foundational nature of the project outcomes.	S
A. 2. Relevance	The project was relevant to GEF IW OPs 9 &10 as well as wider international and regional policy processes and represents a significant contribution to the wider GEF Portfolio.	S/HS
A. 3. Efficiency	Cost effectiveness was enhanced by the project's building on scientific and technical information and knowledge, and cost savings relative to the original two project concepts. The project generated more than double the anticipated co-financing.	HS
<b>B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>	The ROtl analysis, as well as the project sustainability strategy, highlights the how the foundational and demonstration activities provide building blocks to secure longer term outcomes and impacts. However there are substantial financial and socio-political risks.	ML
B. 1. Financial	While continued progress is anticipated, the outcomes and eventual impact of the WIO-LaB project are highly dependent on continued financial investment. The SAP Implementation Plan acknowledges the need to mobilise resources at national, regional and international levels.	ML

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
B. 2. Socio Political	Despite good momentum it remains uncertain whether the breadth of ownership required to secure the momentum of LBSA in will be achieved in all participating countries in a context of competing priorities for government attention and funding.	ML
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	The project was strongly embedded in the political and institutional framework of the Convention. A key result of the project and mechanism for follow up at the regional level is the <i>Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities</i> adopted in April 2010 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries.	L
B. 4. Environmental	The project itself sets out to threats to the health of marine and coastal ecosystems in the WIO region and has helped to establish and reinforce processes to prevent and control such threats.	L
<b>C. Catalytic Role</b>	The project reinforced institutional and policy frameworks particularly at the regional level. Both foundational and innovative demonstration aspects of the project are suitable for replication.	S
<b>D. Country ownership / driveness</b>	The project was well rooted in regional policy processes. The growing level of country ownership during implementation is evidenced by the value of leveraged funds. However there were significant differences in the extent to which countries engaged with activities of the project.	S
<b>E. Stakeholders involvement</b>	Stakeholder engagement was a cross-cutting project implementation approach running through all activities of the project. The project working groups and task forces encouraged and facilitated participation but met with varying success in terms of engaging the private sector and full range of sectoral interests in government organisations.	S
<b>F. Achievement of outputs and activities</b>	Delivery of many of the complementary activities and outputs exceeded expectations and the project was able to adapt is activities maximise its usefulness in a context of differing needs amongst the WIO countries. However many activities were slow to get off the ground.	S
<b>G. Preparation and readiness</b>	The project built on a foundation of ongoing work and technical interventions were well thought out and described in detail. The project document was rather vague as to implementation arrangements and these had to be structured during the first year of implementation.	MS
<b>J. Implementation approach</b>	The institutional arrangements and management of the project were effective with limited constraints experienced. Efforts were made to respond constructively to the constraints.	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>H. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>		S
E. 1. M&E Design	The project developed an M&E plan, but there were shortcomings in the absence of SMART indicators at objective level. The project made ongoing efforts to improve the framework including development of a performance rubric.	S
E. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	PMU reporting was timely, candid, comprehensive, and used for adaptive management. The project strengthened monitoring capacity in participating countries and supported a wide range of activities that were used to establish a regional overview on LBSA.	HS
E. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	The direct budget allocation for M&E was insufficient but the funding shortfall was addressed. This was balanced out by investment in M&E in the wider project activities.	S
<b>I. Financial planning</b>	Financial planning was thorough and timely. Variances in project expenditure can be accounted for by considered changes to activities or implementation approach. There were some delays in disbursements and funds transfer.	S
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping</b>	UNEP DGEP and UNEP DEPI were fully engaged with the project and played appropriate roles related to supervision and technical backstopping of the PMU and wider project activities.	S

#### General Ratings

HS = Highly Satisfactory  
 S = Satisfactory  
 MS = Moderately Satisfactory  
 MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory  
 U = Unsatisfactory  
 HU = Moderately Unsatisfactory

#### Ratings for sustainability sub-criteria. Note: A six-point scale has been used instead of the four point scale proposed in the TOR

HL = Highly Likely: There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability  
 L = Likely  
 ML = Moderately Likely  
 MU = Moderately Unlikely  
 U = Unlikely  
 HU = Unlikely: There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

## 6 Lessons (to be) Learned

197. Section 4 has highlighted a large number of good practices as well as problems encountered by WIO-LaB that provide potentially useful lessons for future projects operating in the WIO region or elsewhere. The following paragraphs describe two examples of good practice in the WIO-LaB project and then consider three weaknesses that emerged from the design and the implementation of WIO-LaB. These are intended to highlight some general lessons that may be applicable in other regions or which it would be important to address in the future design and implementation of projects in the WIO region.

### *A. Mobilisation of scientific expertise in support of environmental management*

198. WIO-LaB succeeding in engaging more than 500 experts, practitioners and other stakeholders in the development of the SAP and TDA through the regional and national working group structure, based on experience generated by an International Waters project in the South China Seas, and through other deliberate efforts including creation of the Forum of Heads of Academic and Research Institutions (FARI) and associated Scientific and Technical review Panel and support to the Consortium for Conservation of the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-C).
199. WIO-LaB's consultative approach has generated a high level of ownership of the TDA and SAP and effectively mobilised the regional scientific community in support of a management and sustainable development. This was a cost-effective approach that could be replicated in the design of regional science-based environmental projects requiring multi-disciplinary input at a regional scale.

### *B. Allow plenty of time for policy development*

200. Allowing sufficient time for in depth consultation and legal review of the text of Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities resulted in a more robust and better adapted text that was owned and championed by the National Focal Points. Participants appreciated the extended consultative process to develop of the Protocol and have indicated that this should be seen as a model for further development of the Convention.
201. This positive lesson from experience has been highlighted in view of its immediate applicability in the context of further development of the Protocol, in view of the decision taken at the Sixth Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention to explore development of an ICZM protocol.

### *C. Work with champions within the wider framework of their host organisations*

202. Much of the success of WIO-LaB can be attributed to the dedication of the national focal points whose roles spanned governance, coordination and oversight, policy development, and in some cases direct management of project activities such as the demonstration projects. The project relied strongly on the NFPs ability to perform these tasks effectively in a context where institutional support was highly variable amongst different countries. A number of NFPs were reassigned during the course of the project and some cases this was associated with loss of continuity and institutional memory particularly where the WIO-LaB project as a whole or a demonstration project had been strongly identified with an individual.
203. It is unlikely that the issue of a projects' dependence on key individuals or champions can be resolved in the immediate future. However, the issues of continuity and support in future projects could be addressed by ensuring that senior managers in host institutions are fully briefed on individual's responsibilities, are kept apprised of developments, and are aware of the need to ensure an effective handover if staff are reassigned.

*D. Use regional frameworks but distinguish project implementation from core business*

204. The WIO-LaB project benefitted strongly from being embedded in the policy framework, governance mechanisms and from extensive experience of operating in the region offered by Convention and its Secretariat, while at the same time it contributed to raising the profile of the Convention in the WIO region. The project was integrated into the workplan of the Convention. At times it became necessary to distinguish between project-related activities and the regular business of the Convention in order to clarify the extent to which the project could be expected to support the Convention's wider programme of work particularly where there was a shared policy interest in an activity such as a meeting.
205. The confusion related to responsibilities was rooted in the limited specification of implementation arrangements and weak and sometimes confusing definition of roles and responsibilities in the project document and may have been exacerbated by changing supervision arrangements during the course of the project.
206. The need to distinguish core business from project activities through clear definition of roles and responsibilities and implementation arrangements is of relevance for future definition and implementation of projects in contexts where project execution is linked to larger ongoing initiatives that have separate funding sources and independent work programme preparation processes.

*E. Allocate sufficient funding for translation*

207. The budget allocation for translation of documents was not sufficient to allow translation of the projects technical outputs nor of key working documents (such as legal texts) produced during the course of the project. This has limited the accessibility and usefulness of products in the francophone and lusophone countries of the WIO region and in some cases affected their participation project activities.
208. The simple lesson for design of projects in multi-lingual regions is to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated in project budgets for translation of documents and technical outputs.

## 7 Recommendations

209. The WIO-LaB project closed on 30 June 2010. In addition to laying the foundation for further work on land-based sources and activities in the Western Indian Ocean region, the project has left a legacy in terms of a number of ongoing processes and activities.
210. The following recommendations address continuation of ongoing WIO-LaB activities; continuation of the coordination and networking bodies and functions established or supported through WIO-LaB, and assimilation of learning at national and regional levels to guide future implementation of the Nairobi Convention and Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities.
211. The recommendations may lead to proposals that would need to be approved as part of the Nairobi Convention workplan.

### *A. Implementation of the SAP and Protocol*

212. The adoption of the *Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities* by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries to the Nairobi Convention in April 2010 together with the endorsement of the Strategic Action Programme and development of NPAs represent significant achievements towards tackling LBSA in the Western Indian Ocean region. Building on the momentum gained through the WIO-LaB project, further support is required to enable mainstreaming of activities to address LBSA at the national level in order to build on the momentum established through the WIO-LaB project and enable countries to fulfil the commitments they have made under the new Protocol in an efficient and expedient manner.
213. **Recommendation 1.** The GEF secretariat should consider supporting a follow on project to WIO-LaB focused on implementation of the SAP and mainstreaming of LBSA activities at the national level. Ideally this project would be implemented within the framework of the Nairobi Convention Programme of Work, with day to day management ensured through a dedicated project team working closely with the NCS. (Deadline: May 2011)

### *B. Ongoing Activities: CHM and Monitoring*

214. The Nairobi Convention Clearinghouse Mechanism (CHM) was developed as a long term facility and service in support of the Nairobi Convention. Development of the facility benefitted from cofinancing from the Belgian government that has now been exhausted and from the consistent technical support of UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment (UNEP/DEWA) that developed the portal, installed equipment and software and provided dedicated in country training and ongoing support to each of the national institutions identified to host a national node of the CHM. Maintenance of the CHM will require ongoing technical support and periodic updating of software and equipment at regional and national levels. In addition not all of the lead collaborating agencies have integrated the ongoing tasks associated with updating of the system into their regular workplans.
215. **Recommendation 2.** The NCS, UNEP/DEWA, national focal points and lead collaborating agencies should assess the ongoing support needs for maintenance of the Clearinghouse Mechanism and together develop a firm proposal regarding its continuation, including by investigating to what extent this can be integrated into the regular work programme and budget of the of the Convention and of the collaborating agencies. (Deadline: June 2011)
216. While initially envisaged as a punctual exercise, maintenance of hotspot monitoring programmes would provide time-series data that would assist countries in meeting their future reporting requirements under the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities and at the same time would encourage continued involvement of relevant personal in research and



laboratory facilities in LBSA activities. Continuation of the programme has significant budget implications in view of logistic and operating costs.

217. **Recommendation 3.** The NCS, national focal points and relevant research institutions and laboratories should assess the ongoing support needs for maintenance of the national hotspot monitoring programme and the NCS and NFPs should develop a firm proposal addressing appropriate arrangements for its continuation. (Deadline: June 2011)

#### *C. Continuation of the coordination and networking bodies*

218. The coordination bodies and functions established under the WIO- Lab project played a central role in task delivery and driving progress of the project but also served to generate and enrich networking opportunities amongst scientists and practicing environmental managers. The WIO-LaB project envisaged continuation of a number of coordination bodies and mechanisms including:

- Four regional task forces on municipal wastewater management, physical alteration and destruction of habitats, legal review and environmental impact assessment, to be maintained under the auspices of the Nairobi Convention;
- The Forum of Heads of Academic and Research Institutions (FARI) and associated Scientific and Technical Review Committee (STAC), to be maintained under the auspices of WIOMA and the Nairobi Convention;
- Consortium for Conservation of the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-C) to be self-sustaining;
- The IW coordination mechanism, to be continued under the auspices of the Nairobi Convention or by one of the ongoing GEF projects.

219. **Recommendation 4.** The NCS should lead a process involving national focal points and relevant stakeholders (such as WIOMSA) to review the status and future utility of the Task Forces and other coordination bodies established and supported by the WIO-LaB project and undertake appropriate courses of action to sustain, devolve or disband them, including with reference to future implementation of the SAP. (Deadline: June 2011)

#### *D. Assimilation of learning at national and regional levels*

220. Implementation of the WIO-LaB project has generated a substantial volume of experience and learning at the national level, particularly amongst the national focal points, that could be used to inform development and effective implementation of future projects. At the same time the benefits and constraints experienced in different countries varied strongly according to their different institutional, socio-economic and cultural settings. Identification and sharing of experience based on self-evaluation would help the individual institutions and the NCS to integrate this experience in the design and implementation approach of future projects.
221. **Recommendation 5.** The NCS should organised a follow up meeting to the regional stocktaking meeting and to this evaluation to reflect on experience at the national level and identify lessons at national and regional level that could inform the design and implementation for future regional initiatives and projects in support of the Nairobi Convention and LBSA Protocol. (Deadline: June 2011).

## **8 List of Annexes**

1. List of interviewees
2. Evaluation timeline
3. The Evaluation Terms of Reference including evaluation criteria
4. List of documents reviewed / consulted
5. Performance Matrix
6. Review of Outcomes to Impacts
7. Summary of Progress on Planned Activities
8. Sustainability, Innovation and Replication in the Demonstration Projects
9. Summary co-finance, expenditure by activity and budget variance
10. The expertise of the evaluation team

## Annex 1. List of interviewees

Name	Designation
<b>UNEP</b>	
1. Peter Scheren	Project Manager, WIO-LaB Project Management Unit
2. Johnson Kitheka	Project Officer, WIO-LaB Project Management Unit
3. Kelly West	Task Manager, Division of GEF Coordination , UNEP
4. Anjan Datta	Program Officer, UNEP-GPA Coordination Office
5. Jacqueline Alder	Head, Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch, DEPI
6. Dixon Waruinge	Programme Officer, Nairobi Convention Secretariat
7. Johannes Akiwumi	Clearing House Mechanism
8. Theuri Mwangi	Clearing House Mechanism
9. Mike Spilsbury	UNEP Evaluation & Oversight Unit (by phone)
<b>UNOPS</b>	
10. Bahaa Al-Asad	Head of Programme, Kenya Operations Centre
11. Susan N. Njoroge	Senior Portfolio Assistant, Kenya Operations Centre
<b>Kenya</b>	
12. Muusya Mwinzi	Director-General, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)
13. Stephen Katua	Deputy-Director, NEMA (National Focal Point)
14. Baraza Wangwe	Officer, NEMA
15. James Kamula	Coast Officer, NEMA Mombasa
16. Prof Mwakio Tole	Pwani University College
17. Dishon Murage	East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS)
18. Saeed Mwaguni	The Mombasa Polytechnic University College
19. Daniel Munga	The Mombasa Polytechnic University College
20. James Kairo	Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)
21. Mwanasiti (Siti) Bendera	Project Coordinator Shimo la Tewa Demonstration Project, Coast Development Authority (CDA)
22. Margret Chuma	Officer in Charge, Shimo la Tewa Prison
<b>South Africa</b>	
23. Mongezi Nqoro	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) (National Focal Point)
24. Yasit Petersen	Marine and Coastal Branch, DEAT
25. Marisa Karshote	DEAT
26. Chumani Mongcu	DEAT (Former National Focal Point)
27. Magnus Ngoile	Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems (ASCLME) Project (by phone)
<b>Mozambique</b>	
28. Bernando Ferraz	Chairman, Grupo de Trabalho Ambiental (GTA)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
29. Veronica Dove	Demonstration Project Coordinator, GTA
30. Ana Maria Alfredo	National Coordinator for Clearing House Mechanism, INAHINA
31. Clousa Sarmento Mamema	Data Manager Coordinator for ODINAFRICA, INAHINA
<b>Tanzania</b>	
32. Bonaventure T Baya	Director NEMC (National Focal Point)
33. Robert Ntakamulenga	Directorate of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement, NEMC
34. Glory Kombe	NEMC
35. Fred Machange	Tanzania Vetiver Network (TAVEN)
36. Ali Juma Hamadi	Director of Environment, Zanzibar
37. Mwalimu Khamis	Head of Environment and Demonstration Project Coordinator, Pemba
38. Julius Francis	Executive Secretary, WIOMSA
<b>Comoros</b>	
39. Farid Anasse	Ministère de l'Agriculture, de la Pêche et de l'Environnement (National Focal Point)
40. Msoili Anfani	Itsamia Project Coordinator
41. Adame Hamadi	UNDP SGP Coordinator
42. Elisa	Maison de Coelacanth Project Operations Manager
<b>Madagascar</b>	
43. Chantal Andrianarivo	Madagascar National Parks (MNP)(National Focal Point)
44. Jocelyn Rakotomalala	MNP Southern Region, Demonstration Project Coordinator
45. Domoina Rakotomalala	MNP project manager
46. Danni Randriamboavonjy	National evaluator for demonstration project
47. Pierre Rahagalala	Chef de l'Unité Collecte de Données, Office National de l'Environnement
48. Misa Ralijoana	Secrétaire technique GIZC pi (ICZM Secretariat), Cellule de Prévention et Gestion des Urgences
49. Pierre Ravelonandro	Director, Centre Nationale de Recherches sur l'Environnement (CNRE)
<b>Mauritius</b>	
50. Dominique S. Lan Ng Yun Wing	Ministry of Environment (National Focal Point)
51. Beedassy Rajiv	Head of ICZM Unit, Ministry of Environment
52. Henna Ramdour	Desk officer and coordinator Ports Project, Ministry of Environment
53. M. Lugman Magho	Desk officer and liaison for Black River Gorges project
54. Devindranath Dindyal	National Environmental Laboratory, Ministry of Environment
55. Vasil Sheik Fareed	National Environmental Laboratory
56. J. Alexis Radhay	Wastewater Management Authority
57. Gaitree Jugusser-Manna	Attorney General's Office

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
58. Gina Bonne	Indian Ocean Commission
59. RM (Jivan) Ramyeed	National evaluator for demonstration projects
60. Kevin Ruhomaun	Coordinator Black River Gorges demonstration project
<b>Seychelles</b>	
61. Jason Jacqueline	Policy, Planning and Services Division, Department of Environment (National Focal Point)
62. Flavian Joubert	Department of Environment and Demonstration Project Coordinator
63. Julianna Legaie	Legal Officer, Department of Environment
64. Begum Nageon	EMPS Coordinator, Department of Environment
65. Justin Prosper	Senior GIS Officer, Department of Environment
66. Riaz Aumeeruddy	Island Conservation Society
67. Didier Dogley	Permanent Secretary of Environment
<b>Royal Norwegian Embassy in Kenya</b>	
68. Morten Nordskog	Deputy-Permanent Representative to UNEP and Habitat

#### **Other stakeholders met**

Kenya: Partners in the Shimo La Tewa prison project including Prisons and Mombasa Water and Sewerage Company staff, Members of the local community in Jimbo;

Mozambique: GTA staff members, Regional and local government representatives and local communities in Lungo;

Tanzania (Pemba): Community leaders and local government representatives in Chake Chake;

Madagascar: Community leaders, members of FIMIMANA, women's association, and tourism operators in Anakao; Project partners including regional director of environment in Tulear;

Mauritius: Meetings with project partners including at Mauritius Ports Authority, Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security National Plant Protection Office, Chair and Members of Black River Gorges project steering committee

Seychelles: Project partners in Wetlands unit and Botanic Gardens

## Annex 2. Evaluation timeline

The Evaluation took place between 23 April and 15 August 2010.

Dates	Activities
24-29 May Kenya	Meetings with WIO-LaB project team (PMU), UNEP Global Programme of Action, DGEF, DEPI Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch Meetings with stakeholders in Nairobi and Mombasa including national focal point Visit to <i>Shimo la Tewa</i> demonstration project and <i>Jimbo</i> Small Grants Project
30-31 May South Africa	Meetings with stakeholders in Cape Town including national focal point
1-4 June Mozambique	Meetings with stakeholders in Maputo Visit to <i>Lumbo</i> demonstration project
5-7 June Tanzania	Visit to <i>Chake Chake</i> Demonstration Project in Pemba Meeting with WIOMSA Meeting with stakeholders in Dar es Salaam including national focal point Visit to <i>Msimbazi Creek</i> demonstration project
8-12 June Comores	Meeting with national focal point in Moroni Visit to <i>Itsamia</i> demonstration project Visit to <i>Maison de Coelacanth</i> Small Grants Project
13-17 June Madagascar	Visit to <i>Anakao</i> demonstration project and meetings with stakeholders in Tulear Meeting with stakeholders in Antananarivo including national focal point
18-23 June Mauritius	Meeting with stakeholders in Saint Louis, Reduit and Quatres Bornes including national focal point Visits to <i>Ports</i> and <i>Black River Gorges</i> demonstration projects and meetings with stakeholders Meeting with Forever Blue (Small Grants Project)
24-26 June Seychelles	Meeting with stakeholders in and around Victoria including national focal point Visit to <i>Brilliant</i> Demonstration Project Meeting with Island Conservation Society (Small Grants Project)
28 June – 2 July Kenya	Meetings with UNEP Clearing House Mechanism, UNOPS, Nairobi Convention Secretariat, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Telephone meeting (ASCLME)

## Annex 3. The Evaluation Terms of Reference

*Note: Key questions raised in the Evaluation are summarized in Section 3 of the TOR.*

### 1. **Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the progress the project has made towards the achievement of its objectives.

### 2. **Methods**

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP Evaluation Office and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager and key representatives of the executing agencies by the UNEP Evaluation Office. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to the UNEP Evaluation Office for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The project documents and monitoring and evaluation reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP, GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports and Report on the Mid-Term Review of the Project) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
  - (c) Technical reports and outputs (toolkits, outputs and reports of the demonstration projects, etc.)
  - (d) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
  - (e) Relevant material published on the project web-site: [www.wiolab.org/](http://www.wiolab.org/)
2. Interviews with project management (such as Project Coordinators, the Executing Agency, UNEP GPA Coordination Office, etc.).
3. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF Project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP's Global Programme of Action Coordination Office as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
4. Consultations with project staff and key stakeholder groups, especially non-governmental and private sector partners, during the Conference of Parties to the Nairobi Convention and related expert meetings (Nairobi, 29 March – 1 April), to consult with relevant stakeholders, including the members of the project Steering Committee and partner NGOs and national and international organizations that are expected to be present.
5. A desk study of all 10 demonstration projects, based on an assessment of the original Terms of Reference, actual implementation of activities, progress reports and realised outcomes. Where needed, the consultant may liaise with the each project team by e-mail or by telephone.
6. Field visits<sup>1</sup> to project locations in all participating countries (Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, and Tanzania). Specific focus of attention during these field visits will be the national demonstration projects. In this regard, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluators should make a brief courtesy call to GEF Country Focal points during field visits if at all possible.

evaluation will cover specifically a review of the performance and impacts of these projects, as well as the principal lessons learnt thereof. While all projects will be covered, the Consultant, in consultation with will select 4 out of the total of 10 projects, based on geographical and thematic spread, for thorough analysis.

7. Interviews and Telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. Interviews with other stakeholders, including NGOs which participated in the project. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.

### **Key Evaluation principles.**

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "**what happened?**" and "**what would have happened anyway?**". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the actions of the project**.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

### **3. Project Ratings**

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below<sup>2</sup>.

It should be noted that many of the evaluation parameters are interrelated. For example, the 'achievement of objectives and planned results' is closely linked to the issue of 'sustainability'. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts and is, in turn, linked to the issues of 'catalytic effects / replication' and, often, 'country ownership' and 'stakeholder participation'.

#### **A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:**

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- **Effectiveness:** Evaluate the **overall likelihood of impact achievement**, taking into account the "achievement indicators", the achievement of outcomes and the progress made towards impacts. UNEP's Evaluation Office advocate the use the **Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROti)** method (described in Annex 7) to establish this rating
- **Relevance:** In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of the GEF.
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing, and any additional resources leveraged by the project, to the project's achievements. Did the project build on earlier initiatives; did it make effective use of available scientific and / or technical information? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects. Specifically the evaluation should:
  - Assess the cost-effectiveness of the activities of the project funded by GEF / NORAD and whether these activities are likely to achieve the goals and objectives within the planned time and budget. How do the costs compare to the costs of similar projects in similar contexts?

<sup>2</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.



- Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources.
- Determine the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have been incorporated within, and have influenced the execution of, the project activities.

## **B. Sustainability:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. **Application of the ROTI method** described in Annex 7 will also assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impact? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes and eventual impact of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impacts? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes and onward progress towards impacts dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes. Would these risks apply in other contexts where the project may be replicated?

## **C. Catalytic Role and Replication**

The catalytic role of the GEF is embodied in its approach of supporting the creation an enabling environment, investing in activities which are innovative and show how new approaches and market changes can work, and supporting activities that upscale new approaches to a national (or regional) level to sustainably achieve global environmental benefits.

In general this catalytic approach can be separated into are three broad categories of GEF activities: (1) “**foundational**” and enabling activities, focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity (2) **demonstration** activities, which focus on demonstration, capacity development, innovation, and market barrier removal; and (3) **investment** activities, full-size projects with high rates of cofunding, catalyzing investments or implementing a new strategic approach at the national level.

In this context the evaluation should assess the catalytic role played by this project by consideration of the following questions:

- **INCENTIVES:** To what extent have the project activities provided incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders?
- **INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE:** To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?
- **POLICY CHANGE:** To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
- **CATALYTIC FINANCING:** To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
- **PROJECT CHAMPIONS:** To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?

The three categories approach combines all the elements that have been shown to catalyze results in international cooperation. Evaluations in the bilateral and multilateral aid community have shown time and again that activities at the micro level of skills transfer—piloting new technologies and demonstrating new approaches—will fail if these activities are not supported at the institutional or market level as well. Evaluations have also consistently shown that institutional capacity development or market interventions on a larger scale will fail if governmental laws, regulatory frameworks, and policies are not in place to support and sustain these improvements. And they show that demonstration, innovation and market barrier removal do not work if there is no follow up through investment or scaling up of financial means.

(Note: the ROTI analysis should provide the necessary information to address these questions)

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources).

Is the project suitable for replication? If so, has the project approach been replicated? If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the strategy / approach adopted by the projected to promote replication effects.

#### **D. Country ownership / drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The review will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess the countries’ level of commitment.

#### **E. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.

- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

**F. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the relevance of the outputs with respect to the achievement of the desired outcomes. Were all the outputs necessary? Were the outputs and activities sufficient to achieve the desired outcomes?

**G. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems.**

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in Annex 4). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

**M&E during project implementation**

- *M&E design.* Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

The evaluator should use the following questions to help assess the M&E design aspects:

SMART-ness of Indicators

- Are there specific indicators in the log frame for each of the project objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators relevant to the objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators for the objectives and outcomes sufficient?
- Are the indicators quantifiable?

Adequacy of Baseline Information

- Is there baseline information?
- Has the methodology for the baseline data collection been explained?
- Is desired level of achievement for indicators based on a reasoned estimate of baseline?

Arrangements for Monitoring of Implementation

- Has a budget been allocated for M&E activities?
- Have the responsibility centers for M&E activities been clearly defined?
- Has the time frame for M&E activities been specified?

Arrangements for Evaluation

- Have specific targets been specified for project outputs?
- Has the desired level of achievement been specified for all Indicators of Objectives and Outcomes?

- *M&E plan implementation.* A Terminal Evaluation should verify that:

- an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logframe or similar);
  - annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings;
  - that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs;
  - and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.
- 
- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

#### **H. Preparation and Readiness**

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

#### **I. Implementation approach:**

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of the management of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels.

#### **J. Financial Planning**

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

## K. UNEP and UNOPS Supervision and Backstopping

The purpose of supervision is to work with the executing agencies in identifying and dealing with problems which have arisen during implementation of the project itself. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/substantive issues in which UNEP has a major contribution to make. The evaluator should assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF and UNEP/DEPI including:

- (i) the adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes;
- (ii) the emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);
- (iii) the realism / candor of project reporting and rating (i.e. are PIR ratings an accurate reflection of the project realities and risks);
- (iv) the quality of documentation of project supervision activities; and
- (v) financial, administrative and other fiduciary aspects of project implementation supervision.

In summary, accountability and implementation support through technical assistance and problem solving are the main elements of project supervision.

The **ratings will be presented in the form of a table**. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

## 4. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

**The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.**

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project

is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see Annex 1);

- vi) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
- Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
  - State or imply some prescriptive action;
  - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)

- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

*Prior to each recommendation*, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

- viii) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:
1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
  2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
  3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
  4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
  5. The expertise of the evaluation team. (brief CV).

TE reports will also include any formal response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP Evaluation Office.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

### **Review of the Draft Evaluation Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP Evaluation Office are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. Where, possible, a consultation is held between the evaluator, Evaluation Office Staff, the Task Manager and key members of the project execution team. The consultation seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. UNEP Evaluation Office collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluator(s) for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

### **5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.**

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief,  
UNEP Evaluation Office  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: (254-20) 7623387  
Fax: (254-20) 7623158  
Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)

The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the following individuals:

Mr. Morten Nordskag  
Deputy Permanent Representative to UNEP and UN-HABITAT  
Royal Norwegian Embassy  
Lion Place, Waiyaki Way, Nairobi  
Mobile: +254 (0) 733 621983  
Direct line: +254 20 42 51 219  
Email: [Morten.Nordskag@mfa.no](mailto:Morten.Nordskag@mfa.no)

Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-7624686  
Fax: + 254-20-623158/4042  
Email: [Maryam.Niamir-Fuller@unep.org](mailto:Maryam.Niamir-Fuller@unep.org)

Kelly West  
Project Task Manager  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
PO Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254 20 7625077  
Fax: 254 20 7624041/2  
Email: [kelly.west@unep.org](mailto:kelly.west@unep.org)

The Final evaluation will also be copied to the GEF Operational Focal Points – Annex 5

The final evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation Office web-site [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou) and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

## **6. Resources and schedule of the evaluation**

This review will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation Office, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2010 and end on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2010 (2.5 months spread over approximately 12 weeks). The evaluator will submit a brief summary report on the 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2010. Full drafts of the 'Lessons Learned' and the WIOLAB Evaluation Report will be submitted on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2010 to UNEP/EO, UNEP/DGEF, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP Evaluation Office for collation and the consultant will be advised of any factual errors to be corrected. The Evaluation Office will send comments on the final draft report to the consultant by 6<sup>th</sup> August 2010 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 15<sup>th</sup> August 2010.

The evaluator will travel to Nairobi to meet with project staff, the staff of DGEF and the Evaluation Office at the beginning of the review.

The evaluator will review project activities and study sites in the following locations:

- Mombasa, Kenya
- Moroni / Moheli, Comoros
- Tana / Toliare, Madagascar
- Port Louis, Mauritius
- Mahe, Seychelles
- Dar es Salaam and Pemba/Zanzibar, Tanzania
- Maputo/ Nampula, Mozambique
- Cape Town/Johannesburg, South Africa

In accordance with UNEP/DGEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the Evaluation Office. The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert with a Master's degree specialized in pollution control, coastal management or marine policy and have experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral French is desirable and oral and written English is required.

## **7. Schedule Of Payment**

### **Fee-only Option**

The evaluator will be submitting three deliverables and will receive a payment of 30% of the total amount upon submission of a brief summary report; 30% upon acceptance of the draft report and 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of assignment. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is **NOT** inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.



## **Annex 4. List of documents reviewed or consulted**

### **Project Definition and Reporting**

- Implementation Plan of the WIOLaB project co-financed by Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Norway: Final Report (April 2004)
- UNEP Project Document, Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-LaB)(June 2004)
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (June 2005)
- Stakeholder Involvement Strategy Version 2 (January 2006)
- Project Sustainability Strategy (December 2005)
- Annual and Semi Annual Reports (June 2005 – December 2009)
- Project Terminal report (draft of 30 June 2010)
- Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) (2006-2010)
- Report of the Mid-term Review (April 2007)
- Management Response to the Mid-term Review (Final, December 2007)
- Demonstration Project Proposals
- Demonstration Project Mid-term reviews (2008 & 2009)

### **Reports of Project Meetings**

- Steering Committee Meetings from April 2005 to December 2009
- Report of the tripartite review and Fourth Steering Committee Meeting (2007)
- Reports of UNEP-Norway Annual Review Meetings
- Report of training courses reports (examples)
- Reports of working group and task force meetings (examples)
- Reports of Multi-stakeholder meetings (Cape Town, 2008; Mombasa, 2009)

### **Technical Outputs**

- Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis Land-based activities and sources of pollution degrading the coastal and marine environment of the Western Indian Ocean (2009)
- Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities (2009)
- Nairobi Convention /UNEP (2009) Final Text of the Protocol for the Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities as adopted in Mombasa (June 2009)
- EIA Guidelines for Impact Assessment in the Western Indian Ocean (2007)
- Guidelines for the Establishment of Environmental Quality Objectives and Targets in the Coastal Zone of the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) Region (2009)
- Environmental Assessment in the WIO Region: An overview of the policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks related to Environmental Impact Assessment in the WIO Region (Draft)
- National Assessment of Capabilities for Marine Pollution Monitoring in the Western Indian Ocean Region (2006)
- Report of the Regional Training Needs Assessment (2007)
- Report of the Regional Educational Needs Assessment (2007)
- National Reports on Marine Litter and Regional Synthesis (2007)
- National Pollution Status Reports, and Regional Synthesis (2009)
- National Reports on Policy, Legal and Institutional Frameworks related to Land-based Sources and Activities, and Regional Synthesis (2009)
- National Reports on Status of Ratification of International Conventions related to Land-based Sources and Activities, and Regional Synthesis (2009)
- National report on Status of Municipal Wastewater Management in the Western Indian Ocean Region, and Regional Synthesis (2010)
- An Assessment of Hydrological and Land Use Characteristics Affecting River-Coast Interactions in the West Indian Ocean Region (2009)
- Environmental Profile of the Inkomati River Basin (2009)

### **Outreach and Promotional Outputs**

- *INSIGHT* WIO-LaB Newsletter
- International Waters Experience Notes

- Nairobi Convention /UNEP (2010) '*Rivers of Life, Oceans of Plenty*' Addressing Land-based Sources and Activities in the Western Indian Ocean.' Produced by ASCLME and WIO-LaB projects.
- Brochures
- Posters
- Country fact sheets

#### **Other Reports**

- Minutes COP 6 Stocktaking Meeting
- UNEP, 2008. *Eastern African training workshop on Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Environmental Management Issues in the National Planning and Budgetary Processes*. Report of the Regional Training Workshop held in Mauritius, 20-22 May 2008
- DEAT, National Programme of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities. First edition October 2008 (Brochure & DVD)

## Annex 5. Performance Matrix

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
<b>Immediate objective 1:</b>  <b>Improved information base and demonstrated guidelines and strategies for the reduction of stress to the ecosystem by improved water and sediment quality.</b>	1. Common regional monitoring methods agreed and pilot monitoring programme implemented by end of 2007	Pilot monitoring implemented in all countries & generates sufficient data for thorough assessment of at least one group of parameters.	Pilot monitoring implemented in all countries & in some generates sufficient data for thorough assessment of at least one group of parameters	Pilot monitoring implemented in all countries & across a wider geographic range for certain parameters.	Pilot monitoring implemented in all countries but only at limited stations.	Pilot monitoring only implemented in some countries & at limited stations.	Pilot monitoring not implemented.	<b>HS</b> > Pilot monitoring undertaken at hotspots in all countries  > Data on organics, nutrients, heavy metals, physical-chemical parameters for all countries
	2. Regionally accessible data-base created by end of 2007	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to all countries, and substantial data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to all countries, but limited data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to 50% of countries, but limited data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, but only accessible to a few countries.	2. Regionally accessible data-base created by end of 2007;	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to all countries, and substantial data posted.	<b>S</b> > This activity was integrated into the Regional Clearing House Mechanism (See O3 A7). > The database includes limited WSS data
	3. Regional EQO/EQS defined & approved by end of 2007	EQO's and EQS's defined and agreed by all the countries, with initial implementation in some countries.	EQOs and EQSs defined and agreed by all countries but not necessarily implemented.	EQO's and EQS's defined and agreed by most countries, but not implemented.	EQO's and EQS's defined but only agreed by 50% of the countries.	EQO's and EQS's defined but not agreed.	EQO's and EQS's not defined.	<b>S</b> > EQOs and EQSs were agreed by Water, Sediment and Biota Quality Working Group and are being domesticated in several countries.

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
	4. Long-term monitoring protocol developed by end of 2007	Monitoring protocol agreed by all countries and implemented by some.	Monitoring protocol agreed by all countries but not implemented.	Monitoring protocol agreed by some countries..	Monitoring protocol developed but not agreed.	Agreement on EQO's, EQS's & monitoring guidelines, not on monitoring protocol.	No agreement on EQO's, EQS's or monitoring guidelines.	<b>S</b> > A 'Long-term Monitoring Protocol' was agreed during the Final Regional Workshop of the Water, Sediment and Biota Quality Working Group
	5. At least 6 demonstration projects successfully implemented by end of project	More than 6 demonstration projects implemented & replication of at least 2 underway.	6 demonstration projects implemented, & replication of at least 2 underway.	6 demonstration projects implemented, but no replication.	Only 4 demonstration projects implemented.	Only 2 demonstration projects implemented.	No demonstration projects implemented.	<b>HS</b> > 9 demonstration projects implemented in 7 countries > Replication underway in two countries and anticipated in more
	6. Regional Annex on GPA Guidelines for MWW developed by end of 2007	Regional Annex developed and endorsed, and utilized in all countries.	Regional Annex developed and endorsed, and utilized in some countries.	Regional Annex developed and endorsed.	Regional Annex developed in 2007, but not agreed.	Regional Annex only developed in 2008.	Regional Annex not developed.	<b>S</b> > This activity was expanded beyond the regional annex > Implementation will be longer term
<b>Immediate objective 2:</b>  <b>Strengthened regional legal basis for preventing LB sources of pollution (GPA implementation)</b>	1. Protocol on LBAs to the Nairobi Convention developed & adopted by COP by end of 2007	Protocol adopted by COP in 2007 (or 2009), & enacted by at least 4 of the 8 countries by project end.	Protocol adopted by COP in 2007 (or 2009), & target dates for enactment agreed.	Protocol adopted by COP in 2007 (or 2009), but no target dates for enactment.	Protocol not adopted by COP in 2007 (or 2009), but steps towards future adoption in place.	Protocol not adopted by COP in 2007 (or 2009), and no agreement on future steps.	COP rejects possibility of adopting Protocol.	<b>S/HS</b> > LBSA Protocol adopted by COP in 2010 > 8 of 10 parties to the Convention have signed

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
	2. Regional guidelines for EIA developed by end of 2007	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed, and utilized in all countries.	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed, and utilized in some countries.	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed.	Regional Guidelines developed in 2007, but not agreed.	Regional Guidelines only developed in 2008.	Regional Guidelines not developed.	<b>S</b> > Guidelines have been developed, are being used in Mozambique, and have been used in EIA policy updates in Kenya and South Africa
	3. NPAs for 4 countries developed by end of project	NPA's for >4 countries in place, with >10% of required resources committed.	NPA's for 4 countries in place, with > 10% of required resources committed.	NPA's for 4 countries in place.	Less than 4 NPA's in place, with >10% of required resources committed.	Less than 4 NPA's in place	No NPA's in place.	<b>S</b> > NPAs developed for Tanzania & South Africa. LBSA issues have been integrated into ICZM /EM plans for Kenya & Madagascar, and are being integrated into ICZM/EM Plans in Comoros & Seychelles. > Resource allocation evident in several countries
	4. One demonstration project on ICARM implemented by end of project	(Performance Indicators not defined)						<i>The activity proved un-implementable and was reoriented. The Inkomati profile and regional river-coast interactions report are valuable outputs</i>
	5. Coordination framework with related GEF	(Performance Indicators not defined)						<i>Collaboration with SWIOFP and ASCLME GEF projects, as well</i>

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
	projects in the WIO functional during project life-time							<i>as other regional projects (e.g. IOC ReCoMaP), was a recognised strength.</i>
<b>Immediate objective 3:</b>  <b>Improved regional capacity and strengthened institutions for sustainable, less polluting development, including implementation of the Nairobi Convention and its Protocols.</b>	1. Strengthened Nairobi Convention Secretariat and RCU (implementation capacity & political support)	<i>(Performance Indicators not defined)</i>						<i>Staffing plus indirect support through enhancing profile of and support for the Convention in participating countries. The project and convention governance processes were mutually supportive.</i>
	2. National training needs identified and at least 8 training courses on LBAs conducted by end of project	Training needs identified with structured response plan, > 5 priority courses completed.	Training needs identified with structured response plan & 5 priority courses completed.	Training needs identified with structured response plan, & limited number of courses completed.	Training needs identified with ad hoc response.	Training needs identified but no response.	Training needs not assessed.	<b>HS</b> > Training Needs assessment undertaken > Some 15 courses organized responding well to demand within the resource constraints of the project
	3. Educational programmes developed & implemented by end of project	Educational strategy developed & implemented through relevant NGO's & CBO's.	Educational strategy developed, but with limited implementation.	Educational strategy developed, but not implemented.	Needs assessed and limited response – few countries, limited uptake by stakeholders.	Needs assessed, but no response.	Education needs not assessed.	<b>S</b> > Education needs assessment undertaken > Limited follow up constrained by resources
	4. Stakeholder awareness & involvement	Stakeholder commitment to SAP & NPA's in	Stakeholder commitment to SAP & NPA's in	Stakeholder support for SAP and NPA's in	Limited stakeholder support for SAP	No stakeholder support for SAP and only limited	No stakeholder support for SAP or NPA's.	<b>S</b> > The SAP development process

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
	activities implemented in all countries by end of project	all countries, & across various sectors.	50% of countries, & some sectors.	only some countries, but only MWW & PADH.	and NPA's in only some countries.	support for NPA's in some countries.		and most NPA processes involved governmental and non-governmental organizations and a wide range of organizations are engaged in follow up
	5. At least 8 Small Grants awarded by end of project	>8 Small Grants effectively implemented.	8 Small Grants effectively implemented.	<8 Small Grants effectively implemented.	<8 Small Grants awarded but not effectively implemented.	8 Small Grants awarded but not effectively implemented.	Small Grants not awarded.	<b>MS</b> Six small grants programme projects were effectively implemented
	6. Updated TDA and SAP developed and approved by end of project	TDA and SAP on LBA's endorsed by all 8 countries, with implementation plan in place.	TDA and SAP on LBA's endorsed by all 8 countries, but no implementation plan in place.	TDA and SAP on LBA's endorsed by only 50% of the countries, and/or limited implementation plan in place.	TDA and SAP on LBA's endorsed by < 50% of the countries, and no implementation plan in place.	TDA and SAP complete, but no support.	TDA and SAP incomplete, and no support.	<b>HS</b> TDA and SAP on LBA's endorsed by all 8 countries. SAP includes general implementation plan and compendium of ongoing activities.
	7. EA node for GPA CHM established & globally accessible by end of 2006.	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to >50% of countries, and substantial data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to >50% of countries, but limited data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, accessible to 50% of countries, but limited data posted.	Data-base created by end of 2007, but only accessible to a few countries.	Data-base created by end of 2007, but not accessible.	Data-base not created by end of 2008.	<b>HS</b> The CHM is operational in all 8 countries, Substantial metadata has been posted and most lead organizations are actively developing the database.

Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
<b>Outcome 1:</b>  <b>The WIO region better equipped to ensure sustainable management of its marine and coastal environment by managing the impacts of LBA's in terms of:</b> <b>* Commonly agreed and applied strategies and standards</b> <b>* A well-designed and applied regional legal framework;</b> <b>* Adequate institutional capacity</b> <b>* Adequate level of stakeholder involvement and awareness.</b>	1. SAP adopted & implemented;	SAP on LBA's endorsed by all 8 countries, with implementation plan in place.	SAP on LBA's endorsed by all 8 countries, but no implementation plan in place.	SAP on LBA's endorsed by only 50% of the countries, and/or limited implementation plan in place.	SAP on LBA's endorsed by < 50% of the countries, and no implementation plan in place.	SAP complete, but no support.	SAP incomplete, and no support.	See above for performance indicators (variously rates S & HS).
	2. Regional guidelines for MWW and PADH management applied	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed, and utilized in all countries.	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed, and utilized in some countries.	Regional Guidelines developed and endorsed.	Regional Guidelines developed but not agreed by all countries.	Regional Guidelines developed but not agreed by any countries	Regional Guidelines not developed.	
	3. EQO/EQSS achieved in accordance with agreed targets	(Performance Indicators not defined)						
	4. Nairobi Convention & Protocols adhered to by all project countries	(Performance Indicators not defined)						
	5. Stakeholder involvement in management/reduction of LBA impacts on coastal & marine environment	Stakeholder commitment to SAP & NPAs in all countries, & across various sectors.	Stakeholder commitment to SAP & NPAs in 50% of countries, & some sectors.	Stakeholder support for SAP and NPAs in only some countries, but only MWW & PADH.	Limited stakeholder support for SAP and NPAs in only some countries.	No stakeholder support for SAP and only limited support for NPAs in some countries.	No stakeholder support for SAP or NPA's.	
	6. Replication of demonstration projects being undertaken	8 demonstration projects implemented & replication of at least 2 underway.	8 demonstration projects implemented, but no replication.	Only 6 demonstration projects implemented.	Only 4 demonstration projects implemented.	Only 2 demonstration projects implemented.	No demonstration projects implemented.	



Logical framework		Agreed project performance indicators						RATING & COMMENTS
Objectives & Outcomes	Verifiable Indicators	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU	
	7. Agreed monitoring protocol being implemented	Monitoring protocol agreed by all countries and implemented by some.	Monitoring protocol agreed by all countries but not implemented.	Monitoring protocol agreed by some countries..	Monitoring protocol developed but not agreed.	Agreement on EQO's, EQS's & monitoring guidelines, not on monitoring protocol.	No agreement on EQO's, EQS's or monitoring guidelines.	
Outcome 2:  Actual reduction in stress from LBA's on the marine and coastal environment.	1. Reduction in levels of pollution in water and sediment	(Performance Indicators not defined; See RoTI)						
	2. Reduction in amount of pollutants discharged to the environment							
	3. Reduction in physical alteration processes & destruction of habitats related to LBAs							

## Annex 6. Review of Outcomes to Impacts

Figure 1. Generalised Theory of Change for WIO-LaB Project

Strategies	Outcomes	Drivers & Assumptions	Intermediate States	Impacts
Improved information base and demonstrated guidelines and strategies	Commonly agreed and applied strategies and standards	Strategies and guidelines are implemented by relevant parties	An effective monitoring system is in place and used to inform management interventions	Reduction in the amount of pollutants discharged to the coastal and marine environment
		Standards are adopted and used as a basis for controlling and reporting LBSA		↓
Strengthen regional legal basis for preventing land-based sources of pollution	A well-designed regional legal framework	Legal and policy frameworks in place at national level	LBSA regulations are applied and enforced	Reduction in levels of pollution in water and sediment
		Adequate control and enforcement mechanisms are in place at national level		Reduction in physical alteration and destruction of habitats related to land based activities
Develop regional capacity and strengthen institutions for sustainable, less polluting development	Strengthened institutional capacity and engagement in LBSA issues	Institutions have adequate financial and political support	Planning controls and permitting procedures pre-empt LBSA issues	↓
Effort sharing & mainstreaming ( <i>not explicit in objectives</i> )	Strengthened stakeholder involvement and awareness	Cross-sectoral engagement on policy development and implementation	Stakeholders actively support LBSA measures	Reduction of stress on coastal and marine ecosystems
		General public understanding of LBSA issues Incentives for private sector action		

### Notes:

- The strategies are based on project objectives. The fourth strategy is not explicit but is derived from outputs.
- The sub-components of Outcome 1 have been modified to reflect what could be realistically achieved by the WIO-LaB project. Specifically, it is no longer suggested that the regional legal framework be applied as an immediate result of the project; 'adequate' has been replaced by 'strengthened' for the sub-components on institutional capacity and stakeholder involvement, and there is explicit reference to institutions being engaged in LBSA issues.
- Outcome 2 is expressed as the project impact. It recognised that the demonstration projects will deliver a direct and localised impact in terms of reduction of stress on marine and coastal ecosystems.
- Intermediate states reflect the complementarity of project strategies. For example, an effective monitoring system that is used to inform management results from efforts to develop standards, to engage stakeholders and to strengthen institutional capacity. A key assumption is financial and political support to institutions.

**Figure 2. Results and ratings of Review of Outcome to Impact (RoTI)**

Results rating of project entitled: Addressing Land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-LaB)							
Development objective: to contribute to the environmentally-sustainable management and development of the West Indian Ocean region, by reducing land-based activities that harm rivers, estuaries, and coastal waters, as well as their biological resources							
Outputs	Outcomes	Rating (D – A)	Intermediary	Rating (D – A)	Impact	Rating (+)	Overall
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common methods for assessing water and sediment quality</li> <li>Updated information on priority pollutants and major sources of pollution for each country</li> <li>Report on regional carrying capacity of ecotones</li> <li>Report on monitoring and assessment of hotspots of pollution and sensitive areas in the region</li> <li>Common regional EQO/EQS standards</li> <li>Long-term monitoring and reporting programme</li> <li>Demonstration projects on MWW and PADH</li> <li>Regional guidelines on best practices for Municipal Waste Water</li> </ul>	Commonly agreed and applied strategies and standards	B	<p>An effective monitoring system is in place and used to inform management interventions</p> <p>LBSA regulations are applied and enforced</p>	C		+	Moderately Likely
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National and regional reports on gaps in national legislation and ratification status</li> <li>Regional guidelines for EIA</li> <li>5 National Plans of Action for LBA's</li> <li>Endorsed protocol on LBA for the Nairobi Convention</li> <li>Demonstration project for the use of ICARM principles</li> <li>A Regional IW coordination mechanism</li> </ul>	A well-designed regional legal framework		<p>Planning controls and permitting procedures pre-empt LBSA issues</p>		Reduction of stress on coastal and marine ecosystems		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NC strengthened through an additional staff member</li> <li>Training needs assessment</li> <li>Training courses on LBAs</li> <li>Education material on LBAs</li> <li>Educational programmes on LBAs</li> <li>Small grants programme</li> <li>Updated Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan</li> <li>East African node for the GPA CHM</li> </ul>	Strengthened institutional capacity and engagement in LBSA issues		Stakeholders actively support LBSA measures				
	<p><b>Rating justification:</b> The outcomes as redefined have been delivered. They are foundational in nature and are designed to feed into a continuing process. There is only a generalised allocation of responsibilities in the SAP and in the LBSA protocol</p>		<p><b>Rating justification:</b> Measures designed to move toward intermediate states have started in a number of countries. However the assumption of adequate political and financial report (which in turn underpins institutional capacity) highlights a risk.</p>		<p><b>Rating justification:</b> The '+' rating reflects local delivery by demonstration projects. This was not taken into account in assigning the overall score since the systematic changes required for this impact to occur at scale have yet to be realised.</p>		

Ratings:

*Rating scale for outcomes and progress towards 'intermediate states'*

Outcome Rating	Rating on progress toward Intermediate States
D: The project's intended outcomes were not delivered	D: No measures taken to move towards intermediate states.
C: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, but were not designed to feed into a continuing process after project funding	<b>C: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started, but have not produced results.</b>
<b>B: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after project funding</b>	B: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which give no indication that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.
A: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, with specific allocation of responsibilities after project funding.	A: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which clearly indicate that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.

*Six point scale for translation of ratings for 'achievement of outcomes' and 'progress towards intermediate states' to ratings for the 'Overall likelihood of impact achievement'.*

Highly Likely	Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Unlikely	Highly Unlikely
AA AB BA CA BB+ CB+ DA+ DB+	BB CB DA DB AC+ <b>BC+</b>	AC <b>BC</b> CC+ DC+	CC DC AD+ BD+	AD BD CD+ DD+	CD DD

## Annex 7. Summary of Progress on Planned Activities

'Outputs' (short-term objectives) and Activities	Status	Key results or deliverables
<b>Output 1: Improved information base and demonstrated guidelines and strategies for the reduction of stress to the ecosystem by improved water and sediment quality</b>		
<b>Activity 1 (Ia):</b> Establish common methods for assessing water and sediment quality	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed methods for analysis of pollution parameters in marine water and sediment.</li> <li>- Improved capacity at national laboratories for undertaking water and sediment quality monitoring</li> <li>- National reports on implementation of the hotspots monitoring programme</li> </ul>
<b>Activity 2 (Ib):</b> Fill gaps in (knowledge concerning) priority pollutants and their sources	Completed	- 8 National Reports and Regional Synthesis Report (2009) on the Status of Pollution in the Western Indian Ocean Region
<b>Activity 3 (Ic):</b> Assess carrying capacity of coastal waters	Completed	- This work was integrated into 'Guidelines for the Establishment of Environmental Quality Objectives and Targets in the Coastal Zone of the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) Region' (Activity 5)
<b>Activity 4 (Id):</b> Determine and assess coastal hot spots of pollution	Completed	- Hotspot analyses were completed for Madagascar and Comoros using the African Process methodology already applied in other countries
<b>Activity 5 (Ie):</b> Establish regional EQOs and EQSs for water and sediment quality	Completed	- Guidelines for the Establishment of Environmental Quality Objectives and Targets in the Coastal Zone of the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) Region (2009)
<b>Activity 6 (If):</b> Develop monitoring protocols and compliance and reporting systems	Completed	- A 'Long-term Monitoring Protocol' was agreed during the Final Regional Workshop of the Water, Sediment and Biota Quality Working Group
<b>Activity 7 (Ig):</b> Implement demonstration projects for major LBAs and pollutant sources	90% completed as of 30 June 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A total of nine demonstration projects were implemented addressing both MWW management and PADH</li> </ul> <p><i>See Separate Table Below (Annex 8)</i></p>
<b>Activity 8 (Ih):</b> Develop guidelines and implement demonstration projects on MWW management	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 7 national reports (excluding Mozambique) and regional synthesis report (2010) of existing MWW management policies, practices and infrastructure</li> <li>- Review of the applicability of the GPA Guidelines at both national and regional level.</li> <li>- MWW Projects are considered under Activity 7.</li> </ul>
<i>Merged Activity (Ii):</i> Select and implement PADH demonstration-projects		- PADH demonstration projects are considered under Activity 7.
<i>Additional Activity (Ij):</i> Assessment of marine litter	Completed	- 8 national and regional synthesis report on marine litter status in the WIO

'Outputs' (short-term objectives) and Activities	Status	Key results or deliverables
problems in the WIO region		
<b>Output 2: Strengthened regional legal basis for preventing land-based sources of pollution</b>		
<b>Activity 9 (IIa):</b> Review gaps in national legislation/regulatory frameworks	Completed	- 8 national reports and regional synthesis report (2009) on existing policy, legal and institutional frameworks for addressing LBSA
<b>Activity 10 (IIb):</b> Review status of ratification of conventions	Completed	- 8 national and one regional synthesis report (2009) on the status of ratification of international Conventions relevant to LBSA
<b>Activity 11(IIc):</b> Establish and implement effective regional EIA guidelines	Completed	- EIA Guidelines for Impact Assessment in the WIO Region (2007) - An overview of the policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks related to Environmental Impact Assessment in the WIO Region (2007, updated 2010)
<b>Activity 12 (IId):</b> Assist countries in developing NPAs for LBAs	Completed	- Two countries developed NPAs (South Africa & Tanzania). - LBSA actions clearly integrated in ICZM plans in Kenya & Madagascar. LBSA actions being integrated into Environmental Management Plan for Seychelles (EMPS) and ICZM process for Comoros. - Mauritius NPA has not progressed but many LBSA measures are already in place. - Mozambique NPA has not progressed.
<b>Activity 13 (IIf):</b> Develop and adopt protocol to the Nairobi Convention	Completed	- The new Protocol on LBSA to the Nairobi Convention was formally adopted by the Conference of plenipotentiaries and signed by 8 countries. Madagascar and South Africa anticipate signature. - Revised text of the Nairobi Convention formally adopted
<b>Activity 14 (IIg):</b> Promote and enhance ICARM principles	Completed	- Environmental Profile of the Inkomati River Basin (2000) - Assessment of hydrological and land use characteristics affecting river-coast interactions in the West Indian Ocean region (2009)
<b>Activity 15 (IIg):</b> Establish a regional IW coordination mechanism	Completed	- An informal coordination mechanism was established between the three GEF projects (WIO-LaB, ASCLME and SWIOFP) and the project managers met frequently during the course of the project. - One joint Steering Committee meeting was organised and a regional stocktaking event was held prior to the NC COP 6. - IW events were organised linked to the WIOMSA symposia.

'Outputs' (short-term objectives) and Activities	Status	Key results or deliverables
<b>Output 3: Improved regional capacity and strengthened institutions for sustainable, less polluting development</b>		
<b>Activity 16 (IIIa):</b> Establish WIO-LaB PMU	Completed	- The PMU was functional from January 2005 to June 2010
<b>Activity 17 (IIIb):</b> Strengthen EAF/RCU and NCS as Regional Seas coordination unit for WIO region	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project supported one additional member of staff in the NCS from 2009 and this post is expected to be maintained for the foreseeable future.</li> <li>- The project has contributed indirectly to strengthening via raising profile and enhanced contributions</li> <li>- No direct efforts with RCU</li> </ul>
<b>Activity 18 (IIIc):</b> Determine and satisfy training needs for LB sources and activities	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training Needs Assessment for the Western Indian Ocean Region (2007)</li> <li>- Some 15 training events were organised during the course of the project at regional or national level.</li> </ul>
<b>Activity 19 (IIId):</b> Develop educational programs on LB sources and activities	90%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Educational Needs Assessment for the Western Indian Ocean Region (2007)</li> <li>- Follow up activities were undertaken by WIO-C members: a school teachers guide and resource book are being finalised</li> </ul>
<b>Activity 20 (IIIe):</b> Develop public-private partnerships	Completed	- Public-private partnerships were established in a number of the demonstration and small grants projects.
<b>Activity 21 (IIIf):</b> Identify and strengthen stakeholder participation in LBS issues	Completed	- Stakeholder engagement plan (Jan 2006)
<b>Activity 22 (IIIg):</b> Implement small-grants programme	Completed	- 6 projects in five countries received grant funding of between USD 7,500 and USD 29,000 per project.
<b>Activity 23 (IIIh):</b> Update TDA and SAP	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The TDA and SAP were produced through extensive consultative processes</li> <li>- The SAP was formally adopted at the NC COP6.</li> </ul>
<b>Activity 24 (IIIi):</b> Develop East-African node of GPA Clearinghouse Mechanism	Completed	- The CHM is operational in all 8 countries, Substantial metadata has been posted and most lead organizations are actively developing the database.

## Annex 8. Sustainability, Innovation and Replication in the Demonstration Projects

Project	Status & Progress as of 30 June 2010 (% completed)	Sustainability	Innovation	Replication / Replicability
Demo 1: WWM at Shimo La Tewa Prison (Kenya) using wetland-lagoon system	99%  Activities are on track to be completed without need for further support.	The treatment system will be maintained as part of the prison's normal maintenance activities.	Strong innovation value in providing a cost effective solution for wastewater treatment in an institutional setting.  The investment worked out at about US\$ 25 per person served.	There has already been limited replication in the adjacent borstal.  There is strong potential for replication in other institutional settings if the results are disseminated appropriately, but this may not occur in the absence of a champion.
Demo 2: Eco-tourism in Toliara (Madagascar)	100%	Two years was insufficient to secure sustainability of activities that call for cultural and organisational changes at community level but there is potential for follow through by other governmental and non-governmental organisations active in Anakao and the surrounding area.	The project has generated substantial experience related to habitat restoration (terrestrial and mangrove) and community development.  Technical innovations include the use of cuttings for terrestrial restoration.	Aspects of the project interventions and approach are replicable in the wider context of marine protected areas and community based coastal tourism in Madagascar. ANGAP, the project implementer, anticipates immediate replication in the newly created Tulear Marine Park.
Demo 3: Constructed wetland and erosion control on landfill site near Dar es Salaam (Tanzania)	100%	There is presently no ongoing management at the site and at this stage the project may benefit from handover to local authorities.	The project demonstrated the use of vetiver in extreme conditions (steep slopes, poor and heavily polluted soils) for erosion and leachate management	Immediate potential for replication including in the planned Dar es Salaam rivers project. TAVEN is actively promoting vetiver as a means of erosion control with economically valuable by-products.



<b>Project</b>	<b>Status &amp; Progress</b> as of 30 June 2010 (% completed)	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Innovation</b>	<b>Replication / Replicability</b>
Demo 4: Integrated solid waste management in Port Louis Harbour (Mauritius)	80%  Activities are on track to be completed by the end of August 2010 without need for further support.	Roles and responsibilities for operation and maintenance of the incinerator have been agreed and costs are expected to be recovered through port operations. Solid waste grids will be maintained by the municipal council.	The practical interventions undertaken by this project are important and demonstrate largely overlooked aspects of LBSA.	The practical interventions are highly replicable.  The supporting measures undertaken by the University of Mauritius provide a wider perspective on port waste management and have strong replication potential in the WIO and elsewhere.
Demo 5: Reduction of stress on mangrove ecosystem (Nampula, Mozambique)	100%	Further support will be required to secure sustainability of activities that call for cultural and organisational changes at community level.  One community association has been formalised as a result of the project and certain activities such as oyster farming are established at local level.	The project was able to adapt a number of PADH approaches associated with community development to its local environment and has generated useful learning and experience in this area.	This was the first well-publicised attempt to plant mangroves in Mozambique and the approach is now being widely replicated in other parts of the country.
Demo 6: Stormwater/wastewater drainage & treatment using a lagoon/constructed wetland system on Pemba Island (Tanzania)	80%  Activities are on track to be completed but may need additional support: the project is at a final but complex stage in its delivery as it installs individual household connections to the sewerage system.	Roles and responsibilities for maintenance of the storm-water drainage and sewerage system are still being negotiated.	This project has demonstrated that a drainage and sewerage system based on low cost constructed wetlands technology can be fitted retrospectively into an established urban setting.	This is potentially a showcase project with excellent potential for replication.  Dissemination of results would be most effective through the water supply and sanitation community.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Status &amp; Progress</b> as of 30 June 2010 (% completed)	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Innovation</b>	<b>Replication / Replicability</b>
Demo 7: ICZM at Itsamia, Moheli MPA (Comoros)	80%  One activity linked to solid waste management has yet to be implemented pending receipt of funding.	The Itsamia 'maison des tortues' is well established and well networked. However its ongoing activities are unlikely to be completely supported by visitor revenues alone in the immediate future.	The project has attempted to reduce soft cliff erosion using local plant species bringing a proactive habitat restoration dimension to community ecotourism.  Follow up monitoring will be valuable.	The approach is replicable in contexts where there are long term incentives (such as nature-based revenue generating potential) for PADH.
Demo 8: Soil erosion control using native species – Black River Park (Mauritius)	70%  The project is now well underway following administrative delays compounded by recruiting difficulties and the seasonal nature of work.	Government financing has been allocated to expand this cost intensive work.  Landowners in the surrounding area are providing ongoing support.	The project has demonstrated a habitat restoration or 'recreation' approach using local vegetation that is suitable in other environmentally sensitive settings.  Is also engaged private landowners.	There are plans to scale up the initiative in the national park and more widely in Mauritius.  Results are being shared through the research and practitioner community concerned with restoration /recreation.
Demo 9: Small Scale Decentralised Wastewater Treatment and Disposal through a Horizontal Subsurface Flow Constructed Wetland (Seychelles)	95%  Activities are on track to be completed by the end of July 2010 without need for further support.	Arrangements have been made with the local housing association for site maintenance and with relevant government departments for quality control and system maintenance.	Constructed wetland technology has succeeded where previous solutions failed due to difficult bedrock and bedrock characteristics.  The project has also tested social acceptability of an 'unconventional' treatment system.	Developers of other housing projects have expressed interest in adopting the technology that is commercially viable as well as adapted to difficult local conditions.
Integrated Algal Ponding System technology for the polishing and beneficiation of municipal sewage treatment effluent (South Africa)	NA - The project was abandoned owing to breakdown of trust amongst key stakeholders.	NA	The project had strong innovation potential with potential to demonstrate economic returns.	The proposed IAPS technology is being explored at other sites.

## Annex 9. Summary co-finance, expenditure by activity and budget variance

### 1. Cofinance & Leveraged funds

Source: PMU records - Status as of 30 June 2010

#### Overview

	In-kind							Cash							Grand total (US\$)	Originally committed co- financing (US\$)
Contributor	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total		
Countries	362'700	405'200	681'826	833'320	1'837'485	618'781	4'739'312	0	0	52'775	50'290	524'300	220'472	847'837	5'587'149	1'395'000
Partners	237'000	297'900	363'500	277'000	315'750	165'500	1'656'650	200'386	960'729	1'509'732	1'358'086	666'628	239'047	4'934'609	6'591'259	3'770'650
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>599'700</b>	<b>703'100</b>	<b>1'045'326</b>	<b>1'110'320</b>	<b>2'153'235</b>	<b>784'281</b>	<b>6'395'962</b>	<b>200'386</b>	<b>960'729</b>	<b>1'562'507</b>	<b>1'408'376</b>	<b>1'190'928</b>	<b>459'519</b>	<b>5'782'446</b>	<b>12'178'408</b>	<b>5'165'650</b>

#### Contributions by country

	In-kind							Cash							Grand total (US\$)	Committed co- financing (US\$)
Country	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total		
Kenya	34'700	56'100	69'300	161'500	110'700	308'850	741'150			0	0	70'000	0	70'000	811'150	not indicated
Tanzania	63'900	49'100	161'186	182'700	64'100	42'535	563'521			0	0	45'500	28'927	74'427	637'948	322'000
Mozambique	32'800	38'700	69'240	60'620	46'700	11'396	259'456			2'775	290	0	6'345	9'410	268'866	235'000
South Africa	85'800	99'600	83'100	160'100	30'200	25'000	483'800			0	0	0	0	0	483'800	170'000
Madagascar	45'100	34'400	111'000	102'900	-89'300	17'000	221'100			50'000	50'000	269'600	0	369'600	590'700	58'000
Mauritius	33'400	52'700	58'900	48'500	1'488'300	167'250	1'849'050			0	0	125'000	171'000	296'000	2'145'050	not indicated
Comoros	34'600	30'500	50'700	62'100	64'260	16'000	258'160			0	0	0	0	0	258'160	550'000
Seychelles	32'400	44'100	78'400	54'900	122'525	30'750	363'075			0	0	14'200	14'200	28'400	391'475	60'000
Somalia	0	0	1'600	600	2'000	1'000	5'200			0	0	0	0	0	5'200	0
France (La Reunion)	0	0	11'000	7'500	35'750	10'000	64'250			0	0	0	0	0	64'250	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>362'700</b>	<b>405'200</b>	<b>681'826</b>	<b>833'320</b>	<b>1'837'485</b>	<b>618'781</b>	<b>4'739'312</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52'775</b>	<b>50'290</b>	<b>524'300</b>	<b>220'472</b>	<b>847'837</b>	<b>5'587'149</b>	<b>1'395'000</b>

## Contributions by Other Partners

Partner	In-kind							Cash							Grand total (US\$)	Committed co-financing (US\$)
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total		
Norway	5'000	5'000	5'000	5'000	5'000	5'000	30'000	170'386	741'229	848'482	1'086'066	508'128	224'047	3'578'339	3'608'339	3'395'650
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167'000	0	0	0	0	167'000	167'000	
SIDA	0	0	70'000	0	0	0	70'000	0	0	523'000	0	0	0	523'000	593'000	
IAEA	25'000	10'000	10'000	10'000	5'000	0	60'000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60'000	
UNEP-NCS	80'000	80'000	80'000	80'000	95'000	50'000	465'000	20'000	20'000	20'000	20'000	20'000	10'000	110'000	575'000	375'000
UNEP-GPA	52'500	55'000	25'500	25'500	25'500	12'500	196'500	0	0	2'500	0	0	0	2'500	199'000	
UNEP-MCEB	7'500	7'500	7'500	7'500	10'000	5'000	45'000	10'000	25'000	0	0	0	0	35'000	80'000	
UNEP-DEWA	11'000	16'000	25'000	25'000	25'000	12'500	114'500	0	0	80'750	0	0	0	80'750	195'250	
UNEP-ROA	15'000	5'000	17'000	17'000	17'000	8'500	79'500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79'500	
UNEP-DEPI	5'000	5'000	5'000	5'000	5'000	2'500	27'500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27'500	
UNEP-DELC	5'000	5'000	5'000	7'500	15'000	7'500	45'000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45'000	
Aqua-for-all	10'000	25'000	50'000	30'000	30'000	15'000	160'000	0	5'000	15'000	62'020	10'000	5'000	97'020	257'020	
ECVM	0	10'000	5'000	5'000	10'000	0	30'000	0	2'500	0	120'000	5'000	0	127'500	157'500	
CSIR				19'500	7'500	7'500	34'500				0	0	0	0	34'500	
IOC-UNESCO	2'000	22'500	5'000	5'000	5'000	2'500	42'000	0	0	20'000	50'000	0	0	70'000	112'000	
WIOMSA	6'500	10'100	10'000	2'500	11'250	2'500	42'850	0	0	0	20'000	20'000	0	40'000	82'850	
WWF	1'500	17'500	14'500	5'500	6'500	2'500	48'000	0	0	0	0	10'000	0	10'000	58'000	
Cordio	0	5'500	0	0	2'000	0	7'500	0	0	0	0	2'500	0	2'500	10'000	
EAWS	0	800	2'000	2'000	0	0	4'800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4'800	
ORI	1'500	800	3'500	2'000	10'000	0	17'800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17'800	
MACEMP	0	1'200	3'000	2'000	2'000	2'000	10'200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10'200	
WCS	0	800	2'000	2'000	0	0	4'800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4'800	
IOC/COI	0	2'500	7'000	4'000	13'500	25'000	52'000	0	0	0	0	91'000	0	91'000	143'000	
IUCN	3'000	5'400	11'500	11'000	13'500	2'500	46'900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46'900	
Birdlife Intern.	0	0	0	2'000	2'000	2'500	6'500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6'500	
Wetlands Int.	0	0	0	2'000	0	0	2'000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2'000	
NEPAD	6'500	7'300	0	0	0	0	13'800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13'800	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>237'000</b>	<b>297'900</b>	<b>363'500</b>	<b>277'000</b>	<b>315'750</b>	<b>165'500</b>	<b>1'656'650</b>	<b>200'386</b>	<b>960'729</b>	<b>1'509'732</b>	<b>1'358'086</b>	<b>666'628</b>	<b>239'047</b>	<b>4'934'609</b>	<b>6'591'259</b>	<b>3'770'650</b>

## 2. Statement of funding allocations by module based on project workplan

Source: Workplan Revision 7

Module		Funding Allocation (USD)					Total
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
1	Water and sediment quality	50'750	216'763	186'250	196'697	0	650'460
2	MWW	76'194	196'360	440'756	545'250	77'250	1'335'810
3	PADH	61'194	201'538	283'712	184'500	91'000	821'944
4	Legal	51'250	58'750	43'250	59'250	62'750	275'250
5	EIA	0	44'250	93'000	5'000	0	142'250
6	NPA	0	88'690	65'000	285'000	20'000	458'690
7	ICARM	0	72'000	40'000	53'000	0	165'000
8	Regional coordination	309'000	290'500	468'000	373'500	348'000	1'789'000
9	Training and education	0	165'000	40'500	148'973	90'000	444'473
10	Stakeholder involvement	0	26'501	55'500	312'500	69'999	464'500
11	TDA and SAP	0	0	130'200	179'000	0	309'200
TOTAL		548'388	1'360'352	1'846'168	2'342'670	758'999	6'856'577

### 3. Variance between planned expenditure and actual expenditure

Showing main budget components plus subcontracts for supporting organizations based on GEF and Norwegian funding only.

Source: Budget Revision 4 (2009)

		Original budget	Revised budget	Difference	%
<b>PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>					
1100	Project Personnel	1'337'461	1'393'643	56'182	4
1200	Consultants	674'945	319'194	-355'751	-53
1600	Travel on official business	224'000	199'196	-24'804	-11
<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>2'236'406</b>	<b>1'912'033</b>	<b>-324'373</b>	<b>-15</b>
<b>SUBCONTRACT COMPONENT</b>					
2100	Sub-contract (MOUs/Las for cooperating agencies)	325'000	148'328	-176'672	-54
2200	Sub-contracts (MOUs/Las for supporting organizations)	2'440'000	2'704'479	264'479	11
	Demonstration projects	845'000	1'237'355	392'355	
	Review of the status of ratification	40'000	0	-40'000	
	NGOs for public awareness	63'000	18'924	-44'076	
	National-level coordination and TDA/SAP development	0	188'723	188'723	
	Small Grants Program	232'000	68'628	-163'372	
	Monitoring water and sediment quality	30'000	458'110	428'110	
	Developing NPAs	500'000	272'379	-227'621	
	ICARM demonstration project	300'000	85'000	-215'000	
	Sustainable tourism (demo projects)	300'000	247'860	-52'140	
	Clearinghouse mechanism	130'000	127'500	-2'500	
2299	Sub-total	2'440'000	2'704'479	264'479	11
2300	Sub-contracts (for Commercial purposes)	35'000	0	-35'000	-100
<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>2'800'000</b>	<b>2'852'807</b>	<b>52'807</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TRAINING COMPONENT</b>					
3200	Training and educational programmes	390'536	356'478	-34'058	-9
3300	Meetings/conferences	1'131'260	1'473'975	342'715	30
<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>1'521'796</b>	<b>1'830'453</b>	<b>308'657</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT</b>					
4100	Expendable equipment (items under \$1500 each)	32'300	16'121	-16'179	-50
4200	Non-expendable equipment	144'600	63'219	-81'381	-56
4300	Premises (rent)	48'000	837	-47'163	-98
<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>224'900</b>	<b>80'177</b>	<b>-144'723</b>	<b>-64</b>
<b>MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>					
5200	Reporting cost	59'395	156'273	96'878	163
5300	Sundry	704'293	660'047	-44'246	-6
5400	Hospitality and entertainment	0	0	0	0
5499	Sub-total	0	0	0	0
5500	Monitoring and Evaluation	35'000	90'000	55'000	157
<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>		<b>798'688</b>	<b>906'320</b>	<b>107'632</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PROJECT GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>7'581'790</b>	<b>7'581'790</b>	<b>-0</b>	

## Annex 10. The Evaluator

**Sarah HUMPHREY, PhD**

### Profile

- Over 18 years working on environmental research and policy, project and programme development and institutional strengthening with a wide range of non-governmental, intergovernmental and research organisations in Europe and Africa.
- Technical background in environmental management, policy and governance, sustainable development, conservation, and project and programme evaluation

### Education

**Open University Business School: MBA (Merit)**

**Department of Marine Sciences and Coastal Management, University of Newcastle**

**PhD:** *Analysis of Approaches for Evaluating the Success of Coastal Management in Europe*

**King's College, University of London: BSc. (Hons Class I): Human Environmental Science**

**Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island:** Summer Institute in Coastal Management

### Employment

**From 2008 Consultant in Environment, Sustainable Development and Conservation**  
for WWF, IUCN, Oxfam International, UNEP, WIOMSA, IOC ReCoMaP, and others

**2000 - 2007 WWF International, Gland, Switzerland**  
Programme Officer, Africa and Madagascar Programme

**1999 – 2000 European Commission, Brussels, Belgium**  
Stagiaire, Environment Directorate: Nature, Coastal Zones and Tourism

**1997 - 1999 University of Newcastle, UK**  
Research Associate, Department of Marine Sciences and Coastal Management

**1996 - 1997 Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA), Zanzibar, Tanzania**  
Development Officer

**1990 - 1995 IUCN - The World Conservation Union, Switzerland & Kenya**  
Research Assistant then Programme Officer, Marine and Coastal Programme