

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2009
(1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009)

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Demonstrating and Capturing Best Practices and Technologies for the Reduction of Land-sourced Impacts Resulting from Coastal Tourism (short title: COAST)
-----------------------	---

Executing Agency:	UNIDO UNWTO as a collaborating partner responsible for executing some project components
--------------------------	---

Project partners:	UNEP DGEF, Nairobi/Abidjan Convention, UNWTO (SDTD), NCRC NGO (Ghana), REDO NGO (Ghana), Ricerca NGO (Ghana), SNV INGO, Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature (MINEP) and Ministry of Tourism, (Cameroon), The National Environment Agency (NEA) and Department of State for Tourism and Culture (The Gambia), The Ministry of Environment (MoE) and Ministry of Tourism (Ghana), The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and Ministry of Tourism (Kenya), The Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA) and Ministry of Tourism (MITUR – Mozambique), The Tourism Authority, Lagos State and the Ministry of Environment, Lagos State, and the Federal Ministry of Environment (Nigeria), Le Direction de l'Environnement et des Etablissements Classes (DEEC) and Ministere du Tourisme (Senegal), Ministry of Environment (DEES) and Seychelles Tourism Board (Seychelles), The Vice President's Office (Environment division) (VPO) and Ministry of Tourism (Tanzania).
--------------------------	--

Geographical Scope:	Regional (West/Central and Eastern Africa)
----------------------------	--

Participating Countries:	Cameroon, The Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Seychelles, Tanzania,
---------------------------------	---

GEF project ID:	2129	IMIS number*¹:	GFL/2328-2732-4987
Focal Area(s):	International Waters	GEF OP #:	10
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	1, 2 & 3 (Innovative demonstrations for; restoring biological diversity, reducing contaminants and addressing water scarcity)	GEF approval date*:	2 August 2007
UNEP approval date:	Nov 2007	First Disbursement*:	06 Dec 2007
Actual start date²:	17/11/2008	Planned duration:	60 months
Intended completion date*:	31 October 2012	Actual or Expected completion date:	15 November 2013

¹ Fields with an * sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

² Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases where a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation*:	\$5,388,200
PDF GEF cost*:	\$626,400	PDF co-financing*:	---
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	\$23,456,816	Total Cost*:	\$29,471,416
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	First quarter 2011	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	---
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	---	No. of revisions*:	None
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	13-15/07/2009	Date of last Revision*:	N/A
Disbursement as of 30 June 2009*:	\$500,000	Date of financial closure*:	N/A
Date of Completion^{3*}:	N/A	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2009⁴:	\$265,145
Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2009⁵:	---	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2009*:	\$104,575
Leveraged financing:⁶	---		---

Project summary⁷	<p>The marine and coastal resources along the 48,000 km of sub-Saharan African coastline are under threat to a varying degree from the impacts of development-related activities. In particular, coastal tourism contributes to the threats to the coastal and marine ecosystems through tourism-related pollution and contamination. At the same time, coastal tourism is often considered the ‘environmentally friendly’ alternative to more exploitative livelihood options. Based on the identified issues and proposals at the Ministerial and Heads of State meeting in Johannesburg at the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the thematic group on coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, the project aims to demonstrate best practices and strategies to reduce the degradation of marine and coastal environments of trans-boundary significance resulting from pollution and contaminants and associated impacts. The project aims to: (i) capture Best Available Practices and Technologies (BAPs and BATs) for contaminant reduction; (ii) develop and implement mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management that measurably reduce degradation of coastal ecosystems from land-based sources of pollution and contamination; (iii) assess and deliver training and capacity requirements emphasizing an integrated approach to sustainable reduction in coastal ecosystem and environmental degradation; (iv) develop and implement information capture, information processing and management mechanisms and information dissemination; and (v) undertake cost-effective project management, coordination, monitoring</p>
------------------------------------	---

³ If there was a “Completion Revision” please use the date of the revision.

⁴ Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

⁵ Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format.

⁶ See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

⁷ As in project document

	and evaluation. The primary emphasis of the Project is aimed toward on-the-ground demonstrations which form the major component of the Project as reflected in the substantial funding for these elements. The lessons learnt and project relevant information will be disseminated through a project information exchange mechanism linked to IW: LEARN.
Project status FY09⁸	This is the first reporting period for the COAST project. The project was initiated through an agreement between UNEP and UNIDO in November 2007, and a first disbursement made to UNIDO in December 2007. Owing to delays in the recruitment of the Technical Coordinator (TC), the project actually only got underway in November 2008. During the last week of November 2008, UNIDO and UNWTO representatives met in Nairobi in order to establish a work plan for the inception phase. The inception phase lasted 8 months leading up to an inception workshop which was held on the 13-14 th July 2009, in Bilene, Mozambique. During these initial months, the Project Coordination office was established, equipment and furniture purchased, and a Project secretary recruited. The TC undertook visits to all 9 participating countries in order to re-establish links with partner country executing agencies, and to establish good personal communication and understanding with Project Focal Points from the Ministries of Environment and Tourism in each country. The revised Demonstration Project documents and workplans for the first year of implementation work were presented during the inception meeting, (taking into account new developments in each country since the end of the PDF-B phase). A full project level budget revision was also prepared and presented. Immediately following the Inception Workshop, the first Steering Committee Meeting of the project was held. At this meeting the country workplans, revised overall budget, logical frameworks (regional level and demonstration level) and outline workplans for the period up to July 2010 were discussed and approved.
Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets⁹	The UNEP Global Program of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land Based Activities (UNEP GPA/LBA) recognizes that the main cause of degradation of the marine environment is due to land-based activities including urbanization and coastal development. It provides a framework for action, that invites governments to assess their respective problems, identify priorities for action, develop strategies, monitor implementation and set common goals. Effective actions to deal with all land-based impacts upon the marine environment (sewage, persistent organic pollutants, radioactive substances, heavy metals, oils (hydrocarbons), nutrients, sediment mobilization, litter, and the physical alteration and destruction of habitats) are targeted. The proposed Project builds on the recognized priorities for action proposed in the regional approach to implementing the GPA/LBA, which include the

⁸ Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

⁹ For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

	strengthening of regional cooperative arrangements. This project contributes specifically to strategic targets number 1 (depletion of coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity), 2 (reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA) and 3 (Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in surface and groundwater basins that are transboundary in nature).
--	---

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project¹⁰

To support and enhance the conservation of globally significant coastal and marine ecosystems and associated biodiversity in sub-Saharan Africa, through the reduction of the negative environmental impacts which they receive as a result of coastal tourism

*Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)*

As stated above, the COAST project has just completed an Inception phase (of eight months) where the work priorities have been:

- a) To establish up-to-date contacts and communication with Focal Point persons (FPs) in each partner country within both the Ministries of Tourism and the Environment;
- b) To revise and update each planned demonstration project and produce a logical framework for each;
- c) To begin a process of obtaining government re-commitment to co-funding pledges made during the PDF-b phase;
- d) To begin a process of partnership development at regional, national and local levels within the project (with particular emphasis on private sector involvement);
- e) To revise the project logical frameworks and budget in view of the revised implementation approach and partnership agreement with UNWTO.

Currently the main challenges envisaged are:

- a) To obtain a practical commitment on the very high levels of co-funding agreed from partner countries as written into the Project Document (GEF funds represent only 25% of the overall total project funding);
- b) To encourage active private sector engagement within each demonstration project site in order to successfully achieve the project objectives in terms of sustainability;
- c) To provide suitably robust training and capacity building inputs in order to overcome skill and knowledge gaps
- d) To provide capacity building inputs in order to establish a practical and robust monitoring and evaluation framework for all demonstration projects and be able to monitor progress on expected outcomes.

¹⁰ Or immediate project objective

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document ¹¹(not more than 200 words)

As the project is only in its first year, it is too early to describe any substantive contributions at this level yet. However the following activities have been completed and will contribute to laying a sound framework for collaboration and cooperation over the project lifespan:

- Planning a needs assessment activity for each demonstration project to identify capacity gaps which will be addressed through appropriate training, education and awareness raising activities to increase human resources capacity and public awareness on the major issues to be addressed;
- Confirmation of partnerships agreed during the PDF-B phase, and agreement on the establishment of a broad stakeholder-based project management structure (including representation from countries from both the Ministries of the Environment and Tourism at regional level) and stakeholder involvement through local management committees, building on partnerships which are to be created around the demonstrations. These are likely to involve governmental and non-governmental organisations, academic and research institutions and the private sector;
- Clear definition and design for each of the nine (confirmed) pilot projects which will aim to develop innovative, effective and cost-efficient solutions for addressing the impacts of land-based and tourism sector related, pollution and contamination;
- The COAST project is expected to contribute towards a better understanding of ecosystem-based approaches to coastal tourism and therefore approaches towards sustainable management of coastal and marine biodiversity through a ‘tourism lens’;
- The COAST project is also expected to contribute towards a better understanding of monitoring, recreation and management needs for lagoon and reef areas among partner countries;
- Finally, the project is expected to contribute best practice and technology examples for wider sharing and knowledge management in the focal area of water resource management and coastal water use policy development.

¹¹ Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹² will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s) –

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

¹² For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

¹³ Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

¹⁴ Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

¹⁵ Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

¹⁶ Use GEF Secretariat six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Objective 1¹⁷ BAPs/BATs strategies for sustainable tourism demonstrated	1.Mechanisms for reduced degradation understood, in place and being utilised	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation, and to include both regional and national level monitoring requirements	All stakeholders and partners aware and understand the major causes of environmental degradation	At least two demo projects have developed mechanisms and are actively testing these to address issues of environmental degradation	Following the first round of country visits, partner countries are better placed to understand the causes of degradation including hotel waste, poor management of community/village wastes and reef damage caused from both fishing and recreation. A number of demo projects have been revised to test practices and technologies to address this ¹⁸	S

¹⁷ Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

¹⁸ Table 1 of the Inception report provides a thematic overview of each demonstration project: EMS is targeted in; Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Senegal (site 1), Seychelles and Tanzania. Eco-tourism is targeted in all countries except the Seychelles. Reef management is targeted in; Kenya, Mozambique, Seychelles and Tanzania.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	2. National indicators to demonstrate sustainable improvements have been agreed & are being used (national (including demo project indicators)) ^o	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation	National indicators have been agreed with all partner countries and data are beginning to be collected	Five partner countries are using national indicators to monitor and measure improvements	Partner country sub-contracts for beginning demonstration projects are currently under development, and a M&E framework will be agreed with each partner country during the next work plan period up to July 2010	MS/MU
	3. Project demonstrations providing replicable BATs/BAPs (with costs & benefits)	No baseline information available.	Four demonstrations are actively being implemented employing BAPs/BATs and are in the process of being documented for sharing and knowledge management	All demonstrations are actively being implemented and each has provided at least one BAT/BAP based upon the project's thematic priorities (EMS, eco-tourism, reefs, ecosystem planning) which has been documented for sharing and knowledge management	A global review of BAPs/BATs is already underway with the consultant expected to report by August 31 st 2009. Partner country sub-contracts for initiating demonstration projects are currently under development	MS

^o Regional level indicators will also be developed as part of the project's M&E framework, and will be discussed during the second SCM in July 2010.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	4. Incentives for sustainable partnerships for civil society, private and public sector documented & disseminated	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation	At least one case study for sustainable partnerships documented and disseminated	At least one case study per thematic area (EMS, Reefs, Eco-tourism, ecosystem planning) for sustainable partnerships documented and disseminated	Partner country visits have been completed for all demo project sites and key stakeholders (including; local govt, NGOs and private hoteliers) informed about the COAST project objectives	MS
Objective 2 Mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management established	<i>Project experiences on sustainable tourism documented and disseminated as a contribution to policy debates in all 9 countries *</i>	Baseline information available as part of the demo project narratives, but require to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Experience sharing for enhancing policy debates underway in at least four countries	Project experiences documented and disseminated as a contribution to policy debates in all partner countries	A partnership agreement with UNWTO is currently under negotiation in order to further this work	S

* “Effective sustainable tourism policies adopted and under implementation in all 9 countries” - The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are more within the control of the project, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown in the table above.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	2. <i>“Project experiences supporting the development or revision of national strategies for sustainable tourism”**</i>	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation as part of a ‘gaps, needs and options’ consultancy	Identification of priority issues for inclusion in National strategies are underway	Project experiences documented and at least one information brief per country disseminated as a contribution towards national strategy development and revision	Partner country visits have been completed and discussions held with project Focal Points on sustainable tourism strategy requirements	S
Objective 3 Training and Capacity Building for sustainable tourism delivered	1. Assessment of training needs for each partner country completed by second SCM	Not existing	Regional assessments completed (East and West Africa)	Regional assessments completed (East and West Africa)	During the inception period partner country visits provided the opportunity to understand some of the capacity gaps which need to be addressed and a full assessment is planned later in 2009	S

** “National strategies and work plans to support reforms to governance and management in place & operational” The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are more within the control of the project, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown above.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	2.Training packages dev and implemented to suit national needs	Not existing	Relevant training packages/inputs are being designed and implemented in some partner countries	All partner countries have benefited from at least two thematic training packages developed to suit specific demo project requirements	Country visits provided the opportunity to understand some of the capacity gaps which need to be addressed and a full assessment is planned later in 2009 through a regional consultancy	S
	3. Training materials incorporating BATs/BAPs from Objective 1 available by end of Yr 3	Not existing	Training materials are under development with some content coming from COAST demo project BAPs/BATs	Training materials incorporating COAST BATs/BAPs and other experiences are available to all partner countries and are being used in at least five	A consultant has been hired to provide a review of BAPs/BATs upon which the COAST project demos can draw for their own guidance	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Objective 4 Establishment of a virtual information coordination & clearing house (eRICH)	1. eRICH established and fully operational within first 2 yrs	Not existing	eRICH is in place	All partner countries are contributing to eRICH through BAPs/BATs and other project documented experiences	Since the original project design this objective has been modified so as to provide a virtual coordination and clearing house rather than as formerly, a physical presence in only one or two countries. Current status of eRICH, discussion completed, but no virtual development yet.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	2. <i>“Project Focal Points contributing to and coordinating information and knowledge management uploading to eRICH at the national level”</i> ***	Not existing	Work with relevant National Environment & Tourism agencies is on-going with the collection of environmental & tourism management information to feed into eRICH	All countries are providing environmental and tourism management information for sharing and dissemination through eRICH	The COAST website template is being developed, but is not yet public. eRICH will initially be part of this website, and project Focal Points will be important ‘nodes’ in this information and knowledge clearing house mechanism.	MS
	3. ****				It is proposed that this indicator be removed from the reporting matrix in future years (see footnote)	N/A

*** “National Environmental Information management and advisory models created together with implementation strategies” - The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are consistent with the smooth operation of eRICH, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown above.

**** “Awareness for sustainable tourism strategies and approaches confirmed through government willingness to provide financing for tourism and environment line agencies” - Since this is well beyond the scope of the COAST project’s potential influence, the project management is proposing to delete this indicator from the logframe and all future PIR reports.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	4. Lessons from awareness of coastal environment and sustainable tourism principles & practices at demo sites presented on eRICH ¹⁹	Not existing	At least two partner countries have shared early lessons from awareness on the subject matter on eRICH	All countries are providing awareness lessons on the subject matter for sharing and dissemination through eRICH	The COAST demo projects are not yet implemented	MS
Outcome 1: <i>Working Environmental Management Systems (EMS) in place at appropriate demo sites</i>	1 National institutes strengthened through EMS training	Not existing	National institutes have initiated demo projects employing EMS at four of the relevant demo project sites	National institutes have monitored & evaluated EMS demo activities in order to share outcomes on; economic, social and environmental benefits	During the recent partner country visits four demonstration project sites were identified specifically for EMS capacity building inputs	MS
	2 ²⁰					N/A

¹⁹ Re-worded from the original logical framework as component 4 of the project is now focusing on eRICH as an information /influencing tool

²⁰ “Enhanced awareness of EMS by all tourism facility stakeholders”. This indicator is being proposed to be combined with indicator no 3 in the revised M&E framework for the project which will be discussed during the second SCM in July 2010.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	3 Increase in capacity of tourism stakeholders to initiate EMS (with the aim to replicate good practices)	Not existing	Stakeholders who are prepared to make their own investments in EMS identified	Collaborative EMS training events involving both domestic and international tour operators have been held in at least two demo sites and have resulted in changes to hotel management practices	Partner country visits indicated that private sector stakeholders in the project are under represented and there is a low level of awareness about EMS. EMS interventions now targeted to begin in; Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Senegal (site1), Seychelles and Tanzania during year 1 of demo projects	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	4 <i>"Project experiences in EMS inform policy and regulatory debates"</i> [∞]	Not existing	Data from Project EMS experiences being collected and collated	Project EMS experiences being documented and disseminated to enhance policy and regulatory debates in at least two partner countries	Partner country visits have indicated that very few tourism regulations take into account EMS criteria when considering new tourism developments EMS demonstration projects agreed, but yet to begin	MU
	5 Eco-labelling plan and certification schemes operational	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Eco-labelling and certification plan for each appropriate demo project location drafted	Eco-labelling and certification plans operational in at least two locations	Seychelles and Tanzania are interested to trial schemes similar to the one currently being introduced in Kenya	S

[∞] "Policy and regulatory framework for EMS developed" - The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are more within the control of the project, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown above.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	6 Waste management control mechanisms operational	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Waste management control mechanisms identified at the appropriate demo project sites	Waste management control mechanisms operational in at least two appropriate demo project sites	Lack of awareness on waste management was found to be common across all countries during the first round of visits. This will be one component of EMS training at the demo project sites A regional level EMS training is programmed for year 1 of demo project implementation	MS
Outcome 2: <i>Eco-tourism initiatives for alternative livelihoods and revenues developed for biodiversity conservation and local communities at relevant demo sites</i>	1. Management procedures & institutional support for developments in eco-tourism established	Not existing	Local civil society and government institutions to support eco-tourism developments identified at all demo sites	Local civil society / government institutions have management capacity support procedures for eco-tourism development in place in at least four demo projects	Partner country visits ensured that designs for demonstration projects include support for eco-tourism initiatives and work on these will start as part of the year 1 workplan	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	2. Improved knowledge & information about eco-tourism within and around each demo site	Some baseline information is presented in the demo project narrative documents, additional information will be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Locally appropriate information and media coverage being developed for eco-tourism services in at least four demo sites	Visitor resource centres and private sector investors are promoting local eco-tourism services in at least four demo projects	During partner country visits a number of eco-tourism stakeholder groups were identified and consulted as part of an initial process of awareness raising about the COAST project	MS
	3.Improved knowledge & information about HIV/AIDS and public health at each demo site (through working with partners competent in this field)	Baseline information is to be collected as part of the M&E framework development during year 1 of demo implementation	Information needs and capacity limitations to inform tourists and local communities on HIV/AIDS and public health understood	Appropriate information on HIV/AIDS and public health being shared locally at each demo project site	No progress to date but, a number of partner countries have raised the issue of social and behavioural conflicts/changes resulting from the tourism industry (particularly sex trade and 'beach boys' culture), and the need for the COAST project to address these as part of an integrated approach	MU

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	4. Partnerships and networks of eco-tourism bodies and professionals formed	Some information has been provided in the demo project narratives, but this needs to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Forums and meetings are being organised to explore network formation/ strengthening opportunities at all demo sites	Network bodies have been formed and represent a growing membership of stakeholders in at least three demo project sites	Data from Kenya and The Gambia available, but no progress yet from other countries Some partner countries already have eco-tourism networks (e.g. Kenya, The Gambia), and the lessons from these will be shared to other countries through the COAST Project	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	5. <i>"Evidence of stakeholders diversifying their eco-tourism activities and revenue sources"</i> <small>∞∞</small>	Some information has been provided in the demo project narratives, but this needs to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Data on eco-tourism facilities and services are being regularly collected at each demo project site	Analysis of data on eco-tourism operations completed for all demo project sites	Potential identified in all partner countries, but no specific interventions yet made. There is a high level of interest among partner countries to promote eco-tourism, and much potential to expand and diversify these services across the selected demonstration projects	MS

∞∞ "Number and type of new eco-tourism operations formed" - The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are more within the control of the project, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown above.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
Outcome 3: <i>Improved reef recreation, management and monitoring mechanisms in place at relevant demo sites</i>	1. Survey and GIS mapping of sensitive areas and damaged sites completed	A number of previous projects have undertaken marine/reef mapping to a limited extent, and this information needs to be verified during year 1 of demo implementation	Survey work is actively on-going at all East African demo project sites	GIS maps showing areas of sensitivity and damage to biodiversity published for all East African demo project sites	Workplans for the first year of demo project implementation have been designed to complement existing survey information which may be available from previous projects in Kenya, Tanzania and Seychelles.	MS
	2. Procurement, installation, management of reef protection equipment as part of reef management strategy	As above	Reef management strategies being actively discussed by all appropriate East African demo projects and reef protection equipment being ordered	Reef management strategies with work plans and protection procedures in place in at least two East African demo project sites	Partner country visits have so far confirmed the type and number of institutions that the COAST project will need to work with to address this activity	MS
	3. Awareness and Capacity Building (CB) on reef conservation being sustained by local stakeholders	Some information is provided in the demo project narrative documents, but this needs to be reviewed during year 1 of demo implementation	Appropriate stakeholders identified and awareness events and information on reef conservation being shared at all East African demo sites	Training and CB on reef conservation has been undertaken at all E African demo project locations and there is evidence of local stakeholder interest to maintain this	Visits to Partner countries identified there may be some locally based research and learning institutions with whom the COAST project can work to build capacity	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹³	Baseline level ¹⁴	Mid-term target ¹⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2009	Progress rating ¹⁶
	4. "Project experiences on reef area management documented and disseminated as a contribution to debates on improving regulatory mechanisms"*	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation	Appropriate locally based government agencies identified and the primary issues affecting reef areas being debated	Demo project experiences being used to inform appropriate locally based government agencies on improving reef management at all E African demo sites	No data yet collected, but programmed for collection during year 1 of demo projects Reefs are recognised as being important resources for both local communities and the tourism industry, but more specific data are required on their status and use in order to improve management approaches	MS

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY2009 rating (First PIR)	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
MS	Many things must still come together, especially at the national level, for the project to make progress towards its outcomes.

* "Regulatory & institutional framework revised/established for reef area management" - The project is proposing to change the wording of this indicator to reflect actions which are more within the control of the project, and will submit an M&E framework for discussion on this at the second SCM to be held in July 2010. A proposed re-wording is shown above.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
1. Discuss and Agree on follow up actions from BAPs/BATs consultancy	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points	Between Oct 31 st – Dec 31 st 2009
2. Training assessment TORs developed in order to commission Training needs assessment (TNA)	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points	Oct 31 st 2009
3. Web support to develop eRICH initiated	COAST Technical Coordinator, UNEP (Bangkok/Nairobi) and Project Focal Points	Between Oct 31 st – Dec 31 st 2009
4. EMS consultancy and training TOR developed and shared	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points	Oct 31 st 2009
5. Follow up on potential private sector involvement in waste management at demo site in Kenya	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points (Kenya), Rottaler Modell (Germany)	Nov 30 th 2009
6. Identify potential partners to work on HIV/AIDS awareness in demo projects	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points, UNAIDS Country Reps	Dec 31 st 2009
7. Develop TOR and work plan for GIS expert (volunteer) and regional technical peer support	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points, Regional Remote Sensing and Mapping Centre (Nairobi)	Nov 30 th 2009

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
No previous yr			

3.2 Project implementation progress –

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
Output 1: (describe²⁴) Capture Best Available Practices and Technologies (BAPs/BATs)				
Activity 1: BAPs & BATs global review completed	Within six months of inception	50%	Consultant expected to produce a draft report by August 31 st 2009	S
Activity 2: Incentives and benefits of partnerships for sustainable tourism identified for all stakeholders and reported upon	By end of Year 1 ²⁵	0%	Due to the late recruitment of the TC and therefore the start up of the project, no work has been achieved on this item yet	MU
Sub theme 1-a: Establishment and Implementation of Environmental Management Systems and Voluntary Eco-certification and Labeling Schemes				
Activity 3: Planning & management procedure for EMS and Eco-certification established at respective demo sites	By end of Year 1	10%	Demonstration sites for EMS and Eco-certification work identified	MU
Activity 4: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	10%	Needs assessment activity is now programmed within the first year of demo project implementation	MU
Activity 5: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been visited and work plans agreed for the first	MS

²⁰ Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

²¹ As per latest workplan (latest project revision) which was approved by members at the Inception workshop and first SCM in July 2009.

²² Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

²³ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

²⁴ Information on expected date of output completion and progress made is a requirement.

²⁵ The convention in this project is to count the end of year 1, as 1 year after the Project Coordinator took up post.

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
			year of demo project implementation	
Activity 6: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	Noted
Sub theme 1-b: Development of eco-tourism to alleviate poverty through sustainable alternative livelihoods and generate revenues for conservation of biodiversity and the benefit of the local community			UNIDO to coordinate but UNWTO to provide Technical Assistance	
Activity 7: Planning & management procedure for Eco-tourism Development established at respective demo sites	By end of Year 1	10%	Demonstration sites for Eco-tourism work identified and agreed	MS
Activity 8: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	10%	Needs assessment activity is now programmed within the first year of demo project implementation	MS
Activity 9: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been visited and work plans agreed for the first year of demo project implementation	MS
Activity 10: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	Noted
Sub theme 1-c: Develop and demonstrate best practices in mitigating environmental impacts of tourism through the implementation of reef recreation management strategies			UNIDO to coordinate but UNWTO to provide Technical Assistance	
Activity 11: Planning & management procedure for reef recreation management established at respective demo sites	By end of Year 1	10%	Demonstration sites for reef management work	MS

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
			identified and agreed	
Activity 12: Survey and GIS Mapping of reefs, sensitive areas, threatened species and damaged sites	Begins end of Year 1, completed by end of Year 4	10%	This work has been programmed into the first year of demo project implementation	MS
Activity 13: Procurement, installation and maintenance of reef protection equipment by relevant stakeholders	Begins end of Year 1, completed by end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on the results from activity 12	MS
Activity 14: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	10%	Needs assessment activity is now programmed within the first year of demo project implementation	MS
Activity 15: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been visited and work plans agreed for the first year of demo project implementation	MS
Activity 16: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	Noted.
Output 2: Development and Implementation of mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management			UNIDO to coordinate but UNWTO to provide Technical Assistance	
Activity 17: National governance reports on 'gaps, needs and options' produced by each country	End of Year 1	10%	Work on this output is to be led by UNWTO and a Letter of Agreement (LoA) is currently under discussion with them	MU
Activity 18: Options and scenarios appropriate for each country examined and refined based on demo project	By end of Year 3	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as the	MS

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
lessons			UNIDO/UNWTO LoA has yet to be activated	
Activity 19: Workplans that promote and support reforms to governance and management agreed and formally adopted in each country	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it follows on from activity 18	MS
Output 3: Assessment and Delivery of training and capacity building requirements emphasising an integrated approach to sustainable tourism				
Activity 20: Assessments undertaken and reports discussed and training & Capacity Building (CB) actions agreed	By end of Year 1	10%	Country assessments have been planned for the first year of demo project implementation	MU
Activity 21: First training packages developed and delivered in all countries	By end of 18 months	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it follows on from activity 20	MS
Activity 22: Training & CB activities being implemented and supported by local institutions in all countries	By end of Year 3	10%	First year demo project workplans have included the identification of relevant local training /research institutions	S
Output 4: Information Capture, management and dissemination				
Activity 23: Project website designed and 'live'	By end of six months	50%	Web site dummy template agreed, documentation being uploaded but not yet made public	MS
Activity 24: National information nodes/focal points established	By end of Year 1	100%	All FPs identified and agreed TORs	S
Activity 25: PCU Nairobi disseminating initial guidelines/BAPs/BATs via website	By end of 18 months	10%	BAPs/BATs consultant currently working to identify existing examples of best practices for sharing with	S

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
			partner countries	
Activity 26: Functioning coastal environment and tourism information management system in all countries (feeding into eRICH through national nodes)	By end of Year 3	0%	It is too early to record any progress on this activity	Noted
Activity 27: Environmental information being used to support improved governance and policy development	By end of Year 4	0%	It is too early to record any progress on this activity	Noted
Output 5: Project management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation				
Activity 28: All PCU staff, equipment, & communications with country Coordinators in place	By end of 2009	50%	Some computer equipment and demo coordinators not yet in place/recruited.	MS
Activity 29: Project Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Group (TAG) confirmed and active**	By time of inception workshop	90%	Technical Advisory Group not yet confirmed as necessary, but Steering Committee membership confirmed and active	MS
Activity 30: National Coordinators and Steering Groups confirmed and active	By time of inception workshop	100%	Steering groups have met in Gambia, Ghana, Senegal, Seychelles Tanzania. Steering groups to be informal and specific to each country context. There is considerable variation across countries on the capacity of these groups	S
Activity 31: National partnerships formed & active	By end of 18 months	30%	Sub contracts have yet to be agreed but are being	MS

** The COAST project management is proposing to drop the need for a TAG, and for its functions to be taken on by the SCM members and hired in consultants as necessary. This will be discussed at the next SCM in July 2010.

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2009) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²² . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²³
			drafted with all country level executing partners	
Activity 32: Appropriate project M&E procedures in place and operational	By end of Year 1	30%	Each demo project now has a draft logical framework, but no M&E framework yet for regional and national level	MU
Activity 33: Appropriate and effective political and financial mechanisms for sustaining project outcomes (from Components 1-4)	By end of project	0%	It is too early to show any progress on this activity	Noted.

Overall project implementation progress²⁶ (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings*):

FY08 rating	FY09 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
No previous yr	MS	Implementation is significantly behind schedule and the scope of inception-level activities was significantly underestimated in the project document.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. (*To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager²⁷*)

NB> These items are not necessarily ranked as MS, MU, U or HU, but rather they are critical to complete so that other activities are able to move forward

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Ensure project M&E procedures are in place and operational	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired consultant	The second SCM (July 2010)
Assessments undertaken, reports discussed and Training & Capacity Building (CB) actions	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired	Between December 31 st 2009 – March 31 st 2010

²⁶ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

²⁷ UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
agreed	consultants	
National governance reports on 'gaps, needs and options' produced by each country	Project Coordination Unit, UNWTO and Project Focal Points in partner countries	March 31 st 2010
Survey and GIS Mapping of reefs, sensitive areas, threatened species and damaged sites completed	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired consultants	March 31 st 2010

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
No previous yr			

3.3. Risk -

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

RISK FACTOR TABLE

Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the Project Document and reflect also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (PM) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (TM). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The UNEP Task Manager should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems	✓						PM: No comments		✓				
										TM: Some risk here at the level of demo projects						
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	✓						PM: No comments	✓					
										TM: No comment						

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment	✓						PM: No comments		✓				
										TM: Expecting some challenges here in responsiveness from partners						
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation			✓				PM: Although the agreement between UNEP and UNIDO was activated in Nov 07, the TC only arrived in post in Nov 08, resulting in a 3 year 'gap' between PDF-B and implementation and the fulltime staff complement is very small			✓			
										TM: Project is at least 1 year behind schedule in implementation, an extension will be proposed to PSC						
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize				✓			PM: The GEF funds on this project represent only 25% of the overall funding requirement, most of the other 75% is supposed to come from partner governments				✓		

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
										TM: Substantial risk. Project must take every opportunity (MOUs, country visits, PSC meetings, NFPs, national PSCs etc) to raise awareness about this.						
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		✓					A revised budget has been prepared for the first SCM with some reallocation needed TM: Agreed		✓				
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	✓						PM: No comments TM: No comment	✓					
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting	✓						PM: No comments		✓				

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	progress and implementation issues								TM: Reports have needed more analysis and reflection, though this has always been forthcoming						
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders			✓				PM: One of the proposed demo project sites still has to be confirmed, and most demos currently have weak engagement with the private sector			✓			
						TM: Agreed. Project will need to make every effort to address this.										
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident			✓				PM: The project has only just completed its inception period and general public awareness is still fragile. There is a need to produce a project publicity brochure			✓			
						TM: Agreed. Project must prioritize communications products										

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected						✓	PM: It is too early to comment on this						✓
										TM: No comment						
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and/or technological uncertainties			✓				PM: One of the key purposes of the demo projects is to test and develop BAPs/BATs, including new technologies and practices				✓		
						TM: The socio-economic context of the region makes challenges for the uptake and replication of technologies										
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives		✓					PM: The project is built upon collaboration across two government sectors (environment & tourism) as well as the private sector and local communities which means there are likely to be continuous trade-offs and negotiations as part of project implementation		✓				

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
										TM: Agreed						
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary	Limited number of fulltime technical staff on the project				✓					PM: The project will have to rely on short term consultancies to bridge some gaps in technical capacity		✓				
										TM: Agreed						

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile		✓					PM: The project is covering 9 African countries over a 5 year period, so some disruption is likely especially during election years TM: Agreed		✓				
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions		✓					PM: As the project is focusing on demonstration sites in coastal areas, activities are likely to be hampered by severe storms and /or flooding/ climate change events TM: Agreed		✓				
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers		✓					PM: Eco-tourism and alternative livelihood business opportunities are currently being negatively affected by the global economic downturn and this is likely to continue during the early years of the project TM: Agreed		✓				

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance			✓				PM: The managerial capacity varies across countries, with limitations in some representing a more substantial risk than in others TM: Agreed			✓			
Others, please specify																

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the **Task Manager** should be provided below*

N/A

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN

Rank – importance of risk
 Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)
 Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk
 Who – person(s) responsible for the action
 Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	Risk Statement ²⁸		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
1	Technical and managerial capacity limitations of institutions and other project partners	Delay of national level support activities as well as effects on performance in implementation of the demonstration projects, including monitoring and progress reporting	Assess specific weaknesses in each institution/FP and define and implement targeted measures to enhance capacity and provide (technical and financial) support to run operations on the ground within the limitations of the GEF budget	Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and UNWTO	By second SCM (July 2010)
2	Limited number of fulltime technical staff on the project	Delays in coordination and TA support, with potential opportunities for synergy with other partners/ projects remaining unrealised	Project Coordination Unit to submit 'gaps analysis' to UNIDO and UNWTO in order to find additional/ supplementary technical support	Project Coordination Unit	By Oct 31st 2009
3	Co-financing inadequate	Unable to undertake all the proposed national level and demo project activities, and therefore unable to show substantive progress on BAPs/BATs for sustainable tourism	a. Project Focal Points in each relevant Ministry (Environment & Tourism) to negotiate for their governments to honour their original investment pledges given during the PDF-B phase b. PCU to explore other opportunities to draw in additional funding from donors, NGO projects and the private sector	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points	By second SCM (July 2010)
4	Lack of private sector stakeholder involvement	The long term sustainability of the BAPs/BATs and sustainable tourism development processes initiated by the COAST project will be at stake if private sector investments are not forthcoming	Ensure during the first year of demo project implementation that direct approaches are made to private sector hoteliers and investors in order to gain their interest and financial commitments	Project Focal Points and Demo Project Coordinators	By second SCM (July 2010)

²⁸ Only for Substantial to High risk.

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY08 rating	FY09 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
No previous yr	Medium/Substantial	At this point in implementation, this project is of moderate risk, owing to project design (which is being adaptively managed during inception phase) and uncertainties related to co-finance and national commitment and capacity to implement the demonstration projects
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation

RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION -

NB> Although outside this reporting period (held July 13-15, 2009) the inception workshop of the COAST project confirmed the need for developing both a regional and national (including demo projects) M & E framework for the project, and this has now been programmed into the Year 2 work plan.

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

In process

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓ (part of first year demo project work plans)

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes ✓ No ☐
- Terminal evaluation Yes ✓ No ☐
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes ✓ No ☐

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

✓ (to early to rank)

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes ✓ No ☐
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓ (to early to rank)
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓ (to early to rank)
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes ☐ No ☐ ✓ (to early to rank)

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

✓ (to early to rank)

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period²⁹

9 country visits were completed by the TC during the inception period of the project (Dec 08- July 09) and these were used in part to assess the continued relevance of the proposed demonstration projects after the 3 year *inter regnum* between the PDF-B phase and project start up.

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

The project has required a longer inception phase (8 months) than was originally designed (3 months) owing to its complex, multi-country and multi-themed nature, and due to the 3 year gap between the planning phase and implementation phase. During year 2 of the project (year 1 for demo project implementation), baseline information is to be collected and an appropriate regional and national M&E framework developed for progress monitoring.

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

Too early to comment on this aspect

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

Too early to comment on this aspect

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions³⁰ are still valid

As footnoted in Table 3.1 a number of changes are being proposed to the current indicators in order to improve the internal logic and consistency between the project objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities. These changes are also being suggested in order to place the project into a more realistic development cycle and scope of influence, than that inferred from its original design. The relevant changes are: Indicators number 2 and 3, under Objective 2; indicators number 2 and 3, under Objective 4; indicator number 5, under Outcome 2 and, indicator number 4, under Outcome 3 .

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

Each demonstration project will hold an annual stakeholder progress assessment workshop in order to capture and record such effects (as part of a participatory assessment exercise)

²⁹ Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

³⁰ Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (*i.e., the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

Already explained under 4.5 above.

4. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design and implementation. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

- Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.

The three year 'gap' between the design of the COAST project and now its implementation has proved to be an initial challenge. In a number of countries there have been institutional changes during the intervening period, including changes in the contact persons (project Focal Points). This has caused some delays in start up as new Focal Points have had to be nominated and their interest in the project objectives encouraged and supported. Personnel and management changes have also occurred in the executing agencies including both UNIDO and UNWTO, and this led to the delayed recruitment of the Technical Coordinator.

The request, and acceptance by UNEP, of a lengthened inception period (Dec 08 – July 09) has been critical in developing a good rapport and communication flow across the 9 partner countries in the project, and for re-establishing the involvement of key stakeholders within each of the 9 demonstration projects.

- Institutional arrangements, including project governance;
- Engagement of the private sector;

Notwithstanding the comments above, the COAST project is still only weakly represented by the private sector, and considerable work will need to be undertaken in the first years of demo project implementation to secure private investor and tourism operator interest and their in-kind and financial contributions which will help towards achieving the project objectives.

- Capacity building;

The original project design was very 'light weight' in terms of both in-country staffing support for coordinating demonstration project activities as well as at the regional technical and managerial level. While it has been possible to re-design the project structure to enhance coordination capacity at the demonstration project level, owing to budget constraints it has not been possible to expand the technical staff complement at the regional level. This capacity limitation is likely to cause delays in implementation and may affect the final outcomes of the project if left unresolved.

- Scientific and technological issues;

- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- Financial management and co-financing.