



**Simplified Minutes of the Local Project Appraisal Committee Meeting**  
**For GOS/UNDP/GEF PROJECT**  
*Seychelles' Protected Areas Finance Project*

<b>Date of the LPAC</b>	<b>Start time</b>	<b>End time</b>	<b>Held at</b>
11 <sup>th</sup> August 2015	09.12 hrs	10.40 hrs	MEECC Offices, Botanical Gardens

<b>Name of LPAC Chairperson:</b>	Mr Alain Decomarmond
<b>Functional Title:</b>	Principal Secretary for Environment
<b>Institution:</b>	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change
<b>Signature:</b>	

<b>Name of LPAC Co-Chair:</b>	Mr Roland Alcindor
<b>Functional Title:</b>	Programme Manager
<b>Institution:</b>	UNDP Seychelles
<b>Signature:</b>	

<b>Have all LPAC participants received the PRODOC for appraisal prior to the meeting and in a timely manner?</b>	√
<b>Remarks:</b>	Cleared version received by UNDP on 20 <sup>th</sup> July. Sent to all LPAC participants on 28 <sup>th</sup> July, allowing 2 weeks for participants to review the document prior to the LPAC. Written comments were received from GIF, who were not able to attend LPAC. SNPA was represented at the LPAC by PS Decomarmond and Mr Denis Matatiken (the latter was the CEO of SNPA up until 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2015 and was the key SNPA staff member involved with the development of the project).

<b>Country:</b>	Seychelles		
<b>Project Title (full):</b>	Seychelles' Protected Areas Finance Project		
<b>Date of submission to the GEF</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> July 2015	<b>Date of approval by the GEF:</b>	
<b>Remarks on approval process, if applicable</b>	At the opening of the meeting, an explanation was given as to what the LPAC entails and that it is a part of the GEF process to now have a final review and appraisal of the project. Many of the members present were familiar with the process and have participated in such meetings before, so it was not necessary to go into details about what the LPAC is all about.		
<b>Name and contact of Environment Focal Point at the UNDP Office:</b>	Mr Roland Alcindor Email: <a href="mailto:roland.alcindor@undp.org">roland.alcindor@undp.org</a>		

<b>UNDAF Outcome(s):</b>	N/A
<b>UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development <u>Primary</u> Outcome:</b>	<i>Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.</i>

*ast*

UNDP Strategic Plan <u>Secondary</u> Outcome:	<i>[From UNDP's Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020:] Signature Programme #2: Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development</i>
Expected CP Outcome(s):	<i>By 2016, the governance systems, use of technologies and practices and financing mechanisms that promote environmental, energy and climate-change adaptation have been mainstreamed into national development plans. Relevant indicator: Area of terrestrial and marine ecosystems under improved management or heightened conservation status increased by 50 per cent by end of 2016</i>
Expected CPAP Output (s):	<i>Seychelles does not have a CPAP</i>

Programme Period:	2016-2020	Total resources required (total project funds)	US\$ 17,876,554
Atlas Award ID:	00088837	<b>Total allocated resources (UNDP managed funds)</b>	US\$ 2,776,000
Project ID:	00095320	Regular (UNDP TRAC)	US\$ 0
PIMS #	4656	GEF	US\$ 2,776,000
Project Start date:	Upon signature	Other (partner managed resources)	
Project expected End Date:	+ 5 years	o Government	US\$ 11,600,000
Proposed Management Arrangements	NIM	o NGOs	US\$ 3,499,654
		o UNDP	US\$ 0

Executing Entity/Implementing Partner	UNDP
Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change; Programme Coordination Unit /

<p>1) Decisions of the LPAC</p> <p>[tick the applicable boxes, if these have been endorsed by the LPAC]</p>	<p><b>General endorsement of the Project's strategy:</b>  <b>Goal, objectives, components and activities (sections 2.1 and 2.2)</b> ✓  LPAC is in agreement with goals and objectives, section 2.1  LPAC is in agreement with components and activities, section 2.2</p> <p><b>Logframe indicators (see Strategic Results Framework, section 5)</b> ✓  LPAC considers the logframe as very complicated, and there may be issues in tracking all the indicators.  Concerning the use of METT scores as indicators: previously there has been a problem with consistency, which can be addressed by making sure that the same people are involved in their completion. A question was raised as to whether there is a budget to allow contracting of a facilitator – in answer it was noted that this would come from the project M&amp;E budget. Generally it was felt that organizations and stakeholders could lead the preparation of their own METTs if appropriate, but could request an external facilitator if needed.  The issue of objectivity of METTs was raised.. The LPAC considered whether there should be a management effectiveness assessment gauging everyone at the same level. The consensus was that the METT process was actually more important than comparing scores.  The above being noted, the LPAC is in agreement with the logframe.</p> <p><b>Management Arrangements (see section 3)</b> ✓  It was noted that the NPM will be recruited according to GOS recruitment processes (which are essentially the same as UNDP). This needs to be amended in the Prodoc.</p>
---	---

*AA*

	<p>LPAC is in agreement (the management arrangements being essentially the same as used for other projects within the GOS-UNDP-GEF portfolio)</p>
	<p><b>Specific endorsement of the project's budget (see section 6) ✓ !</b>  It was noted that there is an inconsistency in budget allocation/notes for the MTE and TE, but the amounts allocated in the budget table are agreed. LPAC also noted that there are multiple budget lines which looks complicated but was due to need to explain in budget notes – this could be simplified in the actual financial reporting.  LPAC was in agreement with the allocated budget and division thereof.</p>
	<p><b>Specific endorsement of the proposed project staff complement (see section 3.1) and the project's organizational structure (page 68) ✓</b>  LPAC is in agreement</p>
	<p><b>Endorsement of the TOR for key project staff (Annex 2) ✓</b>  NPM TORs: In selecting the NPM, the project needs someone with experience in dealing with NGOs – a degree in economics is less important, as technical issues can be addressed by strategic consultancies. But the PM also needs sufficient seniority/presence to be able to handle international inputs, etc. There is a need to adjust the NPM TORs to reflect this prior to advertising.  Abridged TORs for strategic consultancies: LPAC agreed in principle, but noted that the TORs for consultant inputs should be regarded as indicative only, subject to revision if the need arises. Also the list may not be exclusive – other inputs may be identified. LPAC stressed the need to get best global expertise as far as possible – it is critical with component 1 to get the best possible inputs. But some understanding of Seychelles is also needed – possibly this can be obtained through embedding with counterparts.</p>
	<p><b>Endorsement of the proposed strategy for stakeholder engagement (not specifically included – see social sustainability, p.54) ✓</b>  There is no specific strategy to endorse.  Stewardship arrangements discussed here may not be specifically budgeted. There should be funds for communication and outreach to support stakeholder engagement – this needs to be budgeted wherever relevant within activities/components (e.g. robust stakeholder engagement plans are referred to and it needs to be checked that these are actually done).  Sometimes with PAs it is not clear who stakeholders are – e.g. in Strict Nature Reserves there are not very many stakeholders at all, and the question is who should be engaged, if at all.</p>
<b>Remarks on the above</b>	<p>In regard to definition of stakeholders, there may be a need for a stakeholder study; who is really a stakeholder for PAs, how should stakeholders be defined, what should their roles be, etc. This should be considered at Inception.</p> <p>In regard to Denis Island it was noted that this is not a PA and members wondered if and when it might become so. It was clarified that a draft nomination file is ready to be submitted to Government later, but that Government needed to be sure that there had been sufficient internal discussion and stakeholder consultation. It was expected that this could be submitted by September-October 2015 and that the PA Act would be approved by then; meanwhile the island has permission to work towards the implementation of its PA management plan. A decision has already been made by Government, under the PA Policy, that private islands can become PAs if they fulfil the categories for the proposed designation.</p>

101

However, drafting of regulations (under the PA Act) is needed so the timeline may not be realistic. The question was raised as to who would prepare these – preferably as soon as the PA Act was approved. It was proposed by PCU that assistance could be provided under the Outer island project.

## 2) Engagement of Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners

Will the project engage entities other than the national Executing Entity/Implementing Partner?		√ (Annex 8 of PRODOC)
If YES, which and for what purpose?	<b>MCSS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Government department      √ NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Temporal Protected Areas on Inner Islands (Activity 1.3.4)
	<b>SNPA</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Priorities for new cost-effective infrastructures, practices, systems and schemes - Proposal for refining and further consideration by SNPA (Output 2.2 SNPA, Activities 1 through 9)
	<b>SNPA</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	(with ICS) Improving financing strategies to boost PA management via an integrated approach on Silhouette Island National and Marine Parks (Activity 2.2.10)
	<b>Nature Seychelles</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Government department      √ NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Proof of Concept: Sustainable Funding through a Voluntourism Program for Conservation in Seychelles (Activity 2.2.12)
	<b>Seychelles Islands Foundation</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence      √ Other (parastatal)	Development, production and commissioning of a world class exhibition space for the Aldabra House visitor centre on Mahé, Seychelles (Activity 2.2.11)
	<b>Green Islands Foundation</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Government department      √ NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Financing Protected Area management on private islands (Activity 2.2.13)
	<b>Department of Environment</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Improve Communication and management effectiveness; enhance and restore existing habitats and eradication of rabbits in Recif Island Special Nature Reserve (Activity 2.2.14)
	<b>The Nature Conservancy</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Government department      √ NGO (International) <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Operationalizing the Seychelles Conservation and Climate Adaptation Trust (SeyCCAT) (Activities 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)
Is the pre-selection of these partners in line with UNDP procedures and has this been fully endorsed by the LPAC?		√ But see comment noted below
Remarks	<p><i>Prodoc notes that a full list of responsible parties is be soon more closely defined on the basis of rules, procedures and due diligence on candidate responsible parties and proposals made.</i></p> <p>LPAC agreed with the list as given above, noting that proper assessments were still needed for some of those responsible agencies listed as per the Prodoc notation.</p> <p>A question was raised as to how UNISEY (specifically the new Blue Economy Research Institute) links to these activities/project? The BEI is to develop important role in research. LPAC considered that UNISEY can be considered as a collaborating partner: it can be brought in under sub-contracts to support activities, subject to usual tender procedures. It was noted, however, that the main activities here focus on financing mechanisms and that UNISEY therefore cannot be considered as an executing/implementing partner. The LPAC also recalled that BEI is an important implementer under GEF 6.</p>	

MA

### 3) General and Specific Recommendations of the LPAC

LPAC felt that it was important to retain a view of the over-arching aspects of the project (the PA system), not to lose focus into individual PAs. There needs to be synergy and linkages between different sub-contract activities – and to assist this centralized knowledge management is needed. There is a need to look at whether the capacity to enable this centralized knowledge management system is there and if not to build it.

Recommendation: the project Steering Committee has a role here in monitoring and ensuring building of capacity. It is suggested that a specific road map be developed at Inception as to what the role of the SC is and how the SC will support the project to reach specific targets.

A sustainable structure is needed for knowledge management and updating in the long-term. This needs to be budgeted to some level, but the important point is to put synergies in place. The knowledge gathered needs to be actually used in order to refine approaches and move on. To enable this, there is a need to bring together progress and results concerning how individual areas are approaching issue of financial sustainability and identify which format works in the Seychelles scenario.

Recommendation: The project should organize periodic symposia to disseminate/review progress towards project goal/objectives which need to include debates. Enough time should be allocated actually to discuss and reformulate approaches. LAC considered whether this could be done within extended SC meetings, which would contain all the major players, but consensus was that this should be independent from the SC. The point was made that such an information exchange needs to occur prior to the MTR – when some level of change can be recommended and affected. A budget also needs to be allocated for the periodic symposia.

Recommendation: Adaptive management should be applied to make changes where approaches are now working? Specific issues could trigger the MTR – which could be done earlier if major adjustment needs to be approved.

Specific corrections:

p.23 Wildlife Safaris should be Wilderness Safaris; p.35 Wilderness Safaris manages the ecotourism operation, the owner is a private businessman)

Annex 8, correction: reference to Recif island to be moved from SNPA-ICS line to DOE line.

Throughout, SIF is Seychelles Islands Foundation; GIF is Green Islands Foundation

Recommendation and endorsement: The points made having minuted, the LPAC recommended to proceed with the PRODOC to final approval stage.

### 4) List of LPAC members

Mr Alain Decomarmond, Principal Secretary for Environment, MEECC (Chairman)  
Mr Roland Alcindor, Programme Manager, UNDP (Co-chairman)  
Dr Frauke Fleischer-Dogley, CEO, Seychelles Islands Foundation  
Dr David Rowat, Chairman, Marine Conservation Society of Seychelles  
Ms Helena Sims, Project Officer, The Nature Conservancy (Seychelles)  
Mr Ronley Fanchette, Head, Conservation Section, MEECC  
Mr Denis Matatiken, Special Advisor to the Minister, MEECC (former CEO SNPA)  
Dr Nirmal Shah, Chief Executive, Nature Seychelles  
Mr Andrew Grieser Johns, Programme Coordinator PCU (Secretary)

104



