



TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

**Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the
Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra, India**

UNDP Project ID: 00072738

GEF Project ID: PIMS 4242

Date of Submission of TE Report: Draft Submitted 12/15/17; Final on ____

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

GEF Implementing Agency: UNDP

Project Implementing Agency: Government of Maharashtra

Evaluation Team:

Ms. Virginia Ravndal, International Consultant & Team Leader

Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, National Consultant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluators thank all those who patiently took part in interviews and generously took time out of their busy days to share their perspectives and information crucial to the conduct of this evaluation. We are especially appreciative of all the members of the Project Management Unit (PMU), Mr. N. Vasudevan, Head, Mangrove Cell and Project Nodal Officer, Dr. Subir Ghosh, Project Coordinator, the excellent Project field staff at Malvan, the very capable UNVs, the excellent logistical support provided by the PMU, Ms. Lianchawii Chhakchuak, Programme Analyst, UNDP/India, Government officials of the Forest Department and Fisheries Department, the District Collector and CEO of Sindhudurg District, the project's technical partners, and local stakeholders for their valuable contributions to the TET.

ACRONYMS

AWP	Annual Work Plan
BMC	Biodiversity Management Committee
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIBA	Central Institute for Brackish Water Aquaculture
CIFT	Central Institute for Fisheries Technology
CMFRI	Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute
EC	Executive Committee
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOI	Government of India
GOM	Government of Maharashtra
IGCMP	India GEF Coastal Marine Programme
IISDA	Institute of Scuba Diving and Aquatic Sports
KCRT	Konkan Cetacean Research Team
LLPMU	Landscape Level Project Management Unit
LP	Landscape level zoning plan
MoEF&CC	Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change
MMFRA	Maharashtra Marine Fisheries Regulation Act
MPEDA	Marine Products Export Development Authority
MSFD	Maharashtra State Forest Department
MMS	Malvan Marine Sanctuary
MTR	Mid Term Review
NCSCM	National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIO	National Institute of Oceanography
NPD	National Project Director
NPMU	National Project Management Unit
NPSC	National Project Steering Committee
PIF	Project Identification Form

PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	used to refer collectively to the project's management units at national, state and landscape level
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
QWP	Quarterly Work Plan
Rampini	A traditional form of sea fishing practiced in western India
RGCA	Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture
SACON	Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History
SCME	Sindhudurg coastal and marine ecosystem
SHG	Self Help Group
SMART	Specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound – criteria for identifying appropriate indicators
SPD	State Project Director
SPMU	State Project Management Unit
SPSC	State Project Steering Committee
SRI	System of Rice Intensification
Taluka	A subdivision of a District consisting of a group of several villages organized for revenue purposes
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TET	Terminal Evaluation Team
ToR	Terms of Reference
UC	Utilization Certificate
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNV	United Nations Volunteer

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	3
CONTENTS	5
Table 1. Project Summary Table	8
1.0 INTRODUCTION	15
1.1 Purpose of this Evaluation	15
1.2 Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation	15
1.3 Structure of this Report.....	16
1.4 Code of Conduct adhered to by the TET.....	16
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	16
2.1 Ecological & Development Context	16
2.2 Project Start and Duration	18
2.3 Problems the Project Sought to Address.....	18
2.4 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project	19
2.5 Project Description and Strategy	19
2.6 The Main Stakeholders	19
2.7 Expected Results.....	21
3. FINDINGS	23
3.1.1 Analysis of Project Logical/Results Framework	23
3.1.2 Analysis of Assumptions and Risks	24
3.1.3 Lessons from Relevant Initiatives Incorporated	24
3.1.4 Planned Stakeholder Participation	25
3.1.5 Replication Approach	25
3.1.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage	25
3.1.7 Linkages with Other Interventions in the Sector (in the country).....	25
3.1.8 Project Management Arrangements	27
3.2 Project Implementation	29
3.2.1 Adaptive Management.....	30
3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements	31
3.2.3 Project Finance	31

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partners Implementation/Execution*, Coordination and Operational Issues.....	37
3.3 Project Results.....	38
3.3.1 Overall Results* (attainment of project objectives) (MS)	38
3.3.2 Relevance* (R)	38
3.3.3 Effectiveness & Efficiency * (MS)	39
3.3.4 Country Ownership	40
3.3.5 Mainstreaming Gender	40
3.3.7 Impact	41
3.3.7 Sustainability* (L)	41
4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS	43
4.1 Conclusions & Lessons	43
4.2 Recommendations	46
ANNEXES	48
Annex I: Ratings	48
Annex II: Terms of Reference for Terminal Evaluation	49
ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICALFRAMEWORK.....	60
ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS	68
ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS	69
ANNEX D: RATING SCALES	72
ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE ⁴	75
ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM	77
Annexe III: Terminal Evaluation Mission Itinerary.....	78
Annex IV: Documents Reviewed by the TET	83
Annex V: Stakeholders Interviewed.....	86
Annex VI: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct	89
Annex VII: Project Results Framework.....	90
Annex VIII: Evaluation Criteria Matrix	95
Annex IX: Summary of Site Visits	105
Annex X: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.....	108
Annex XI: Map of the project area.....	109

Tables

Table 1. Project Summary Table	8
Table 2. Terminal Evaluation Ratings Assigned to the Project	12
Table 3. Summary of Key TE Recommendations	13
Table 4. Linkages between the project and the other relevant initiatives within the country.....	26
Table 5. Summary of Audit Observations and Actions Taken to Address them	33
Table 6. Summary of co-financing situation at time of TE	34
Table 7. Co-financing disaggregated by entity and whether in kind or in cash	34
Table 8. Actual expenditures versus budget	35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table 1. Project Summary Table

Project Title: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra			
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	4242	PIF Approval Date:	Nov 13, 2009
GEF Project ID:	3941		
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Project ID:	00072738	Project Document Signature Date (date project began):	27 Oct 2011
Country:	India		
Region:	Asia/Pacific	Inception Workshop date:	Jan 25, 2014
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Midterm review completion date:	Sep 30, 2015
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objectives:	Strategic Objective 2: 'To mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors', and with GEF BD Strategic Objective 4 'Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity'	Planned closing date (according to Project Document):	May, 2016
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF TF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	Dec 29, 2017
Executing Agency/ Implementing partner:	Government of India (Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change) & Mangrove Cell, State Forest Department, State Government of Maharashtra		
Project Financing	<i>At CEO endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>At Terminal Evaluation (US\$)</i>	
[1] GEF financing:	US\$3,438,294	US\$3,438,294	
[2] UNDP contribution:			
[3] Government:	US\$12,000,000	US\$10,797,502	
[4] Other partners: Grant			
[5] Total co-financing [2+3+4]:	US\$12,000,000	US\$10,797,502	
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1+5]:	US\$15,438,294	US\$14,235,796	

Project Description

Maharashtra state lies on the western side of India and is one of India's top five states in terms of species biodiversity. Sindhudurg District, on the southern end Maharashtra, is considered to be the richest in the State in terms of coastal diversity and habitat types. However, in recent years, there has been a depletion of these coastal and marine resources and an associated loss of globally significant biological diversity. The Project document identified several threats to the natural resources and biodiversity, of which the most important were non-sustainable fishing and pollution/habitat disturbance from tourism.

In response, this Project aims to “*mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into production sectors that impact the coastal and marine ecosystems of the Sindhudurg Coast of Maharashtra*”. This is to be achieved through three Outcomes: (1): Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations; (2) Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan; and (3) Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the Sindhudurg coast and marine ecosystem.

Summary of Terminal Evaluation Findings and the Terminal Evaluation Ratings

A summary of the key findings of this TE is presented in the Box below. Full details and justifications are provided in the relevant sections of Sections 3 and 4 of this report. The summary includes what the TE considers to be: 1) the most important successes of the project, and 2) areas that might have benefitted from a different approach than the one adopted.

Follow-on actions required to ensure the impact of project-initiated activities are fully realized and sustained are described in Section 3.

Key Terminal Evaluation Findings

- The project was relevant to both the GEF and to the people and Government of India at community, District, and State levels.
- The geographic scope (one District within one State) was appropriate and realistic.
- The thematic scope as defined in the PRODOC was ambitious given the project funding and time frame. The project added further to what was already an ambitious project, increasing its thematic scope beyond what was intended in the PRODOC. This resulted in being overly ambitious and was one reason why the impact of the project in the production sectors of original focus (i.e., fisheries and tourism) is not as strong as it might otherwise have been.
- Although generally providing good direction to the project, the PSCs should have been more proactive in ensuring the project successfully overcame some of the hurdles it faced including greater adaptive management applied to find creative solutions to the MMS issue instead of simply allowing the project to wait until the very end of the project (indeed the last month) to develop the MMS management plan, quicker resolution of the budget head issue (a temporary solution was ultimately found but only after almost a year), ensuring that good quality TOR were produced for all major project activities/outputs, ensuring that international expertise be contracted as required when it struggled for long periods with finding the right expertise in country (as was the case with the development of the landscape plan), ensuring that GEF rules be followed (the PSC should not have allowed the project to invest funds into the Foundation for the purpose of expending these funds after project end to “ensure sustainability and scale-up of project activities”), and ensuring that the project inception workshop be well understood and take place in a timely fashion (according to the PRODOC and the normal practice in GEF financed projects, the inception workshop was to be one of the first project activities. Its purpose was to build ownership, plan the first year, review and revise indicators and targets in the RF, and define the roles and responsibilities of the Project organization structures. The inception workshop took place only after more than two years of Project operation and even then was really mostly a presentation of the project.

- Although not stated as such in the PRODOC, in addition to other aspects of the project, the project is intended to demonstrate approaches (some but not all of which are, according to the UNDP CO, new to both the District of Sindhudurg and to India) including: 1) How to effectively incorporate biodiversity conservation considerations into production sector policies and practices, 2) how to adopt a landscape/seascape level approach to biodiversity conservation (as opposed to a species specific, habitat specific, or ecosystem specific approach), 3) how to plan across a landscape/seascape *and* across sectors (e.g., how does sewage from coastal communities going untreated to the sea affect marine tourism, fisheries, health, coastal and marine biodiversity and what needs to be done to reduce negative impacts), 4) how to ensure livelihoods of those most directly dependent on natural resources can be shifted so as to avoid negative impact on biodiversity. Although the project contributed to all of these, it fell short in one of the four (#3) in the sense of providing a true model, and, although a helpful intervention, it did not provide a comprehensive model in any of the four.
- Lack of a well-prepared Results Framework and lack of consistency between the PRODOC and the RF, compounded by lack of an in-depth threats and barriers analysis (which should have been undertaken at project inception) was an important reason for the rather scattered approach the project adopted.
- An in-depth threats analysis at the outset of the project would have been very helpful in bringing greater focus to the project. Without this, and without clear guidance from the RF or the PRODOC, the project attempted to address all sectors (agriculture, fisheries, solid waste management, tourism, conservation) clearly an impossible task given the project time frame and funding.
- Many key expected outputs of the project were significantly delayed due to inability to identify a qualified Implementing Partner in country, financial management issues, or lack of buy-in or resistance by local community. These delays had significant consequences in terms of achieving expected project outcomes. Some of these delays could have been avoided by applying greater adaptive management and with greater guidance from UNDP.
- Many of the successes achieved during the project period have a good chance of being sustained, replicated and scaled-up as a result of both Government commitment (especially at District and State levels) and the establishment of the Mangrove and Marine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation (hereafter referred to as “the Foundation”).
- By supporting the *technical* establishment of the Foundation, the project served to catalyze a mechanism which allows for flexibility and innovations in future conservation activities in and by the State.
- The project’s investment of Fifty Lakhs (approximately US\$75,000) to create a Sindhudurg “chapter” within the Foundation to pay the salary of three members of the project team for two years after the project end in order to “sustain and scale-up” project activities was an inappropriate use of GEF Trust funds.
- Further work is required to ensure that the Foundation does actually serve as a mechanism for promoting sustainability and replication of project-initiated efforts and that Sindhudurg is not now given lower relative priority compared to other Districts because it “already had its turn”, or that it is not seen as only having access to the funds within the so-called Sindhudurg Chapter of the Foundation (the only funds of which exist in that chapter being the project funds invested).
- The Foundation has a very significant corpus of almost US\$27 million, the vast majority of which funds come from State Government as payments for degradation/destruction of mangroves caused by State Government projects. There is also great scope for funds to be invested by the private sector in the Foundation in future. Another potentially important funding source, however, has not been pursued which is donations from wealthy individuals, of which Mumbai (in the State of Maharashtra) has many.
- Extension of the responsibilities of the Forest Department to include coastal areas was unprecedented (the District of Sindhudurg representing the first case of its application in India) and coincided with the project start. The project provided a mechanism whereby the relevant government entities could adopt the flexibility needed to undertake certain new activities. It is not always the actual funds that make the biggest difference in a project’s ability to bring about positive change. Although the funds are important, sometimes it is the flexibility that a project enables that is equally or more important.
- As a result of this project, many new partnerships were formed which would certainly not have been formed otherwise and which *if* sustained can make a positive difference for biodiversity. Joint fishing patrols by Forest, Fisheries and Police are one such example. The model is important including the deputizing of Fisheries Officers to enable them to enforce regulations which would otherwise only be enforceable by Forest Department personnel. Clearly, the project was successful in initiating and demonstrating this innovative model of joint

patrols, nevertheless the sustainability of this model is in question as the Fisheries Department has only filled 2 of the 7 posts in Sindhudurg (so staff is a big constraint to further implementing these joint patrols) and none of the 3 partners has a boat fast enough for patrolling purposes therefore leaving in question the sustainability of the activity.

- Foundation funds should not be used to pay for those activities which are considered normal Government activities such as patrolling. If the Foundation funds are used to pay for normal Government activities, then in a sense the Government would be paying itself to destroy mangroves since the majority of Foundation funds are from CAMPA.
- Important regulations regarding fishing have been put in place, significantly reducing by-catch and juvenile catch, and reducing conflicts between traditional and mechanized fishers but there are still unsustainable fishing practices which have important negative implications for biodiversity which have not been adequately addressed (phasing out of purse seining, bottom trawling).
- The innovative approach undertaken in the elaboration of fishing gear (4mm square mesh net) regulations which entailed actual demonstrations using the fishing boats of the community fishermen and involving the fishermen themselves in all aspects was one reason for its successful uptake.
- At the end of six years of project activities, the District Administration (a key player in ensuring biodiversity is mainstreamed into production sectors) still has some of the same concerns that challenged the District Administration's ability to promote and regulate tourism and livelihood activities at the outset of the project. Although highly successful in bringing about positive regulatory measures related to some aspects of fisheries, the project was less attentive to regulatory framework clarification needs pertaining to tourism and livelihood.
- There are plans to significantly expand crab farming, one of the livelihood options introduced by the project. Although this could be beneficial to both local people and to mangrove conservation if done correctly and at an appropriate scale, it is important that these checks be put in place before expansion.
- A disproportionate amount of co-financing was designated for crab farming activities with even the co-financing from the Tourism Department not related to tourism but rather to crab hatchery.
- Using GEF funds to support activities which are already known to be economically viable (even if not formerly applied in a designated geographic area) should be avoided.
- The interpretation by the PMU that "additional livelihoods" was the same as "alternative livelihoods" should have been clarified by the PSC at the outset.
- The District Cross Sectoral Committee established because of the project has provided a good forum for decision makers in various sectors to come together in making development and biodiversity conservation decisions for Sindhudurg.
- The Landscape/Seascape plan could, in principle, be utilized as a tool to ensure biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into development planning and practices but not in its present form. Development of the plan was severely delayed and is still in draft form with only weeks to project closure. Although it compiles a lot of information including new data gathered with the project support, there is scope for improving the plan to make it a more practical and useful decision-making tool. Being the first plan of its kind in India, it is important to do so if this is to be used as a model to be replicated elsewhere.
- At least part of the PMU should have been based in the District Administration Offices in Malvan with a smaller contingent based in the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department in Mumbai. There would be benefits of being located physically in the same government entity that is ultimately responsible for planning related to mainstreaming biodiversity into production sectors and cross-sectoral planning. Likewise, it may have been helpful in the project's ability to pursue certain activities at an earlier stage if the project had not been so strongly associated with the Forest Department. According to the Forest Department, a contentious relationship existed at the project outset between the local communities and the Forest Department which made it almost impossible for either the Forest Department or the project to operate. There was no such contentious relationship between the people and the District Administration.
- Paying a full-time project person to sit in the MoEF&CC in Delhi was inappropriate and not cost-effective.
- It was not necessary to delay undertaking the inception activities such as scrutinizing the RF and suggesting any needed changes to indicators and targets because of the resistance towards the MMS by local people (the reason given by UNDP for this delay). Part of the reason for the delay in the inception workshop was the misunderstanding of its purpose, something which UNDP should have helped to clarify early on.

- Although the project provided a very important instrument, it is important to recognize that several factors external to the project contributed significantly to the project's successes including: Existence of strong champions in high-level Government positions (Additional Chief Secretary, GoM), Stability of highly qualified and dedicated Government personnel (Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Mangrove Cell), Strong government buy-in at District level and the dynamic, results-oriented approach undertaken by District of Sindhudurg decision makers (District Collector & CEO).
- No real exit strategy was developed despite the MTR recommendation to do so. There are quite a few important issues that are now left hanging with no specific action plan to ensure necessary follow up including designation of Angria Bank as a MPA, next steps for developing the MMS management plan, next steps for finalizing the landscape/seascape plan (which the TE does not believe can reasonably be done within the remaining period of the project).

EVALUATION RATINGS

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the TE, ratings have been assigned to the project using the obligatory GEF rating scale presented in Annex 1.

Table 2. Terminal Evaluation Ratings Assigned to the Project

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA& EA Execution	Rating
M&E Design at Project Start	S	GEF Implementing Agency Execution (UNDP)	S
M&E Plan Implementation	S	Executing Agency Execution (Government)	S
Overall Quality of M&E	S	Overall Quality of Project Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	R	Financial Resources	L
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-economic/political	L
Efficiency	MS	Institutional Framework and Governance	L
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	MS	Environmental	L
		Overall Likelihood of Risks to Sustainability	L
5. Impact	Rating		
Environmental Status Improvement	MS		
Environmental Stress Reduction	MS		
Progress towards Stress/Status Change	S		
Overall Project Results	MS		

HS = Highly Satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; MS = Moderately Satisfactory; MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory; U= Unsatisfactory; HU = Highly Unsatisfactory; L= Likely; ML = Moderately Likely; MU= Moderately Unlikely; U = Unlikely; R = Relevant; NR = Not Relevant

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the evidence collected, the TE makes 15 (the maximum allowable according to the TOR for the TE) recommendations to the Project stakeholders and managers. These are summarized in Table 3 below. Further details, explanations and a justification for each of these recommendations is presented in Chapter 4.

Table 3. Summary of Key TE Recommendations

	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
1	Even at this late stage, an Exit Strategy should be prepared which outlines specific step-by-step actions required to ensure the project-initiated activity is sustained and if possible replicated and scaled up. A presentation of the exit strategy should be made to the key entities that need to follow up on matters. This presentation should be made before project closure.	PMU, UNDP
2	Develop a proposal for submission to the Foundation Governing Board on priorities for project funding based on what was left undone or requires further support after project end.	PMU
3	Finalize the Landscape/seascape plan ensuring that: Once the landscape/seascape is finalized, UNDP in partnership with the Foundation, should arrange for a presentation made to key decision makers (especially the Additional Secretary for Coastal Management and District Collectors & District CEOs from coastal districts with imp biodiversity) to promote its replication.	PMU, The Foundation & UNDP
4	As returning the funds to the project does not seem to be an option at this point with less than one month left in the project, the TET recommends that UNDP approach the GEF for advice on what if any action is now required to redress the US\$75,000 equivalent project funds invested in the Foundation.	UNDP
5	The efforts in declaring the Angria Bank as an offshore MPA should be further pursued & the project should develop a concise outline of next steps required in this pursuit.	MoEF&CC & PMU
6	The draft Malvan Marine Sanctuary management plan should be prepared (an early first draft was available at the time of the TE) without further delay incorporating the technical data based on the studies undertaken during the project. This draft plan should then be shared jointly by the Forest Department and the District Administration with stakeholders for gaining their inputs.	Forest Department, Sindhudurg District Administration
7	Complement the draft Tourism Plan developed with project support by further developing and adopting certification and incentive systems related to coastal and marine tourism to both control any negative impacts of such tourism and to ensure maximum benefit from coastal and marine tourism activities are received by local communities (as opposed to by big tour operators or others). These certification and incentive systems should be developed for both large-scale tourism as well as small-scale community-based ecotourism.	Tourism Department with technical support from a project funded by the Foundation for this purpose
8	Further develop small-scale, low-impact tourism adopting ecotourism models.	Tourism Department with technical support from a project funded by the Foundation for this purpose
9	Scale-up solid waste management efforts which in part through project support have become highly successful but require scaling up to maximum impact.	Municipalities & District Governments
10	Prepare a technical proposal to be submitted to the relevant Government authorities to clarify the regulatory framework pertaining to District Administration questions related to tourism (scuba diving) and to livelihoods (aquaculture).	PMU with inputs from the Mangrove Cell, District

		Administration & MMB
11	Use the Cross Sectoral Committee which has been established in Sindhudurg under the Chairmanship of the District Collector as a model to be replicated in other coastal districts with some modifications. Use such a cross sectoral committee as the primary body responsible for implementing the Landscape/Seascape plan. Instead of establishing a new committee in other coastal districts who decide to pursue the development of their own Landscape/Seascape plans, use the existing District Coastal Zone Management Authority in those districts and simply expand their scope to include the cross sectoral functions currently undertaken by the Cross Sectoral Committee in Sindhudurg. The Mangrove Cell should have a representative on these Committees as it is currently in process of taking on the responsibility for all mangrove areas.	District Administration
12	The environmental impacts of crab farming should be carefully considered before expanding this livelihood broadly throughout the creeks as is envisaged, and appropriate safeguards put in place. (The project document entitled "EIA of Crab Farming" did not focus on the environmental impact issues despite its title which would suggest otherwise.)	
13.	Encourage the pursuit of private individual donations into the Foundation putting the appropriate checks and balances in place to avoid any potential conflict of interest.	
14	Resist the common practice of referring to the Foundation as the "Mangrove" Foundation as this does not accurately reflect its mandate. Although a convenient name, prospective donors and others may perceive a restricted scope which will not be helpful.	All concerned

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Evaluation

1. The evaluation was initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project in accordance with evaluation requirements set forth by the GEF. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the TE, the aim of the TE is “to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from the project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming”. In accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, this TE is also intended to “promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives; including the global environmental benefits”.

1.2 Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation

2. The evaluation was conducted by one International Consultant/Team Leader and one National Consultant during November/December 2017, approximately six weeks before anticipated project closure and almost two and a half years (twenty-seven months) after the Mid-Term evaluation. Both consultants were independent of, and external to, the Project and the Project sponsors. The Team included one international and one national expert in order to ensure that the MTR benefitted from knowledge of the GEF and of international best practices as well as knowledge and familiarity with relevant country policies, programmes, initiatives and circumstances. The total number of days given for the evaluation was 30 work days, thirteen of which were in country.

3. The TE was conducted in accordance with the “UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects (2012)”, and the “*GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*”, and in line with GEF principles including independence, impartiality, transparency, and participation. The TE sought to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. In this regard, the Terminal Evaluation Team (TET) followed a participatory and consultative approach, and used a variety of evaluation instruments including:

4. **Evaluation Matrix:** An evaluation matrix was developed based on the set of questions covering the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact which were included in the TOR for the TE and which were amended by the TET to be most useful to this particular TE. The matrix (presented in Annex VIII) served as a general guide for the interviews conducted by the TET.

5. **Documentation Review:** The TET reviewed documents including the project document (PROCOC), project reports including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) report, progress reports, the GEF Tracking Tool prepared by the project, project files, policy and national strategy documents, and other relevant documents. A complete list of documentation reviewed by the TET is included as Annex IV to this report.

6. **Interviews:** In-person interviews were conducted with more than 97 stakeholders. Several of these meetings took place with small groups of up to 15 people such as, for example, with an organized Self-Help Group of women or a group of fishermen. The complete list of stakeholders met is included in Annex V.

7. **Follow-up Email & Skype Communications:** As time did not allow for all the necessary information to be gathered during the in-country mission, some information was requested from the PMU and from the UNDP Country Office following the end of the in-country mission.

8. **Project Visits:** Because of the large number of “sub-projects” included in the project (63), the time constraints of the evaluation, and the distances to be covered, the TET was able to visit only some of the many projects. Visits were made to 14 projects in all three of the coastal talukas in the Sindhudurg District (i.e., Vengurla, Malvan, and Devgad). The projects to be visited were chosen by the PMU based primarily on logistics, i.e., proximity to other projects and ease of access, and with the overall criteria that these should include a representative sample that would allow assessment of a variety of project types including those related to each of the project components.

9. **Terminal Evaluation Mission Itinerary:** The TE mission itinerary is presented in Annex III.

10. **Ratings:** In accordance with GEF guidelines for project evaluations, achievement ratings as well as sustainability and relevance ratings were assigned by the TET. The TET rated project achievements and outcomes according to the GEF project review criteria (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability), using the obligatory GEF ratings of: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). A full description of these ratings and other GEF rating scales is provided in Annex I. The TET also rated various dimensions of sustainability of project outcomes using the GEF obligatory rating scale of: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and, Unlikely (U).

1.3 Structure of this Report

11. This terminal evaluation report documents the achievements and successes as well as the shortcomings and constraints encountered by the project and includes four sections organized as per the Table of Contents included in the TOR for terminal evaluations. Section 1 briefly describes the purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation; Section 2 presents an overview of the project; and Section 3 presents the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons are presented in Section 4. Annexes are found at the end of the report.

1.4 Code of Conduct adhered to by the TET

12. The TET reviewed and agreed to adhere to the UNEP “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations”. The “Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form” signed by the TET is attached as Annex VI.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Ecological & Development Context

13. The reader is referred to the comprehensive description of the ecological and development context as presented in the project document (PRODOC). The following summary is extracted both from the PRODOC and from the MTR report.

14. According to India’s Fourth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (2009), more than 13,000 species of flora and fauna have been recorded in India’s coastal and marine areas. Maharashtra state lies on the western side of the Indian Peninsula and is one of the top five states in terms of species biodiversity. It has 720 km or 9% of India’s total coastline stretching along the five coastal districts, with Sindhudurg being the furthest south of these (see map in Figure 1). The Sindhudurg coast is considered to be the richest of the coast of Maharashtra in terms of diversity and habitat types. Critical habitats include: rocky

shores, sandy shores, rocky islands, estuaries, mud flats, marsh lands, mangroves, coral reefs and sargassum forests (seasonal).

15. One of India's seven marine sanctuaries, the Malvan Marine Sanctuary, is off the coast of Sindhudurg. It was legally established 30 years ago (in 1987) under the national Wildlife (Protection) Act but, unlike the majority of protected areas in India, no management plan for it was developed. The MMS covers an area of 29.12 km² near the town of Malvan and around the old Sindhudurg fort.

16. At the time of the writing of the Project Document, 367 species of marine flora and fauna had been reported for the Malvan coast including 73 species of marine algae, 18 species of mangrove trees and shrubs, 11 species of coral, 73 species of molluscs, 47 species each of polychaetes and arthropods, 18 species of sea anemones and 74 species of fish. This includes several species classified as threatened either in India or globally. Another notable feature of the Sindhudurg coast is the coral reefs recorded at several sites, with several new coral reef areas having been found during the project.

17. Another key aspect of the coastal ecology in this area is the Angria Bank. Angria Bank is a submerged, sunken atoll at the edge of the continental shelf approximately 105 km off the Sindhudurg coast with a depth of 20.1 meters. It stretches 40 km from north to south and 15 km from east to west and has important coral habitats.

18. Sindhudurg district includes 3 coastal *Talukas*^{*3}: which are (from north to south) Devgad, Malvan and Vengurla. According to the 2001 census, the total population of these 3 Talukas was approximately 330,000. This population is slowly declining due to emigration to other districts and urban areas. The latest information available at the time of the TE suggests that the population has declined/grown to 218,617 (census of India 2011). In 2001 the male to female ratio was approximately 1:1. Annual per capita income in 2005-06 in Sindhudurg was INR 32,862 (or approximately US\$ 550), considerably below the average for Maharashtra state.

19. Fisheries and fishery associated activities are the principal economic activity of communities along the Sindhudurg coast. According to a 2003 census undertaken by the Department of Fisheries, the three Talukas included 87 fishing villages with a total fishing population of 25,365 in 5085 households (data from Department of Fisheries through PMU). These communities, together with fishermen from elsewhere, exploit the sea up to a depth of 40 fathoms – an area of approximately 55,500 km². Data in the Project document suggest that 33 species were being exploited and that the district includes 8 major fishing centres and 35 landing centres. Although the majority of the fish catch is taken by mechanised fishing vessels, non-mechanised (using both motorized vessels and traditional practices) fishing continues to play an important role, particularly for the poorer communities. Although the fishing is undertaken by men, almost all post-catch work is undertaken by women, giving women a key role in fishery-related decision-making and in social organization.

20. Tourism is considered a high potential economic activity and Sindhudurg was declared a 'tourism district' twenty years ago (in 1997). The Sindhudurg fort is one of the favorite tourist destinations and the number of visitors to the fort grew from 251,842 in 2010-2011 to 394,684 in 2016-2017.

21. Further inland beyond the coastal area, agriculture (including rice, cashew, and mango production) is the main economic activity.

*Each district within a State is further divided administratively into *Talukas*. Talukas have *Panchayats* and villages within them with Gram Panchayats being the local administrative entity including several panchayats.

2.2 Project Start and Duration

22. The project began officially with the signing of the PRODOC in October, 2011 and will end in less than one month on 31 December, 2017. What was originally planned as a five year project with a closing date of August 2016 will end up being a six and a half year project.

2.3 Problems the Project Sought to Address

23. The ultimate problem to be addressed by the project was the ongoing depletion of the coastal and marine resources along the Sindhudurg coast and the associated loss of globally significant biological diversity. The Project document identified several threats to the biodiversity. Detailed statistics were not available, but the two main threats were identified as:

- Unsustainable fishing including unsustainable fishing practices and fishing gear, and the non-respect of management regimes;
- Pollution and habitat disturbance associated with tourism. Although recognized as a potential positive force for biodiversity conservation, the Project document emphasizes that unplanned and irresponsible tourism can lead to coastal and marine pollution, as well as to disturbance and direct damage to fragile ecosystems, notably to coral reef;

24. In addition, several other lesser threats were mentioned (which were also not quantified or given relative importance rankings). These were:

- Pollution from fishing vehicles and maritime traffic – notably small oil leakages and release of ballast water;
- Agriculture related pollution – notably related to the use of pesticides with cash crops such as mangos, cashew, areca nuts and coconuts;
- Illegal trade in marine species;
 - Pollution from industrial activities
 - climate change

25. Prior to this Project, the government and other stakeholders had taken some measures to overcome the above threats and were continuing to do so. This included regulatory and legislative measures related to protection and sustainable fishing, and small-scale development initiatives to provide additional revenue-generating activities for local people in an attempt to discourage them from undertaking economic activities that damage the natural resource or the biodiversity.

26. One of the key steps taken to protect the natural resources and biodiversity had been the establishment of the MMS in 1987. However, this sanctuary had been formally notified very quickly without following a due process⁴. Accordingly, until the time of the Project document, it had not been a successful measure. The MMS was not accepted by the local communities (especially the fisher folk). The MTR indicates that “The government authorities did not have the resources or the capacity to implement the MMS, or even to establish a dialogue with local stakeholders on this issue.”

27. The Project Document envisions a long term situation in which fisheries, tourism and other economic activities continue to prosper, in which the local communities enjoy sustained socio-economic development,

the natural resources along the coast improve, and the globally significant biodiversity is protected. It identifies the following barriers to reaching this long term situation:

- Weak coordination between sectors;
- Inadequate information base for decision-making, including the inadequate representation of the interests of coastal communities;
- Inadequacy of the Wildlife Act for protecting marine areas;
- Weaknesses in fisheries legislation;
- Inadequate capacities and approaches in sectoral institutions; and,
- Insufficient incentives and know-how at the community level for sustainable resource use.

2.4 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

28. According to the Project Document *“the long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and addressing retrogressive factors such as the anticipated impacts of climate change”*.

29. The immediate objective of the project is *“to mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into production sectors that impact the coastal and marine ecosystems of the Sindhudurg Coast of Maharashtra”*.

The Project Objective was to be achieved through three Outcomes.

- *Outcome 1: Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations.*
- *Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan.*
- *Outcome 3: Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the Sindhudurg coast and marine ecosystem (SCME).*

2.5 Project Description and Strategy

30. The Project strategy was to incorporate biodiversity considerations and concerns into planning and implementation of development plans and practices related especially to the fisheries and tourism sectors (the key production sectors to be targeted by the project) so as to minimize the negative effects of these sectors on biodiversity and indeed to attempt to ensure that these sectors might actively contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. Because this project was justified under the GEF, the biodiversity of interest was supposed to be of not only national interest but also global interest.

31. The approach set out in the PRODOC consisted of data collection, analysis, scientific studies, planning (involving consultation and participation) followed by training and on-the-ground action. The actions identified included regulatory measures as well as the modification of production process.

2.6 The Main Stakeholders

32. The project’s stakeholders include those at the local community level, at the taluka level, at the District level, at the State level, at the national level, and at the global level.

33. At the local level, the main stakeholders were fisher folk and their families and other community members who make a livelihood from the natural resources including small-scale agriculture.

34. At the District level, government agencies responsible for the local implementation of issues related to forests, conservation, fisheries, biodiversity, tourism, environment, maritime issues and rural development are concerned. Private sector organizations – both small scale and medium scale – that utilize local resources in order to provide for livelihoods and generate profit are also important stakeholders.

35. At the State level, the stakeholders are mainly Governmental and include those technical departments responsible for forests, conservation, fisheries, biodiversity, tourism, environment, maritime issues and rural development. More specifically these are the Maharashtra State Biodiversity Board, the Maharashtra State Maritime Board, the Maharashtra Tourism Development Corporation, Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, Maharashtra Coastal Zone Management Authority and Department of Fisheries.

36. At the national level, the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) is the key stakeholder responsible for national level legislation related to biodiversity conservation and wildlife protection and for ensuring alignment to international agreements and best practices. It is also responsible for coordination across States as necessary, for trouble-shooting and for replication to other states. The Additional Secretary, i/c Coastal Zone Management, MoEF&CC, GOI is also a stakeholder, as this office is responsible for coastal zone management at the national level. UNDP in coordination with the office of the Additional Secretary is intending to have a national level workshop to disseminate the landscape-seascape plan in early or mid-January 2018. Other stakeholders include national institutions such as Archaeological Survey of India, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Central Institute of Brackish Water Aquaculture, Central Institute for Fisheries Technology, Marine Products Export Development Authority, National Coastal Zone Regulation Authority, Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture, Department of Ocean Development, Wildlife Institute of India, the National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management, National Institute of Oceanography and National Institute of Ocean Technology

37. Local and national NGOs including those working on sea turtle conservation, gender equality, and on rural development including Sahyadri Nisarg Mitra, Centre for Social Research, Dakshin Foundation, Dilasa Janavikas Pratishthan, Ela Foundation, Killa Rahivasi Sangh, Killa Sindhudurg Prernostav Samittee, Mayem Panlot Sangh and Suprakrutti Madhushala are also important stakeholders.

38. Research and academic institutions are also stakeholders, particularly those with expertise in marine and coastal biology. This relates to undertaking the science and providing the data on which to base rationale decision-making. In general, this community is based in southern India (notably in Maharashtra, Kerala and Tamil Nadu), although this is certainly not exclusively the case.

39. At the global level, the stakeholders include those who provided funding to the GEF and those concerned with biodiversity conservation and a more sustainable approach to development.

40. Clearly, other critically important stakeholders (which are somehow often overlooked in lists of stakeholders) are the marine and coastal species of flora and fauna whose individuals and populations are directly affected by either the success or failure of initiatives such as the one represented by this project and the ecosystems and the landscapes/seascapes of which these species form a part.

2.7 Expected Results

41. The expected results are described in the project's logical framework (log frame) in which performance indicators are described along with the baseline for these indicators at project start, and the targets to be achieved related to these indicators by the end of the project.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets
Project objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into those production sectors that impact coastal and marine ecosystems of the SCME.	Landscape/seascape area in the SCME where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	About 6,327 sq. km. (2,327 sq. km as area of direct influence and 4,000 sq. km as area of indirect influence)
	Extent of coral reefs in the project area	360 sq.km and this will be verified in first 6 months of the project	The extent of coral cover remains at least stable or increasing.
	Population status of following critical species: Olive Ridley turtle and Indo-pacific hunch back dolphin	40-50 nesting sites of Olive Ridley Turtles reported and 100150 Indo-pacific hunch back dolphins frequent the region. This will be verified in first 6 months of the project	Population status remain at least stable/ increasing
	Population status of birds (including migratory):	This will be verified in first one year of the project	Population status remains at least stable or increases.
Outcome 1: Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations	Landscape level zoning plan (LP) that zones resource use by taking into account conservation needs of the SCME	0	1 Landscape Plan that prepared and integrated with the District level planning process
	Establishing a functional cross-sectoral Stakeholder Committee for the management of SCME involving District Planning Dept., Forest Dept., the Maritime Board, Dept. of Industries, Fisheries, Agriculture, Tourism, Private Sector & NGOs	0	1
	Recommendations on reform of Wildlife (Protection) Act	WPA has a terrestrial focus that is not suited to marine PAs	Amendments that give explicit recognition to marine PAs are approved or under consideration by the MoEF&CC
	Recommendations on reform of MFRA	MFRA does not adequately incorporate the integration of the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity	Amendments to MFRA incorporating provisions for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity approved or under consideration by State Department of Agriculture/ Fisheries
	Compliance of new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports,	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that	By project end any new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports,

	mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	takes into account conservation needs	mining and agricultural activity conform with the LP
	Compliance of existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end an action plan for bringing existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in line with the LP is developed and approved by sectoral departments
	Zoning of MMS in line with LP	Current MMS boundaries do not capture key biodiversity rich areas and there is conflict with local fishermen on resource use issues	MMS boundaries and zoning are rationalized to accord protection to biodiversity rich areas and to guarantee occupational interests and innocent passage of local fishers
	Financial sustainability strategy for continued implementation of landscape-level management of SCME	0	1
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan	Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming and integration of environmental management considerations and safeguards into policies, plans and activities of key sectors	0	Production sector: 1 000 Conservation sector: 100 Livelihood sector: 5 000
	Mesh size laws are followed by the trawlers	To be collected in the first year	50% of trawlers follow the mesh size norms set up by Mesh Regulation Committee, 1983
	Incidence of encroachment of intensive fishing operations into traditional fishing grounds	Encroachment is taking place	By project end, all fishing activity complies with zoning specified in LP and there are no reports of encroachment
	Reduction/ elimination of trawlers from outside SCME i.e., from Ratnagiri (Maharashtra), Goa and Karnataka	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	50% reduction of trawlers from outside SCME
	Community based ecotourism operations as a % of all tourism operations in project area	25%	50% by project end
	Number of violations of MMS Management Plan, compared with year of initial patrolling	Baseline violations to be measured in 1st 3 months of project	Declines by 50% by year 5
Outcome 3: Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the SCME	Traditional fishing communities continue to practice sustainable, low-impact, traditional fishing activity as measured by extent of rampani fishing and related cooperatives	98 rampani fishing cooperatives	50% increase

	Number of EDCs active in the SCME	0	15
	Number of skills development activities carried out for VLIs and other local institutions for alternative livelihoods or sustainable ecosystem based livelihoods that reduce pressures on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans
	Amount of resources flowing to local communities annually from community based ecotourism activities	USD 2.5 million	USD 5 million (this is estimated as a reasonable trajectory by local experts based on local conditions and the anticipated impact of project interventions in this regard; target value to be re-confirmed and modified as appropriate once micro-plans are developed)
	Number of people shifting to alternative livelihood options that reduce pressure on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans

3. FINDINGS

3.1.1 Analysis of Project Logical/Results Framework

42. There are significant weaknesses in both the original RF (log frame) and the revised one. The RF was assessed at the time of the MTR. The weaknesses in terms of description of outputs, activities, indicators and baseline were noted at that time. The RF did not include outputs even though these were described within the text. Regarding project activities, these had not been described but the outputs provided sufficient guidance as to the type of activities required. Regarding indicators, the observation was made that the project objective level indicators were not good indicators of overall project success given that no baseline was available, collection of data to establish the baseline would be beyond the scope of the project, some indicators were vague while others were parameters unlikely to change within the timespan of the project and could easily be affected by factors external to the project. It was further observed that approximately half of the “indicators” for the three expected Project outcomes were not really indicators but rather outputs in that they were all things which the Project could directly deliver and did not indicate that the outcome had been reached. The remaining indicators were true indicators but most of them were not S.M.A.R.T. For most, there was no baseline and it was not realistic that many could be measured with Project resources and these generally did not provide a good indication of progress towards the various expected outcomes. Based on this analysis, the MTR recommended that the indicators be substantively revised.

43. In response to the MTR request, the Project elaborated a revised log frame which was subsequently submitted for approval to the MoEF&CC. Several years later, as of the time of the TE the revised RF has yet to be approved. The project was left unsure of which RF to utilize. The revised RF does not, in the opinion of the

TE, represent a significant improvement over the original with the same problems persisting regarding indicators that are not S.M.A.R.T.

44. In future, it would be very helpful to ensure those elaborating RFs as well as at least one person involved in the first part of the inception workshop (where the RF is analysed, revised and updated as necessary) have practical experience elaborating (and implementing) RFs.

3.1.2 Analysis of Assumptions and Risks

45. Perhaps the biggest mistaken assumption in the PRODOC was that the project would be able to operate in the project area from the start with no resistance from the local community and that the development of the MMS management plan could proceed without delay and without need for conflict resolution. This mistaken assumption caused the project significant delays in implementing key activities especially related to the MMS and also caused the project to incur additional costs which were not originally envisaged (related to PRAs and “entry level” activities).

46. Not necessarily an assumption per se but more of a lack of critical work planning, the Project did not adequately estimate the time required to obtain all the scientific and other data and information required in elaborating sectoral plans and then including these in a comprehensive, cross-sectoral planning tool such as the landscape/seascape plan.

3.1.3 Lessons from Relevant Initiatives Incorporated

47 UNDP facilitated linkages with relevant initiatives in country and tried to ensure that lessons and best practices learned from these were shared and incorporated into the design of the project.

Study Missions Abroad

48. A study mission was undertaken midway through the project (2014) to the Philippines. This was a relevant choice of countries to visit as the two projects share many similar issues (national integrated coastal management program, sustainable coral reef fishery management plan, coral triangle initiative, marine protected areas, coral restoration, reef fish recovery, fisheries resource management, income diversification, fish sanctuaries, incentivizing conservation of mangroves, livelihood opportunities for fisher folk during closed season). It would, however, have been even more beneficial in terms of ensuring that lessons from this initiative was incorporated into the project approach if the District Collector and at least one President of a fisheries society in Sindhudurg and one representative of a women’s SHG had been invited to join on this nine person visit which included individuals which, understanding the limited budget for these visits, may not have been as critical.

49. UNDP has a great potential comparative advantage in its knowledge of relevant initiatives around the world, both ongoing and completed. Furthermore, UNDP has the ability to reach out to these initiatives and help projects to establish communication with ongoing relevant initiatives, and, where appropriate, establish actual linkages. Regarding the landscape/seascape approach, this may be new to India but it is not new to the world. The GEF and others support numerous projects around the world that adopt the “landscape approach” as well as projects on “mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production sectors”. UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency for some of these projects. For example, the “Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in Mauritius”, a project which adopts a landscape/seascape wide integrated

approach, or the Tanzania “Marine and Coastal Environment Management” project. It would have been helpful for UNDP to put this project in touch with those.

50. There are also many good publications available (e.g. Biodiversity Mainstreaming in Practice: A Review of GEF experience (2017), Advances in Cross-Sectoral Mainstreaming of Biodiversity in Mauritius (May, 2017), Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Sectoral Policies (2011-2016) an OECD publication, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice: A STAP Advisory Document (2014). UNDP might have placed even greater emphasis early on (beginning at project design stage) on ensuring this Project study the relevant initiatives worldwide (both ongoing and recent past) and take contact with those relevant initiatives that are still ongoing to learn from their experiences, even making the initial introduction for them.

3.1.4 Planned Stakeholder Participation

51. As stated above, the project planned on community support and participation but did not adequately consider the resistance to the implementing entity (the Forest Department) and to certain project activities.

Stakeholder participation in all other activities was strong and well planned and implemented.

3.1.5 Replication Approach

52. A good approach to promote the replication of successful initiatives supported by the project was adopted, especially in regards to some of the livelihood activities such as crab farming, oyster/mussel farming, SRI. Self-help groups and others involved in these projects were invited to share their experiences with members from other communities and the project facilitated these visits. The approach adopted to promote replication of the solid waste management activities was also good, inviting much press and attention to the dump/recycling center and encouraging many visits to the site.

3.1.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage

53. UNDP has the advantage of years of experience in GEF project design. A recurring theme in project evaluations has been that these tend to be overly ambitious in terms of scope (both thematic and geographic) for a single project. This project was very appropriate in terms of its geographic scope and although no record exists indicating that this was a result of purposeful guidance from UNDP, it is commendable. On the other hand, the thematic scope was quite ambitious to begin with (mainstreaming biodiversity into two major production sectors in addition to numerous other major actions including management planning for protected areas). Despite this the project was allowed to expand its scope even further (to include the agriculture sector).

54. UNDP has a comparative advantage (as compared for example with an NGO) in terms of its ability to invite (“convene”) a wide array of stakeholders to share experiences gained through projects it supports. Once the landscape/seascape plan is finalized, the TE understands there are tentative plans to arrange for a presentation to be made to key decision makers in Delhi (Additional Secretary for Coastal Zone Management) to promote its replication.

3.1.7 Linkages with Other Interventions in the Sector (in the country)

55. Some helpful linkages were made between this project and other relevant initiatives in the country as described in Table 4 below. Establishment of additional linkages, especially regarding the livelihood activities this project undertook, might have been helpful. The TE believes it would have been beneficial to ensure a strong link with the Small Grants Programme which has been operating in India for twenty years and has

“tested” many livelihood options and developed innovative marketing and communications approaches. Having the PMU spend a few days visiting some of the SGP sites and becoming familiar with their marketing and communications would have been beneficial. The SGP has a strong focus on gender mainstreaming and has learned important lessons that could have also been shared with this Project.

Table 4. Linkages between the project and the other relevant initiatives within the country

Project	Envisaged coordination, synergy, or complementarities (as described in the PRODOC)	Actual linkages made by the Project
The UNDP – GEF Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve project	An integrated, multi-sectoral approach was adopted to secure the critical linkage between improved coastal and marine resources and the local livelihoods, which is particularly relevant to the Sindhudurg project.	The Sindhudurg Project team visited the GoM Biosphere Reserve Project to study the Artificial Reef and Coral Transplant project. The lessons and best practices of this project were captured for replication in Sindhudurg.
UNDP project – Community Based Natural Resource Management	This project developed models of viable and ecologically sustainable “community owned ecosystem based enterprises”.	Considering that the given Project was not relevant in the coastal and marine environment, activities from the Project could not be directly replicated, as it did not align with the Sindhudurg Project objectives. However, the idea of promoting community owned ecosystem based enterprises have been captured in the livelihood activities and particularly in the eco-tourism activities.
East Godavari Riverine Estuarine Ecosystem (EGREE) project	This is the “sister project” to this project, both of which are part of the India GEF Coastal and Marine Programme (IGCMP)	There has been a strong linkage between the Sindhudurg and the EGREE Projects. The idea of having a foundation originated from the EGREE Project. Joint workshops have been conducted in partnership and a combined NPSC has been set up to provide a common platform for sharing best practices and lessons.
Integrated Coastal and Marine Management (ICMAM) of the Department of Ocean Development (DOD)	The project will build on the earlier scientific work including through NIO on marine studies and ICMAM’s recommendation for Malvan.	The studies from the ICMAM Project contributed to establishing a baseline for the scientific marine studies in the SCME, in particular on the Angria Bank. This Project supported the updating and expansion of the findings of the earlier ICMAM studies through its

		partnership with the National Institute of Oceanography (NIO).
Sustainable Coastal Protection and Management Project 2010 to 2018 (Asian Development Bank)	The project will avoid duplication by working closely with the ADB, MMB and other stakeholders to ensure complementarities. Specifically, the project proposal has identified 16 sites along the coast of Maharashtra. Specific micro-plans for these sites along with detailed budget was given by Maharashtra Maritime Board of which ADB was to fund 4 sites under Tranche-2 programme proposed to ADB.	The relevant activities included building offshore reefs, beach nourishment, as well as beach clean-up under 'Nirmal Sagar Tat Abhiyan' of GoI. The same did not happen, the reason being budget constraints.
Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project (ICZM), World Bank	The proposed project will avoid duplication by working closely with the World Bank, government partners and other stakeholders to ensure complementarities. Specifically, the project will add value to this larger programme by focusing on demonstrating effective approaches for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives into production activities in relation to ICZM	The landscape/seascape plan of the project and other sectoral plans were designed to ensure complementarities with the ICZM project and for sustainability.
Bay of Bengal Program (BOBP)	The project will align with the activities of BOBP in the long term development and utilization of coastal resources of the project including responsible fishery practices and environmentally sound management of resources.	The BoBP Project contributed significantly in preparing the manual for Sustainable Marine Fishing for capacity building of fishermen of 30 Fishermen Coop Societies, and also helped develop an effective programme for promoting responsible fisheries in Sindhudurg.
UNDP-GEF Global Ballast Water Management Project	The project will work with the Global Ballast Water Management Project, under which India is developing and implementing a comprehensive National Work Plan to address the global threat of marine bio-invasion through ship ballast water.	The project did not have any association with this project.

3.1.8 Project Management Arrangements

PMU

56. The TE concurs with the MTR that “for this project to succeed, the energy and ownership should lie mostly at the State level or even below”. Indeed, although the relationship the Project had with the Mangrove Cell of

the Forest Department was critical to its successes in regulatory aspects related to fisheries and to numerous other project activities, we believe consideration should have been given to basing most of the PMU in the District Administration Offices in Malvan instead of in the Forest Department in Mumbai. This is for both technical and social reasons. This is a project to mainstream biodiversity conservation into production sectors, not a strict conservation project. The project is specifically for the District of Sindhudurg. As such it is the District Administration, the key player responsible for planning and implementation of plans at the District level, which should have been an important base for the PMU. The second reason is a social one. The project's ability to operate may not have been so impeded/delayed had the project been associated primarily with the District Administration instead of with the State Forest Department which, according to the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department and various project reports, was experiencing a contentious relationship with the local community at project outset. Indeed, on several occasions during the TE it was mentioned that it was not even possible for the Forest Department to operate in the area at project start. Such a relationship did not exist between local people and the District Administration and there is the added benefit that many local people visit the DA offices and this could have helped in spreading knowledge of the livelihood and other activities supported by the project. To be clear, the TE recognizes the importance of the association with the Forest Department and the benefits derived as a result of that association. We are not suggesting that the project should not have been associated with the Forest Department but rather that while maintaining a close relationship between the project and the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department, the biggest part of the PMU should have been physically located at the DA offices in Malvan.

57. A project vehicle should have been based in Malvan. PMU staff based in Mumbai could have operated by hiring a car as needed instead of vice-versa which was the actual case.

58. Although understanding the explanation provided by UNDP and having seen the job description for him, the TE does not agree that a full-time project-paid person (the "Project Manager") was required to sit in the Ministry of Environment in Delhi to ensure that State initiatives are known at the national level in order to promote replication of these. The monthly cost to the project of this one person was equivalent to paying the monthly salaries of most of the Malvan PMU staff. Instead of paying a full-time person in Delhi to sit within the Ministry in order to promote knowledge and replication of project approaches and activities at the national level, the approach which UNDP now plans to adopt in presenting the "model" of the landscape/seascape plan would have been a much more cost-effective approach. It was not necessary or appropriate for the project to pay both a full time "Project Manager" and a full time "Project Coordinator".

PSC

59. The project had two steering committees, a State Project Steering Committee which met 10 times and a National Project Steering Committee which met 4 times. An Executive Committee was also formed which met 19 times, most recently on 20 June, 2017. At the time of the TE, no final/wrap up meetings were scheduled for either the State or the National Project Steering Committees.

60. In the opinion of the TE, it would have been more cost-effective to have a single Project Steering Committee -- a State Project Steering Committee, in which the relevant individuals from Delhi could have participated (as indeed UNDP did on a regular basis).

61. Although generally providing good direction to the project, the PSCs should have been more proactive in ensuring the project successfully overcame some of the hurdles it faced including greater adaptive management applied to find creative solutions to the MMS issue instead of allowing the project to wait until the very end of the project (indeed the last month) to develop the MMS management plan; quicker resolution of the budget

head issue (a temporary solution was ultimately found but only after almost a year); ensuring that international expertise be contracted as required when it became apparent that finding the expertise in country was not likely (as was the case with the development of the landscape plan); ensuring that GEF rules be followed (the PSC should not have allowed the project to invest funds into the Foundation for the purpose of expending these funds after project end to “ensure sustainability and scale-up of project activities”); and ensuring that the project inception workshop be well understood and take place in a timely fashion (The inception workshop took place only after more than two years of Project operation and even then was merely a presentation of the project.) According to the PRODOC and the normal practice in GEF financed projects, the inception workshop was to be one of the first project activities. Its purpose was to build ownership, plan the first year, review and revise indicators and targets in the RF, and define the roles and responsibilities of the Project organization structures.

3.2 Project Implementation

62. The Project Coordinator started in late 2012, a year after the official project start date (27 Oct, 2011). A few on the ground project activities began in 2013, a year and a half after the official project start date. The PMU attributes the delay in the start of on the ground project activities to the opposition of the local community to both the Forest Department and to the project. Although it is not within the TOR to assess the relationship between the local community and the Forest Department, according to the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department, the relationship has significantly improved since project start. Although the MTR mentions that community opposition to the Sanctuary, while still present at the time of the MTR, had “softened”, the TE believes that this issue is still very much present and that the community opposition to the project has only changed because the contentious issue within the project of the MMS was deferred until project end. The issues surrounding the MMS have not yet been resolved at project end and basically no progress has been made on the plan until the last week of the TE mission when the Conservation Biologist on the PMU in Mumbai drafted a sketch of the plan to be presented to the TE. The PMU indicated that the development of the MMS was delayed because it was necessary to wait until scientific data was available regarding coral reefs and biodiversity of the area so that this information could be used in developing the plan. Although in agreement with the PMU on this, the TE believes that some of this data could have been (and actually was) collected earlier on in the project thereby not necessitating such a significant delay. The TE does agree that undertaking the PRA exercises with the community early on in the project was very strategic and this was done well and in a timely fashion. This represents effective adaptive management as such exercises were not originally envisaged in the PRODOC. The other and perhaps more important reason for the delay in the development of the MMS management plan was a purposeful strategy by the Mangrove Cell and the Project to develop the plan (based on the scientific data collected but without social input) and then only after its development, present it to the local community, the Forest Department doing so together with the District Collector. The plan would have already addressed the issues of concern to the community, i.e., assurance of no displacement of people from the Sanctuary, reducing the size of the Sanctuary where conflicts between fisher folk would exist while increasing the size of the Sanctuary to include coral reef areas not previously included in the Sanctuary, and in essence designating an insignificant area as an “Eco-sensitive Zone”. Given that the issues which made the MMS contentious are all addressed in the way in which the community is likely to find favorable, the TE does not believe that leaving this issue until the very end of the project was necessary.

63. While some project activities were undertaken in a timely fashion (PRAs, fisheries plan, many capacity development activities) or even accomplished significantly ahead of time (establishment of the Foundation), many project activities, including some major ones, were significantly behind schedule (landscape plan, MMS

management plan, Tourism plan, ecotourism livelihood activities, conservation messaging on buses) or never actually took place (second expedition to Angria Bank, sea turtle tracking).

The Inception Workshop

64. The inception workshop is critical to project planning. Part of the reason for the significant delay in the inception workshop was the misunderstanding of its purpose. There are two aspects to an inception workshop, one – the one that takes place first—is a small group of well-informed people (including the PMU and technical experts in the relevant fields) sitting down together for several days to critically review and make necessary changes to the RF (especially the indicators and targets), review the threats analysis to see if it has gone into the necessary level of detail and is still up-to-date (and if not, to define important information gaps and decide on how these will be filled), based on these to define specific project activities, and begin to define the best implementing partners and whether international expertise may be required in some areas. The second aspect of the inception workshop is a general presentation of the project to key stakeholders to build ownership and to gain their inputs but this should be done only once the aforementioned is in fair shape.

3.2.1 Adaptive Management

65. In some respects adaptive management was very good:

- Setting up a foundation for the entire state of Maharashtra instead of only the District of Sindhudurg as was originally envisaged. This made the foundation viable in terms of ensuring a sizable corpus with sufficient interest to fund projects, and made it of interest to the State government, without which it would not have been sustainable.
- Recognition of the need to do an initial participatory rural appraisal (PRA) early on in the project to establish a positive connection with local communities and recognition of the importance of using “entry point” activities (gazebo, jetties, bandhara) to help establish community buy-in to the project (neither activity was originally foreseen but both were helpful).

66. In other instances, adaptive management was either not adequately applied, not strategic, or inappropriate. Part of adaptive management is, of course, dealing with roadblocks.

- The budget head issue should not have caused the project such significant (more than a year for some activities) delays. Believing month after month (for more than a year) that the creation of the budget head was imminent, the NPSC was not prepared with a back-up plan and did not establish benchmarks related to alternative actions. A temporary solution while waiting for the budget head to be established was eventually found but should have been found by the NPSC much sooner. Establishment of benchmarks would have been helpful in better managing this issue, e.g., if by date X budget head not created, go to Plan B. And, have a Plan “B” ready.
- The resistance of the local community (especially some fisher folk in the taluka of Malvan) to the Forest Department and to some activities of the project was another cause of significant delays in implementing certain project activities (i.e., development of the MMS management plan).
- The approach to development of the MMS management plan did not demonstrate adequate adaptive management. This issue was addressed in the previous section.

- Although it was logical in many ways to base the PMU in the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department in Mumbai, given the Forest Department's own admission that it was not possible for them to work in the project area at the beginning of the project and given the high relevance of the project to the District Administration, another option which should have been seriously considered at project outset is to base most of the PMU at the District Administration offices in Malvan with a smaller contingent in Mumbai.
- The project replaced "alternative" livelihoods with "additional" livelihood. Even the PIRs adopted this terminology. Alternative livelihoods and additional livelihoods are not the same thing and this misinterpretation has very significant implications discussed further in another section of this report. This was inappropriate adaptive management.
- Inappropriate adaptive management. The PRODOC did not envisage development of an agricultural sector plan for climate resilient agricultural practices and sustainability or support to agriculture. This project was already very ambitious in focusing on two production sectors, i.e., fisheries and tourism. It was not appropriate adaptive management to further expand the scope of the project to include the agriculture sector.

3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements

67. The project worked with many "implementing partners" including research institutes, government technical departments, NGOs and others and formed partnerships with institutions as varied as the National Institute of Oceanography, the Marine Products Export Development Authority, the Maharashtra Remote Sensing Applications Centre, the Zoological Survey of India, the Central Institute for Fisheries Technology, the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Sugandhi Devadason Memorial Research Institute, Central Institute of Brackish Water Aquaculture, Maharashtra State Biodiversity Board, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management, Indian Institute of Scuba Diving and Aquatic Sports. These are for the most part very capable partners. It may have been beneficial to also include a few others such as international partners when the specific required expertise did not exist in country (contracting the NCSCM for development of the landscape plan was good but including an international expert on that team from the outset may have been beneficial).

68. There were some missed partnership opportunities including collaboration with the GEF Small Grants Programme which has had decades of experience with alternative livelihoods. Another missed partnership opportunity was with the Wildlife Institute of India. It would have been beneficial to the project to involve the WII in various wildlife related project activities and indeed this was envisaged (telemetric monitoring of sea turtles) but due to problems with importing equipment this was not realized. Finally, it may have been beneficial to involve the mangrove crab farming expert Mr. Ilanchelizhan from Pichavaram, Tamil Nadu in the crab farming activities to better mainstream biodiversity considerations into this activity especially as the main project partner on this activity (MPEDA) adopted a highly commercial approach to it.

3.2.3 Project Finance

Financial Management

69. There were some significant challenges associated with financial management of the Project.

Issue 1: Budget Head. One of the most significant financial management challenges was encountered beginning in year three of the project when in September, 2016 the GoI took the decision that funds from all externally-supported projects be channeled from that time on through a Government budget head. Thus, instead of UNDP/Delhi releasing funds directly to a project, funds would go from UNDP to the Government and then from the relevant Government entity to the project. This caused significant delays in 2017 in implementing certain project activities. The project had sufficient funds to operate until December 2016 (and 85% of those funds were utilized) so the budget head issue did not represent a constraint until January 2017 when funds ran out. The problem was finally temporarily resolved in August 2017 by a decision of the NPSC to use an existing budget head (not specific to the project) because the new budget head had still not been created by Government. Even though this temporary solution has been found, the project has still not received funds as of the time of the TE as UNDP has not released funds. The way in which the budget head issue was addressed is assessed in the section on adaptive management of this report.

Issue 2: Transfer of project funds to the Foundation. In 2015, approximately \$75,000 was transferred from the project to the M&MBD Foundation as “seed money for the Sindhudurg Chapter of Mangrove Foundation”, an action discussed and approved by the NPSC and by the Executive Committee (see NPSC and Executive Committee Meeting Minutes). This was part of the project’s exit strategy to ensure sustainability and scaling-up of project activities after project end. The description of how these funds were to be used as per memo shared by the PMU with the TE was initially to pay the salaries of the Nodal Officer of the Mangrove Cell, the Project Coordinator, and the Project Finance Officer for a period of time after the project ended. The intended use of the funds was subsequently modified (although no written record of this was produced by the PMU as requested by the TET) to be used to pay the salary of the 3 Malvan PMU staff for two years following the end of the project in order “to sustain and scale-up project initiated activities”.

70. This is an inappropriate use of GEF Trust Fund monies. Not only is it inappropriate for GEF trust fund monies to be used to fund another trust fund¹, but stipulating that the funds would be used only after the project ended also clearly means the project and UNDP have no say in how the funds are used and no ability to monitor the use of those GEF funds.

Issue 3: No Finance Officer for the first full year of the project. A Finance Officer only joined the PMU after almost a full year of project operation during which time the Project Coordinator, who had not received training regarding financial management/accounting of GEF projects was solely responsible for financial reporting. If a Finance Officer could not be contracted at the outset of the project, UNDP should have ensured that the Project Coordinator received sufficient orientation regarding financial management/accounting requirements.

Issue 4: Utilization Certificates issue. The issue with respect to Utilization Certificates was discussed during the MTR and it was suggested that there should be a grace period up to February of the following year for all the payments made in the months of November and December of the previous calendar year to ensure that the project agencies had time to spend the money released to them following their own financial year closure (which does not coincide with that of UNDP’s). As UNDP does not have the flexibility to do as suggested, this issue was not resolved.

¹ The distinction is made between what was done by the project in this case and using a very small amount of a GEF project’s funds to open an account/fund to make it operational (which would be a legitimate use of GEF funds).

External Audits

71. Six external audits were conducted during the project. This is as expected. The TET finds that all audit recommendations were adequately addressed. A summary of audit observations and actions taken to address each of these is presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Summary of Audit Observations and Actions Taken to address them

Sr. No.	Year of Audit	Audit Recommendation	Action taken	Period
1.	Audit 2013	Maintaining accounts in some accounting software against the current practice of maintain the same in excel files.	On the basis of recommendation, accounting software Tally (ERP) was installed for day to day entries. All the data from inception ie; 2012 has been duly entered in Tally Software. The same has been audited as well.	The same was implemented from the year 2014.
2.	Audit 2014	Non-Submission of Utilization Certificate from Commissioner of Fisheries and Wild Life trust of India, as a result the accounts submitted did not show a correct picture of expense incurred.	Based on the observation the amounts were recalled from the respective agencies and the same was adjusted against the expenses incurred. (Reversal of expense booked)**	Year 2015. Utilization certificate from Commissioner of Fisheries was submitted and the same was booked as expenses for the year 2015.
3.	Audit 2014	No. and date not mentioned in Vouchers. They reviewed the Cash and Bank Payment voucher and observed that Voucher No were not mentioned in vouchers and further in some cases the vouchers were not dated.	All the vouchers are now serially numbered and dated	The same implemented from the starting of year 2015.
4.	Audit 2014	Fixed assets register was not in agreement with the list of assets. They suggested that the same should be reconciled with the assets maintained at Malvan. In these cases the date of payment has been shown as date of acquisition instead of the date of receipt of the Assets / Invoice.	Necessary corrections as were suggested by the auditors were made. Revised Physical verification report was duly submitted to the auditors. Now only one register is maintained for Malvan and Mumbai.	The same was implemented with effect from March 2015.
5.	Audit 2015	Vouchers should have a "Paid and Cancelled" stamp to avoid duplication of payments.	A stamp with "Cancelled and paid" has been made and all the vouchers have been duly stamped.	The same was implemented with effect from year 2016.

6.	Audit 2015	Auditors suggested that UNDP should obtain authorization letters from private agencies.	Two projects were awarded to Pvt. Agencies, ELA Foundation and Dakshin Foundation. Directors of both the agencies submitted the Authority letters.	The letters were duly submitted in the month of Feb 2016.
----	------------	---	--	---

Co-Financing

Table 6. Summary of co-financing situation at time of TE

Sources of Co-financing	Pledged Amount (in US\$)	Actually Accounted at TE (US\$)	Actually Accounted at TE (%)
Government	12,000,000	10,797,502	90
GEF Agency			
Others			
Total	12,000,000	10,797,502	90

Table 7. Co-financing disaggregated by entity and whether in kind or in cash

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	In-Kind	In Cash	Actually Accounted at TE (US\$)
Government	Fisheries Department	Allotment of Building for Stranding center at Malvan including land		85,622
			Fisheries infrastructure in Sindhudurg (2012-2017)	4,371,194
	Tourism Department		Funding support under "Chanda to Banda" Scheme of Govt. of Maharashtra, towards crab hatchery & crab farming	1,492,537
		Valuation of land designated for crab hatchery		44,776
	Forest Department		Budget allocation(2017-18), towards crab hatchery funding	1,343,284
			Budget allocated for Livelihood interventions	2,174,627
		Office Rental (Mumbai Staff)		97,015

		Salary of RFO, Guards, DCF and CCF Mangrove Cell		103,433
	District Planning Development Committee		DPDC funding for Square mesh net	28,657
	Malvan Nagar Parishad (Municipality of Malvan)		support towards Solid waste management	152,090
	Agriculture Department		Extending System of Rice intensification (SRI) to 1000 Acre	22,388
Total (US\$)				9,915,622

72. As can be seen from Table 7 above, 90% of the originally committed co-financing has been secured. Thus there is a shortfall of 10% in the co-financing anticipated (and committed) at project signing and the amount actually received. Of the co-financing received, a significant percentage is for fisheries infrastructure and for crab farming, specifically for a crab hatchery. Even the Tourism co-financing is for this crab hatchery (rather than for tourism-related activities). Crab farming is already known to be economically viable on both large and small scales. GEF funds should not normally be used to scale up initiatives that have already been piloted and are widely known to be economically viable. There is also significant co-financing dedicated to livelihoods. This is an appropriate use of co-financing.

73. It is noted that there is no co-financing for strict biodiversity conservation activities unless stranding centers are considered as such and even then the amount dedicated to this is very little.

Budget allocated vs. expended

74. Of the total GEF budget allocated to the project of \$3.4 million, \$2,961,621 (86%) has been expended as of the time of the TE. The remaining 14% (\$476,673) has been allocated in the AWP for 2017 but 0% of this has been expended as of the time of the TE. In actuality, 7% of the 14% remaining have already been spent (representing the loan taken by the project from the Mangrove Foundation) but since the project has not yet repaid that loan it does not show as being expended. Because of the budget head issue, the project has been operating with a loan from the Mangrove foundation since March of this year. With only 6 weeks left until project closes (as of the time of the end of the TE mission), the loan to the M&MBD Foundation still needs to be repaid and the remaining 7% of the total project budget is still to be expended. As long as funds are released in time, there should not be an issue with expending those funds as they will be used by end of December to cover PMU costs.

Table 8. Actual expenditures versus budget

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		Total
	Budget	Expended	Budget	Expended	Budget	Expended	Budget	Expended	Budget	Expended	
GEF	603,340	592,573	932,815	927,421	936,340	927,421	682,949	563,404	476,673	63,593	3,074,412
% expended of	1.78		1.6		1.0		17.6		86.7		

amount budgeted						
% of total amount of project funds delivered to date	98.2	99.4	99.0	82.4	13.3	

3.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry and implementation* (S)

The MTR & TE

75. Both the MTR and the TE took place as per GEF Guidelines and within the specified time period for mid-term reviews. The TE took place when approximately 93% of GEF funds had been delivered², and with one month remaining until project closure. This is within the stipulated time period for terminal evaluations (which should take place up to 3 months prior to project closure or up to 3 months after project closure).

Use of the Results Framework as a tool for monitoring and evaluation

76. The Results Framework should normally be used as one of the primary tools by the project for self-monitoring and evaluation. Yet, because of the weaknesses in the RF, especially as related to the indicators and targets (both the original one presented in the PRODOC and the proposed modified one which was never officially accepted) this could not effectively be used to evaluate impact although the RF was used in the PIRs to report on progress.

PIRs

77. Beginning in 2014, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), were prepared every year, with the last one being in 2017. As these are a reporting requirement of the GEF, they do use the RF as a basis for monitoring the progress of the project. These were comprehensive and well prepared. One aspect of the PIRs that could be improved is the tendency in some sections of the PIRs to use imprecise language. A few illustrative examples follow: "The Fisheries Department has also "taken up" the programme of joint patrolling in the other coastal districts" (PIR 2017). What exactly does "taken up" mean? According to the Fisheries Department staff with whom the TE met, no patrols had been conducted other than the two supported by the project for lack of a speedboat, lack of Fisheries staff (there are 7 posts but only 2 of these are filled), and lack of funds. Likewise, the PIR states, "the Fisheries Department *has taken major decisions in recent times* to render the small scale marine fisheries sector sustainable and resolve conflicts with mechanized fishing vessels". What decisions? When? How were the issues resolved?

Activity Level Monitoring

78. Three professional and very capable project staff are based in the District of Sindhudurg (all of them based in the one taluka of Malvan but each covering a different taluka -- Malvan, Devgad, Vengurla). These individuals regularly visit Project sites and activities, and prepare informative monthly reports on progress and issues. It should be noted that even though they are the project people "in the field", they do not have a project vehicle but rather depend on accompanying the Forest Range Officer when he goes to areas and hiring a vehicle as needed. Although the field staff do not have their own vehicle, there is a project vehicle in Mumbai. It may have been helpful to have the opposite arrangement to facilitate project site visits. Although the project is focused on the three coastal talukas within one District, distances take a long time to cover. Had they had both

² Although see above note on funds expended.

a full-time vehicle at their disposal as well as the funds to hire a second vehicle as needed, this could have facilitated even more continuous activity level engagement and monitoring. It should be noted that although field activity level monitoring was good, it *could have been improved by being more impact-oriented, ensuring that* at least one aspect of the impact being assessed was biodiversity.

79. The Project has also ensured that progress reports are prepared by the many implementing partners which is a helpful practice in activity-level monitoring.

Application of the METT

80. The GEF requires that the Tracking Tools be completed at three points during a project, at CEO endorsement, at mid-term and at project completion. This was done.

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partners Implementation/Execution*, Coordination and Operational Issues

81. UNDP was the GEF Implementing Agency for this project. Although the UNDP Country Office provided helpful guidance to the project in many respects, more involvement and direction was required in other areas. In particular, greater UNDP involvement would have been beneficial in:

- providing the PMU with more guidance at the beginning of the project regarding the purpose and timing of the inception workshop,
- providing the PMU with more guidance at the beginning of the project regarding financial management/accounting requirements (the project was without a Finance Officer for the first full year of operation and the Project Coordinator could have benefitted from greater guidance in these matters),
- playing a more active role in ensuring that the RF was improved, approved officially, and used as an effective tool for monitoring and evaluation,
- providing greater guidance to the NPSC and Executive Committee regarding the (inappropriate) transfer of project funds to the Foundation (if there were any questions regarding this matter the UNDP CO should have approached the RTA),
- facilitating greater exchange of experiences between relevant initiatives, both within India and in other countries (not just EGREE). In particular, the project could have benefitted from greater familiarity with India's SGP which has been operating for some 20 years and has experience with many livelihood options and innovative marketing and communications strategies that would be of relevance to this project. Also, even though landscape/seascape-level planning is new to India, there are several countries around the world with substantial experience. Informing about this and facilitating contact between them would have been helpful.
- ensuring that the specific recommendation of the MTR be adhered to in regards to the extension of the project which the MTR said under no circumstances should be allowed to run beyond March, 2017 even if all conditions set forth in the MTR were met.

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall Results* (attainment of project objectives) (MS)

82. Following is a summary of results. A Mangrove and Marine Biodiversity Foundation has been established by the State of Maharashtra and is functional with a large corpus generating significant annual interest for use to fund projects and undertake mangrove and marine biodiversity conservation activities. A landscape plan (including a land use zoning map and an activity map) has been developed but is still in draft. A fisheries sector “plan” (called a plan but not really a plan although a very comprehensive high quality document) has been developed. A solid waste management plan for Sindhudurg has been prepared (and is being implemented). A tourism management plan is being prepared but is still incomplete. An agriculture sector plan is being prepared for climate resilient agricultural practices (still in draft). A management plan for the MMS is being prepared (still in draft). A Cross-Sectoral Stakeholder Consultation Committee has been officially established by District Government. Alternative underwater tourism sites have been identified and the District Administration has allocated a budget for developing these sites. Proposed amendments to the Wildlife Protection Act that would give explicit recognition to marine PAs have been developed and submitted to MoEF&CC. Suggestions regarding marine and coastal biodiversity have been incorporated into the National Wildlife Action Plan (2017-2031). Fisheries Officials have been empowered under the WPA to enforce marine wildlife protection laws (previously a void). Two joint patrols by Fisheries Department, Forest Department and police have taken place. The Maharashtra Marine Fishing Regulation Act has been amended as follows: Use of 40 mm square mesh nets at cod ends is mandatory for mechanized trawlers (fully implemented). No new purse/ring seining licenses will be issued (already in effect). The number of existing purse/ring seining licenses will be brought down in a phased manner (not yet specified or implemented). The zone, season and minimum depth of water required for purse seining is restricted. Purse seine gear used by mechanized fishing vessels within the territorial waters is regulated. Fisheries zoning plan has been developed delineating areas for mechanized and non-mechanized fishing vessels and is being implemented. Three community-based eco-tourism projects have been initiated. Forty-three biodiversity management committees have been formed and 10 People’s Biodiversity Registers have been completed. Livelihood options including crab farming, mussel farming, oyster farming, SRI, multi-trophic aquaculture, apiculture, and eco-tourism have been introduced (and mostly operational on a small scale). Seventeen (17) ha of mangroves have been planted. A mangrove nursery has been established and has distributed (one time) to four locales. Many capacity development activities have taken place for fishermen, boat operators that offer dolphin watching tours, nature guides, bed and breakfast owners, Fisheries department personnel, and others.

83. Did these results add up to achieving the project objective of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production sectors that impact the coastal and marine ecosystems of the Sindhudurg Coast? To some extent, and in some production sectors, yes. The fisheries “production sector” clearly does incorporate some biodiversity conservation measures now were not considered before the project and these changes can be directly attributed to the project efforts working together with the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department and with the Fisheries Department.

3.3.2 Relevance* (R)

84. Most of the project activities have been relevant to both the GEF and to the people and Government of India. The fisheries related activities and activities related to fisheries legislative and regulatory framework revision were highly relevant, as were most of the livelihood activities. Less relevant activities included SRI (although a good activity for a sustainable agriculture project not very relevant to this project’s objectives),

development of marine mammal stranding centres (not a significant issue in Sindhudurg with only 3 strandings reported over a 6 year period), development of an agriculture sector plan for climate resilient agricultural practices (again, a good activity for a sustainable agriculture project but not highly relevant for a biodiversity project in which agriculture was not identified as a major threat). Green ratings related to ecotourism could have been highly relevant but as implemented were not (e.g., the green ratings were based on criteria which are not highly relevant in the context of Sindhudurg and ratings (when achieved) were not directly linked with meaningful benefits). Mangrove planting activities undertaken by the project are also considered to be less relevant. Only 17 ha of mangroves were planted and this was done in an area that formerly did not have mangroves according to the Forest Ranger. Thus, this should be considered an afforestation rather than a reforestation effort and as such is not highly relevant for biodiversity conservation. Rehabilitating degraded mangroves would have been much more relevant, but even then the scale would have to be far bigger to be considered effective. Another issue to consider here is that mangrove planting is part of the normal Forest Department activities. GEF-financed projects should be funding activities additional to what is already being done by governments and others, not paying for what is normally being done by others.

3.3.3 Effectiveness & Efficiency * (MS)

85. Before the establishment of the Mangrove Cell, there were no management entities looking after marine biodiversity conservation. Some scientific institutions existed but those do not have management responsibilities. Thus, there existed a void in marine biodiversity conservation management in the Sindhudurg coastal and marine ecosystems (with the exception of mangrove management) which void also existed in other coastal Districts and States of India. This extension of the responsibilities of the Forest Department to include coastal areas was unprecedented, the District of Sindhudurg representing the first case of its application in India. The project, which started at almost the same time as the Mangrove Cell was created, provided an important mechanism whereby the key relevant government entities could adopt the flexibility needed to undertake innovative (out of the norm for them) activities. As a result, many new partnerships were formed which would certainly not have been formed otherwise and which *if* sustained can make a positive difference for biodiversity.

86. Establishment of the Foundation was highly effective. The project played a part in the technical establishment of the Foundation (together with the GIZ project). And, of course the funding from the State Government enables the Foundation to function.

87. At the end of six years of project activities, the District Collector still has some of the same concerns that challenged the District Administration's ability to promote and regulate tourism and livelihood activities at the outset of the project. Although highly successful in bringing about positive regulatory measures related to some aspects of fisheries, the project was less attentive to regulatory framework clarification needs pertaining to tourism and livelihood. For example, the District Collector is still asking for clarification of whether he can allow people to hang cages for aquaculture in the creek (something that was immediately clarified with one sentence from the Additional Chief Secretary during the presentation of preliminary findings of the TE and which should have been clarified much earlier), and the lack of clarity regarding who is the responsible entity for regulating scuba diving (the DA or the MMB). The project could have clarified the first concern almost immediately and could have made a concrete proposal to the necessary authorities to help clarify the second. The District Collector and the District CEO are very dynamic individuals who truly are engaged and want to make a difference. They are ready and willing to mainstream biodiversity conservation into production sectors. Regulatory concerns and lack of clarity are one of the barriers preventing them from advancing more in this regard. Had the project been more responsive to these concerns, effectiveness would have been enhanced.

88. The plastic-free Fort campaign was very effective. The beach clean-up campaigns were helpful but need to be done more regularly to be effective. Although reduced, the problem of plastic and of “ghost” nets along the shore and in the sea continues to be a problem for many aquatic species.

89. Artificial reef construction was very small in scale and, as the TET understands it, was not undertaken in areas where coral reefs were degraded but rather in areas where conditions existed for coral reefs to grow. Thus, as in the case of the mangrove plantation efforts, this was really a form of acoralization which would not be considered appropriate for a biodiversity conservation project. Had the project instead identified degraded coral reefs and targeted the artificial reef construction and coral transplant in these areas, this would have been highly relevant.

90. Finally, the effectiveness of the landscape plan cannot be judged at this stage since it is still in draft form. Perhaps one aspect of it can be said to have been effective already in that it introduced a new approach to planning and the dynamic District Administration seems keen on adopting this approach and implementing the plan (assuming it is finalized and becomes an actual plan rather than a compilation of information).

91. In an attempt to keep this report within page limits, but wishing also to share some more specific observations related to each of the activities the TE had the opportunity of visiting, we have included this information in an annex (Annex IX).

92. Regarding efficiency, the Project has already been extended by more than 19 months. The MTR recommended that the project could be extended for up to 18 months if certain conditions were met but that “under no circumstances should the project be allowed to run until later than March 2017”. Even though the project was extended an additional nine months after the end date recommended by the MTR, there are still several key project outputs which are not finalized. The Landscape Plan is still in draft. The Tourism plan is incomplete (the chapter on ecotourism development is not finished). The agriculture plan is still in draft. The conservation messaging on public buses has not started.

3.3.4 Country Ownership

93. In part as a result of project’s efforts to ensure government was well informed and involved, the buy-in of government decision makers (Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra; District Collector, Sindhudurg) has been excellent. This has been demonstrated in part by the sanctioning of funds by both State and District governments as indicated in other sections of this report.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming Gender

94. The MTR recommended that “the Project consider providing the PMU with a one-day workshop on gender. The workshop output would be specific approaches for the Project to adopt to mainstream biodiversity”. The report noted that “impacts on the ground in terms of the number of female beneficiaries are not yet sufficient”. Although to our knowledge no such workshop took place, the Project has made a conscious effort to increase the number of women beneficiaries. The required (by GEF) gender analysis was conducted and showed that almost half of the participants involved in the livelihood and conservation activities were women. There is strong participation of women in the ecotourism activities supported by the project. Even though there are many women beneficiaries, the TE is not aware of any systematic approach to gender mainstreaming or women’s empowerment. It is noted that no organization/entity related to gender issues had been invited to the preliminary presentation of TE findings. It may have been useful for MAVIN to be there.

3.3.7 Impact

95. The impact of the project activities varied significantly with those related to the modifications to the MMFRA, joint patrols, community involvement in sea turtle conservation, floating anchorages for tourist boats, and others being very impactful and almost immediately felt to those activities for which the impact simply cannot be assessed at this point, not even the likely impact, since the outputs have not yet been finalized and of course not yet applied. This is the case with some of the main project outputs including the landscape/seascape plan, the MMS management plan, the Tourism plan, and the agricultural sector plan. What can be assessed is that the involvement of the District Administration in both capacity building exercises and in the Cross-Sectoral Committee has clearly sparked interest in landscape/seascape planning and there is clear recognition of the importance of incorporating biodiversity conservation into this planning. Other project activities including training fisher folk to become certified scuba divers, training dolphin-watch boat operators, and certification efforts related to ecotourism have potential for having strong impact and already have had some impact in significantly enhancing awareness of the need to conserve biodiversity. The ultimate impact of these activities will depend on how regulatory frameworks are designed around certification systems. Livelihood activities have already shown a positive impact on local communities, enhancing their appreciation for biodiversity while increasing their incomes. Some of these livelihoods may eventually become the primary or only source of income for people but at present the livelihoods introduced by the project are mostly additional rather than alternative thus even although their impact on family and community income may be strong, the impact on environment is relatively less so (e.g., fisher folk may become scuba divers certified to take tourists diving but if they continue to fish and only do scuba diving occasionally, the impact is less than in a true shift of livelihoods scenario).

3.3.7 Sustainability* (L)

96. Many of the successes achieved during the project period have a good chance of being sustained, replicated and scaled-up as a result of both Government commitment and the establishment of the Mangrove and Marine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation with the technical support of this project (and the GIZ project) and with financing from the State Government of Maharashtra. This Foundation created a mechanism to accept funds for conservation purposes (CAMPAs, CSR, private individual donations, external project funds). The Foundation has the potential for very significantly contributing to the sustainability of efforts initiated by the project (if used for this purpose) and also allows for some biodiversity-related activities to be financed which Government entities may not otherwise be able to pursue due to want of flexibility in use of Government funds. (As explained in another section of this report, investing project funds in the Foundation “to guarantee sustainability and to scale up activities after project end” was inappropriate but it was also in the opinion of the TE, not strategic in terms of promoting sustainability. When the project invested its own funds in the Foundation, it formed the “Sindhudurg Chapter” within the Foundation. To date the only funds in this “chapter” are what the project gave. Having a chapter devoted specifically to Sindhudurg may actually be detrimental in that the Foundation may perceive that the rest of the funds should be used for other districts of the state.)

97. The strong Government buy-in at State, District and local levels very significantly enhances prospects for sustainability. One good indicator of sustainability is the significant amount of funds sanctioned by the District Collector for the continuation and expansion of several project-initiated activities including the square mesh net programme, solid waste management model in Vengurla municipality (which other Districts in the State of Maharashtra have indicated they will replicate in their own Districts), and SRI which will be scaled up significantly with a budgetary allocation by the District beginning in 2018.

98. The livelihood activities initiated by the project will very likely be sustained and replicated especially as the

Government recently established the “Mangrove Conservation and Livelihood Generation Scheme” in late 2017 with an initial investment from the State Government budget of USD 2.5 million. By demonstrating these “new” livelihood opportunities, this project was an important catalyst for the establishment of this new scheme. Particular interest has been shown by Government (at all levels) in continuing and significantly scaling-up crab farming.

99. Several other project initiated activities, especially the stricter conservation activities, will depend primarily on funding from The Foundation. The Foundation now has a significant corpus of approximately USD\$27 million with significant annual interest available to cover the cost of its own operation and to support mangrove and marine biodiversity conservation activities across the State of Maharashtra. Should the Foundation choose to support these activities, their sustainability will be greatly enhanced. This is not, however, guaranteed. One concern expressed by the Mangrove Cell is that because Sindhudurg has already benefitted, the tendency will now be to award funds to other Districts that have not yet “had their turn”. To date, the Foundation has supported only six projects, not all of these directly concerned with conservation. None of the projects have to do with marine conservation. According to the list of proposed programmes for 2017-18, the Foundation may fund capacity building on management of coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, small research projects on coastal and marine biodiversity, communications, survey and demarcation of mangrove areas, marine stranding and rescue centres as well as administrative and other costs related to its own operation. The Government is also looking toward the proposed GCF project (not yet approved) as a way of continuing on and expanding upon activities initiated by this project.

100. No exit strategy was developed by the project. An exit strategy can greatly enhance prospects for sustainability. Lack of an exit strategy means there are quite a few important issues that are now left hanging with no specific action plan to ensure necessary follow up (e.g., Angria Bank, MMS management plan, landscape plan finalization and capacity building for implementation support, clarification of regulatory framework related to aquaculture and scuba diving, regulations pertaining to semi-pelagic and bottom trawling).

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

4.1 Conclusions & Lessons

101. The main conclusions are derived from the meeting held during the terminal evaluation mission and documents reviewed by the TEE, and are substantiated in the relevant sections of the text of this report. The main conclusions are:

102. The project was relevant to both the GEF and to the people and Government of India at community, District, and State levels.

103. The geographic scope (one District within one State) was appropriate and realistic.

104. The thematic scope as defined in the PRODOC was ambitious given the project funding and time frame. The project added further to what was already an ambitious project, increasing its thematic scope beyond what was intended in the PRODOC. This resulted in being overly ambitious and was one reason why the impact of the project in the production sectors of original focus (i.e., fisheries and tourism) is not as strong as it might otherwise have been.

105. Although generally providing good direction to the project, the PSCs should have been more proactive in ensuring the project successfully overcame some of the hurdles it faced including greater adaptive management applied to find creative solutions to the MMS issue and the budget head issue, ensuring that international expertise be contracted as required when it struggled for long periods with finding the right expertise in country (as was the case with the development of the landscape plan), ensuring that GEF rules be followed (the PSC should not have allowed the project to invest funds into the Foundation for the purpose of expending these funds after project end to “ensure sustainability and scale-up of project activities”), and ensuring that the purpose of the project inception workshop be well understood and take place in a timely fashion.

106. Although not stated as such in the PRODOC, in addition to other aspects of the project, the project is intended to demonstrate approaches (some but not all of which are, according to the UNDP CO, are new to both the District of Sindhudurg and to India) including: 1) How to effectively incorporate biodiversity conservation considerations into production sector policies and practices, 2) how to adopt a landscape/seascape level approach to biodiversity conservation (as opposed to a species specific, habitat specific, or ecosystem specific approach), 3) how to plan across a landscape/seascape *and* across sectors (e.g., how does sewage from coastal communities going untreated to the sea affect marine tourism, fisheries, health, coastal and marine biodiversity and what needs to be done to reduce negative impacts), 4) how to ensure livelihoods of those most directly dependent on natural resources can be shifted so as to avoid negative impact on biodiversity. Although the project contributed to all of these, it fell short in one of the four (#3) in the sense of providing a true model, and, although a helpful intervention, the project did not provide a comprehensive model in any of the four.

107. Lack of a well-prepared Results Framework and lack of consistency between the PRODOC and the RF, compounded by lack of an in-depth threats and barriers analysis (which should have been undertaken at project inception) was an important reason for the rather scattered approach the project adopted in terms of the great number and variety of activities undertaken.

108. An in-depth threats analysis at the outset of the project would have been helpful in bringing greater focus to the project. Without this, and without clear guidance from the RF or the PRODOC, the project attempted to address all sectors (agriculture, fisheries, solid waste management, tourism, conservation) -- clearly an impossible task given the project time frame and funding.

109. Several key expected outputs of the project were significantly delayed due to inability to identify a qualified Implementing Partner in country, financial management issues, or lack of buy-in or resistance by local community. These delays had consequences in terms of achieving expected project outcomes. Some of these delays could have been avoided by applying greater adaptive management and with greater guidance from UNDP.

110. Many of the successes achieved during the project period have a good chance of being sustained, replicated and scaled-up as a result of both Government commitment (especially at District and State levels) and the establishment of the Mangrove and Marine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation.

111. By supporting the *technical* establishment of the Foundation, the project served to catalyze a mechanism which allows for flexibility and innovations in future conservation activities in and by the State.

112. The project's investment of Fifty Lakhs (approximately US\$75,000) to create a Sindhudurg "chapter" within the Foundation to pay the salary of three members of the project team for two years after the project end in order to "sustain and scale-up" project activities was an inappropriate use of GEF Trust funds.

113. Further work is required to ensure that the Foundation does actually serve as a mechanism for promoting sustainability and replication of project-initiated efforts and that Sindhudurg is not now given lower relative priority compared to other Districts because it "already had its turn", or that it is not seen as only having access to the funds within the so-called Sindhudurg Chapter of the Foundation.

114. The Foundation has a very significant corpus of almost US\$27 million, the vast majority of which funds come from State Government as payments for degradation/destruction of mangroves caused by State Government projects. There is also great scope for funds to be invested by the private sector in the Foundation in future. Another potentially important funding source, however, has not been pursued which is donations from wealthy individuals, of which Mumbai (in the State of Maharashtra) has many.

115. Extension of the responsibilities of the Forest Department to include coastal areas was unprecedented (the District of Sindhudurg representing the first case of its application in India) and coincided with the project start. The project provided a mechanism whereby the relevant government entities could adopt the flexibility needed to undertake certain new activities. It is not always the actual funds that make the biggest difference in a project's ability to bring about positive change. Although the funds are important, sometimes it is the flexibility that a project enables that is equally or more important.

116. As a result of this project, many new partnerships were formed which would certainly not have been formed otherwise and which *if* sustained can make a positive difference for biodiversity. Joint fishing patrols by Forest, Fisheries and Police are one such example.

117. Important regulations regarding fishing have been put in place, significantly reducing by-catch and juvenile catch, and reducing conflicts between traditional and mechanized fishers but there are still unsustainable fishing practices which have important negative implications for biodiversity which have not been completely addressed (concrete plan to implement the phasing out of purse seining, bottom trawling).

118. The innovative approach undertaken in the elaboration of fishing gear (4mm square mesh net) regulations which entailed actual demonstrations using the fishing boats of the community fishermen and involving the fishermen themselves in all aspects was one reason for its successful uptake.

119. At the end of six years of project activities, the District Administration (a key player in ensuring biodiversity is mainstreamed into production sectors) still has some of the same concerns that challenged the District Administration's ability to promote and regulate tourism and to promote livelihood activities at the outset of the project. Although highly successful in bringing about positive regulatory measures related to some aspects of fisheries, the project was less attentive to regulatory framework clarification needs pertaining to tourism and livelihood.

120. There are plans to significantly expand crab farming, one of the livelihood options introduced by the project. Although this could be beneficial to both local people and to mangrove conservation if done correctly and at an appropriate scale, it is important that these checks be put in place before expansion.

121. A disproportionate amount of co-financing was designated for crab farming activities (with even co-financing from the Tourism Department related to establishment of a crab hatchery instead of anything to do with tourism).

122. Using GEF funds to support activities which are already known to be economically viable (even if not formerly applied in a designated geographic area) should be avoided.

123. The interpretation by the PMU that "additional livelihoods" was the same as "alternative livelihoods" should have been clarified by the PSC at the outset.

124. The District Cross Sectoral Committee established with support of the project has provided a good forum for decision makers from various sectors to come together in making development and biodiversity conservation decisions for Sindhudurg.

125. The Landscape/Seascape plan could, in principle, be utilized as a tool to ensure biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into development planning and practices but not in its present form. Development of the plan was severely delayed and is still in draft form with only weeks to project closure. Although it compiles a lot of information including new data gathered with the project support, there is scope for improving the plan to make it a more practical and useful decision-making tool. Being the first plan of its kind in India, it is important to do so if this is to be used as a model to be replicated elsewhere.

126. At least part of the PMU should have been based in the District Administration Offices in Malvan with a smaller contingent based in the Mangrove Cell of the Forest Department in Mumbai. There would be benefits of being located physically in the same government entity that is ultimately responsible for planning related to mainstreaming biodiversity into production sectors and cross-sectoral planning. Likewise, it may have been helpful in the project's ability to pursue certain activities at an earlier stage if the project had not been so strongly associated with the Forest Department. According to the Forest Department, a contentious relationship existed at the project outset between the local communities and the Forest Department which made it almost impossible for either the Forest Department or the project to operate. There was no such contentious relationship between the people and the District Administration.

127. Paying a full-time project person to sit in the MoEF&CC in Delhi was inappropriate and not cost-effective.

128. It was not necessary to delay undertaking the inception activities such as scrutinizing the RF and suggesting some needed changes to indicators and targets because of the resistance towards the MMS by local people (the reason given by UNDP for this delay). Part of the reason for the delay in the inception workshop was the misunderstanding of its purpose, something which UNDP should have helped to clarify early on.

129. Although the project provided a very important instrument, it is important to recognize that several factors external to the project contributed significantly to the project's successes including: Existence of strong champions in high-level Government positions (Additional Chief Secretary, GoM), Stability of highly qualified and dedicated Government personnel (Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Mangrove Cell), Strong government buy-in at District level and the dynamic, results-oriented approach undertaken by District of Sindhudurg decision makers (District Collector & CEO).

130. No real exit strategy was developed despite the MTR recommendation to do so. There are quite a few important issues that are now left hanging with no specific action plan to ensure necessary follow up including designation of Angria Bank as a MPA, next steps for developing the MMS management plan, next steps for finalizing the landscape/seascape plan (which the TE does not believe can reasonably be done within the remaining period of the project).

4.2 Recommendations

131. Lessons are highlighted and have been included in the relevant sections of the text of this report. The recommendations outlined below are substantiated in the text of this report. These recommendations are intended to be helpful to the District Administration and State Government of Maharashtra in upscaling the positive and locally relevant activities of the project and in sustaining them with policy level initiations across the state of Maharashtra and in other states in India through MoEF&CC and UNDPs intervention.

1. Even at this late stage, an Exit Strategy should be prepared which outlines specific step-by-step actions required to ensure the project-initiated activity is sustained and if possible replicated and scaled up. A presentation of the exit strategy should be made to the key entities that need to follow up on matters. This presentation should be made before project closure.
2. Develop a proposal for submission to the Foundation Governing Board on priorities for project funding based on what was left undone or requires further support after project end.
3. Once the landscape/seascape plan is finalized, UNDP in partnership with the Foundation, should arrange for a presentation to be made to key decision makers (especially the Additional Secretary for Coastal Zone Management and District Collectors & District CEOs from coastal districts with important biodiversity) to promote its replication.
4. As returning the funds to the project does not seem to be an option at this point with less than one month left in the project, the TET recommends that UNDP approach the GEF for advice on what if any action is now required to redress the US\$75,000 equivalent project funds invested in the Foundation.
5. The efforts in declaring the Angria Bank as an offshore MPA should be further pursued & the project should develop a concise outline of next steps required in this pursuit.
6. The draft Malvan Marine Sanctuary management plan should be prepared (an early first draft was available at the time of the TE) without further delay incorporating the technical data based on the studies

undertaken during the project. This draft plan should then be shared jointly by the Forest Department and the District Administration with stakeholders for gaining their inputs.

7. Complement the draft Tourism Plan developed with project support by further developing and adopting certification and incentive systems related to coastal and marine tourism to both control any negative impacts of such tourism and to ensure maximum benefit from coastal and marine tourism activities are received by local communities (as opposed to by big tour operators or others). These certification and incentive systems should be developed for both large-scale tourism as well as small-scale community-based ecotourism.
8. Further develop small-scale, low-impact tourism adopting ecotourism models.
9. Scale-up solid waste management efforts which in part through project support have become highly successful but require scaling up to maximum impact.
10. Prepare a technical proposal to be submitted to the relevant Government authorities to clarify the regulatory framework pertaining to District Administration questions related to tourism (scuba diving) and to livelihoods (aquaculture).
11. Use the Cross Sectoral Committee which has been established in Sindhudurg under the Chairmanship of the District Collector as a model to be replicated in other coastal districts with some modifications. Use such a cross sectoral committee as the primary body responsible for implementing the Landscape/Seascape plan. Instead of establishing a new committee in other coastal districts who decide to pursue the development of their own Landscape/Seascape plans, use the existing District Coastal Zone Management Authority in those districts and simply expand their scope to include the cross sectoral functions currently undertaken by the Cross Sectoral Committee in Sindhudurg. The Mangrove Cell should have a representative on these Committees as it is currently in process of taking on the responsibility for all mangrove areas.
12. The environmental impacts of crab farming should be carefully considered before expanding this livelihood broadly throughout the creeks as is envisaged, and appropriate safeguards put in place. (The project document entitled “EIA of Crab Farming” did not focus on the environmental impact issues despite its title which would suggest otherwise.)
13. Encourage the pursuit of private individual donations into the Foundation putting the appropriate checks and balances in place to avoid any potential conflict of interest.
14. Resist the common practice of referring to the Foundation as the “Mangrove” Foundation as this does not accurately reflect its mandate. Although a convenient name, prospective donors and others may perceive a restricted scope which will not be helpful.

ANNEXES

Annex I: Ratings

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problem	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risk	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

Annex II: Terms of Reference for Terminal Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors in Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra (PIMS: 4242)*

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Sindhudurg Coastal and Marine Ecosystem (SCME)			
GEF Project ID:	00072738		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00058538	GEF financing:	3.438	3.438
Country:	India	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Region:	South Asia	Government:	12.00	9.92 (received) + 2.08 (likely by project end)
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0.00	0.00
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors	Total co-financing:	12.00	12.00
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	15.438	15.438
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Department of Revenue and Forests, Government of Maharashtra	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		May 2012
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual: December 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Sindhudurg Coastal and Marine Ecosystem (SCME), located on the west coast of India (Maharashtra) is one of the 11 ecologically and economically critical habitats identified along the Indian coast. The area is rich in mangroves, coral reefs, apart from varied marine flora and fauna including globally significant species like Whale shark, Indo-pacific humpback dolphins, and Olive Ridley, Green and Leatherback turtles. Due to its high ecological importance, 29.12 sq. km of SCME was designated as the Malvan Marine Sanctuary (MMS) in 1987. SCME has enormous economic significance as well, being one of the major fish landing centers, and as a rapidly emerging tourism destination. The primary drivers of ecosystem degradation in the SCME include unsustainable fishing by trawlers, an expanding tourism sector, and pollution from fishing vessels and other maritime traffic. The existing institutional arrangement in the SCME being inadequate in addressing these issues from a landscape perspective, the UNDP-GEF intervention aimed to address this through the following outcomes: (1) Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation; (2) Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan; and (3) Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use. By the project end, it has been envisioned that production activities in at least 6,327 sq. km of SCME mainstream biodiversity conservation objectives, in turn improving the conservation prospects of critical species and ecosystems, apart from contributing to the sustainable development of the region.

Project Strategy:

- The first outcome *viz*, 'Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations' suggests strategies for ensuring more effective cross-sectoral planning for the SCME, wherein the interests of conservation, livelihood and production sectors are effectively integrated for long term sustainable environmental management of the SCME. These were planned to be achieved through the following Outputs:
- Output 1.1: Developing a landscape level zoning plan- Sindhudurg Coast requires an integrated approach for the conservation of coastal and marine biological diversity, cultural attributes, and wise use of natural resources for sustainable livelihoods. The objective is to make the optimal allocation of coastal and marine areas to different uses based on ecological carrying capacity and socio-economic needs over the long-term. The project will undertake several diagnostic studies like comprehensive biodiversity profiling and mapping of SCME; economic assessment of ecosystem goods and services of the SCME; etc. in order to support development of the zoning plan. The preparation of the zoning plan will be based on a consultative process involving private sector stakeholder representatives from the fisheries sector (traditional fisher-folk, commercial operators), tourism sector, agriculture/ horticulture, and mining and other industrial activities.
- Output 1.2. Establishing Cross Sectoral Stakeholder Consultation Committee- Cross-sectoral dialogue will be critical for the development and implementation of the zoning plan. The project will, therefore, support the establishment of a cross-sectoral stakeholder consultation committee under the chairmanship of the Conservator of Forests in charge of the MMS. The Committee shall also have representation from private sector, local communities and other key stakeholders in the SCME. The committee will be supported by the Project Management Unit.

- Output 1.3. Recommendations for strengthening relevant legislations- There are two areas where legislation can be strengthened to better reflect the needs of coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, viz, the Wildlife Protection Act and the MFRA. The project will support this legislative reform process by developing specific recommendations based on the experience in the SCME on legal provisions that need to be made to ensure that fishing activity in the EEZ is also sustainable.
- The Second outcome, viz, 'Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan' focuses on translating the elements of the zoning plan into implement-able actions on the ground, by developing institutional capacities for sustainable fisheries management, sustainable ecotourism management and effective management of the marine sanctuary. This outcome has been proposed to be achieved through:
- Output 2.1. Developing and implementing sustainable fisheries management based on an Ecosystem Approach- The major threats to biodiversity come from large scale commercial fishing trawlers. Therefore, priority will be given to the development of a sustainable Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) that is based on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF). The development of the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan will be based on FAO guidelines. Several studies will be undertaken like impact of trawlers using purse-seine nets; assessment of fisheries potential/ carrying capacity in the SCME; etc. The findings of these assessments will inform development of the Fisheries Management Plan. If found appropriate, the project will support the Fisheries Department in pursuing certification in collaboration with MPEDA (Marine Products Exports Development Authority), SEAI (Sea foods Exports Association of India), as well as WWF-India which is supporting certification for small-scale fisheries. Development of the FMP will, therefore, be based on extensive consultation and participation. Research agencies will also be involved to assist in the initiation of EAF-based fisheries management, such as the Wildlife Institute of India, Science & Technology Park of Pune University, and Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute. Training will be provided to staff from the Fisheries Department and Forest Department, as well as to local representatives of the Maharashtra Maritime Board that oversees maritime traffic and ports, and the Coast Guards as part of capacity building for aiding implementation of Fisheries Management Plan.
- Output 2.2. Developing and implementing sustainable tourism management - Tourism is a rapidly growing sector in the SCME. The rapid growth of recreational, cultural and eco-tourism present the coastal communities of the SCME with opportunities and challenges. However, the Local communities have started benefiting from the economic potential of sustainable and responsible tourism. The project will therefore support the development of planned, low-impact, less intrusive, community-driven tourism that can significantly reduce negative dependency on bio-resources, boost the local economy and help in developing a strong constituency for marine and coastal biodiversity conservation. The project will support development of a Sustainable Tourism Management Plan for the SCME. The plan will also establish appropriate norms and standards for development of both types of tourism in the SCME given the ecological significance of the area. Consultations with key stakeholders and capacity building would be part of the project.
- Output 2.3. Strengthened Management Effectiveness of the Malvan Marine Sanctuary- Several provisions under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 are yet to be completed in the Malvan Sanctuary. With greater involvement of communities in the decision-making process, better

outcomes can be expected vis-à-vis compliance with conservation measures. The project will also implement capacity building exercise for Forest Department staff.

- Under the third outcome of the project 'Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use', the project will work with fishing communities in all 3 target talukas of Devgad, Malvan and Vengurla and has been proposed to be realized through:
- Output 3.1. Supporting traditional fishing practices and capacity building on conservation management- The project will provide technical and financial support to traditional fishing communities to reinforce their low-impact practices and manage their fishing effort in line with the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan. In addition, fishing communities will be trained in conservation management practices so that they can become effective partners in conservation actions initiated by the Forestry and Fisheries Departments.
- Output 3.2. Implementing livelihood diversification strategy and related socio-economic interventions- The project envisages developing micro plans to identify opportunities for income generation during the lean period, and opportunities for alternate livelihoods.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

Annex C

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Sindhudurg, including the following project sites *Mumbai and Delhi*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (i) Senior officers of MoEF&CC; (ii) UNDP Management; (iii) Officers

of Mangrove Cell, Maharashtra; (iv) Senior Officers of Maharashtra State Forest Department; (v) Officials of State Departments of Fisheries, Tourism and Agriculture; (vi) Officials of Sindhudurg District Administration; (vii) PMU/LPU Officials; (viii) representatives of various Institutions/Organizations involved in the Project implementation; (ix) Local community representatives.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 16

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document,

- Project reports – including Annual APR/PIR,
- Project budget revisions, midterm review,
- Progress reports,
- GEF focal area tracking tools,
- Project files,
- National strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill.US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in [India](#). The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be thirty working days spread over three months according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing
Preparation of TE team, document review etc.	2 days
Preparation of TE inception report	3 days
TE review Mission	12 days
Draft TE Report	7 days
Final Report	4 days
A stakeholder workshop to share the findings of the TE	2 days

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO

Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
Stakeholder workshop	Stakeholder workshop to share the findings of the TE	Within 29 days of submitting final report	

***When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.**

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 consultants – international and national evaluators. The international consultant will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The Team members must present the following qualifications:

National consultant Academic Qualifications:

- Master's degree in natural resources management/marine biodiversity conservation, and related fields.

Professional Qualification:

- A minimum of 8 years of work experience in the relevant field is required;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF processes.

Cumulative analysis:

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

Responsive; having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

- Technical Criteria weight -70%;
- Financial Criteria weight -30%.

Technical Criteria:

- Experience specific to mainstreaming of marine and coastal biodiversity conservation into production sectors and related projects is advantageous; (Credibility of completion/on-going support documents to be included) (20%)
- Knowledgeable and familiarity on conservation institutions and projects in the country, conservation issues and priorities, and related policies and legislations particularly in relation to coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, including inter-departmental coordination issues at the national and local levels is necessary.(20%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (10%)
- Proposed work methodology with timelines (20%)

Responsibilities:

- ☐ Documentation review and data gathering
- ☐ Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- ☐ Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- ☐ Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- ☐ Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

The consultant should be fluent in English with excellent writing skills. In addition, they should possess excellent computing skills, including MS Word, Excel, Power Point and other related programmes. The consultant must bring his/ her own computing equipment.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	On submission of agreed work plan.
50%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICALFRAMEWORK

Objective: The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and addressing retrogressive factors such as the anticipated impacts of climate change.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into those production sectors that impact coastal and marine ecosystems of the SCME.	Landscape/seascape area in the SCME where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	About 6,327 sq. km. (2,327 sq. km as area of direct influence and 4,000 sq. km as area of indirect influence)	Project Reports; Independent mid- term and final evaluations	Project approach is not internalized by state government departments responsible for tourism, fisheries, ports, conservation, agriculture, mining and other industrial activity in the SCME Government departments do not provide co-financing in a timely manner to
	Extent of coral reefs in the project area	360 sq.km and this will be verified in first 6 months of the project	The extent of coral cover remains at least stable or increasing.	Monitoring reports	
	Population status of following critical species: Olive Ridley turtle and Indo-pacific hunch back dolphin	40-50 nesting sites of Olive Ridley Turtles reported and 100-150 Indo-pacific hunch back dolphins frequent the region. This will be verified in first 6 months	Population status remain at least stable/ increasing	Monitoring reports	

		of the project			support implementation of the project strategy
	Population status of birds (including migratory):	This will be verified in first one year of the project	Population status remains at least stable or increases.	Annual bird count	Government Representatives of the different sectors do not work in a collaborative manner
Outcome 1: Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity	Landscape level zoning plan (LP) that zones resource use by taking into account conservation needs of the SCME	0	1 Landscape Plan that prepared and integrated with the District level planning process	Approved Landscape Plan document	Stakeholder institutions may not provide high-level representation in the cross-sectoral Stakeholder consultation

conservation considerations	Establishing a functional cross-sectoral Stakeholder Committee for the management of SCME involving District Planning Dept., Forest Dept., the Maritime Board, Dept. of Industries, Fisheries, Agriculture, Tourism, Private Sector & NGOs	0	1	Notification/ Constitution/ memorandum of the Stakeholder Committee for SCME	committee Stakeholder institutions are unwilling to share information that is required for developing LP that mainstreams coastal and marine biodiversity conservation concerns Recommendations on legislative amendments for addressing biodiversity conservation in sector practices may not receive government and political support
	Recommendations on reform of Wildlife (Protection) Act	WPA has a terrestrial focus that is not suited to marine PAs	Amendments that give explicit recognition to marine PAs are approved or under consideration by the MoEF&CC	Government notification/ order/ records	
	Recommendations on reform of MFRA	MFRA does not adequately incorporate the integration of the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity	Amendments to MFRA incorporating provisions for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity approved or under consideration by State Department of Agriculture/ Fisheries	Government notification/ order/ records	LP is not integrated in

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Compliance of new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end any new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity conform with the LP	Final Evaluation	<p>the District development planning process</p> <p>Local communities do not support the LP</p>
	Compliance of existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end an action plan for bringing existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in line with the LP is developed and approved by sectoral departments	Final Evaluation	
	Zoning of MMS in line with LP	Current MMS boundaries do not capture key biodiversity rich areas and there is conflict with local fishermen on resource use issues	MMS boundaries and zoning are rationalized to accord protection to biodiversity rich areas and to guarantee occupational interests and innocent passage of local	Approved new MMS Management Plan	

			fishers		
	Financial sustainability strategy for continued implementation of landscape-level management of SCME	0	1	Strategy document	
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management	Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming and integration of environmental management considerations and safeguards into policies, plans and activities of key sectors	0	Production sector: 1 000 Conservation sector: 100 Livelihood sector: 5 000	Training records; training evaluations	<p>Institutions are unwilling to commit the expected number of personnel for training and capacity building</p> <p>Trained staff may not continue in current roles</p> <p>Fisheries and Tourism sector representatives may not be</p>

plan and MMS management plan	Mesh size laws are followed by the trawlers	To be collected in the first year	50% of trawlers follow the mesh size norms set up by Mesh Regulation Committee, 1983	Survey reports of Fisheries Department	committed to implementing the EAF-based Fisheries Management Plan and the Sustainable Tourism Plan
	Incidence of encroachment of intensive fishing operations into traditional fishing grounds	Encroachment is taking place	By project end, all fishing activity complies with zoning specified in LP and there are no reports of encroachment	Records of Forests and Fisheries Department	
	Reduction/ elimination of trawlers from outside SCME i.e., from Ratnagiri (Maharashtra), Goa and Karnataka	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	50% reduction of trawlers from outside SCME	Monthly Fishing Reports	
	Community based Ecotourism operations as a % of all tourism operations in project area	25%	50% by project end	Final Evaluation	
	Number of violations of MMS Management Plan, compared with year of initial patrolling	Baseline violations to be measured in 1 st 3 months of project	Declines by 50% by year 5	Survey reports	

Outcome 3: Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the SCME	Traditional fishing communities continue to practice sustainable, low-impact, traditional fishing activity as measured by extent of rampani fishing and related cooperatives	98 rampani fishing cooperatives	50% increase	Records of Fisheries Department	Local communities may not be willing to participate in the conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems unless the project addresses their livelihood needs
	Number of EDCs active in the SCME	0	15	Records of the Forest Department	The livelihood activities supported under the project may not add significantly to income opportunities of local people so that the dependency on natural resources is reduced.
	Number of skills-development activities carried out for VLIs and other local institutions for alternative livelihoods or sustainable ecosystem-based livelihoods that reduce pressures on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Administrative reports and records	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Amount of resources flowing to local communities annually from community based ecotourism activities	USD 2.5 million	USD 5 million (this is estimated as a reasonable trajectory by local experts based on local conditions and the anticipated impact of project interventions in this regard; target value to be re-confirmed and modified as appropriate once micro-plans are developed)	Records of VLIs, administrative records, etc.	
	Number of people shifting to alternative livelihood options that reduce pressure on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Records of VLIs, administrative records, etc.	

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document
- Inception Workshop Report
- Annual Work and Financial Plans
- Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) for 2013;
- Review the tracking tool. If it is not available, review the required information to complete the tracking tool as required for climate change mitigation projects.
- Quarterly Reports
- Minutes of Project Technical Committee/Project Steering Committee meetings
- Back-to-Office Reports of UNDP staff (if any)
- Study reports/Conference proceedings/government guidelines, etc.
- Midterm review Report
- Other evaluation Reports, if any.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicator s	Source s	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity and climate change focal area?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant to India's environment and sustainable development objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	•	•	•
• Is the project internally coherent in its design?	•	•	•
• How is the project relevant with respect to other donor- supported activities?	•	•	•
• Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			

• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	•	•	•
• How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was project support provided in an efficient way?	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Effectiveness: To what extent have/ will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?	•	•	•
• Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	•	•	•
• How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	•	•	•
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	•	•	•

• Was project support provided in an efficient way	•	•	•
• How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	•	•	•
• Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	•	•	•
• What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?	•	•	•
• Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• Have the entities/people that will carry on the project been identified and prepared?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence financial resources are committed to support project results after the project has closed	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements?	•	•	•
• Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems?	•	•	•
• Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN
System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (**where relevant**): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Place on date

Signature: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

i.	Opening page: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project UNDP and GEF project ID #s. Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report Countries included in the project GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program Implementing Partner and other project partners Evaluation team members Acknowledgements
ii.	Executive Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Summary Table Project Description(brief) Evaluation Rating Table Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UNDP Editorial Manual ⁵)
1.	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of the evaluation Scope & Methodology Structure of the evaluation report
2.	Project description and development context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project start and duration Problems that the project sought to address Immediate and development objectives of the project Baseline Indicators established Main stakeholders Expected Results
3.	Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated ⁶)
3.1	Project Design / Formulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) Assumptions and Risks Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design Planned stakeholder participation Replication approach UNDP comparative advantage Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector Management arrangements

3.2	<p>Project Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) • Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) • Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management • Project Finance: • Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation(*) • UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
3.3	<p>Project Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall results (attainment of objectives)(*) • Relevance(*) • Effectiveness & Efficiency(*) • Country ownership • Mainstreaming • Sustainability(*) • Impact •
4.	<p>Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project • Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project • Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives • Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
5.	<p>Annexes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tore • Itinerary • List of persons interviewed • Summary of field visits • List of documents reviewed • Evaluation Question Matrix • Questionnaire used and summary of results • Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the

Evaluation Report Reviewed and

Cleared by UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEFRTA

Name: _____

final

Annexe III: Terminal Evaluation Mission Itinerary

Date	From	To	Travel Plan and activities	Approximate Distance
4-11-2017			Arrival of Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli at Mumbai Airport and Check-In at Ramee Guestline Hotel, Juhu, Mumbai	4 km, Pick-up by Hotel
5-11-2017			Review of Documents	
6-11-2017			Arrival of Dr. Virginia Ravndal at Mumbai Airport and Check-In at Ramee Guestline Hotel, Juhu, Mumbai	4 km, Pick-up by Hotel
6-11-2017	09:00	10:00	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	11 km, Pick-up by Mangrove Cell
	10:00	12:00	Presentations / Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	
	12:00	13:30	Dr. Baban Ingole, Sr. Scientist, National Institute of Oceanography, Goa	
	13:30	14:30	Lunch	
	14:30	16:00	Presentation by Dr. R. Ramesh and his team, NCSCM on Landscape level Plan and Mapping Coastal vulnerability	
	16:00	17:00	Presentation by Dr. S. Babu, (SACON), Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu.	
	17:00	18:00	Presentation by Ms. Ketki Jog, Konkan Cetacean Research Team	
	18:00	19:15	Presentation by Shri Chetan Rao, Dakshin Foundation	
	19:30	20:30	Mangrove Cell to Hotel	11 km, Drop by Mangrove Cell
7-11-2017	09:00	10:00	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	11 km, Pick-up by Mangrove Cell
	10:00	11:30	Discussion and presentations by PMU	
	11:30	12:30	Presentation by Dr. Kandan, Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Coastal Aquaculture	
	12:30	13:30	Discussions with Shri Rajendra Jadhav, Jt. Commissioner, Fisheries, GOM	
	12:30	13:30	Lunch	
	14:00	15:30	Travel from Mangrove Cell to Nariman Point	18 km
	16:00	16:45	Discussions with Shri Vikas Kharge, IAS, Secretary, Forests & Revenue, GoM	
	17:00	17:30	Discussions with Shri Vikas V. Deshmukh, IAS, Secretary, Fisheries, GoM	
	17:45	19:30	Mantralaya to Hotel at Juhu	26 km, Drop by Mangrove Cell
8-11-2017	9:30	10:30	Check-Out from Hotel at Juhu	
	10:30	13:00	Presentations / Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	

	13:00	14:00	Hotel to CSI Airport	4 km, Drop by Hotel
	15:15	16:40	Mumbai to Goa Flight	
	17:00		Stay at hotel in Goa (Panjim)	
9-11-2017	07:30	09:00	Panjim to Mandavi Jetty, Vengurla	
	10:00	12:00	Visit to and discussion at Solid Waste Management unit and interaction with Mr. Ramdas Tukaram Kokare, Chief Officer Vengurla Municipal Council	Successful integrated Solid waste management intervention wherein council has received various awards
	12:30	14:30	Visit to Mangrove crab farm (pen culture) at Shiroda, Taluka Vengurla	SHG operated crab farm over the past 3 phases.
	14:45	15:30	Lunch at Hotel Coconut, Kudal	
	16:00	17:30	Interaction with District Collector and CEO Zilla Parishad	Overall review of the project in the coastal talukas of Sindhudurg District
	17:30	18:30	Travel to Hotel Ocean Bliss	
10-11-2017	07:30	08:00	Travel from hotel to Sarjekot Jetty	
	08:00	10:30	Visit to Kawada rock island for artificial reef and coral transplantation along with dolphin watching and interaction with local scuba divers' group (Dive masters) Interaction with Kille Preranotsav Samiti on Plastic Free Sindhudurg Fort	Interaction with 1. Representatives of technical agency implementing the project activities and visit to the deployment site. 2. Local youth trained as PADI Dive Masters and their ocean clean up activity 3. NGO involved in the implementation of plastic free Sindhudurg fort project
	10:30	10:45	Travel from Sarjekot to Gram Panchayat Hadi	
	10:45	13:30	Breakfast and Overview of Hadi ecotourism & Visit to Juva island and cage culture unit Interaction with Hospitality management training beneficiary owning Bed & Breakfast unit at Hadi	Interaction with community and stakeholders on various activities proposed under Community based Eco tourism at Hadi village and visit to cage culture unit
	13:30	14:00	Travel to Achara	
	14:00	15:00	Lunch at Jamdul Resort Achara	
	15:00	15:30	Visit to crab farm unit at Achara	
	15:30	16:00	Travel to Miryabanda, Sarjekot	
	16:00	17:00	Interaction with BMC at Gram Panchayat Miryabanda	Interaction with BMC on its involvement in the project and efforts in preparation of PBR
	17:30	18:30	Visit to dive institute IISDA at Tarkarli	Visit to IISDA and interaction with local youth trained under the capacity

				building projects. Discussion on alternative tourism destination project and outcome of the project
	18:30	18:45	Travel to Hotel Ocean Bliss	
11-11-2017	08:00	09:15	Travel to Mithbav mangrove plantation site	
	09:15	09:45	Visit to Mangrove Plantation site	Visit to 17 Ha of mangrove plantation site. Interaction with Forest Guard on the mangrove plantation
	09:45	10:00	Travel to Tambaldeg Beach	
	10:00	11:30	Interaction with turtle conservation point persons and Honorary Wildlife Warden Dr. Nagesh Daptardar actively involved in Turtle Conservation and other marine conservation activities	Meeting with local youth working as turtle point persons and Interaction with Dr. Daptardar
	11:30	12:15	Travel to Wadatar	
	12:15	14:00	Overview of bivalve farming and ecotourism activities and interaction with groups involved	Presentation by women SHG practising Bivalve culture. Discussion with Village President on various activities proposed under Community based Eco tourism at Wadatar village.
	14:00	15:00	Travel to and lunch at Devgad	
	15:00	15:45	Travel to Dahibav	
	15:45	17:00	Interaction with SRI farmer and site visit	Interaction with farmers practising SRI and their experience
	17:00	18:30	Travel to Hotel Ocean Bliss	
12-11-2017	08:30	10:00	Check out from Hotel Ocean Bliss & travel to Vengurla	
	10:00	10:45	Mangrove safari, group interaction (Swamini SHG), Inauguration of Spoken English Class	First Women SHG to initiate innovative mangrove safari ecotourism activity in the State of Maharashtra. Similar such models promoting community based ecotourism are proposed to be developed in Hadi village, Malvan taluka and Wadatar village in Devgad taluka
	11:00	12:00	Interaction with Square mesh trawl owners and Chairman Vengurla Fishermen society on Vengurla jetty	Interaction with fishers community on their

				experience using square nets
	12:00	13:00	Interaction with Asst. Comm. Fisheries at Vengurla	Discussion with ACF Mr. Pradeep Vast -involvement of Fisheries Dept. and role played by them in the project interventions
	13:00	14:15	Travel and lunch at Hotel Mayboli, Vengurla	
	14:15	16:15	Travel to and Check in at Hotel in Goa	
13-11-2017	10:30	11:45	Check out from Hotel and travel to Dabolim Airport	
	13:35	14:45	Goa to Mumbai Flight	
	14:45	16:00	CSI Airport to Hotel	4 km, Pick-up by Hotel
14-11-2017	09:30	10:30	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	11 km, Pick-up by Mangrove Cell
	10:30	13:00	Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	
	13:00	14:00	Lunch	
	14:00	17:00	Discussions with the Project Team	
	17:00	18:00	Office to Hotel	
15-11-2017	10:00	11:00	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	
	11:00	13:00	Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	
	13:00	14:00	Lunch	
	14:30	16:00	Travel to Mantralayam, Secretariat, GOM	
	17:00	17:45	Discussion meeting with Mr. Praveen Pardeshi, Additional CS and Personal Secretary to the Chief Minister of Maharashtra	
	18:00	19:00	Mantralayam to Hotel	
16-11-2017	09:30	10:30	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	11 km, Pick-up by Mangrove Cell
	10:30	13:00	Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	
	13:00	14:00	Lunch	
	14:00	17:00	Discussions with the Project Team	
	17:00	18:00	Office to Hotel	
17-11-2017	09:30	10:30	Hotel to Office of the APCCF, Mangrove Cell, Bandra East	11 km, Pick-up by Mangrove Cell
	10:30	13:00	Discussions with APCCF and the Project Team	
	13:00	14:00	Lunch	
	14:00	17:00	Discussions with the Project Team	
	17:00	18:00	Office to Hotel	
18-11-2017	10:30	17:30	Interaction with PMU, gap filling and report preparation	

19-11-2017	10:30	17:30	Interaction with PMU, gap filling and report preparation	
	23:30	24:00	Dr. Virginia Ravndal travel to CSI airport and departure for New York on the way home	
20-11-2017	08:30	09:45	Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli travel to CSI airport and departure for Visakhapatnam on the way home	

Annex IV: Documents Reviewed by the TET

- Project Identification Form (PIF) - 2009
- Project Document - 2011
- Inception workshop report - 2014
- Mid Term Review Report (MTR) - 2015
- Draft Landscape plan
- Audit Reports for the years – 2013 to 2017
- Annual Work Plans for the years – 2012 to 2017
- Minutes of Executive Committee - 1-19
- Recommendations for Biodiversity Management Plan of MMS
- Project Implementation Review for the years - 2014 to 2017
- Minutes of NPSC (Sindhudurg) 2012
- Minutes of the 1st Joint NPSC 2013
- Minutes of the 2nd joint NPSC 2015
- Minutes of the SPSC from 1st to 10th meetings
- Sagarika magazine
- Fisheries Management Plan Part 1 and Part 2 -2014
- Development of Alternative Tourism Destinations along the Sindhudurg Coast –
- District Tourism Master Plan Sindhudurg, Maharashtra 2013 – 2033
- Green Rating for MTDC Bed & Breakfast Units in Sindhudurg district (GRBBS)
- An Assessment of Solid Waste Management Systems and Preparation of a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Plan for Sindhudurg District – 2016
- Integrated Sustainable Tourism Working Plan -
- EIA of Mangrove Crab in coastal villages of Sindhudurg - 2017

List of Publications by the project

No	Title of Publication	Date	Shared with Whom	Language
1	Project Brochure	2013	General public and partners	English & Marathi
2	Angria Bank Interim Report	2014	Partner and Project implementing agencies	English
3	Field Guide on Mangroves	2014	Shared with Forest Guards, tourists at Swamini mangrove tours and general public for awareness	English & Marathi
4	Plastic-free fort campaign pamphlets	2014	Locals and tourists at Sindhudurg Fort	English

5	Report of the Indian Study Mission to Philippines on The Best Practices in Management of Coastal and Marine Resources and Conservation of Biodiversity of the Seas of East Asia	2014	Internal partner agencies	English
6	Best Practices	2014-2016	To be distributed among partner agencies and other agencies and government organizations looking to replicate similar projects in their region	English
7	Project Factsheet	2014, 2015, 2016	Partner agencies, general public for awareness	English
8	Sagarika Magazine	2015	Partner agencies	English
9	Beekeeping Apiculture Booklet	2015	Apiculture beneficiaries	Marathi
10	Inception Workshop Report	2014-2015	Partner agencies	English
11	Project Flyers	2015	Media, partner agencies, general public	English
12	Project Activity Posters	2015	Exhibitions	Marathi
13	Demonstration of Bycatch Reduction and Juvenile Fish Excluder Devices (BRJED) Brochure	2015	Fishers community	English & Marathi
14	Capacity Building of Fishermen on Sustainable Fishing Practices Booklet	2015	Fishers community	English & Marathi
15	Manual on Identification of Marine Mammal Species	2015	Fishers societies, Forest guards and participants of capacity building programs	English & Marathi
16	Manual on Dealing with Stranded and Beached Cetaceans	2015	Fishers societies, Forest guards and participants of capacity building programs	English & Marathi
17	Cetaceans of Sindhudurg Book	2015	Dolphin tour operators	English & Marathi
18	Green rating for MTDC-registered Bed and Breakfast Units Report	2015	MTDC	English

19	Artificial Reef and Coral Transplantation flyers	2015	Locals and officers	English & Marathi
20	Coral Monitoring Protocol Booklet	2015	Local tour operators	Bilingual
21	Posters for CMS Vatavaran	2015	Visitors at CMS Vatavaran Environment & Wildlife Film Festival and Forum	English
22	Updated Project Flyers	2016	Media and general public	English
23	Training Manual on Bivalve Farming	2016	Beneficiaries of the bivalve farming program	English & Marathi
24	Regeneration Techniques in Mangroves Book	2016	Forest guards	English
25	Gender Mainstreaming Posters	2016	Locals and tourists	Marathi
26	Nature Trail Training Manual <i>(soft copy available)</i>	2016	Locals and nature trail guides	English
27	ELA Foundation e-Journal	2017	General public	English
28	Sustainable Tourism Initiatives Implemented Under the Program - Report	2017	General public for awareness	English
29	Sea Snakes Book	2017	To be distributed among fisher community	English
30	SRI Training Manual	2017	To be distributed among farming communities and agencies involved in promotion of SRI	English
31	Livelihood Initiatives Implemented Under the Program - Report	2017	To be distributed as a manual for beneficiaries	English
32	Project activity posters for International Day for Biological Diversity	2017	Exhibition on International Day for Biological Diversity	English

Annex V: Stakeholders Interviewed

Government Stakeholders

- 1) Mr. Praveen Pardeshi, Principal Secretary to Chief Minister, Government of Maharashtra
- 2) Mr. Vikas Kharge, Secretary (Forests), Government of Maharashtra
- 3) Mr. Vikas V. Deshmukh, Secretary (Fisheries), Government of Maharashtra
- 4) Mr. N. Vasudevan, Chief Conservator of Forests (Mangrove Cell) Government of Maharashtra
- 5) Mr. Virendra Tiwari, Chief Conservator Forests (Revenue and Forest Department) Government of Maharashtra
- 6) Dr. B. N. Patil, Director (Environment Department) Government of Maharashtra
- 7) Mr. R. Jayaram Gowda, Deputy Conservator of Forests and Joint Director, Mangrove Cell, Government of Maharashtra
- 8) Mr. Uday Chaudhari, District Collector and Magistrate, Sindhudurg
- 9) Mr. Shekhar Singh, CEO, Zilla Parishad, Sindhudurg
- 10) Mr. Rajendar Jadhav, Joint Commissioner, Fisheries, Government of Maharashtra
- 11) Mr. Pradeep Vast, Assistant Commissioner of Fisheries, Vengurla, Government of Maharashtra
- 12) Dr. Nagesh Daptardar, Honorary Wildlife Warden, Sindhudurg district, (Turtle Conservation Specialist - Tambaldeg)
- 13) Mr. Ramdas Tukaram Kokare, Chief Officer, Vengurla Municipal Council (Solid Waste Management)
- 14) Mr. A. N. Bange, Forest Guard, Mangrove Plantation, Mithbav, Kankoli Range Forest, Government of Maharashtra

Technical Partners

- 1) Dr. Baban Ingole, Chief Scientist, National Institute of Oceanography (NIO)
- 2) Dr. P. K. Asokan (Principal Scientist), Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI)
- 3) Dr. R. Ramesh, Director, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM)
- 4) Dr. Purvaja Ramachandran, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM)
- 5) Dr. S. Yogeshwari, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM)
- 6) Dr. K. R. Abhilash, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM)
- 7) Dr. R. Muruganandam, National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM)
- 8) Dr. S. Babu, Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History (SACON)
- 9) Ms. Ketki Jog, Konkan Cetacean Research Team (KCRT)
- 10) Mr. Chetan Rao, Dakshin Foundation – Sea Snakes
- 11) Dr. S. Kandan, Project Director, Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture (RGCA)
- 12) Dr. G. K. Dinakaran, Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture (RGCA)
- 13) Mr. S. Pandiarajan, Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA)
- 14) Dr. Madhu V R, Senior Scientist, Fishing Technology Division, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology (CIFT)
- 15) Mr. Gurunath Rane, Eco tourism Consultant, Dhuriwada, Malvan (Eco tourism in Hadi and Juva Island)
He was there in Hadi eco-tourism meeting– and left due to his daughter’s illness
- 16) Dr. C.P. Balasubramanian, Principal Scientist, Central Institute for Brackish Water Aquaculture (CIBA)
- 17) Mr. Santosh Patil, Scientist, Central Institute for Brackish Water Aquaculture (CIBA)
- 18) Mr. Shailesh Mhaskar, Project Field Officer, Central Institute for Brackish Water Aquaculture (CIBA)
- 19) Dr. Sarang Kulkarni, Chief Instructor and General Manager, Institute of Scuba Diving and Aquatic Sports (IISDA)
- 20) Dr. Sachin Tendulkar, Project Coordinator, Mayem Panlot Sangh (System of Rice Intensification)

- 21) Dr. Dhanashri Patil, Head of Botany Department, Dr. Balasaheb Khardekar College, Vengurla – Tutor, English language training.
- 22) Dr. Manisha Mumjumdar, Head of English Department, Dr. Balasaheb Khardekar College, Vengurla - English language training.
- 23) Mr. Balasaheb G Gaikwad, Asst. Prof of English, Dr. Balasaheb Khardekar College, Vengurla - English language training.
- 24) Mr. Kedar Palav, Technical Officer, Mangrove and Marine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation (Crab farming)

Local stakeholders/beneficiary groups

- 1) Ms. Asmita Rawool, Vice President, Vengurla Municipal Council, Taluka Vengurla (Solid Waste Management)
- 2) Mr. Uday UthamGawde, Chairman, Sree Vignahartha SHG, Shiroda, Vengurla Taluka (Crab Farming)
- 3) Shivram Gawade, Vice President, Sree Vignahartha SHG, Shiroda, Vengurla Taluka (Crab Farming)
- 4) Swarupa Gawade, Member, Sree Vignahartha SHG, Shiroda, Vengurla Taluka (Crab Farming)
- 5) Mr. Bhushan, Padi Dive Guide, Indian Scuba Diving and Aquatic Life Saving Foundation, Sarji (Eco Tourism)
- 6) Mr. Vishal, Padi Dive Guide, Indian Scuba Diving and Aquatic Life Saving Foundation, Sarji (Eco Tourism)
- 7) Mr. Mahesh Manjrekar, President, Hadi Panchayat (Ecotourism in Hadi and Juva Island)
- 8) Mr. Vilas Hadkar, Ex. President, (Ecotourism in Hadi and Juva Island)
- 9) Ms. Swati Hatle, (Hospitality management beneficiary and owner of B&B)
- 10) Ms. Supriya Salkar, (Hospitality management beneficiary and owner of B&B)
- 11) Mr. Kishore Hatle, (Hospitality management beneficiary and owner of B&B)
- 12) Mr. Ratnadeep Kadam, Juva Island (Nature guide)
- 13) Ms. Vaijanti Surve, Juva Island (Nature guide)
- 14) Ms. Neelima Mestri, Juva Island (Nature guide)
- 15) Mr. Santosh Mithbavakar, Juva Island, (Cage culture farmer)
- 16) Mr. Satish Pednekar, Juva Island, (Cage culture farmer)
- 17) Mr. Sagar Maladkar, Turtle point person, Tambaldeg beach, Taluka Devgad
- 18) Mr. Sudhakar Mestri, Fisherman, Tambaldeg beach, Taluka Devgad
- 19) Mr. Kesrinath Shantaram Mayba, Chairman, Miryabanda Biodiversity Management Committee (BMC)
- 20) Ms. R. N. Chendvankar, Secretary, Miryabanda BMC
- 21) Ms. Sunidha Suresh Khavnekar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 22) Ms. Sakshi Vijay Nikam, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 23) Mr. Subodh Atmaram Keluskar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 24) Mr. Rajan Vasudev Achrekar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 25) Mr. Laxman Shiva Kolambkar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 26) Mr. Santosh Ramchandra Revandkar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 27) Mr. Ravindra Vinayak Paradkar, Member, Miryabanda BMC
- 28) Ms. Ulka Joshi, President, Wada Gram Panchayat (Wadatar bivalve farming and Eco tourism)
- 29) Ms. Kasturi Dake, Prerna SHG ((Wadatar bivalve farming and Eco tourism)
- 30) Ms. Reena Bhabal, Prerna SHG ((Wadatar bivalve farming and Eco tourism)
- 31) Ms. Ayesha Hule, President, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 32) Ms. Shweta Hule, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 33) Ms. Goutami Hule, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 34) Ms. Sai Satardekar, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 35) Ms. Priyanka Dabholkar, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)

- 36) Ms. Radhika Lone, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 37) Ms. Janhavi Hule, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 38) Ms. Sneha Khobarekar, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 39) Ms. Sushila Hule, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 40) Ms. Satish Hule, Member, Swamini SHG, (Mangrove Safari - Vengurla)
- 41) Mr. Rajendra Kubal, Chairman, Vengurla Fishermen Cooperative Society (Traditional fisherman using gill nets)
- 42) Mr. Nitas Girap, Vice-chairman, Vengurla Fishermen Cooperative Society (Square-mesh project beneficiary)
- 43) Mr. Harshal Redkar, Trawl owner fisherman, Vengurla (Square-mesh project beneficiary)
- 44) Mr. Satish Hule, Purse seine fisherman, Vengurla
- 45) Mr. Ashok Ganpat Dalvi, Farmer, SRI, Dahibav
- 46) Mr. Sakharam Pandurang Parab, Farmer, SRI, Dahibav
- 47) Mr. Sunil S, Project Manager, Dilasa Janvikas Pratishthan, SRI Dahibav
- 48) Mr. Shashikant Kastle, District Co-ordinator, Dilasa Janvikas Pratishthan, SRI Dahibav
- 49) 9 Scuba Guides

Project Team

- 1) Mr. N. Vasudevan, Nodal Officer, Mumbai
- 2) Dr. Subir Ghosh, Project Coordinator, Mumbai
- 3) Mr. Avadhoot Velankar, Conservation Biologist UNV, Mumbai
- 4) Mr. Rohit Sawant, Project Management Specialist, Malvan
- 5) Ms. Durga Thigale, Project Management Specialist, Malvan
- 6) Ms. Daya Patki, Project Management Specialist, Malvan
- 7) Ms. Rinky Rajdev, Project Management Specialist, (Finance and Accounts) Mumbai
- 8) Ms. Suvarna Khandare, Finance and Administrative Assistant, Mumbai
- 9) Ms. Sneha Pillai, Outreach and Monitoring Associate, UNV, Mumbai
- 10) Ms. Aditi Tandon, Communication Associate, UNV, Mumbai

Annex VI: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Annex VII: Project Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP for India (2008-2012): Outcome 4.3 Progress towards meeting national commitments under multilateral environmental agreements; and Output 4.3.2 National efforts supported towards conservation and management of natural resources					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Output 4.3.2 Indicator: Number of new joint initiatives undertaken for integrated biodiversity conservation					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Strategic Objective 2 – To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors; Strategic Priority 4 – Strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks for mainstreaming biodiversity					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity incorporated in the productive landscape (area of influence of economic activities in and around Malvan Marine Sanctuary, Sindhudurg District, Maharashtra)					
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets ⁶¹	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and addressing retrogressive factors such as the anticipated impacts of climate change.					
Project objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations into those production sectors that impact coastal and marine ecosystems of the SCME.	Landscape/seascape area in the SCME where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	About 6,327 sq. km. (2,327 sq km as area of direct influence and 4,000 sq km as area of indirect influence)	Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations	Project approach is not internalized by state government departments responsible for tourism, fisheries, ports, conservation, agriculture, mining and other industrial activity in the SCME Government departments do not provide cofinancing in a timely manner to support implementation of the project strategy Government Representatives of the different sectors do not work in a collaborative manner
	Extent of coral reefs in the project area	360 sq.km and this will be verified in first 6 months of the project	The extent of coral cover remains at least stable or increasing.	Monitoring reports	
	Population status of following critical species: Olive Ridley turtle and Indo-pacific hunch back dolphin	40-50 nesting sites of Olive Ridley Turtles reported and 100- 150 Indo-pacific hunch back dolphins frequent the region. This will be verified in first 6 months of the project	Population status remain at least stable/ increasing	Monitoring reports	
	Population status of birds (including migratory):	This will be verified in first one year of the project	Population status remains at least stable or increases.	Annual bird count	
Outcome 1:	Landscape level zoning	0	1 Landscape Plan that prepared and	Approved Landscape	Stakeholder institutions

Cross-sectoral planning framework that mainstreams biodiversity	plan (LP) that zones resource use by taking into account conservation needs of the SCME		integrated with the District level planning process	Plan document	may not provide high-level representation in the cross-sectoral Stakeholder consultation committee
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
conservation considerations	Establishing a functional cross-sectoral Stakeholder Committee for the management of SCME involving District Planning Dept, Forest Dept, the Maritime Board, Dept. of Industries, Fisheries, Agriculture, Tourism, Private Sector & NGOs	0	1	Notification/ Constitution/ memorandum of the Stakeholder Committee for SCME	<p>Stakeholder institutions are unwilling to share information that is required for developing LP that mainstreams coastal and marine biodiversity conservation concerns</p> <p>Recommendations on legislative amendments for addressing biodiversity conservation in sector practices may not receive government and political support</p> <p>LP is not integrated in the District development planning process</p> <p>Local communities do not support the LP</p>
	Recommendations on reform of Wildlife (Protection) Act	WPA has a terrestrial focus that is not suited to marine PAs	Amendments that give explicit recognition to marine PAs are approved or under consideration by the MoEF	Government notification/ order/ records	
	Recommendations on reform of MFRA	MFRA does not adequately incorporate the integration of the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity	Amendments to MFRA incorporating provisions for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity approved or under consideration by State Department of Agriculture/ Fisheries	Government notification/ order/ records	
	Compliance of new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports,	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in	By project end any new developments related to tourism, fisheries, ports,	Final Evaluation	

	mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	mining and agricultural activity conform with the LP		
	Compliance of existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in the target landscape with the LP	There is no comprehensive zoning plan for production activities in the SCME that takes into account conservation needs	By project end an action plan for bringing existing activities related to tourism, fisheries, ports, mining and agricultural activity in line with the LP is developed and approved by sectoral departments	Final Evaluation	
	Zoning of MMS in line with LP	Current MMS boundaries do not capture key biodiversity rich areas and there is conflict with local fishermen on resource use issues	MMS boundaries and zoning are rationalized to accord protection to biodiversity rich areas and to guarantee occupational interests and innocent passage of local fishers	Approved new MMS Management Plan	
	Financial sustainability strategy for continued implementation of landscape-level management of SCME	0	1	Strategy document	
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly fisheries management plan, ecotourism management plan and MMS management plan	Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming and integration of environmental management considerations and safeguards into policies, plans and activities of key sectors	0	Production sector: 1 000 Conservation sector: 100 Livelihood sector: 5 000	Training records; training evaluations	Institutions are unwilling to commit the expected number of personnel for training and capacity building Trained staff may not continue in current roles Fisheries and Tourism sector representatives may not be committed to implementing the EAF- based Fisheries Management Plan and the Sustainable Tourism Plan
	Mesh size laws are followed by the trawlers	To be collected in the first year	50% of trawlers follow the mesh size norms set up by Mesh Regulation Committee, 1983	Survey reports of Fisheries Department	
	Incidence of encroachment of intensive fishing operations into traditional fishing grounds	Encroachment is taking place	By project end, all fishing activity complies with zoning specified in LP and there are no reports of encroachment	Records of Forests and Fisheries Department	

	Reduction/ elimination of trawlers from outside SCME i.e., from Ratnagiri (Maharashtra), Goa and Karnataka	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	50% reduction of trawlers from outside SCME	Monthly Fishing Reports	
	Community based ecotourism operations as a % of all tourism operations in project area	25%	50% by project end	Final Evaluation	
	Number of violations of MMS Management Plan, compared with year of initial patrolling	Baseline violations to be measured in 1st 3 months of project	Declines by 50% by year 5	Survey reports	
Outcome 3: Sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource use in the SCME	Traditional fishing communities continue to practice sustainable, low-impact, traditional fishing activity as measured by extent of rampani fishing and related cooperatives	98 rampani fishing cooperatives	50% increase	Records of Fisheries Department	Local communities may not be willing to participate in the conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems unless the project addresses their livelihood needs
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of EDCs active in the SCME	0	15	Records of the Forest Department	The livelihood activities supported under the project may not add significantly to income opportunities of local people so that the dependency on natural resources is reduced.
	Number of skills-development activities carried out for VLLs and other local institutions for alternative livelihoods or sustainable ecosystem-based livelihoods that reduce pressures on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Administrative reports and records	
	Amount of resources flowing to local communities annually from community based ecotourism activities	USD 2.5 million	USD 5 million (this is estimated as a reasonable trajectory by local experts based on local conditions and the anticipated impact of project interventions in this regard; target value to be re-confirmed and modified as appropriate once micro-	Records of VLLs, administrative records, etc	

			plans are developed)		
	Number of people shifting to alternative livelihood options that reduce pressure on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Records of VLIs, administrative records, etc	

Annex VIII: Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD and to the GEF Biodiversity focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for indigenous crop and livestock diversity conservation in India?				
Is the project relevant to the UNCBD objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design Extent to which the project is implemented in line with incremental cost argument 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally UNCBD and other international convention web sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities related to agro-biodiversity conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents GEF focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses GEF website Interviews with UNDP and project team
Is the project relevant to India's environment and sustainable development objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of India? Is the project country-driven? What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies Key project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with UNDP and project partners
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project partners and stakeholders Needs assessment studies Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews with relevant stakeholders

<p>Is the project internally coherent in its design?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic • Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program and project documents • Key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Key interviews
---	---	--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? 			
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents from other donor supported activities Other donor representatives Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and logframe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				

Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? • Were the accounting and financial systems in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of financial and progress reports • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • UNDP • Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Key interviews
--	--	---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? How was results-based management used during project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives 		
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, Examples of supported partnerships Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations UNDP Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Results: What are the current actual, and potential long-term, results of activities supported by the project?				

<p>How is the project effective in achieving its long-term objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the project achieve its overall objective ? • Is the globally significant biodiversity of the target area likely to be conserved? • What barriers remain to achieving long-term objectives, or what necessary steps remain to be taken by stakeholders to achieve sustained impacts and Global Environmental Benefits? • Are there unanticipated results achieved or contributed to by the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To pool/mobilize resources ○ For related policy making and strategic planning ○ For implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance • Change in use and implementation of sustainable livelihoods • Change in the number and strength of barriers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Key stakeholders • Monitoring data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis • Meetings with UNDP, project team and project partners • Interviews with project beneficiaries
---	---	--	--	--

		such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knowledge about biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources, and economic incentives in these areas ○ Cross-institutional coordination and inter- sectoral dialogue ○ Knowledge of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use practices by end users ○ Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating biodiversity conservation and agro-environmental strategies ○ Agro-environmental economic incentives for stakeholders 		and other stakeholders
How is the project effective in achieving the objectives of the UNCBD?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the impacts or likely impacts of the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On the local environment; ○ On economic well-being; ○ On other socio-economic issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide specific examples of impacts at species, ecosystem or genetic levels, as relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • UNCDB documents • Key Stakeholders • Monitoring data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis • Interviews with key stakeholders
Future directions for results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the project build on its successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis
Sustainability: Are the conditions in place for project-related benefits and results to be sustained?				
Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy • Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews
Financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? • Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable? • What are the main institutions/organizations in country that will take the project efforts forward after project end and what is the budget they have assigned to this? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends • Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end • Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews

Institutional and governance sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures? • Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support? • What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results? • Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations • Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end • Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews
--	---	--	---	---

Social-economic sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the project? Are there policies or practices in place that create perverse incentives that would negatively affect long-term benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State of enforcement and law making capacity Evidences of commitment by government enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there adequate incentives to ensure sustained benefits achieved through the project? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations UNDP, project personnel and project partners Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Documentation review
Environmental sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur? Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project? Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of potential threats such as infrastructure development Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations Threat assessments Government documents or other external published information UNDP, project personnel and project partners Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Documentation review
Individual, institutional and systemic capacity development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the capacity in place at the regional, national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (regional, national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project personnel and project partners Beneficiaries Capacity assessments available, if any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews Documentation review
Replication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there potential to scale up or replicate project activities? Did the project's Exit Strategy actively promote replication? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/quality of replicated initiatives Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives Scale of additional investment leveraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy UNDP, project personnel and project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
Challenges to sustainability of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts? Have any of these been addressed through project management? What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project Education strategy and partnership with school, education institutions etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and evaluations Beneficiaries UNDP, project personnel and project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

Future directions for sustainability and catalytic role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which areas/arrangements under the project show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results? • What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the project initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis
--	--	--	--	---

Annex IX: Summary of Site Visits

Date 09-11-2017

Site visit 1 – Vengurla Solid waste management unit

Interacted with Mr. Ramdas Tukaram Kokare, Chief Officer, Vengurla Municipal Council. Discussed on the methods and functioning of Solid Waste management unit and the support provided by the project. Observed that community including other stakeholders are participating effectively and waste management is done in an effect way. It has also taken advantage of the national programme on Swacha Bharat (Pure/clean India). International Centre for Solid Waste Management is being constructed with the support of District Administration.

Site visit 2 – Mangrove Crab Farm (pen culture) at Shiroda, Vengurla Taluka

Interacted with Mr. Uday Utham Gawde, Chairman of Sree Vignahartha SHG that is practising crab farming nearby Redy creek. Crab seed supply from RGCA is an issue as it is located in Tamil Nadu. Efforts are being made by the GOM to start a crab hatchery for ensuring sustainable crab farming along the coast of Maharashtra. Rats and Otters poach on the crabs. Bombay and Goa are the places of market potential for the full grown crabs.

Site visit 3 – Office of the District Collectorate, Malvan, Sindhudurg District

Interacted with the District Collector and CEO Zilla Parishad (District Development Council). Discussed on the sustainability of the project interventions in the Sindhudurg district as the district administration is involved the field activities of the project. Fisheries, tourism are the sectors the district administration is promoting by implementing the orders of the respective policies and regulations.

Date 10-11-2017

Site visit 4 - Visit to Kawada rock island for artificial reef and coral transplantation along with dolphin watching and interaction with local scuba divers' group (Dive masters).

Interacted with dive masters' and the scuba divers near Kawada rock island and discussed on the potential and the ongoing efforts on coral transplantation near rocky habitat extending the natural habitat. Also discussed on the awareness level and the livelihood component of fishermen involved in the recent dive tourism and its economic potential. Interacted with local youth trained as PADI Dive Master by UNDP project and the MTDC and their ocean clean up activity by removing ghost nets.

Site visit 5 – Hadi Gram Panchayat, Malvan Taluka

Interacted with Mr. Mahesh Manjrekar, President of Gram Panchayat on the Community based Eco tourism in three creeks and one island nearby Hadi village. 15 boys and 5 girls were trained by the project in Hospitality management. Mr. Gurunath Rane an ecosystem consultant will help set up the Ecotourism Information Centre for promoting tourism in the region.

Visited PankulaJuva Village along Gaad River which has been promoted as a tourism island for ecotourism and home stay tourism. Integrated Multitrophic Aquaculture (IMTA) is being tried with the technical support of Central Institute for Brackish water Aquaculture on a pilot scale with bivalves and sea bass fish. One villager has started this just 10 days before the site visit.

Site visit 6 – Visit to Achara village, Pirawadi, Malvan Taluka

Interacted with women entrepreneurs practising crab farming in two acre farm at Achara village. A better method practiced by Mr. Ilanchelizhan in Tamil Nadu near Pichavaram could be tried and the services of Mr. Ilanchelizhan may be used before taking the crab farming on large scale which is being considered by the fisheries department of GOM with the support of Mangrove Cell, GOM

Site visit 7 – Visit to Miryabanda Gram Panchayat, Sarjekot Taluka

Interacted with Mr. Mayba Kesarinath and other members of Miryabanda BMC at Gram Panchayat Miryabanda. Discussed on the support of the project through Maharashtra State Biodiversity Board in constituting BMC and the preparation of PBR and its relevance to the project. BMC should be playing greater role in the Cross Sectoral Consultative Committees constituted at District level for sustainability of project intervention.

Site visit 8 – Visit to Institute of Scuba Diving and Aquatic Sports a dive institute at Tarkarli

Interaction with Dr. Sarang Kulkarni Chief Instructor and General Manager at IISDA and local youth trained under the capacity building projects. Discussed on alternative tourism destination project promoted by UNDP project and GOM to reduce pressure on existing coral sites and promote tourism in new found alternative tourism sites. So far, UNDP project has supported with the training cost of 20 fishermen in responsible tourism and clean environment. The moment created by the project will sustain dive tourism with responsible do and don'ts of diving.

Date 11-11-2017

Site visit 9 – Visit to Mithbav mangrove plantation site

Interacted with Forest Guard Mr. A. N. Bange on the nursery established for RET species and the efforts of the project in establishing 17 ha of mangrove plantation in Kankoli Range Forest.

Site visit 10 – Visit Tambaldeg Beach

Interacted with Honorary Wildlife Warden Dr. Nagesh Daptardar involved in the turtle conservation and related marine conservation activities by training the local youth. He has been involved in identifying and protecting the turtle nesting sites along 28 spots in Sindhudurg area. Visited nesting site of white bellied sea eagle a schedule 1 species of the WL Protection Act. Project has supported the study on Avifauna of SCME.

Site visit 11 – Visit to Wadatar bivalve farming site

Interaction with Ms. Usha Joshi, President of Wada Gram Panchayat and the members of women groups involved in bivalve farming and ecotourism activities in Wadatar. Ms. Kasturi Dake and Ms. Reena Bhabal of Perna SHG made a power point presentation on the bivalve farming they have been practicing with the support of the project and CMFRI. Also discussed with Mr. Asokan and Mr. Madhu Scientists with CMFRI on the method and cost effectiveness of the model used here. CMFRI is planning to set up an Oyster Depuration Unit (DPU) to enhance the market value of oysters farmed by the SHGs in future. Discussed on the Eco tourism activities at Wadatar village which is similar to project supported ecotourism activities in other sites.

Site visit 12– Visit to Dahibav SRI farming sites

Interacted with farmers practising SRI and their experience. SRI was initially started in 2 acres. Replication is difficult given the difficulty in convincing the farmers to adopt to SRI. Presently more

farmers are practising SRI given the nil costs on fertilizers and pesticides. It has also brought back the traditional rice varieties of *Son fana* and *Sonkalfana*.

Date 12-11-2017

Site visit 13 – Visit to Vengurla village

Interacted with members of Swamini women SHG undertaking mangrove safari ecotourism first the first time in Maharashtra State. It was informed that similar such models promoting community based ecotourism are proposed in Hadi village, Malvan taluka and Wadatar village in Devgad taluka. SrishtiGyan and NGO from Bombay gave training to the SHG on mangrove safari.

Interacted with square mesh trawl owners and Chairman, Vengurla Fishermen cooperative society on the benefits of using the square nets in place of the diamond nets used before and on the cost effectiveness.

Discussed with Assistant Commissioner of Fisheries, Mr. Pradeep Vast on the joint patrol by forest and fisheries department for effective implementation of MMFRA. Want of human resources is a critical issue as five out of seven posts of fisheries officials are vacant.

Annex X: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final report)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and	
Cleared by UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEFRTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

Annex XI: Map of the project area

