

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year
(1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010)**

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation*:	\$5,388,200
PDF GEF cost*:	\$626,400	PDF co-financing*:	---
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	\$23,456,816	Total Cost*:	\$29,471,416
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	3 rd or 4 th quarter 2011	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	---
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	---	No. of revisions*:	None
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	13-15/07/2009	Date of last Revision*:	N/A
Disbursement as of 30 June 2010*:	\$ 1,660,609	Date of financial closure*:	N/A
Date of Completion^{3*}:	N/A	Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2010⁴:	US\$ 410,318
Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2010⁵:	6,9M US\$ ⁶	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2010*:	US\$ 410,318
Leveraged financing:⁷	---		---

Project summary⁸	<p>The marine and coastal resources along the 48,000 km of sub-Saharan African coastline are under threat to a varying degree from the impacts of development-related activities. In particular, coastal tourism contributes to the threats to the coastal and marine ecosystems through tourism-related pollution and contamination. At the same time, coastal tourism is often considered the ‘environmentally friendly’ alternative to more exploitative livelihood options. Based on the identified issues and proposals at the Ministerial and Heads of State meeting in Johannesburg at the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the thematic group on coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, the project aims to demonstrate best practices and strategies to reduce the degradation of marine and coastal environments of trans-boundary significance resulting from pollution and contaminants and associated impacts. The project aims to: (i) capture Best Available Practices and Technologies (BAPs and BATs) for contaminant reduction; (ii) develop and implement mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management that measurably reduce degradation of coastal ecosystems from land-based sources of pollution and contamination; (iii) assess and deliver training and capacity requirements emphasizing an integrated approach to sustainable reduction in coastal ecosystem and environmental degradation; (iv) develop and implement information capture, information processing and management mechanisms and information dissemination; and (v)</p>
------------------------------------	---

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

⁴ Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

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

⁶ As per formal communications to be presented by project partners at project Steering Committee to be held in August 2010

⁷ See above note on co-financing and Glossary (Annex 1)

	undertake cost-effective project management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation. The primary emphasis of the Project is aimed toward on-the-ground demonstrations which form the major component of the Project as reflected in the substantial funding for these elements. The lessons learnt and project relevant information will be disseminated through a project information exchange mechanism linked to IW: LEARN.
Project status FY09⁹	This is the first reporting period for the COAST project. The project was initiated through an agreement between UNEP and UNIDO in November 2007, and a first disbursement made to UNIDO in December 2007. Owing to delays in the recruitment of the Technical Coordinator (TC), the project actually only got underway in November 2008. During the last week of November 2008, UNIDO and UNWTO representatives met in Nairobi in order to establish a work plan for the inception phase. The inception phase lasted 8 months leading up to an inception workshop which was held on the 13-14 th July 2009, in Bilene, Mozambique. During these initial months, the Project Coordination office was established, equipment and furniture purchased, and a Project secretary recruited. The TC undertook visits to all 9 participating countries in order to re-establish links with partner country executing agencies, and to establish good personal communication and understanding with Project Focal Points from the Ministries of Environment and Tourism in each country. The revised Demonstration Project documents and workplans for the first year of implementation work were presented during the inception meeting, (taking into account new developments in each country since the end of the PDF-B phase). A full project level budget revision was also prepared and presented. Immediately following the Inception Workshop, the first Steering Committee Meeting of the project was held. At this meeting the country workplans, revised overall budget, logical frameworks (regional level and demonstration level) and outline workplans for the period up to July 2010 were discussed and approved.
Project status FY10¹⁰	This is the second PIR for the COAST project. Following a successful first Steering Committee Meeting of the COAST project held in Mozambique during July 2009, all the demonstration project coordinators are now identified and ready to coordinate and supervise the implementation of activities in the targeted areas once agreements with UNIDO are finalised. Three induction training workshops for Demo project coordinators have been completed at different demo project sites (in Senegal, Kenya and Nigeria). Sub-contracts for implementation responsibilities and associated disbursement of GEF funds have been developed and are now being activated with all partner

⁸ As in project document

⁹ Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

¹⁰ Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

	<p>countries (which represents 25% of overall project expenditure) and a Letter of Agreement (LoA) with UNWTO has been agreed. Equipment for the PCU (GIS software and computers) is now in place and being utilised. A project-wide Training Needs Assessment consultancy was commissioned and completed during the period, and this will provide a baseline for planning interventions over the remaining project period. The COAST project website is now active (www.coast.iwlearn.org) and important reports and information on events are being regularly uploaded to the site for project partners and others to use. At the forthcoming second Steering committee meeting (25-27th August 2010) country-level three year draft work plans and budgets will be finalised and agreed upon. In addition a regional and national level monitoring framework which links to the logical frameworks of the project (regional level and demonstration level) will be discussed and agreed, so that baseline data collection for each demonstration can proceed during the later half of 2010.</p>
Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets¹¹	<p>The UNEP Global Program of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land Based Activities (UNEP GPA/LBA) recognizes that the main cause of degradation of the marine environment is due to land-based activities including urbanization and coastal development. It provides a framework for action, that invites governments to assess their respective problems, identify priorities for action, develop strategies, monitor implementation and set common goals. Effective actions to deal with all land-based impacts upon the marine environment (sewage, persistent organic pollutants, radioactive substances, heavy metals, oils (hydrocarbons), nutrients, sediment mobilization, litter, and the physical alteration and destruction of habitats) are targeted. The proposed Project builds on the recognized priorities for action proposed in the regional approach to implementing the GPA/LBA, which include the strengthening of regional cooperative arrangements. This project contributes specifically to strategic targets number 1 (depletion of coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity), 2 (reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA) and 3 (Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in surface and groundwater basins that are transboundary in nature).</p>

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project¹²

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

¹¹ For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

¹² Or immediate project objective

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

The COAST project is now in its second year of implementation where the work priorities have been:

- a) To train each Demonstration project coordinator in each partner country in preparation for the implementation of activities;
- b) To undertake a comprehensive training needs assessment in each partner country, so as to guide future capacity building interventions;
- c) To prepare an initial sub contract with each partner so as to undertake preparatory and awareness raising work at each demo site;
- d) To finalise the Letter of Agreement with UNWTO so as to activate this partnership;
- e) To prepare three year rolling demonstration project budgets in view of the revised implementation approach agreed with UNEP in order to improve project activity and output flows.

Currently the main challenges are:

- a) To obtain a practical commitment on the very high levels of co-funding agreed from partner countries as written into the Project Document (GEF funds represent only 25% of the overall total project funding). The three year rolling budgets above set a target of 50% match funding from each partner country in order to successfully achieve the project expected outcomes;
- b) To streamline UN inter-agency administration procedures in order to shorten the sub contracting process with partner countries and agencies, while at the same time encouraging 'ownership' of the project nationally (within each Ministry of Tourism and Environment) such that the administration and management delays the project is experiencing can be overcome;
- c) To encourage active private sector engagement within each demonstration project site in order to successfully achieve the project objectives in terms of sustainability;
- d) To provide suitably robust training and capacity building inputs in order to overcome skill and knowledge gaps;
- e) To provide adequate technical back stopping support and capacity building inputs in order to establish a practical and robust monitoring and evaluation framework for all demonstration projects and be able to monitor progress on expected outcomes;
- f) To receive progress reports of a reasonable quality and timeliness from country partners in order to adequately meet UNEP reporting requirements.

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document ¹³(not more than 200 words)

Despite the project being in its second year of implementation, it is too early to describe any substantive contributions at this level yet. This is primarily due to the delays being experienced in establishing contractual agreements with the lead institution in each partner country. This has resulted in a delay in the release of GEF funds and also counter part country level funds. However, the following activities have been completed and will contribute to laying a sound framework for

¹³ Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

collaboration and cooperation over the remaining project lifespan:

- Completion of a needs assessment activity for each demonstration project to identify capacity gaps which will be addressed through appropriate training, education and awareness raising activities to increase human resources capacity and public awareness on the major issues to be addressed;
- The development of a proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for use by National Focal Points and the RCU to monitor progress towards project outcomes;
- A Letter of Agreement (LoA) with the UNWTO which will bring additional technical and policy development expertise into the project specifically to support work on sustainable eco-tourism design for demonstration projects, and policy and governance analysis across partner country tourism sectors;
- The COAST project is expected to contribute towards a better understanding of ecosystem-based approaches to coastal tourism and therefore approaches towards sustainable management of coastal and marine biodiversity through a 'tourism lens';
- The COAST project is also expected to contribute towards a better understanding of monitoring, recreation and management needs for lagoon and reef areas among partner countries;
- Finally, the project is expected to contribute best practice and technology examples for wider sharing and knowledge management in the focal area of water resource management (including waste water) and coastal water use policy development.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹⁴ will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

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

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

¹⁴ For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s) –

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ¹⁵	Baseline level ¹⁶	Mid-term target ¹⁷	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2010	Progress rating ¹⁸
Objective 1¹⁹ BAPs/BATs strategies for sustainable tourism demonstrated	1.Mechanisms for reduced degradation understood, in place and being utilised	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation, and to include both regional and national level monitoring requirements	All stakeholders and partners aware and understand the major causes of environmental degradation	At least two demo projects have developed mechanisms and are actively testing these to address issues of environmental degradation	Though a number of demo projects have been revised to test practices and technologies to address this, actual implementation has been delayed due to administrative and management processes both within the UN system and partner countries ²⁰	U

¹⁵ Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

¹⁶ Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

¹⁷ Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

¹⁸ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

¹⁹ Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

²⁰ Table 1 of the Inception report provides a thematic overview of each demonstration project: EMS is targeted in; Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Senegal (site 1), Seychelles and Tanzania. Eco-tourism is targeted in all countries except the Seychelles. Reef management is targeted in; Kenya, Mozambique, Seychelles and Tanzania.

	2. National indicators to demonstrate sustainable improvements have been agreed & are being used (national (including demo project indicators)) ^o	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation	National indicators have been agreed with all partner countries and data are beginning to be collected	Five partner countries are using national indicators to monitor and measure improvements	Partner country sub-contracts for beginning demonstration projects have been agreed, and a M&E framework to support data collection will be agreed with each partner country during the next Steering committee in August 2010	MU
	3. Project demonstrations providing replicable BATs/BAPs (with costs & benefits)	No baseline information available.	Four demonstrations are actively being implemented employing BAPs/BATs and are in the process of being documented for sharing and knowledge management	All demonstrations are actively being implemented and each has provided at least one BAT/BAP based upon the project's thematic priorities (EMS, eco-tourism, reefs, ecosystem planning) which has been documented for sharing and knowledge management	A global review of BAPs/BATs has been completed and the outcome report is available on the COAST project website (www.coast.iwlearn.org)	MU

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

	4. Incentives for sustainable partnerships for civil society, private and public sector documented & disseminated	Baseline information unavailable, but to be confirmed during year 1 of demo implementation	At least one case study for sustainable partnerships documented and disseminated	At least one case study per thematic area (EMS, Reefs, Eco-tourism, ecosystem planning) for sustainable partnerships documented and disseminated	Without funds flowing to support the demonstration projects it has not been possible to progress this work. However, potential partners (including; local govt, NGOs and private hoteliers) are being kept informed about the COAST project objectives through the Demo Project Coordinators	U
Objective 2 Mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management established	<i>Project experiences on sustainable tourism documented and disseminated as a contribution to policy debates in all 9 countries *</i>	Baseline information available as part of the demo project narratives, but require to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Experience sharing for enhancing policy debates underway in at least four countries	Project experiences documented and disseminated as a contribution to policy debates in all partner countries	A partnership agreement with UNWTO has been agreed which amongst other things will focus on this aspect of the project. UNWTO is due to make a presentation to the next SCM on a proposal to collect evidence to support policy contributions in all partner countries	U

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

	2. <i>“Project experiences supporting the development or revision of national strategies and work plans for sustainable tourism”**</i>	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation as part of a ‘gaps, needs and options’ consultancy	Identification of priority issues for inclusion in National strategies are underway	Project experiences documented and at least one information brief per country disseminated as a contribution towards national strategy development and revision	As part of the above mentioned UNWTO proposal, outcomes will be translated into appropriate information/policy briefs as part of this intervention	MS
Objective 3 Training and Capacity Building for sustainable tourism delivered	1. Assessment of training needs for each partner country completed by second SCM	Not existing	Regional assessments completed (East and West Africa)	Regional assessments completed (East and West Africa)	A team of international consultants have completed a full assessment in June 2010 of training needs within the project partner countries and a summary report on this will be presented at the next SCM in August 2010. The full report is available on the project website: www.coast.iwlearn.org	S

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

	2.Training packages dev and implemented to suit national needs	Not existing	Relevant training packages/inputs are being designed and implemented in some partner countries	All partner countries have benefited from at least two thematic training packages developed to suit specific demo project requirements	Following a presentation which is to be made at the next SCM in August 2010, plans will be formulated to begin developing/ identifying suitable training packages to support project work during the latter part of 2010 and beyond	MS
	3. Training materials incorporating BATs/BAPs from Objective 1 available by end of Yr 3	Not existing	Training materials are under development with some content coming from COAST demo project BAPs/BATs	Training materials incorporating COAST BATs/BAPs and other experiences are available to all partner countries and are being used in at least five	A global review of appropriate BAPs/BATs upon which the COAST project demos can draw for their own guidance is now published on the project website	MS
Objective 4 Establishment of a virtual information coordination & clearing house (eRICH)	1. eRICH established and fully operational within first 2 yrs	Not existing	eRICH is in place	All partner countries are contributing to eRICH through BAPs/BATs and other project documented experiences	A project website is now 'live' and is being regularly updated with project information and reports (www.coast.iwlearn.org)	MS

	2. <i>“Project Focal Points contributing to and coordinating information and knowledge management uploading to eRICH at the national level”</i> ***	Not existing	Work with relevant National Environment & Tourism agencies is on-going with the collection of environmental & tourism management information to feed into eRICH	All countries are providing environmental and tourism management information for sharing and dissemination through eRICH	The COAST website is now active. eRICH will initially be part of this website, and project Focal Points will be important ‘nodes’ in this information and knowledge clearing house mechanism. Focal Points need to be encouraged to engage in project activities on both a practical and virtual level	MS
	3. ****				It is proposed that this indicator be removed from the reporting matrix in future years (see footnote)	N/A
	4. Lessons from awareness of coastal environment and sustainable tourism principles & practices at demo sites presented on eRICH ²¹	Not existing	At least two partner countries have shared early lessons from awareness on the subject matter on eRICH	All countries are providing awareness lessons on the subject matter for sharing and dissemination through eRICH	The COAST demo projects are not yet implemented	MU

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

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

²¹ Re-worded from the original logical framework as component 4 of the project is now focusing on eRICH as an information /influencing tool

Outcome 1: <i>Working Environmental Management Systems (EMS) in place at appropriate demo sites</i>	1 National institutes strengthened through EMS training	Not existing	National institutes have initiated demo projects employing EMS at four of the relevant demo project sites	National institutes have monitored & evaluated EMS demo activities in order to share outcomes on; economic, social and environmental benefits	Recent partner country training needs assessment has identified which sites specifically need EMS capacity building inputs	MU
	2 ^{dd}					N/A
	3 Increase in capacity of tourism stakeholders to initiate EMS (with the aim to replicate good practices)	Not existing	Stakeholders who are prepared to make their own investments in EMS identified	Collaborative EMS training events involving both domestic and international tour operators have been held in at least two demo sites and have resulted in changes to hotel management practices	Based on the recently concluded training needs assessment, EMS interventions now targeted to begin in; Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Senegal (site1), Seychelles and Tanzania during year 1 of the actual implementation of the demo projects	MU

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

	4 <i>"Project experiences in EMS inform policy and regulatory debates"</i> [∞]	Not existing	Data from Project EMS experiences being collected and collated	Project EMS experiences being documented and disseminated to enhance policy and regulatory debates in at least two partner countries	EMS demonstration projects agreed, but yet to begin	MU
	5 Eco-labelling plan and certification schemes operational	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Eco-labelling and certification plan for each appropriate demo project location drafted	Eco-labelling and certification plans operational in at least two locations	Seychelles are developing their own sustainability standard, Kenya already has one standard (eco-tourism society) and Tanzania are interested to trial a similar scheme	MS
	6 Waste management control mechanisms operational	Baseline information unavailable, but to be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Waste management control mechanisms identified at the appropriate demo project sites	Waste management control mechanisms operational in at least two appropriate demo project sites	This will be one component of EMS training at the demo project sites A regional level EMS training is programmed for year 1 of actual demo project implementation	MU

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

Outcome 2: <i>Eco-tourism initiatives for alternative livelihoods and revenues developed for biodiversity conservation and local communities at relevant demo sites</i>	1. Management procedures & institutional support for developments in eco-tourism established	Not existing	Local civil society and government institutions to support eco-tourism developments identified at all demo sites	Local civil society / government institutions have management capacity support procedures for eco-tourism development in place in at least four demo projects	The UNWTO LoA focuses in part on this aspect of the COAST project and work on this will be completed between 2010 and 2012	S
	2. Improved knowledge & information about eco-tourism within and around each demo site	Some baseline information is presented in the demo project narrative documents, additional information will be collected during year 1 of demo implementation	Locally appropriate information and media coverage being developed for eco-tourism services in at least four demo sites	Visitor resource centres and private sector investors are promoting local eco-tourism services in at least four demo projects	One of the key activities in the first sub contracting period which has now been agreed with partner countries is support to a process of awareness raising about the COAST project in each demo site	U
	3.Improved knowledge & information about HIV/AIDS and public health at each demo site (through working with partners competent in this field)	Baseline information is to be collected as part of the M&E framework development during year 1 of demo implementation	Information needs and capacity limitations to inform tourists and local communities on HIV/AIDS and public health understood	Appropriate information on HIV/AIDS and public health being shared locally at each demo project site	Demo project site committees once established will need to address the issue of social and behavioural conflicts/changes resulting from the local tourism industry (particularly sex trade and 'beach boys' culture), and the need to address these as part of an integrated approach	U

	4. Partnerships and networks of eco-tourism bodies and professionals formed	Some information has been provided in the demo project narratives, but this needs to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Forums and meetings are being organised to explore network formation/ strengthening opportunities at all demo sites	Network bodies have been formed and represent a growing membership of stakeholders in at least three demo project sites	Recent data collection on enterprises involved in eco-tourism from the Kenya coast will be uploaded to the project website and shared with other partner countries in order for them to develop a similar resource for networking and partnership development purposes	MU
	5. <i>"Evidence of stakeholders diversifying their eco-tourism activities and revenue sources at the demo sites"</i> ^{ooc}	Some information has been provided in the demo project narratives, but this needs to be updated during year 1 of demo implementation	Data on eco-tourism facilities and services are being regularly collected at each demo project site	Analysis of data on eco-tourism operations completed for all demo project sites	Potential identified in all partner countries, but no specific interventions yet made. There is a high level of interest among partner countries to promote eco-tourism, and much potential to expand and diversify these services across the selected demonstration projects	MU

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

Outcome 3: <i>Improved reef recreation, management and monitoring mechanisms in place at relevant demo sites</i>	1. Survey and GIS mapping of sensitive areas and damaged sites completed	A number of previous projects have undertaken marine/reef mapping to a limited extent, and this information needs to be verified during year 1 of demo implementation	Survey work is actively on-going at all East African demo project sites	GIS maps showing areas of sensitivity and damage to biodiversity published for all East African demo project sites	First draft map products for the Kenya demo site are being prepared for sharing at the second SCM in August 2010. It is hoped that this will encourage other partner countries to produce similar products for integrated coastal planning purposes. An agreement has been reached between UNEP and UNIDO to provide additional technical assistance in this area through the part time services of a JPO	U
	2. Procurement, installation, management of reef protection equipment as part of reef management strategy	As above	Reef management strategies being actively discussed by all appropriate East African demo projects and reef protection equipment being ordered	Reef management strategies with work plans and protection procedures in place in at least two East African demo project sites	Partner country visits have so far confirmed the type and number of institutions that the COAST project will need to work with to address this activity	U
	3. Awareness and Capacity Building (CB) on reef conservation being sustained by local stakeholders	Some information is provided in the demo project narrative documents, but this needs to be reviewed during year 1 of demo implementation	Appropriate stakeholders identified and awareness events and information on reef conservation being shared at all East African demo sites	Training and CB on reef conservation has been undertaken at all E African demo project locations and there is evidence of local stakeholder interest to maintain this	During the first sub contracting period for the Demo projects, Demo Project Coordinators (DPCs) will need to identify specific locally based research and learning institutions to build such capacity	U

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

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

FY2009 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
MS	Many things must still come together, especially at the national level, for the project to make progress towards its outcomes.
FY2010 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
MU	<p>The two S and six MS ratings for some regional-level objectives reflect some good work and achievements in the reporting period. However the significant delays occurred in FY10 in activating contractual arrangements and setting-up operations at the demonstration sites are negatively affecting most elements of the project. This is the principal underlying reason resulting in nine U and nine MU ratings. Therefore the project is assigned an overall MU rating for FY10.</p> <p>The project is now entering its third year of operation. In the coming year, the pace of progress towards stated</p>

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

FY2009 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
	<p>outcomes and delivery of agreed outputs, especially at the site level, has to increase significantly, if the project is to be back on track. This will be critical in order to avoid a possible U rating in FY 2011. Such rating would require immediate and major changes in the project design and set-up, and significant re-adjustments to the project workplan and budget.</p> <p>At this stage it appears also that the project Mid-Term Evaluation will also have to be postponed as it will not be possible to assess any significant progress at the site level, in the originally planned time-frame.</p>

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

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>The entire project team recognises that the pace of progress towards stated outcomes and delivery of agreed outputs, especially at the site level, has to increase significantly in FY11, in order to bring the project back on track. This affects most project outputs with progress ratings at MS, MU and U. Agreed management urgent measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment and full activation of contractual agreements with all partners at the country level; • UNIDO to step-up and provide consistent support and guidance to project manager and demo sites (and particularly in project management and administration aspects, besides technical support) so as to ensure the timely delivery of agreed outputs in FY11, bringing the project back on track; • UNIDO Coordinator based in Nairobi 	<p>All project team members, COAST Technical Coordinator, UNIDO Project team, UNWTO, Country Focal Points and Demo Project Coordinators.</p>	<p>With immediate effect and with objective of achieving significant progress and bringing the project back on track by June 2011 with a majority of ratings at S or MS level.</p>

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>to take on a more proactive role in project management aspects, including more proactive liaison with the Vienna Office and all sub-contractors, so as to ensure a more timely finalisation and set-up of all managerial, contractual and financial aspects of the project that are still not fully in place;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO Project Manager in Vienna and contracts team are to significantly step-up their level of time-input and support for this project. The level provided so far is clearly well below the minimum required, as demonstrated by the very poor performance of this project since its inception. • Country teams also have to increase their level of responsiveness and interaction with the UNIDO team, in order to fully activate all contractual arrangements and initiate the effective disbursement of GEF funds at the country level. • All parties to prioritise the setting up local teams at each demo site and equipping them with financial and technical means to implement their TOR and workplan, so that they may feed into and benefit from the broader project activities; • The UNIDO coordinator to take the lead and define a Training Programme on the basis of the TNA and starting identification and contracting of relevant training institutions - 		

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>implementation should start as soon as local coordinators are employed and their demo projects are active;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO to activate the long overdue LoA with the UNWTO so as to initiate the ST-EP training and other UNWTO activities; • All team to enhance the use of the project website as a mean of internal team communication; • UNIDO contracts/management to team prepare immediately for the next 3-year rolling contracts that will take the country demos sites from early 2011 to end of project. This is of paramount importance to avoid a further gap in funds disbursements and associated delays with site-level activities. The new contracting process should be started in September 2010 so as to ensure a smooth transition from the current contracts to the 3 year rolling contracts. 		

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

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
1. Agree on follow up actions from BAPs/BATs consultancy	Posting of full report and case studies on the Project website	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points	Between Oct 31 st – Dec 31 st 2009
2. Need for a Training	TORs developed, advertised and consultants hired	COAST Technical	Oct 31 st 2009 – June

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
Assessment across all partner countries	for the task. Report completed and awaiting uploading to the Project website	Coordinator, Project Focal Points, Demo Coordinators and Consultants	2010
3. Web support to develop eRICH initiated	Project website and resource and information pages developed and now actively being updated	COAST Technical Coordinator, UNEP (Bangkok/Nairobi) and Project Focal Points	Between Oct 31 st – Dec 31 st 2009
4. EMS awareness training	No action taken to date due to the delays in activation of partner sub contracts	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points	Yet to be agreed
5. Follow up on potential private sector involvement in waste management at demo site in Kenya	No action taken to date, as until a local site management committee is in place it is not possible to explore this opportunity further	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points (Kenya), Rottaler Modell (Germany)	Yet to be agreed
6. Identify potential partners to work on HIV/AIDS awareness in demo projects	No action taken to date due to the delays in activation of partner sub contracts and therefore delays in establishing local site management committees	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points, UNAIDS Country Reps	Yet to be agreed
7. Develop TOR and work plan for GIS expert (volunteer) and regional technical peer support	TORs developed and volunteer GIS expert has been working part time since January 2010. Example (draft) GIS map products are being prepared for sharing at the second SCM in August 2010. Regional Remote Sensing and Mapping Centre has provided imagery and technical input on a cost basis.	COAST Technical Coordinator and Project Focal Points, Regional Remote Sensing and Mapping Centre (Nairobi)	January 2010 – on-going

3.2 Project implementation progress –

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²⁴ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²⁵
Output 1: (describe ²⁶) Capture Best Available Practices and Technologies (BAPs/BATs)				
Activity 1: BAPs & BATs global review completed	Within six months of inception	100%	Reports now published on the COAST project website	S
Activity 2: Incentives and benefits of partnerships for sustainable tourism identified for all stakeholders and reported upon	By end of Year 1	0%	Due to the delays experienced in activating the demo projects, no work has been achieved on this item yet	U
Sub theme 1-a: Establishment and Implementation of Environmental Management Systems and Voluntary Eco-certification and Labeling Schemes				
Activity 3: Planning & management procedure for EMS and Eco-certification established at respective demo sites	By end of Year 1	20%	Demonstration sites for EMS and Eco-certification work identified and training needs documented	MU
Activity 4: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	90%	Needs assessment activity is now complete and the reports are uploaded to the project website	S
Activity 5: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been agreed and sub contracts & work plans agreed for the first year	U

²² Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

²³ As per latest workplan (latest project revision) which was approved by members at the Inception workshop and first SCM in July 2009.

²⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

²⁵ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

²⁶ Information on expected date of output completion and progress made is a requirement.

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²⁴ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²⁵
			implementation	
Activity 6: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	N/A
Sub theme 1-b: Development of eco-tourism to alleviate poverty through sustainable alternative livelihoods and generate revenues for conservation of biodiversity and the benefit of the local community			UNIDO to coordinate but UNWTO to provide Technical Assistance	
Activity 7: Planning & management procedure for Eco-tourism Development established at respective demo sites	By end of Year 1	15%	ST_EP training workshops agreed for demonstration sites coordinators in developing eco-tourism support activities	MU
Activity 8: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	90%	Needs assessment activity is now complete and the reports are uploaded to the project website	S
Activity 9: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been agreed and sub contracts & work plans agreed for the first year implementation	U
Activity 10: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	N/A
Sub theme 1-c: Develop and demonstrate best practices in mitigating environmental impacts of tourism through the implementation of reef recreation management strategies			UNIDO to coordinate but with technical support from consultants	
Activity 11: Planning & management procedure for reef	By end of	10%	Demonstration sites for	U

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance²⁴. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating²⁵
recreation management established at respective demo sites	Year 1		reef management work identified and agreed	
Activity 12: Survey and GIS Mapping of reefs, sensitive areas, threatened species and damaged sites	Begins end of Year 1, completed by end of Year 4	15%	This work has been started at the Kenya demo site and UNEP and UNIDO have agreed additional technical part time support will be available through a JPO	MU
Activity 13: Procurement, installation and maintenance of reef protection equipment by relevant stakeholders	Begins end of Year 1, completed by end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on the results from activity 12	U
Activity 14: Needs assessment for capacity building & training completed	By end of Year 1	90%	Needs assessment activity is now complete and the reports are uploaded to the project website	S
Activity 15: National demo projects successfully implemented and completed and case studies shared in each of the participating countries	By end of Year 4	10%	Nine demonstration sites have been agreed and sub contracts & work plans agreed for the first year implementation	U
Activity 16: Policy workshops to evaluate recommended reforms completed in all countries	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it is dependent on outcomes from the demo projects	N/A
Output 2: Development and Implementation of mechanisms for sustainable tourism governance and management			UNIDO to coordinate but UNWTO to provide Technical Assistance	
Activity 17: National governance reports on 'gaps, needs and options' produced by each country	End of Year 1	10%	Work on this output is to be led by UNWTO and a Letter of Agreement (LoA)	U

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²⁴ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²⁵
			has now been finalised	
Activity 18: Options and scenarios appropriate for each country examined and refined based on demo project lessons	By end of Year 3	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as the UNIDO/UNWTO LoA has yet to be activated	MU
Activity 19: Workplans that promote and support reforms to governance and management agreed and formally adopted in each country	By end of Year 4	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it follows on from activity 18	N/A
Output 3: Assessment and Delivery of training and capacity building requirements emphasising an integrated approach to sustainable tourism				
Activity 20: Assessments undertaken and reports discussed and training & Capacity Building (CB) actions agreed	By end of Year 1	60%	Country assessments have been completed and a summary report is due to be discussed at the second SCM in August 2010	MS
Activity 21: First training packages developed and delivered in all countries	By end of 18 months	0%	No work achieved on this item yet as it follows on from activity 20	MU
Activity 22: Training & CB activities being implemented and supported by local institutions in all countries	By end of Year 3	10%	The Training Needs Assessment consultancy has led to further identification of relevant local training /research institutions to involve in this work	MU
Output 4: Information Capture, management and dissemination				
Activity 23: Project website designed and 'live'	By end of six months	100%	Web site public and project materials being regularly uploaded (www.coast.iwlearn.org)	S

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance²⁴. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating²⁵
Activity 24: National information nodes/focal points established	By end of Year 1	100%	All FPs identified and agreed TORs	S
Activity 25: PCU Nairobi disseminating initial guidelines/BAPs/BATs via website	By end of 18 months	25%	Global BAPs/BATs examples of best practices available on the project website	S
Activity 26: Functioning coastal environment and tourism information management system in all countries (feeding into eRICH through national nodes)	By end of Year 3	0%	It is too early to record any progress on this activity	N/A
Activity 27: Environmental information being used to support improved governance and policy development	By end of Year 4	0%	It is too early to record any progress on this activity	N/A
Output 5: Project management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation				
Activity 28: All PCU staff, equipment, & communications with country Coordinators in place	By end of 2009	60%	Computer equipment and stationery for demo coordinators not yet in place.	U
Activity 29: Project Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Group (TAG) confirmed and active**	By time of inception workshop	90%	Technical Advisory Group functions to be taken on by the Steering Committee and hired in consultants	S
Activity 30: National Coordinators and Steering Groups confirmed and active	By time of inception workshop	30%	Steering groups have met in Gambia, Ghana, Senegal, Seychelles Tanzania. Steering groups to be informal and specific to each country context. There is considerable	U

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

Outputs ²²	Expected completion date ²³	Implementation status as of end of reporting period (June 30 th 2010) expressed in %	Comments if variance ²⁴ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ²⁵
			variation across countries on the capacity of these groups	
Activity 31: National partnerships formed & active	By end of 18 months	30%	Sub contracts have now been agreed and are starting to be activated by country level executing partners	U
Activity 32: Appropriate project M&E procedures in place and operational	By end of Year 1	30%	Each demo project now has a draft logical framework, and a regional/national M&E framework is to be presented and discussed at the second SCM in August 2010	U
Activity 33: Appropriate and effective political and financial mechanisms for sustaining project outcomes (from Components 1-4)	By end of project	0%	It is too early to show any progress on this activity	N/A

Overall project implementation progress ²⁷ *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please include columns to reflect prior years' ratings):*

FY09 rating	FY10 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
MS	MU	Implementation remains now even more behind schedule than at FY09, especially at the site level. The significant delays occurred in FY10 in activating contractual arrangements and setting-up operations at the demonstration sites are negatively affecting most elements of the project. In addition, the fact that the budget allocation for the Project Coordination team is being expended

²⁷ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

		<p>while site-level work has not yet started, creates a situation where the remaining time available to implement site-level work is being shortened significantly. This is the principal underlying reason for an overall MU rating for FY10.</p> <p>The project is now entering its third year of operation. In the coming year, the pace of progress towards stated outcomes and delivery of agreed outputs, especially at the site level, has to increase significantly, if the project is to be back on track by FY11.</p>
--	--	---

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. *(To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager²⁸)*

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

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Same as in previous section. The entire project team recognises that the pace of progress towards stated outcomes and delivery of agreed outputs, especially at the site level, has to increase significantly in FY11, in order to bring the project back on track. This affects most project outputs with progress ratings at MS, MU and U. Agreed management urgent measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment and full activation of contractual agreements with all partners at the country level; UNIDO to step-up and provide consistent support and guidance to project manager and demo sites (and particularly in project management and administration aspects, besides technical support) so as to ensure the timely delivery of agreed outputs in FY11, bringing the project back on track; 	<p>All project team members; COAST Technical Coordinator, UNIDO Project team, UNWTO, Country Focal Points and Local Demo Coordinators.</p>	<p>With immediate effect and with the objective of achieving significant progress and bringing the project back on track by June 2011 with a majority of ratings at S or MS level.</p>

²⁸ UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO Coordinator based in Nairobi to take on a more proactive role in project management aspects, including more proactive liaison with the Vienna Office and all sub-contractors, so as to ensure a more timely finalisation and set-up of all managerial, contractual and financial aspects of the project that are still not fully in place; • UNIDO Project Manager in Vienna and contracts team are to significantly step-up their level of time-input and support for this project. The level provided so far is clearly well below the minimum required, as demonstrated by the very poor performance of this project since its inception. • Country teams also have to increase their level of responsiveness and interaction with the UNIDO team, in order to fully activate all contractual arrangements and initiate the effective disbursement of GEF funds at the country level. • All parties to prioritise the setting up local teams at each demo site and equipping them with financial and technical means to implement their TOR and workplan, so that they may feed into and benefit from the broader project activities; • The UNIDO coordinator to take the lead and define a Training Programme on the basis of the TNA and starting identification and contracting of 		

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>relevant training institutions - implementation should start as soon as local coordinators are employed and their demo projects are active;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO to activate the long overdue LoA with the UNWTO so as to initiate the ST-EP training and other UNWTO activities; • All team to enhance the use of the project website as a mean of internal team communication; • UNIDO contracts/management to team prepare immediately for the next 3-year rolling contracts that will take the country demos sites from early 2011 to end of project. This is of paramount importance to avoid a further gap in funds disbursements and associated delays with site-level activities. The new contracting process should be started in September 2010 so as to ensure a smooth transition from the current contracts to the 3 year rolling contracts. 		

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

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
Ensure project M&E procedures are in place and operational	M&E Framework developed for sharing at the second SCM	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired	By the second SCM (August 2010)

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
		consultant	
Assessments undertaken, reports discussed and Training & Capacity Building (CB) actions agreed	Training Needs Assessments carried out for all 9 partner countries	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired consultants	By the second SCM (August 2010) and to continue thereafter
National governance reports on 'gaps, needs and options' produced by each country	National governance reports on 'gaps, needs and options' to be produced by each country	Project Coordination Unit, UNWTO and Project Focal Points in partner countries	Now planned between the last quarter of 2010 and early 2012
Survey and GIS Mapping of reefs, sensitive areas, threatened species and damaged sites completed	Surveys and GIS Mapping of reefs, sensitive areas, threatened species and damaged sites required. Work has begun at one site (Kenya demo) and will be presented at the second SCM in August.	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points in partner countries, and hired consultants	By second SCM (August 2010) and to continue thereafter for all other relevant sites

3.3. Risk -

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

RISK FACTOR TABLE																
<i>Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the Project Document and reflect also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (PM) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (TM). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The UNEP Task Manager should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.</i>																
				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
INTERNAL RISK																

Project management													
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems			✓				PM: No comments 2010 – main challenge at the Demo project level will be time commitment of Coordinators			✓
										TM: Substantial risk here at the country level / demo projects where internal management and administrative capacity is weak. The project team will have to provide consistent and timely assistance to the site teams in this respect – once they will be in place – also by facilitating interactions between focal points and local coordinators			
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	✓						PM: No comments 2010 – some country Focal Points have changed and this will require new commitment from those new to the SCM (e.g. Kenya (envir), Tanzania (envir), Senegal (envir), Gambia (tourism), Ghana (tourism), Nigeria (federal))	✓		
										TM: No comment			
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment		✓					PM: No comments 2010- partnership arrangement through LoA and sub contracts has been very long winded and with many communication difficulties		✓	
										TM: Expecting some challenges here to ensure smooth operations at the country level			

Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation				✓			PM: Although the agreement between UNEP and UNIDO was activated in Nov 07, the TC only arrived in post in Nov 08, resulting in a 3 year 'gap' between PDF-B and implementation and the fulltime staff complement is very small 2010 – further delays have been experienced in activating the project due to lack of clarity in the partnership development process				✓		
										TM: Project is now almost 2 years behind schedule in implementation, and hence moved from substantial to high risk						
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize				✓			PM: The GEF funds on this project represent only 25% of the overall funding requirement, most of the other 75% is supposed to come from partner governments 2010 – partner governments have been waiting for the signing of their sub contracts with UNIDO before committing their own resources to the project				✓		
										TM: High risk, now compounded by the implementation delay that will also allow less time to mobilise the pledged co-financing. Project must take every opportunity (MOUs, country visits, PSC meetings, NFPs, national level meetings) to address this issue.						

Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		✓					A revised budget has been prepared for the first SCM with some reallocation needed 2010 – three year rolling budgets have been prepared in order to speed up the implementation of project activities			✓			
										TM: Agreed. However risk increased to high, due to accumulating delay in project financial delivery especially at the site level.						
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds		✓					PM: No comments 2010 – no comments			✓			
										TM: once demo projects will be activated financial management and reporting at the country level will be a critical factor requiring close monitoring and support by the UNIDO team. Risk increased to high as this is a critical element of the project.						
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting		✓					PM: No comments 2010 – Comments and feedback from partner countries always takes longer than expected, and reporting is more often than not by the RCU alone		✓				
										TM: Reports have needed more analysis and reflection, though this has always been forthcoming						

Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders			✓				PM: One of the proposed demo project sites still has to be confirmed, and most demos currently have weak engagement with the private sector 2010 – awareness raising and stakeholder involvement through site committees must be a central element as the project moves forward TM: Agreed. Project will need to make every effort to address this.			✓			
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident			✓				PM: The project has only just completed its inception period and general public awareness is still fragile. There is a need to produce a project publicity brochure 2010 – the project website is now active and reports are regularly uploaded for sharing TM: Agreed. Project must prioritize communications products			✓			
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected						✓	PM: It is too early to comment on this 2010 – as above TM: No comment						✓

Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties		✓				PM: One of the key purposes of the demo projects is to test and develop BAPs/BATs, including new technologies and practices 2010 – partner countries need to be constantly encouraged to utilise physical and virtual networks to access best science and technologies, but will assist where priorities are clear with consultant inputs TM: The socio-economic context of the region makes challenges for the uptake and replication of technologies. The project should therefore focus on the design and delivery of tools and training support that is appropriately tailored to the needs and capacities of country partners.			✓		
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives		✓				PM: The project is built upon collaboration across two government sectors (environment & tourism) as well as the private sector and local communities which means there are likely to be continuous trade-offs and negotiations as part of project implementation 2010 – as above TM: Agreed		✓			
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary	Limited number of fulltime technical staff on the project				✓				PM: The project will have to rely on short term consultancies to bridge some gaps in technical capacity at the national level 2010 – as above TM: Agreed		✓			

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile		✓					PM: The project is covering 9 African countries over a 5 year period, so some disruption is likely especially during election years 2010 – as above		✓				
					TM: Agreed											
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions		✓					PM: As the project is focusing on demonstration sites in coastal areas, activities may be hampered by severe storms and /or flooding/ climate change events 2010 – as above		✓				
					TM: Agreed											

				Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers		✓					PM: Eco-tourism and alternative livelihood business opportunities are currently being negatively affected by the global economic downturn and this is likely to continue during the early years of the project 2010 – as above TM: Agreed		✓				
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance			✓				PM: The managerial capacity varies across countries, with limitations in some representing a more substantial risk than in others 2010 – as above, but a recently concluded Training Needs Assessment should help to focus on areas likely to most hamper project progress TM: Agreed and risk rated High as the limited time remaining puts additional pressure on the country teams to deliver their tasks in a shorter time.				✓		
Others, please specify																

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

N/A

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN

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

Rank	Risk Statement ²⁹		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
1	Technical and managerial capacity limitations of institutions and other project partners	Delay of national level support activities as well as effects on performance in implementation of the demonstration projects, including monitoring and progress reporting	Assess specific weaknesses in each institution/FP and define and implement targeted measures to enhance capacity and provide (technical and financial) support to run operations on the ground within the limitations of the GEF budget	Project Coordination Unit (PCU), UNWTO and Site Committee partners	From July 2010 onwards
2	Limited number of fulltime technical staff on the project	Delays in coordination and TA support, with potential opportunities for synergy with other partners/ projects remaining unrealised	Project Coordination Unit to submit 'gaps analysis' to UNIDO and UNWTO in order to find additional/ supplementary technical support	Project Coordination Unit	Reporting completed Oct 2009, but still under review
3	Co-financing inadequate	Unable to undertake all the proposed national level and demo project activities, and therefore unable to show substantive progress on BAPs/BATs for sustainable tourism	a. Project Focal Points in each relevant Ministry (Environment & Tourism) to negotiate for their governments to honour their original investment pledges given during the PDF-B phase b. PCU to explore other	Project Coordination Unit and Project Focal Points	From July 2010 onwards

²⁹ Only for Substantial to High risk.

Rank	Risk Statement ²⁹		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
			opportunities to draw in additional funding from donors, NGO projects and the private sector		
4	Lack of private sector stakeholder involvement	The long term sustainability of the BAPs/BATs and sustainable tourism development processes initiated by the COAST project will be at stake if private sector investments and/or commitment are not forthcoming	Ensure during the first year of demo project implementation that direct approaches are made to private sector hoteliers and investors in order to gain their interest and financial commitments	Project Focal Points and Demo Project Coordinators	From August 2010 onwards
5	Limited awareness about the COAST project website and eRICH concept	Lack of cross country and partner interaction and therefore limited learning and sharing of BAPs/BATs	Ensure that all COAST project FPs, DPCs, site committee members, UNWTO and other partners are made aware and encouraged to proactively use this facility	Project Coordination Unit, Project Focal Points and Demo Project Coordinators (DPCs)	From August 2010 onwards

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

FY.08 rating	FY.09 rating	FY.10 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
No previous yr	Medium/Substantial	Substantial	At this point in implementation, this project is now at substantial risk level, owing to (a) the significant accumulated delay, to (b) uncertainties related to co-finance and national commitment and (c) uncertainty over the required capacity to timely implement the demonstration projects at the country level
If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation			

From above table item:

1. Training Needs Analysis has been completed and is to be discussed at the second SCM in August 2010.
2. A supplementary project note was circulated within UNIDO, and a small subsidiary project on clean water may be funded at one of the partner government demo sites (Watamu, Kenya), subject to further internal UNIDO decisions.
3. The proposed three year rolling budgets are an attempt to get matching commitments from partner governments for project implementation during the remaining project period.
4. Delays in implementation at the demo site level, means that this action is still valid and should be prioritised in the coming annual cycle.
5. The COAST Project website (www.coast.iwlearn.org) is now public and is being regularly updated with reports and events.

RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION -

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

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

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

In process

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

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| • Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |
| • SMART indicators to track project outcomes | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |
| • A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ (part of first year demo project implementation plans) |

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

- | | | |
|--|-------|-----------------------------|
| • Mid-term review/evaluation | Yes ✓ | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Terminal evaluation | Yes ✓ | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information | Yes ✓ | No <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): MU - The finalization of a revised M&E plan is well behind schedule as most project activities

4.3 Has the project:

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| • Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |
| • Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) | Yes ✓ | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| • Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ (not applicable) |
| • Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ (to early to rank) |

- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes ✓ No ☐

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): MU – As above, the finalization of a revised M&E plan is well behind schedule as most project activities

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period³⁰

2010 – a draft national and regional M&E framework was developed and is to be presented at the second SCM in August 2010, and will be supported with desk-based consultancy inputs so as to ensure adequate baseline data are collected for each demo site and on any issues identified by indicators at national level

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

The project has required a longer inception phase (8 months) than was originally designed (3 months) owing to its complex, multi-country and multi-themed nature, and due to the 3 year gap between the planning phase and implementation phase. During year 2 of the project (year 1 for demo project implementation), baseline information is to be collected and an appropriate regional and national M&E framework developed for progress monitoring. 2010 – owing to delays in signing partnership contracts and thereby activating the flow of funds for demonstration purposes, baseline information has yet to be collected for each site

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

Too early to comment on this aspect
2010 – as above

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

Too early to comment on this aspect
2010 – as above

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions³¹ are still valid

As footnoted in Table 3.1 a number of changes are being proposed to the current indicators in order to improve the internal logic and consistency between the project objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities. These changes are also being suggested in order to place the project into a more realistic development cycle and scope of influence, than that inferred from its original design. The relevant changes are: Indicators number 2 and 3, under Objective 2; indicators number 2 and 3, under Objective 4; indicator number 5, under Outcome 2 and, indicator number 4, under Outcome 3. 2010 – the above changes are to be discussed as part of an M&E presentation at the second SCM in August 2010.

³⁰ Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

³¹ Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (*i.e., the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C*) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

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

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

2010 – owing to demo implementation delays this exercise has not been carried out for the 2009/2010 cycle.

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

Already explained under 4.5 above.

2010 – there is a clear need to support M&E capacity development within the partner countries, and UNIDO has set aside funds for this purpose at both the sub-contract level with partners implementing specific projects as well as at regional/national level.

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

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

Special request from GEF Sec for FY10 is to highlight Best Practices and Lessons learned from the following categories:

- i. CLO1³²: Enhancing social impacts through the improved understanding of the causal relationships between environmental management and local community welfare.

Too early to comment on this CLO as the demonstration projects are only just being activated.

- ii. CLO2: Enhancing the catalytic effect of GEF financing with the aim of: identifying, scaling up and replicating best practices, improving the science evidence base to develop projects, strategies and policies, and capturing learning from demonstrations across all focal areas.

Too early to comment on this CLO as the demonstration projects are only just being activated

- iii. CLO3: Enhancing the impact of capacity development support provided across focal areas.

Too early to comment on this CLO. A project-wide Training Needs Assessment has just been completed, and during the next year training events /inputs are to be planned to address prioritized ‘capacity gaps’ at demo project as well as national levels

³² CLO: Corporate Learning Objective of GEF Sec.

iv. CLO4 : Improving performance monitoring at project and portfolio level

Too early to comment on this CLO, but the COAST project is putting forward a proposal at the second SCM to be held in August 2010 for additional technical consultancy support for demo project coordinators and site committee members to be able to call upon for guidance in establishing baseline and monitoring data for each demo project.

If the Lessons Learned from this project does not fit the above CLO categories, please provide them in the relevant categories below:

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

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

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

2010 – country level 'ownership' remains a challenge with six partner countries making changes to their SCM representation in this second year cycle (as mentioned above these are; Kenya, Tanzania, Nigeria, Ghana, Gambia and Senegal).

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

Notwithstanding the comments above, the COAST project is still only weakly represented by the private sector, and considerable work will need to be undertaken in the first years of demo project implementation (from July 2010 onwards) to secure private investor and tourism operator interest and their in-kind and financial contributions which will help towards achieving the project objectives.

2010 – the comment above remains valid, and should be one of the main foci for demonstration projects as they now get underway during the 2010/2011 cycle.

- Capacity building;

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

2010 – a comprehensive Training Needs Assessment has been completed for all partner countries, and this should provide the SCM and RCU with direction for enhancing capacity at both national and demonstration project levels over the coming few years.

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

2010 – Co-financing remains a limiting factor to the COAST project's sustainability and long term success. To date only two partner countries have responded to the RCU's request for co-funding accountability to track commitments made from the planning phase up to the first year of implementation (e.g. Cameroon has estimated its contributions to date have been as follows; regional level: US\$8400, national level: US\$ 77450, and Demo level: US\$ 5400; while Tanzania's figures for the same categories have been: US\$ 36750, US\$ 4950, US\$ 15450).