

**UNEP-UNIDO-GEF PROJECT ON DEMONSTRATING AND CAPTURING BEST
PRACTICES AND TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE REDUCTION OF LAND-SOURCED
IMPACTS RESULTING FROM COASTAL TOURISM**

OPTIONAL ANNEXES

- Annex D: Threats and Root Causes and Barrier Analysis
- Annex E: Stakeholder Involvement Plan Summary
- Annex F: Summary of National Reports
- Annex G: List of SCTSSA-related, GEF supported or funded initiatives in Africa
- Annex H: Endorsement Letter from NFPs and Co-Financing letters (separate files)
- Annex I: Project Conformity with OP 10 Requirements
- Annex J: List of Private Sector Partners and Letters of Endorsement
- Annex K: Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- Annex L: Response to GEF Secretariat and Implementing Agencies Reviews at Submission

ANNEX D

THREATS AND ROOT CAUSES AND BARRIERS ANALYSIS AND PROPOSED INTERVENTION LOGIC

The following Table of Analysis identifies the Threats and Root Causes in the context of the overall Project Objective, i.e. What tourism-related impacts are threatening those marine and coastal ecosystems of transboundary significance within the participating countries, and what issues and concerns are acting as barriers to the adoption of more sustainable tourism approaches that would effectively mitigate or remove such threats? Nearly all of the coastal and marine areas of these countries have a potential or real transboundary significance that is or could be threatened by inappropriate tourism activities and development. The coral reefs, wetlands, mangroves and seagrass beds of the various participating countries represent important feeding and breeding grounds for species that naturally migrate along the coast and that have planktonic stages that frequently settle many 100's of miles from their origins (e.g., corals, lobster, etc). Quite a number of these species that are of transboundary significance are also of commercial importance as well as critical to the balance and well-being of the coastal and marine ecosystem. These same areas are also attractive to tourism for development both in relation to their basic recreational nature (sun, sea , sand and culture) and in the context of ecotourism related to the presence of these same ecological high-interest natural resources (coral reefs, wetlands, mangroves, charismatic and endangered species, etc). This can create a conflict of interest between the need to conserve and protect this coastal biodiversity and the demand to exploit it for socio-economic benefit. The immediate dollar value is seen in relation to expansion and development but currently at the expense and gradual obliteration of coastal biodiversity and natural resources. Foremost among the threats are the impacts originating from land-based sources such as contaminants and pollutants. The GEF OP10 aims to demonstrate barrier removal through adoption of best practices and has a particular focus aimed at strategies for addressing land-based activities that degrade marine waters. The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities lists pollutant categories as sewage, persistent organic pollutants, radioactive substances, heavy metals, oils and hydrocarbons, litter, nutrients.

The overall risk at the global level therefore is the loss of significant transboundary marine and coastal ecosystems, and the underlying causal threats and negative impacts resulting from tourism are listed below (Column 1) along with their proximate causes (Column 2). Column 3 presents the Overall Management Issues & Key Barriers and effectively summarises the set of root causes that need to be addressed in order to mitigate and remove the impacts and causes identified under the two previous columns. Column 3 thereby identifies the single integrated issues or barriers for intervention and/or removal. Proposed solutions for such interventions and barrier removal are captured in the following column (4). Column 5 describes any on-going baseline activities that may be addressing these issues through regional level interventions.

Threat/Impact	Causes	Synopsis of Overall Management Issues & Key Barriers (The Root Causes)	Solutions: Interventions from Project / Barrier removal activity	Baseline activity
1: DAMAGE FROM TOURISM-RELATED POLLUTION AND CONTAMINATION				

Threat/Impact	Causes	Synopsis of Overall Management Issues & Key Barriers (The Root Causes)	Solutions: Interventions from Project / Barrier removal activity	Baseline activity
A. Brown-water and Grey-water discharges from tourist amenities	Ineffective legislation addressing pollution and contamination coupled with inadequate monitoring and enforcement of legislation	Need for improved institutional arrangements between the key agencies involved in tourism and the environment, to improve coordination and local community and private sector participation.	Realignment and streamlining of institutional arrangements based on a review of current capacity and operations, adequacy of structure relative to sustainable tourism and to remove overlap and clarify mandates (e.g. environmental monitoring) and improve local stakeholder and private sector involvement	Institutional and legislative, policy reviews have or will soon been initiated by other regional projects (such as UNEP/GEF WIO-Lab and GCLME), will provide a basis for further review, but they will not be specific to sustainable tourism development.
B. Hydrocarbon discharges from tourism-related vessels	Appropriate treatment technologies (method and price) for potential pollutants and contaminants unavailable or unknown to developers and private sector	Need for a more integrated set of legislations, policies and management strategies dealing with pollution & contamination, land zoning and use, protected species/habitats and sensitive areas, natural resource exploitation (e.g. fisheries, water resources), innocent passage and access and incentives for environmental management systems and self-regulation,.	Reforms to existing legislation and policy in the participating countries based on a review of needs and of other successful case studies for effective legislation and policy in other tourist destinations	Some countries are already making efforts to revise national level legislations and tourism related policies. In most participating countries, Environmental Management plans as well as Tourism Management Plans are being developed or have been prepared, others are developing ICZM.
C. Solid contaminants resulting from dumping and tipping (land-based) and flotsam and jetsam(sea-based)	Limited use of Environmental Management Systems and Accounting within the tourism sector (linked to lack of incentives)	Need for baseline information on tourism and environmental carrying capacity and a mechanism to monitor on the impacts of tourism on the environment, and feed the information back to decision makers.	Development and implementation of an effective information and data gathering and management process to support coastal land-use management, environmental monitoring and zoning	A dialogue between public and private sector is being gradually developed. Some countries already classify and licence hotels using environmental criteria (e.g. Kenya), guidelines for EMS and environmental audit are being developed by others (e.g. Seychelles).
D. Sediments from tourism-related activities (construction activities, deforestation, removal of coastal protection/filtration functions provided by wetlands and mangroves)	Appropriate mass treatment facilities not provided by government or by private sector Inappropriate allocation or approval of lands for development Absence of formal guidelines for developers and for tourist activities	Need for proper mapping and zoning that addresses sectoral land use, critical habitats, ecosystem services, and community/ individual rights in terms of public access, land tenure and livelihood	Development and implementation of a targeted information delivery mechanism with a two-way flow allowing appropriate advice and guidance to reach decision-makers and enabling decision-makers to identify data and information needs for policy development	Some countries (e.g. Kenya and Seychelles) have undertaken coastal habitat mapping and sensitivity mapping. Methods / presentation could be
E. Noise pollution impacting on sensitive wildlife areas (nesting, breeding and feeding sites)	Poor awareness of importance of ecosystem functions such as coastal protection against wave action, soil stabilisation by vegetation, filtration properties of wetlands and mangroves, etc. Absent or inappropriate designation or management of sensitive areas requiring special oversight or protection	Insufficient numbers of trained human resources to monitor compliance and to enforce legislation	Identification of training needs across a wide range of stakeholders (CBOs, NGOs, CSO, Gov authorities/agencies & private sector) and evolution / implementation of training and	

Threat/Impact	Causes	Synopsis of Overall Management Issues & Key Barriers (The Root Causes)	Solutions: Interventions from Project / Barrier removal activity	Baseline activity
2. DIRECT DESTRUCTION AND DEGRADATION OF COASTAL AND MARINE ECOSYSTEMS				
A. Land Clearance for construction purposes	Inadequate or absent legislation and policy relating to zoning of coastal areas for development, management or protection			
B. Reclamation and infilling of habitats	Perception that certain coastal habitats are valueless and expendable			
C. Physical damage caused by recreational activities (snorkelling, diving, anchor damage, boating impacts, etc.)	No accountability among tourism operators			
	Inadequate legislation for protection of habitats and species coupled with inadequate monitoring and enforcement			
3. UNSUSTAINABLE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES BY THE TOURISM SECTOR				

Threat/Impact	Causes	Synopsis of Overall Management Issues & Key Barriers (The Root Causes)	Solutions: Interventions from Project / Barrier removal activity	Baseline activity
<p>A. Overharvesting of living resources for consumption and trade related to tourism (fishing, curios and memorabilia)</p> <p>B. Inappropriate harvesting techniques that damage habitats and species (dynamite fishing, sand-mining, coral-mining)</p> <p>C. Excessive water abstraction depriving ecosystems of a vital life-support commodity</p> <p>D. Other conflicting, specific needs for land-use creating competition between human demands and ecosystem requirements (e.g. agricultural land, beach access. Fish landing sites)</p>	<p>Inadequate or absent legislation and policy relating to fisheries (zoning, resource rights, quotas, catch size limits, methods and allowable gear, etc) coupled with inadequate monitoring and enforcement of said legislation</p> <p>Unethical/unsustainable demand for living-resource curios</p> <p>Inadequate or absent legislation and policy relating to exploitation of natural resources coupled with inadequate monitoring and enforcement of said legislation</p> <p>Limited or no control over water allocation, management and use as a result of ineffective policy, legislation and/or enforcement and limited self-regulation by the sector to promote water re-use and conservation</p> <p>Inadequate or absent sectoral zoning for land-use and limited protection of critical or sensitive areas</p> <p>Absence of effective legislation protecting rights of free and innocent access or recognising common lands</p>			

ANNEX E

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT PLAN

The primary stakeholders in this Project at the national level will be the various government agencies responsible for tourism and for the management and protection of the environment, especially at the coastal level, the private sector working directly and indirectly with tourism, the coastal communities and those with livelihoods that depend on or conflict with tourism and the competing uses for the coastal zone and associated habitats and resources. In reality all coastal dwellers and those engaged in activities along the coastlines of the participating countries will be stakeholders to a greater or lesser extent. At the regional and global level the stakeholders will be various signatories to environmentally-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (e.g. CBD, CCD, Nairobi Convention, Abidjan Convention, etc) and all individuals and organisations associated with the sustainable management and conservation of global biodiversity. The stakeholder participation plan per Project output is outlined below along with details of the key stakeholders, their roles and interest in this Project, and any potential sources of conflict and associated mitigation measures.

The project preparation involved a significant amount of stakeholder consultations at a number of levels. During the UNEP/GEF-MSP development process under the African Process, eleven countries worked collaboratively to identify priority areas for intervention. Later during the GEF PDF-B process for the development of this current project, each participating country held national stakeholder consultation processes and produced national reports providing situation analyses with respect to coastal tourism and environmental impacts

COMPONENT 1: CAPTURE OF BEST AVAILABLE PRACTICES AND TECHNOLOGIES

Output 1.A: Identification of Best Available Practices (BAPS) and Best Available Technologies (BATs) (on a global scale) applicable to sustainable tourism within the sub-Saharan African situation

This Output primarily focuses on capturing information from case studies all over the world (including the participating countries) that will provide valuable information for the guidance, design and implementation of appropriate national strategies for sustainable tourism management. This will involve a number of stakeholders in tourism and environmental issues outside of the system boundary and the expectation is that this will generate new working partnerships and professional linkages to individuals and agencies around the world that have similar concerns and interests. This should result in the evolution of a valuable network of stakeholders at the global level who, although not always having a ‘stake’ in the precise activities happening within the participating country, have a global concern and interest in sustainable management *per se*. Of course, all of the coastal stakeholders within the 9 participating countries will benefit from this Output and a number, especially in the private sector, may gain significant advantages from the identification of appropriate technologies and other benefits that could be gained through tri-sector partnerships (e.g. efficiency and cost-savings associated with resource use, corporate reputation, competitive advantages etc.). In the interests of the incremental nature of GEF and the need for global benefits it should be noted that the benefits gained by the private sector in this sense would be transferred to the objectives of the project and the global aims by way of improvements in sustainable tourism management and the protection and maintenance of important transboundary ecosystem functions.

Output 1.B: Implementation of National Demonstrations to elaborate Best Available Practices (BAPs) and Best Available Technologies (BAPS) for Sustainable Tourism

The identification and endorsement of the national demonstration sites and activities followed a detailed stakeholder consultation process including an integrated problem analysis which was used to

identify Hotspots and Sensitive Areas (as part of the African Process). During the PDFB phase of project, participating countries prepared National Tourism Reports through a stakeholder consultative process, and identified eligible demonstration projects. Guidelines for the country reports included a basic set of criteria to help countries identify suitable sites on the basis of: the availability of the basic tourism features, background information, the presence of sustainability issues and the willingness of local stakeholders to participate. The private sector was involved throughout this process and was represented on the National Steering Committees and at National Stakeholder Meetings. Full details of this process and the requisite stakeholder participation are given in Appendix A. The draft proposed demonstration sites and thematic project descriptions went to a final stakeholder meeting in each country for final endorsement before inclusion in this Project document.

Stakeholder involvement during the actual implementation of the more specific, on-the-ground deliverables associated with the demonstrations will be considerable. A list of some of the organisations (private and community based) that will be involved in the project are listed in Annex A2 of Appendix A, and it is anticipated that more organisations may become involved at inception following the National Partnership Meetings (Output 5.3). The Demonstrations that are dealing with Environmental Management Systems and Eco-certification will require close liaison with and involvement of the private tourism sector including in-house training in methods and techniques. The Project will attempt, where possible, to undertake such training on a group basis both for reasons of economy as well as to encourage the development of stakeholder networking and partnerships. Demonstrations that are addressing alternative livelihoods will be working closely with community level stakeholders, and particularly individuals who may need guidance with tourism-related employment, or in improving their eco-friendly approaches and reducing impacts from their activities. The Project will encourage group consultation and feedback from communities and tourism operatives as well as fishermen and others who may find themselves in conflict with tourism operators and the tourist industry. This would be addressed through workshops and information field-trips and the Project would assist in conflict resolution and identifying solutions to any such issues.

COMPONENT 2: DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MECHANISMS FOR SUSTAINABLE TOURISM GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Output 2.A: National reviews and assessments of policy, legislation, institutional arrangements and financial mechanisms to identify needs and requirements

Effective and comprehensive stakeholder consultation will be essential during these reviews if the final assessments are to be accurate and if all opinions and issues are to be properly aired and reviewed so as to arrive at accurate conclusions and recommendations. Both the public and private sector have a strong vested interest here in ensure that their opinions and inputs are properly considered and recorded before the project moves to Output 2.B.

Output 2.B: Development of model guidelines and individual national strategies and work-plans for Sustainable Tourism based on 2.A and the Outputs from Component 1

Although the obvious and direct stakeholders here would be various line management agencies in government and those bodies dealing with fiscal, legislative and policy measures, it will be important also to liaise closely with those stakeholders who are most likely to be affected by any reforms. These would include developers, contractors, tourism activity operators. These reforms will also have implications for enforcement personnel such as police officers. Consequently the evolution and development of such reforms and financial mechanisms will need to include regular opportunities for consultation across all sectors and for stakeholder workshops to enable varying points-of-view to be considered and discussed. Proposed new financial mechanisms (or alterations to existing ones) will be of particular interest where the burden of payment falls on specific groups or sectors. The Project will endeavour to make Output 2.A and 2.B a consecutive process ensuring the same stakeholders are involved in the interests of transparency and accuracy.

Output 2.C: Implementation of individual national strategies and work-plans for Sustainable Tourism

The same stakeholders appertain to Output 2.C as to the previous two Outputs. It will be important to arrange feedback workshops after implementation has begun to capture any concerns and needs for fine-tuning or amendments to the Strategies. The Independent Terminal Evaluation of the Project will be a vital instrument in advising the Project and its stakeholders on the success of this Component. However, Post-Project evaluation is an important and necessary concept and activity that must be captured. The concept of sustainable tourism and associated management mechanisms is by essence dynamic and will inevitably need further revision and improvements and the Project will need to work with the countries and stakeholders to ensure that provisions are left in place for such requirements.

COMPONENT 3: ASSESSMENT AND DELIVERY OF TRAINING AND CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS EMPHASISING AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Output 3.A: Assessment of national baselines and requirements within various sectors

Again training and capacity will be a multi-sectoral issue within the Project. Much as in 2.A. above, the initial reviews and assessments will need to include all affected stakeholders. It may be that the private sector has strong opinions on some of the training and capacity building necessary within government departments and *vice versa*. No doubt the private sector itself is in need and would wish to benefit from training and capacity building in more sustainable tourism practices that reduce wastes and protect the landscape that is necessary for the continuation of a successful tourism business. Appropriate stakeholder meetings will be organised by the Project and a final Assessment document will be made available to interested parties in both the public and private sector.

Output 3.B: Development of sectoral model packages and guidelines for national dissemination

Similar consideration applies here as in Output 2.B. Training packages will need to be focused at appropriate groups of stakeholders although there should be flexibility allowed here by the project inasmuch as there is value in allowing individual or groups from outside the obvious target group to participate where they feel interested or may have a particular concern. Any opportunities for sharing the issues and concerns of various stakeholders so as to propagate better understanding and chances for discussion and explanation should be encouraged by the Project as part of its role in conflict-resolution.

Output 3.C: Adoption and implementation of national programmes for T&CB (with agreed work-plans) targeting relevant sector

It will be important to have work-plans and schedules for implementing training programmes and any capacity building exercises or procurements to ensure that A, appropriate numbers and types of persons receiving the training and B. that the training is relevant to the national situation, especially in relation to the deliveries form Component 2. The stakeholders related to particular packages or programmes of training should be clearly identified but, again as mentioned under 3.B, with sufficient flexibility allowed.

COMPONENT 4: INFORMATION CAPTURE, MANAGEMENT AND DISSEMINATION

Output 4.A: Establish a Regional Information Coordination House (RICH) and an associated Environmental Information Management and Advisory System (EIMAS) that coordinates information and provides guidance and materials for the capture and analysis and dissemination of data pertinent to Sustainable Tourism.

This Output addresses an enormous number of stakeholders across all sectors and throughout the world. The primary stakeholders would, of course, be those agencies and individuals that rely on precise and accurate information and data presentation upon which to base management and policy decisions. In this respect the interest of such stakeholders have been well-addressed by the Project through the EIMAS approach at both regional and national level and the incorporation of a two-lane contra-flow information 'highway' allowing information to be delivered to primary stakeholders but also allowing them to request specific information. The RICH will help to coordinate the information needs at the Project level to deal with the requirements of the various Outputs and their associated stakeholders.

Output 4.B: Identify national data capture and management needs (including GIS, mapping, zoning, monitoring, presentation, etc)

The primary stakeholders for this exercise will be those agencies and individuals within the government who dealing with mapping, zoning and GIS management. These will be the immediate target of consultations and assessments regarding needs (as well as existing capabilities). However, other stakeholders that should not be overlooked include developers, public works managers, and those persons responsible for protection and management of the environment (especially in relation to designated Parks and Protected Areas). Etc. These people may have valuable insights and may wish to identify their own personal requirement sin the context of data capture and management

Output 4.C: Develop national models for Environmental Information Management and Advisory Systems (including feedbacks between data gathering and policy-making needs).

Again, the Project would need to consult with the same stakeholders as under Output 4.C. The requirements of the line managers and policy makers should not be overlooked here. They will need to have opportunities to define their information needs and to specify the most suitable format for delivery.

Output 4.D: Implement national work-plans for EIMAS adoption and institutionalisation

Stakeholders will be similar to Output 4.C and 4.D but careful consideration will need to given to the work-plan and time schedule in relation to human resource needs and government plans, as well as to the prioritisation of information needs. The most appropriate body/agency will need to be selected for hosting a national EIMAS and this may not always be the most obvious or indeed the one chosen at the initial stages of the project as an Information node.

Output 4.E: Develop and implement national delivery programmes for targeted awareness packages and policy level sensitisation

Important consideration will be needed from the Project and its management as to how these specific packages would be delivered to their target audience. Certain stakeholders may be able and willing to assist the Project and the NGO community is an obvious source of expertise and manpower that could be requisitioned in the interests of

COMPONENT 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Output 5.1: Establish Project Coordination Unit

Primary stakeholders here will be the National Focal Points, the EAs and the IAs as well as the host country. However, in the long-term all of the participating countries as a whole should be stakeholders depending on the fate of the PCU and the need for responsibilities defined during the Project lifetime to be adopted through some other agency.

Output 5.2: Establish Regional Coordination Mechanisms (Steering Committees and Technical Advisory Groups)

The Regional Project Steering Committee membership will represent the stakeholder interests of the countries as well as of the Implementing Agency (UNEP) and the Executing Agency (UNIDO). Other stakeholder members may also be adopted onto the RPSC as appropriate (for example, from the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions and from NEPAD). The Technical Advisory Groups will represent the technical interests of the countries. Both groups (Steering and Technical) will effectively be representing the interest also of the various MEA Conventions.

Output 5.3: Establish National Coordination Mechanisms (Interministerial Steering Committees and Technical Advisory Groups)

National Stakeholder Committees will represent the policy and management concerns of stakeholders at the country level and the Project will provide guidance on membership to ensure that this is both effective and fully participatory. To achieve this the membership will need to be multi-sectoral and with representation from the private sector and community level. Likewise for the National Technical Advisory Groups which should also include NGO participation.

Output 5.4: Adopt appropriate indicators and necessary M&E procedures (including assessment and evaluation of post-project sustainability)

This is an important Output under which stakeholder participation needs to be carefully evolved and encouraged. The actual success indicators for Project delivery (which are built into the Logical Framework will be assessed and evaluated through a formal independent process driven by the PCU and the IA. However, there is also a vital need to adopt and measure indicators more appropriate to sustainable tourism and which can identify trends in such areas as water quality, maintenance of ecosystem functions, welfare of biological habitats and species, social indicators of improvements, financial indicators of economic growth, etc. The Project will define and agree on the most appropriate indicators through its national and regional coordination mechanisms during the earliest stages of project implementation, and will then work closely to identify the most appropriate stakeholder groups to collect and process these indicators.

ANNEX F

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL REPORTS

Summary:

Although the tourism industry in each of the participating countries has unique characteristics and is at different levels and stages of development, the growth of hotels and associated tourism infrastructure in each of the participating countries is generating negative environmental impacts on sensitive coastal and marine environments, which will be further exacerbated in the absence of improved environmental management practices by hotels. At the same time, while the sustainability of the tourism industry itself depends on a clean and attractive environment, in the absence of legally enforceable environmental standards there is a tendency for many hotel developers to focus on profitability in the short term. In some regions of the world, notably in Europe and North America, the tourism industry has started to address environmental concerns, partly as a result of stricter environmental laws and partly in response to consumer demands. However, in sub-Saharan Africa, tourism development is generally taking place in the absence of such controls and consumer pressures. The project aims to mitigate and reduce the environmental impacts of the tourism industry in coastal and marine areas through implementation of a number of demonstration activities which will then be used as the basis for wider application within each participating country.

Cameroon

Cameroon offers a surprising diversity of landscapes on the base of which the Ministry of Tourism sales the destination with the slogan “The whole Africa in one country”. In its southern part, the country is covered by the humid equatorial forest which has made possible the constitution of parks (Korup National park) and reserves (Dja reserve of biosphere). Mount Cameroon (4100 m) is one of the highest spot of sub Saharan Africa. In North of the country, many games reserves (Waza, Benoué, Bouba Ndjidadah). With its 360 Km of coastal line, the country shows a wide range of coastal ecosystems, ranging from mangroves near the Nigerian boarder to the surprising beaches with brown sand at the foot of Mount Cameroon. Southwards, the most beautiful beaches are in Mouanko, Souellaba and Yoyo. Surprisingly, this huge potential is yet to be taped. The institutional awareness on tourism started 45 years ago with the creation of the National Tourism Board. But it’s only in 1989 that a whole Ministry will be created to develop this sector. Despite this political willingness to develop tourism the sector input in GDP is only 2.3% (2003). According to the National statistics directorate, tourism is ranked 13th among the first twenty branch of activities. Coastal tourism seems to receive more attention. In the framework of the National Environmental Management Programme (NEMP) coastal and marine ecosystems were identified as fragile ecosystems. To enable the sustainable use of coastal resources, with the support of UNIDO, the country elaborated the Country Coastal Profile. Recently, a presidential decree created a specific board (MEAO) whose purpose is to submit guidelines for the management and tourism development in the southern coast of Cameroon. Benefiting from the recent decentralization law endorsed by the national assembly, the municipalities of the Kribi Campo coastal area decided to request technical support in order to draft an integrated coastal zone management strategy. This was achieved thanks to SNV (Dutch Development Organization) . The plan was endorsed by the Ministry of Plan and development. An intercommunal Tourism Office is currently being implemented in Kribi. WTO is supporting the Ministry of tourism in developing pro poor tourism activities through STEP (Sustainable Tourism to Eliminate Poverty). These efforts are far to addressed the problems of coastal tourism in the country. Among them, lack of physical planning, poor infrastructure, lack of coordinating mechanisms are the more crucial. Te country suffers also from poor marketing of the destination, high international travel cost, high entry fee. As a result of the above, even though some beaches still pristine, where there is no problem of access, human pollution, illegal settlements (Londji beach), and mangrove degradation (Yoyo beach) constitute serious concern. Every where, occupation of sea front by private investors seems to accelerate natural erosion (Kribi, Limbe). Among the major threats on coastal areas, pollution by industries (Industrial palm oil and rubber plantation in Kribi) Oil industries in Kribi and Limbe) appears as the more critical one. Recently, the Ministry of Tourism completed a National tourism strategy in which there is component on coastal zone tourism and another one targeting ecotourism.

On its side the Ministry of Environment and Nature protection is drafting guidelines on EIA and EMS. Despite the fact tourism occupies the 13th position among the 20 best income generating activities, it's considered by the presidency as the 5th priority sector for sustainable development. If lack of enforcement and poor regulatory framework continue to hinder the development of this sector, the private sector will continue to invest in sensitive areas. With no policy of capacity building and awareness, local community will maintain the pressure on coastal natural resources. It's a pity to note that in the Cameroonian case, success story in community based ecotourism from grassroots are not rare (Ebodjé, Mount Cameroon). It's not late for Cameroon to tap its immense tourist potentialities and protect its rich but fragile natural ecosystems. The root cause of the problem here is rather institutional than linked to natural factors. This programme appears as a unique opportunity for the country to demonstrate alternative approaches to sustainable coastal zone management. Cameroon should also take advantage of the fact it is part of the GCLME which targeted Kribi as a pilot demonstration site for ICZM.

Gambia:

In The Gambia, tourism was introduced more than 40 years and there is increased pressure exerted on coastal beaches as a result of rapid expansion and intensification of the tourist industry along the coastal areas. The tourism industry has become a leading sector in the national economy, with direct and indirect benefits estimated at 17% of GDP.. The sector is also one of the country's largest sources of foreign exchange. Net foreign exchange earnings are projected to increase from an estimated \$40 million in 2004 to \$130 million in 2020. Tourism generated employment is projected to increase from an estimated 16,000 jobs in 2004 to around 35,000 jobs in 2020. This level of economic impact makes tourism economically significant to The Gambia and to the Gambian people; In the Gambia, this sector provides employment for about 10,000 people directly and 15,000 people indirectly. Present bed capacity is estimated at just above 6,000 beds. Tourist arrivals are increasing annually, as the number of (tourist) hotels nearly doubled from 18 in 1989 to 33 in 1997.

The majority of these hotels (and beach bars and restaurants) are situated along the 80 km stretch of coast. North of Serekunda, the Atlantic Coast resorts of Bakau, Fajara, Kotu and Kololi are the heart of Gambia's tourist industry, with some 20 hotels along a 10km stretch of beach. At the Southern end of the coastal strip at Kololi is the small wildlife reserve, Bijolo Forest Park, and just upstream from the capital, Banjul, is the Abuko Nature Reserve. The long-term vision sees tourism in The Gambia developing through ten differentiated Tourism Development Areas (TDA's)

Tourism and related activities are having an impact on the coastal vegetation because of the construction of lodges and tourist camps along the estuaries where large areas of mangrove vegetation are being removed. During the period 1972 to 1988 the forest cover of The Gambia declined from some 30% of total land area to just 6%. Much of the remaining natural heritage is protected in national parks and reserves that cover around 4% of the national land area. The Nuimi National Park, situated in the northwest corner of the country, gazetted in 1996 proposed as a Ramsar site, is also under pressure from the expansion of tourism including the building of more guesthouses. Tourism development along the coast has also changed much of the natural environment. Beach erosion is a major threat to coastal tourism in The Gambia. Information is compiled from various sources, including National Reports, World Tourism Organisation (WTO), and the Regional Tourism Organisation for Southern Africa (RETOSA). 3 (1993 figure) habitat from Cape Point South to Bijilo.. The key institution leading tourism sector in the Gambia is GTA (Gambian Tourism Authority). The Tourism Master Plan developed reviewed recently under the supervision of this authority highlighted among other as key issues for tourism in the country the bumper problem which appears as key priority for the country. The diversification of community based enterprises in tourism (eco tourism) is also a priority as it appears as an income generating activity as well as an effective response to address drift to urban areas. In this regard, the Kartung ecotourism project and the Makasutu culture forest are considered as success stories even though improvements are awaited. They are selected as pilot demonstration project for the country. Even though coordinating mechanisms were identified as weaknesses, GTA is planning to improve its relations with NEA (National Environment Agency) in order to address environmental issues related to tourism development.

Ghana:

In Ghana, tourism is an emergent key source of national income contributing an estimated US\$400 million to the GDP of Ghana. It is currently the 4th largest foreign exchange earner in the country. Its peaceful atmosphere and stable political climate make it a good choice for investors. As far as coastal tourism is concerned, the country is endowed with a wide range of both natural and historical potentialities. Thus, Ghana's coastline extends for about 550km and is generally low lying ($\leq 200\text{m}$ above sea level). The coastal zone of Ghana abounds in rich marine ecosystems coupled with considerable historical monuments. Generally concentrated along the coast are attractive old forts and castles built by Europeans during the period 1482 to 1837. The forts and castles which initially served as trading posts for the trade in gold and ivory were later used as slave dungeons and transit points for slaves who were shipped to the Americas. Currently a number of the forts and castles including Cape Coast and Elmina castles have been designated as UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Ghana's castles attract several thousands of international and domestic tourists annually. It must be noted that all along the coast of Ghana, relatively improved road infrastructure is available. Ghana is one the West African country with high class resort (e.g. La Palm Royal Beach Hotel, Elmina beach resort as well as Busua beach resort). However, poor sanitation and management of human wastes in the coastal settlements could adversely affect patronage of beaches by foreign tourists. In addition, sewage pollution from major cities, like Abidjan in Cote d'Ivoire, has in the past resulted in algal blooms on the western coast of Ghana, which besides creating serious problems for artisanal fishermen also reduces the aesthetic value of the beaches. Plastic bags and other solid waste constitute in several points of the coast a serious concern. This has recently led to a project of collection and recycling of plastic in Central region of Ghana. The historic city of Ada, which is a major tourist attraction, has lost some 150 meters of land (from the Volta estuary to Otrokpe) to the sea as a result of coastal erosion over the past 45 years. Other beaches suffering from erosion are The Keta coast (from Dzelukofe to Blekusu); This led to the Keta land reclamation project. The Labadi beach which is seriously attacked from Osu to Kpeshi lagoon). The mangroves and wetlands in Ghana are threatened and steadily being destroyed as a result of fuel wood gathering, clearance for salt pans by the Salt extraction Industry, urban Pollution and urban encroachment. The destruction of mangroves and wetlands affect biological diversity and eventually pose a threat to coastal eco-tourism particularly bird watching activities. Sand and gravel mining on the beaches although banned continues to be main supply source for construction of houses in the smaller towns and settlements. It is one of the causes of coastal erosion. The exposed pits from the quarries affect the aesthetical attractiveness of these areas. Despite these problems Legal Framework for Coastal Zones and the Tourism Industry is regularly reshaped to offer a good framework to address the above difficulties. But enforcement is yet to be successfully implemented.

A study by Ghana's Ministry of Tourism, UNDP and World Tourism Organisation in 1996 (National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana, 1996-2010) noted that the entire Volta estuary offer good beaches, quiet water areas for marine recreation and a serene environment suitable for picnicking, walking and boating. In 2004 the sector contributed US \$800,000 and created 180,000 jobs with 650,000 international arrivals. The Government of Ghana has a projected an income of about US \$274 million from employment of 307,000 persons in the tourism industry by the year 2010 from tourism. It further expects that net foreign exchange earnings will be US\$1,250 million and total tourism receipts of US \$1,562 million. Contribution of tourism to gross GDP is expected to rise from 3.9% in 2000 to 7.4% in 2010. Trends in the contribution of the tourism sector to the economy of Ghana indicate a steady rise. For example tourist arrivals in Ghana rose from 92,000 in 1986 to 146,000 by 1990. It is further estimated that almost 300,000 arrivals were recorded in 1995. In terms of contributions to GDP, receipts from tourism were 0.45% in 1986 and rose to 3.5% in 1995. It is projected that GDP contribution will reach a gross 7.4% by 2010. Nominal receipts also rose from US\$ 27 million in 1986 to US\$237 million by 1995. Ghana's tourism development plan targets the coastal zone as one of the centres for growth. In view of the above any degradation that could put tourists at risk will result in the non-achievement of the set targets. It's important to point out that in some high class resorts, (Labadi Beach Hotel, La Palm Royal Beach, there is a growing awareness on environmental management systems. Efforts of overcome difficulties related to lack of coordinating mechanisms are being made. The private Tourism sector association is very active in the country.

Kenya:

The coastal economy of Kenya is heavily dependent on maritime and harbour activities, fisheries, commerce and tourism. In Kenya, tourism has been steadily growing both in terms of numbers and revenue generated since independence and it continues to be one of the most important economic sectors in the country. Tourism contributes 12.5% of the GDP to the country, of which, coastal tourism accounts for 60%. Even though safari tourism has been for years the main tourist product for East Africa, coastal region is currently the main tourist destination for both national and international tourists (visitors). Immediately after independence, tourism was the fastest growing sector of the Kenyan economy. Only coffee and tea production brought in more foreign exchange. Income from tourism first exceeded that from coffee in 1989. Between 1990 and 1993, 3.23 million foreign visitors came to Kenya, representing about 5% of the tourist trade in Africa and about 28% of that of Eastern Africa. However, besides the positive gains from tourism, the sector also impacts negatively on the coastal and marine environment. The first hotels in the northern part of Diani were built in the late 1960s/early 1970s, and over time it has grown to become Kenya's most developed beach resort. Beach front property that priced at 1,000s of Kenya shillings an acre 30 years ago are now sold in the range tens of millions. The result has been exclusion of fishing and other local communities from prime land with beachfront access; the northern part of Diani has already lost three traditional fishery landing sites. In the past, intense competition has existed between fishing and tourism and development interests, with the latter succeeding in taking over beach-front land and conversion of many public access routes to private property.

Mass tourism is at the origin of the key issues in coastal areas in the country. In Malindi, resorts are constructed without any serious feasibility study. Cases of encroachment on fishing landing sites and marine parks and privatization of beaches are numerous. Lack of physical planning in the coastal zone has two main consequences: a) the development of resort at the sea front resulting in the acceleration of beach erosion (Mombassa) ; b) occupation of sensitive habitats by local communities with its effects on biodiversity loss. Tourism activities in the coral reefs (Diani – Chale coral reef, Malindi coral reef...) cause direct pressure e.g. boating and reef walking, whereas collection of ornaments including shells and ornamental fish for the tourist market add indirect pressure on the coral ecosystem. Generally, with the exception of protected areas, most coral reef areas along the coast are under pressure from over-exploitation. Land development activities that increase pressure on the issue include urbanization attributed with 30%, agriculture sector 30% and the tourism sector with 25%. Coastal urban centres, including Mombasa, experience poor waste management because of inadequate (as in Mombasa) or non-existent waste disposal facilities and infrastructure, such as sewage treatment and/or sewerage facilities. Regulations are generally framed out but there is a critical problem of enforcement, related to poor institutional governance. This is surprising in a country where private sector seems to be well empowered and organized. Nevertheless, lack of an institutional framework that would facilitate public-private partnerships in undertaking activities that would minimize the negative impacts of tourism remains a serious challenge. On the other hand, there is lack of coordination with neighbouring countries in respect of developing tourist facilities and promoting regional tourism, despite the fact that the country depends on and often share the same ecosystems as its coastal neighbours for tourism. Despite these problems, there is a growing awareness on the issue of responsible tourism. Success stories generally come from the community based ecotourism projects (e.g. Wasini, Watamu, Mida creek). Some key National and Regional institutions however have basic capacities to address these constraints. Thus the NEPAD Coastal and Marine (COSMAR) Sub-theme of the NEPAD Environmental Initiative has been established within the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and is hosted through a Secretariat based in Nairobi. With the support from Global Environmental Facility COSMAR has the responsibility to develop and protect the marine and coastal environment. Another positive aspect is the experience of The Kenya in Eco-rating Scheme which is a voluntary initiative by the Kenya tourism industry designed to further the goals of sustainable tourism by recognizing the efforts aimed at preserving environmental, social and cultural values. The Ecotourism Society of Kenya launched the Scheme in October 2003. Nevertheless, the country is yet to succeed in minimizing the environmental and the socio cultural negative impacts of mass tourism. Tanzania claims their sustainable tourism strategy aims at avoiding the difficulties Kenya is facing to sustain this sector.

Mozambique:

Historically, Mozambique had a thriving tourism industry, mainly in the centre and south of the country, with (the former) Rhodesia and South Africa providing the main markets. In recent years tourism has re-emerged and is now one of the fastest-recovering sectors of the economy, with most tourists coming from South Africa. The tourism potential of Mozambique speaks for itself, with 2700 km of tropical coastline, abundant nature and a rich cultural heritage. Tourism contributed 1.2 per cent to the national GDP of Mozambique (Ministry of Planning and Finance); this is very low, compared to a contribution of 8 percent in South Africa and an average contribution to GDP of 6.9 percent to GDP in sub-Saharan Africa. As a prospective investment sector, tourism is doing well however. Tourism accounted for 16% of total investment applications in Mozambique over the last five years (period 1998 – 2002). This makes tourism, with a total investment of 1,3 billion USD, the third largest sector for investment in the Country, after Industry (33%) and Energy and Natural Resources (18%). Inhambane Province ranks at the third place as the favourite destination for tourism investment applications, after Cabo Delgado and Maputo (data: CPI).

Tourist arrivals increased from 136,000 in 1994 to about 550,000 in 1996, and 400,000 in 2001 and contributed 2% of GDP. The opportunity exists to develop both these historical markets and the markets of the north, as Mozambique has excellent potential for both coastal and wildlife based tourism. In 2000 there were 157 hotel establishments with 2,978 rooms and 5,382 beds. However, the poor development of infrastructure and unsustainable tourism practices poses a major threat. Conflicts over natural resource utilization (i.e. between tourism developments and local communities and protected areas) is also a problem. Coastal tourism is well developed in the southern part of the country, south of Save River. Beautiful sandy beaches and extensive corals characterize this region, and tourism has expanded rapidly after the end of the civil war in 1992. Many areas in the southern Mozambique are now experiencing tourist pressure due, in part, to uncontrolled tourism development. Several sites of natural beauty and important biodiversity resources are particularly threatened, such as Inhaca Island (located in the Maputo Bay) and Matutuine, where there are plans for developing a large tourism industry that could threaten endemism. The Bazaruto Archipelago site that is threatened by the development of tourism, which if not controlled may surpass the carrying capacity. The Marrromeu and Zambezi Delta wetland areas located near the Zambezi delta, is an important breeding site for migratory birds and also supports a variety of (terrestrial) wildlife, is another area of significance to tourism. Corals and mangroves are also under some threat from tourism development, and represent a threat to local communities that often have an important dependency on such resources. In a nutshell the main threats of the tourism sector in Mozambique are the environmental impacts and loss of marine resources through uncontrolled growth of tourism and local fishing techniques, the uncontrolled growth and development of the tourism sector and the weak level of participation of local communities in tourism sector.

Recognizing the opportunities in economic growth through tourism, the Mozambican Government has created a separate Ministry of Tourism in 2000 and approved in April 2003, the National Tourism Policy and Strategy. It's important to note that the responsibility for Conservation Areas was transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Tourism in 2001. This statement in the country TMP shows it's not a mechanistic association: *"Where conserved areas are well managed and tourists enjoy their exposure to them, they form a constituency that supports conservation"*. Mozambique, together with other countries from the region, made a strong commitment in the World Summit in Johannesburg, to boost the protection of its coastal and marine resources. Actions are well advanced in Mozambique for the creation of Ponta de Ouro Coastal/Marine Protected Area to be linked with Saint Lucia Marine Park in South Africa to form a Transboundary Marine Protected Area. This activity is being carried out within the Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative linking Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa. The same is happening in Northern Mozambique where actions are being implemented to create a Marine Protected Area north of Quirimbas Marine National Park, in Cabo-Delgado Province, to be linked with Mnazi Bay Marine Park in Southern Tanzania. In its Strategic Plan for the Development of Tourism (Draft Version, April 2003), the Government has identified 17 Priority Areas for Tourism Development (PATI's) that will be the focus of tourism

planning and resources. Of these zones 8 have been identified as short-term priorities, 3 as medium term priorities and 6 as long-term priorities

Nigeria:

Nigeria is known to have many ecotourism potentials, which unfortunately are yet to be harnessed for generating employment opportunities and foreign exchange. Nigeria's involvement in the preparation of the African Process (Management of the Coastal and Marine Environment in sub-Saharan Africa) already was a sign of the existing political will by the country to endorse positive development activities towards the proper management of coastal areas. Tourism is becoming one of Nigeria's fastest growing industries. Many areas along the coast are exceptionally favourable to coastal tourism. Nigeria has a coastline that is rich in natural resources which stretches for over 700 kilometres and dotted with small coastal settlements which engage primarily in farming, fishing, and trading. The Calabar coast for example is blessed with natural attractions like game reserves, a national park with variety of rare primates, birds' and other fauna. In addition, beautiful coastlines exist in Badagry and Akassa areas.

Less than 4% of GDP comes from tourism and in 2000 only 800,000 tourists visited the country. The total income derived from these arrivals was USD 800,000. This poor level of development is due to the fact that the country has greatly planned its development with a strategy of over dependency on oil and gas. For decades, Nigerian tourism industry used to put more emphasis on inland tourism which focused on cultural and natural areas of significance. Nevertheless there is growing interest in the development of tourism and a suitable framework for tourism development is being prepared. In 1960 Nigeria had 1,129 forest reserve. These reserves serves, which have abundant flora and wildlife such as, drill monkeys. Nigeria has the third largest rainforest in the world, which is located in Cross River State. Today only 40 exist due to deforestation. Game reserves in the northern part of the country are also areas crying for tourism development. However the country still lacks facilities, efficient means to develop many sites for tourism. Various factors have contributed to the positive and negative influence on tourism development in Nigeria. These factors consist of: a. Economic constraints b. Social constraints Tourism development in Nigeria will assist in reducing unemployment and there by alleviate poverty.

The current National Tourism Policy recognizes the appropriate use of Beach Fronts in the country and proposes relevant institutional arrangements for such areas. The strategies and plans for the implementation of the tourism policies as contained in the draft tourism policy (2004) are focused on four main pivot areas. In 1992, the Federal Government promulgated the Decree No. 81 of 1992. This replaced Decree No. 54 of 1976 which established the National Tourist Board (NTB). The new Decree thus scrapped the National Tourist Board and replaced it with the Nigerian Tourism Development Corporation (NTDC).

One of the major threat on coastal tourism in the country is pollution from exploration and exploitation of petroleum resources. Most of these activities take place in the coastal areas. Inadequate treatment and disposal of wastes from the petroleum industry inflict severe damages on the eco-system. The effect on the soil and on economic crops is even more devastating as extensive agricultural lands have become unproductive due to environmental hazards arising from spillage and other oil exploration activities. It's a pity that the Lagos waterfront blessed with a marvellous lagoon stretching linking Lagos to Badagry has not yet found appropriate responses to address the solid and liquid waste issue due to lack of enforcement and poor physical planning strategy. Some local government. (Cross river, Akwa Ibom, Lagos) have proved their commitment to promote and develop sustainable coastal tourism. While Badagry relies on its slave trade relics, Cross river has been able to attract private investor in a unique tourist and trade complex project in sub Saharan Africa (Tinapa). The Akwa Ibom Coastal Tourism Project Area incorporates the major components of tourism (Ecotourism, wildlife and landscape features, Culture, 5 star resort with marina). With the promulgation of various enabling laws at federal and state levels along with the establishment of relevant institutional arrangements, the development of coastal tourism in Nigeria has begun in earnest. The establishment of Niger Delta Development Commission, the preparation of National Tourism Policy, and the National Tourism Master Plan are some of the positive actions taken by the government to ensure effective development of tourism.

Senegal:

The tourism industry in Senegal has grown at an annual rate of around 10% over the past 3 decades and now ranks as the second industry in terms of foreign exchange earnings (78.7 billion CFA francs in 1995), and contributes about 4.6% to GDP. Between 1973 and 2002, the growth rate of the hosting capacities is estimated at 6.5% per annum; the number of beds is multiplied by 6, going from 3340 in 1973 to 8600 and 1729 respectively in 1982 and 2002. The night's stays followed the same tendency, 574 293 to 1 701 703 respectively in 1973 and 2002. The arrivals, with more than 85% non-residents, doubled since 1994 due to the local currency (FCFA) devaluation which gave more competitiveness to Senegal as a destination. The industry accounts for around 75,000 direct jobs, some of which are seasonal. Arrivals reached 369,116 in 1999, and 530,000 in 2000. In 1999 there were 245 hotel establishments and a total of 17,586 beds. Establishments range from four-star hotels (luxury) to villages/camps ("campements villageois"), which is regarded as an innovation in "discovery tourism". Most tourism development has been centered on the coastal zone, while there has been only limited environmental management. The coastal areas constitute more than 90% of the tourist destinations. Balneal tourism being the first product (54.3% of the night's stays in 2000). Almost all the tourism infrastructures are in the coastal zone. The country is endowed with a total coastal line of 700 km among which 300 km of sandy beaches. Tourism is especially well developed along the South Coast and on the coast of Casamance. In the Saloum estuary, a big estuarine complex with a drainage basin of 29 720 km², tourism is one of the main activities, although it is not as developed as along the South Coast. The National Report of Senegal identified an urgent need of improved planning and diversification (ecotourism, discovery, game fishing etc.) of the tourism sector. While attention is being given to the development of tourism, especially in coastal areas, far less attention is being given to the social and environmental impacts. A unique Ministry deals with Tourism and Environment. Senegal has set up a 3 levels SDP: Consultation frameworks, Planning and setting of a legal framework and a Regulatory framework. The Decentralization law (1996) allows the transfer of NRM to local communities. This strategy gives priority to community based protected areas. A 4 years Action Plan involving all the actors (public/private) has been set up. From a General Delegation (1969), Secretariat of State (1980) a whole Ministry was created for Tourism as from 1983. Efforts to increase hosting capacity from 1000 rooms in 20 hotels to 5000 rooms in 115 hotels between 1978 and 1985. The Senegalese Tourism Strategic Plan sets itself the target to accommodate 1.3 million international tourists by 2010. An Environmental Audit of tourism decided by the government revealed the lack of basic drainage infrastructures in most of the tourist sites which were established without a prior Impact Study. Nevertheless, few isolated initiatives of good EM practices were described: (recycling of treated used water by Saly Portudal station). Coastal tourism in Senegal is facing (12-18m between Ngaparou and Mbour). Unplanned land use in tourism attractive areas resulted in anarchistic occupation of the coast. So, the surface occupied by houses tripled from 1978 to 2001. The beaches surface dropped drastically (105 ha in 1978 to 35 ha in 2001) around Saly station. In Casamance and in the Saloum islands, destruction of the mangrove less by the touristic infrastructures than by the populations themselves is a long term threat for the expansion of tourism in the zone. Still some problems are yet to be addressed: the Lack of basic infrastructure (roads, electricity, water and sewage facilities) Overlapping roles and mandates in land policies. Government is making efforts to sustain the sector. Thus, SAPCO is a parastatal in charge of the promotion and the development of coastal areas in Senegal. They have already planned the Saly station in la Petite Côte. Nowadays the errors of planning as well as the negative social impacts identified in the Saly station are taken into account in the process of conceiving new tourist development areas (Mbodienne). Capacity building in GIS, physical planning and EIA exist in the country, the CSE (Center of Environmental Monitoring) has been participating in elaborating ecological maps and carrying on sensitive zones surveys in Senegal as well as in some neighbouring countries (Gambia). Interesting examples of community based ecotourism can be visited in Ngasobil and in Saloum Islands. Important potentialities are available also in a great variety of Birds Reserves, (Djoudj, Kalissaye), National Parks and Reserves (Low Casamance, Langue de la Barbarie, Madeleine Islands...), archaeological sites (Saloum Islands). But, there is no structured exploitation of these sites yet (no reliable hosting infrastructures, no policy of promotion, lack of training, poor local sensitization).. If the issues of physical planning and waste management are properly addressed, therefore the country can achieve its goal of strengthening tourism sector while preserving the ecosystems.

Seychelles:

Seychelles tourism industry started to take off in the early 1970's, following the opening of an international airport in 1971. Since then tourist arrivals grew to around 50,000 per year in the early 1980s, to a peak of 130,955 in 1996. While arrivals declined slightly between 1996 and 1999, they recovered to 130,046 in 2000 and 132,246 in 2002. Tourism is the most important pillar of the Seychelles economy through direct and indirect contributions to the domestic economy (GDP), and through inflows of foreign currency, including tourism receipts and foreign direct investment. Receipts from tourism have increased steadily from SR 353 million in 1986, reaching about SR750 million in 1999. In 1999 tourism was calculated to contribute about 29% of total export or foreign exchange earnings of the country, approximately 5,000 direct jobs or about 17% of total employment and about 20% of the Gross Domestic Product. Being constituted of a number of islands, the Seychelles can be considered as coastal zones in their entirety. Given the fact that the hinterland of the main island is constituted with heterogeneous relief characterised by steep slopes, thus roughly 90% of human settlement and infrastructure are located on the coastal areas of the country. The above situation explains why Seychelles is exclusively a coastal tourism destination, characterised by a sun sand and sea label. In other words the contribution of tourist sector of 18.5% to the country GDP must be attributed to coastal tourism. The growth in the tourism industry has largely been the foundation for the remarkable advances in national socio-economic development achieved by Seychelles. In order to sustain previous levels of socio-economic development, and also to meet the rising expectations of the population, Government has found it necessary to promote the further growth of the tourism industry. This will inevitably result in increased pressures of coastal and marine ecosystems, despite Government's policy to promote sustainable tourism development, as is highlighted in the soon to be published document *"Vision 21: for Tourism Development 2001-2010"* which starts with the following statement: *"Tourism in Seychelles shall continue to be developed to the highest standards for the optimum social and economic benefits of the Seychelles people while maintaining a commitment to the protection and conservation of the natural environment and biodiversity"* In particular, the targeted growth in tourist arrivals from 130,046 in 2000 to around 190,000 by the year 2010 will place a huge strain on the carrying capacity of coastal areas that are considered as prime sites for tourism development, particularly on the main islands of Mahe, Praslin and La Digue, as well as on natural resources such as water. A major threat of such growth in the tourism industry, which was identified in the National Report, is related to the modification and loss of sensitive marine and coastal habitats as a result of continued beachfront development. There are 11 new hotel projects planned over the next 4 years which will add 2000 beds. Given the fact that Seychelles is a mountainous granitic island, the narrow coastline concentrates almost all the economic activities including tourism. This narrow constructive zone is subject to floods with consequences on high level of water table and related consequences on septic tanks which are likely to contaminate fresh water. The main ecotourism sites of the country are Vallee de Mai, Aride Island, the Botanical Gardens, Cousin Island, The Morne Seychellois National Park. An Ecotourism strategy has been drafted in September 2003. Some of the key issues addressed by the ecotourism strategy are : Eco-tourism activities related to the natural environment, Marine related activities, Community based tourism, Cultural heritage, Handicrafts, Public beach parks. The involvement of local communities is recognized as a major objective of this policy. The first EMPS provided the government with a valuable instrument to plan and manage the Seychelles' environment. In terms of project management the EMPS has been very successful and about 90% of the projects have been implemented or are under implementation. A coordination unit has been set up to ensure that the new EMPS is integrated across sectors and that the broader principles of the EMPS are incorporated in all programmes

Following the example of Kenya, Seychelles has recently started to elaborate a voluntary scheme for hotels. Green Globe is now trying to set up a more inclusive approach for sustainability certification of hotels. It seems there is an institutional awareness on the importance of certification scheme as it could increase the exclusivity of Seychelles as tourism destination. So, VISION 21 has requested the introduction of Eco-label and Eco-certification schemes in the hotel industry. One of the main goals of this procedure is to convince existing establishment to adopt sustainable management practices. A

survey of the existing certification initiatives in the accommodation sector has been recently initiated with the collaboration of one University in Switzerland.

Tanzania:

In Tanzania, tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of the economy. The sector has shown a positive growth and contributes significantly in economic development and the reduction of poverty. The coastline is over 1,424 km long, and includes the islands of Zanzibar, Pemba and Mafia, which offer a wide array of natural, cultural, historical and archaeological attractions. During the first three decades following independence, tourism was given a very low profile, but the industry has been much more actively promoted since the promulgation of the National Tourism Policy in 1991. This explains the growth in visitor arrivals, from 153,00 in 1990 to 564,000 in 1999, before decreasing to 459,000 in 2000 and increasing again to 576,198 in 2003. The industry accounted for around 16% of the GDP in 2001/ 2002 with earnings of US\$ 730 million in 2003. For years Tanzania used to rely mostly on wildlife tourism, now with increasing demand on cultural and coastal tourism, this good coastal zone potential is likely to be exploited intensively. This coastal zone offers diversified but rich ecosystems that can serve as potential tourism attractions: Natural sand beaches found at various places along the coast (Bagamoyo, Mafia) ;The great variety of flora and fauna of the coastal zone; An extensive coral reef; Marine parks; Forest reserves and National parks (Saadani);

While it is generally felt that so far there have been only limited impacts from tourism on the coast, the recent construction of large coastal resort hotels coupled with urbanization has resulted in greater pressure on resources such as safe drinking water and clean bathing beaches. Garbage is accumulating on beaches because of inadequate waste disposal systems. Ocean disposal of sewage from hotels threatens to undermine the very resources tourists have come to enjoy, and has also resulted in contamination of seafood. This situation is really critical in Dar Es Salaam where tourism is rather a victim of pollution from the municipality. Thus, a resort project cannot step to implementation due to severe environmental problems related to liquid and solid waste from the city. In Dar Es Salaam, for instance, sewers serve only 20% of the area and, of this, 80% is discharged untreated into coastal waters. The rapid growth of coastal tourism in Tanzania has put a tremendous pressure on existing services and amenities. Poor land use planning has created the above existing problems especially in Dar es Salaam and Bagamoyo. In Coastal Tourism, the Minister in charge of Environment is responsible for approving/disapproving environmental impact statements on projects that might have impact on coastal environment. (New Environmental Management Act, 2004). The Tourism Division is responsible for the formulation, the enhancement and regulatory of the policy of this sector . The TMP was validated by the Government in 1996 and revised in 2002. The TMP identifies the coastal zone as one of the priority areas for tourism development. It provides a roadmap for future tourism development in Tanzania. The plan focuses on the following areas: Expanding the tourism product; maximizing linkages and minimizing leakages, provision of training; and regulate environment surrounding tourism development.

However, lack of shared vision on how coastal tourism poses an obstacle to the coordination and the implementation of these policies. Recently, the government in collaboration with donor agencies through Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership (TCMP) has assessed the current status of Coastal Tourism in Tanzania and has identified priority actions needed to develop sustainable coastal tourism. They are now looking forward to prepare the implementation of some of the proposed actions. TCMP targets coastal governance and sustainable development of coastal area. Among other activities, it's in charge of the preparation of Integrated Coastal Management Strategy (livelihoods of coastal communities, environmental planning of key economic opportunities including tourism, management of coastal habitats, and building institutions and human capacity for effective coastal management). Currently, the MPRU (Marine Park and Reserve Unit) is assisting the local residents living in or within the vicinity of Marine Park or close to Marine Reserves to play a big role in sustainable coastal tourism as well as conserving the fragile marine and coastal ecosystems. The Mangrove Management Project, financed jointly by the Forestry Division (MNRT) and NORAD among other projects along the coast is in charge of one the numerous forest reserves. This Project is assessing the possibility of developing eco-tourism facilities in selected Mangrove Reserves. Nevertheless the level of participation by local communities in Ecotourism development is still low. Specific policies and plans

for eco-tourism development in coastal areas are yet to be formulated. With the anticipated further growth of coastal tourism, it is important that the future development of coastal tourism infrastructure is well-planned and regulated. This project will contribute towards addressing the most critical issues, and in particular the need for environmental impact assessments prior to development; controlling and limiting development in certain sensitive areas, and the establishment of setbacks and buffer zones.

ANNEX G

LIST OF SCTSSA-RELATED GEF SUPPORTED OR FUNDED INITIATIVES IN AFRICA

Country / Area	Project Name	Focal Area	Agency	Project Type	GEF Grant (US\$M)	Project Stage
Cameroon	National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management	MFA	UNEP	Enabling Activity	0.2	CEO Approved
Gambia	Integrated Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management	BD	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.985	CEO Approved
Ghana	Biodiversity Conservation of Lake Bosumtwé Basin	BD	UNDP	Medium Size Project	0.52	CEO Approved
Ghana	Coastal Wetlands Management	BD	IBRD	Full Size Project	7.2	Project Closure
Kenya	Assessment of Capacity Building to Conserve Biological Diversity Participation in the National Clearing House Mechanism and Preparation of a Second National Report to the CBD (Add On)	BD	UNEP	Enabling Activity	0.244	CEO Approved
Kenya	Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan and First National Report to the CBD	BD	IBRD	Enabling Activity	0.157	CEO Approved
Mozambique	Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project	BD	IBRD	Full Size Project	4.08	CEO Endorsed
Senegal	Integrated Marine and Coastal Resource Management	BD	IBRD	Full Size Project	5.343	CEO Endorsed
Seychelles	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities	BD	UNDP	Full Size Project	5.0	Under Submission
Seychelles	Biodiversity Conservation and Marine Pollution Abatement	BD	IBRD	Full Size Project	1.8	Project Closure
Seychelles	Improving Management of NGO and Privately Owned Nature Reserves and High Biodiversity Islands in Seychelles	BD	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.839	CEO Approved
Seychelles	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Seychelles	BD	UNDP	Full Size Project	5.3	PDF B
Seychelles	Management of Avian Ecosystems	BD	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.74	Project Completion
Seychelles	Marine Ecosystem Management Project	BD	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.747	CEO Approved
Tanzania	Development of Mnazi Bay Marine Park	BD	UNDP	Full Size Project	1.615	CEO Endorsed
Tanzania	Marine and Coastal Environment Management Project (MACEMP)	BD	IBRD	Full Size Project	10.33	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Addressing Land-based	IW	UNEP	Full Size	4.511	CEO

Country Area /	Project Name	Focal Area	Agency	Project Type	GEF Grant (US\$M)	Project Stage
	Activities in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-LaB)			Project		Endorsed
Regional	Addressing Transboundary Concerns in the Volta River Basin and its Downstream Coastal Area	IW	UNEP	Full Size Project	5.845	Council Approved
Regional	Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management	IW	UNEP/ UNDP	Full Size Project	12	Pipeline
Regional	Climate, Water and Agriculture: Impacts on and Adaptation of Agro-Ecological Systems in Africa	MFA	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.7	CEO Approved
Regional	Combating Living Resource Depletion and Coastal Area Degradation in the Guinea Current LME through Ecosystem-based Regional Actions	IW	UNDP/ UNEP	Full Size Project	21.449	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Coral Reef Monitoring Network in Member States of the Indian Ocean Commission (COI), within the Global Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN)	BD	IBRD	Medium Size Project	0.737	CEO Approved
Regional	Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa	IW	UNEP	Medium Size Project	0.75	CEO Approved
Regional	Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Sites of Wetlands Required by Migratory Waterbirds on the African/Eurasian Flyways.	BD	UNEP	Full Size Project	6.35	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Groundwater and Drought Management in SADC	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	7.35	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project, Tranche 1	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	17.15	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Nile Transboundary Environmental Action Project, Tranche 2	IW	UNDP	Full Size Project	10	Pipeline
Regional	Partnership Interventions for the Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for Lake Tanganyika	IW	UNDP	Full Size Project	14.2	Council Approved
Regional	Pollution Control and Other Measures to Protect Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika	IW	UNDP	Full Size Project	10	Project Completion
Regional	Reversal of Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Lake Chad Basin Ecosystem	IW	UNDP	Full Size Project	10.294	CEO Endorsed

Country / Area	Project Name	Focal Area	Agency	Project Type	GEF Grant (US\$M)	Project Stage
Regional	Reversing Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Niger River Basin	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	13.375	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Senegal River Basin Water and Environmental Management Program	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	7.625	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Western Indian Ocean Islands Oil Spill Contingency Planning	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	3.164	CEO Endorsed
Regional	Western Indian Ocean Marine Highway Development and Coastal and Marine Contamination Prevention Project	IW	IBRD	Full Size Project	11.7	Council Approved
Global	Coastal Resilience to Climate Change: Developing a Generalizable Method for Assessing Vulnerability and Adaptation of Mangroves and Associated Ecosystems	BD	UNEP	Medium Size Project	1	CEO Approved
Global	Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Species that Threaten Biological Diversity	BD	UNEP	Medium Size Project	0.75	CEO Approved
Global	Reduction of Environmental Impact from Tropical Shrimp Trawling through Introduction of By-catch Technologies and Change of Management	IW	UNEP	Full Size Project	4.78	CEO Endorsed
Global	Removal of Barriers to the Introduction of Cleaner Artisanal Gold Mining and Extraction Technologies	IW	UNDP	Full Size Project	7.125	CEO Endorsed

ANNEX H

ENDORSEMENT LETTES FROM NFPs AND CO-FINANCING LETTERS

Provided in separate files

ANNEX I

PROJECT CONFORMITY WITH OP10 REQUIREMENTS

OPERATIONAL PROGRAM 10 REQUIREMENTS	PROJECT CONFORMITY WITH OPERATIONAL PROGRAM
Overcoming barriers to the adoption of best practices that limit contamination of the International Waters Environment, with particular reference to waste management strategies and pollution prevention	Best practices related to waste management and pollution prevention and that are typical and specific to the regional tourism situation and its impacts will be captured through all of the demonstrations. Those addressing EMS will, by nature, directly address waste management and discharges; Ecotourism planning and management will also be required to confront these concerns; while reef recreation and management will be providing inventories of those areas most sensitive to assist in zoning and planning related to waste management and pollution.
Use of new technology to assess and reduce contaminant loading of International Waters	The EMS and Ecotourism demonstrations linked to coastal tourism businesses will be specifically exploring appropriate and innovative technologies for contaminant reduction and treatment at the localised level with particular focus on protecting sensitive areas and areas of high biodiversity.
Involving the private sector in utilizing technological advances for resolving transboundary priority concerns	Private sector involvement is a key objective within the overall project and is clearly targeted through the demonstration activities. The EMS demonstration projects will achieve their primary aim by engaging the private sector into the EMS process, and strengthen public-private partnerships in minimising negative impacts from tourism on marine and coastal areas, and especially on sensitive and vulnerable protected areas
Leverage of substantial private sector resources (through demonstration projects) to remove the barriers to adoption of measures to prevent pollution	The private sector will be encouraged to adopt Environmental Management Systems through demonstration projects, which will contribute towards reducing the contamination. The project will explore the introduction of investment incentives and awards schemes to raise awareness, encourage and promote environmentally responsible tourism operators. An annual national award scheme will be initiated to recognise environmental efforts by the tourism industry, and to build industry champions for different types of tourism enterprises (e.g. hoteliers, dive operators, guides) and document lessons. In the first year the award scheme will reward existing best practice, the criteria will be developed in subsequent years to reward good management practices. The project will also explore

	mechanisms to encourage joint ventures and partnership arrangements for assisting in community based ecotourism projects.
Demonstrating strategies for addressing land-based activities (under the Global Programme of Action for Land-based Sources of Pollution) that degrade marine waters	The various demonstration projects will investigate appropriate innovative, cost effective solutions for addressing such priority key issues as waste treatment (through appropriate effluent treatment systems) to control coastal degradation and erosion leading to raised suspended sediments levels (through zoning and planning) , etc .
Demonstrating the use of innovative policies or economic instruments	The EMS demonstration projects, will explore the introduction of investment incentives and awards schemes to raise awareness, encourage and promote environmentally responsible tourism operators. The Ecotourism demonstrations will explore several novel economic instruments including: 1. Joint venture opportunities to develop sustainable tourism enterprises that directly benefit the local community and have minimal impact on the environment by creating ecotourism concessions on community land will be opened to international tender. The tendering process will ensure that investors incorporate proposals for (a) local community equity, (b) local employment, training and procurement; (c) sensitive environmental management and EIAs; (d) conservation management of local reserves / MPAs. 2. How to strengthen the national environmental planning for the tourism industry by implementing Strategic Environmental Assessment of coastal tourism into the existing coastal planning and management programmes and structures. 3. Maximisation of tourism benefits, and identification of the economic and environmental linkages between the tourism sector and environmental costs/benefits within the coastal zone and demonstrate how tourism sectors' capacity to contribute to CZM and cleanup activities that could be replicated elsewhere in the region.
Demonstrating the removal of barriers related to a lack of information or lack of training, while addressing legal, regulatory or sectoral reforms for the reduction environmental stress	A region-wide needs assessments will identify the capacity and training requirements of the different stakeholder groups involved in the tourism sector (Government, NGOs, CBOs, Private sector) at the national level, within each participating country. Training material on planning and management of sustainable tourism and on the specific tools and techniques required for the implementation of demonstration projects (e.g. EIA, SIA, SEA and EMS) will be developed using technical experts from within the region and elsewhere.

	<p>Workplans will be developed for 1. A regional 'training of trainers' programme, to expand the pool of trained personnel able to provide training at the national level, and 2. A series of national training programmes targeted at different stakeholder groups (where necessary). Towards the end of the project the possibility of starting specific training programmes in local institutions on subjects such as EMS will be explored to ensure a continued supply of well qualified personnel.</p>
Replication of demonstrations and approaches can be utilised by Implementing Agencies over time for removal of barriers to the adoption of pollution prevention measures	<p>The lessons and best practice examples from national demonstration projects on EMS, Ecotourism and Reef Recreation will be captured and stored on the Regional Environmental Information System. The EIMS will be a searchable database with information on coastal tourism initiatives and other marine and coastal programmes within the region with relevance to marine and coastal conservation management. The EIMS will be developed specifically for the project but will serve as a major resource for use by Implementing Agencies beyond the end of the project. Regional guidelines and training modules developed during the project on key strategic tools for use in planning and management of tourism activities will also be made available.</p>
Delivering outputs such as the development of computer simulation models, use of remotes sensing technology and information systems, especially for marine areas, to assist countries to sort through complex decisions for dealing with root causes of transboundary environmental degradation	<p>A regional Environmental Information Management System (EIMS) will be developed during the project. The EIMS will be a geospatial database capable of storing different types of information on sustainable tourism related initiatives within the region. The EIMS will have the capability of storing a numerical and text information, as well as remotely sensed raster and vector data types. As the information will be geographically referenced it will be possible to search and query the database spatially as well as by using 'keyword' style searches. The EIMS will be developed and housed within the Regional Project Coordination Offices. The structure and design of the database will be tailored to fit the needs of the project and to ensure utility beyond the duration of the project. The design will initially be based upon information capture from a compilation and review of existing tourism initiatives within the regional, facilitated by the National Project Coordination Offices. Once the structure has been developed and it will be made accessible online. National Project Coordination Offices will be provided with the necessary resources (trained personnel, hardware and software) to be able to access the information and input</p>

	<p>information from the demonstration projects as other activities get underway. The volume of information available EIMS will therefore continue to grow throughout the duration of the project and it will serve as an essential resource to aid decision making at the national level as well as regionally.</p>
--	---

ANNEX J

PRIVATE SECTOR AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN PROJECT

Following is a list of Private Sector Stakeholders, CBOs, CSO, NGOs and IGOs that have been consulted and agreed to participate in Project. There are a number of supportive letters to this effect:

Cameroon

NGOs:

- The Ebodjé community
- The Grand Batanga beach cook initiative
- WWF
- CAEC
- Kribi Urban Council, Kribi Rural Council,
- EBOTOUR, BEACH COOK, GICPATHBEL

Private Sector: Industrial Companies and Developmental Agencies: MEAO, MIDEPECAM, HEVECAM SOCAPALM, COTCO SNV, IUCN, WWF, GTZ, COOPI , CERECOMA, CED SNH, OMT-STEP, Chamber of Commerce and Industries,

The Gambia

Community Based Ecotourism initiatives to be supported:

- The Tumani Tenda CBE Project one of the first CBE, promoting the village and surrounds, specifically their culture, handicrafts, cuisine and history.
- The Sanyan Community Forest is searching for partners to assist them.
- Oyster Creek tourist-boat owners operate mangrove and fishing tours and need coordination.
- The Kartong Community Ecotourism Site has basic accommodation and restaurant facilities. A joint venture is being formed between the community and the private sector enterprise, Gamespirit.

Private Sector: Gamespirit

Ghana

Private Sector: Ghana Hotels Association (Letter of support below)

Bilateral Donors: Netherlands Development Organization (SNV)

NGOs:

- Ghana Wildlife Society
- Resources and Environment Development Organization
- Ricerca e Cooperazione (RC) International NGO
- Nature Conservation Research Centre
- Earth Service-

Kenya

•Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)

•Tourism industry umbrella organisations (Kenya Tourism Federation, Kenya Tourism Board, Kenya Association of Tour Operators, Kenya Association of Tour Guides)

Private Sector Hoteliers and their associations (Kenya Association of Hotel Keepers and Caterers, Mombasa Coast and Tourism Association)

NGOs:

- Ecotourism Society of Kenya
- Local boat operators and curio seller associations
- Tour operators and their associations (Kenya Association of Tour Operators)
- Beach Management Units (Fishermen)
- Local residents associations and NGOs
- Education and research institutions dealing with tourism issues

Mozambique

Private sector: Diving operators, hotels, activities through the representative associations (e.g. Reserva do Pomene S.A.R.L.)

Local community based organizations, including the Comité de co-gestão de Tofo, Tofinao, Barra e Rocha (CTBR), Hagitlrela (in Pomene) and fishing associations.

- Centro do Desenvolvimento Sustentável (CDS) –experience in macrozoning
- Inhambane Provincial Tourism Association
- MICOA and MITUR (national Ministries of Environment and Tourism)
- Mozambique National Cleaner Production Centre (MNCPC) - a UNIDO-UNEP initiative which provides give awareness raising seminars, trainings as well as undergo Cleaner Production audits.

Nigeria**Private Sector:**

- Federation of Tourism Associations of Nigeria
- The Lagos State Waterfront and Tourism Development Corporation
- Nigeria Hotels Association
- National Association of Tourist Boat operators and water transport
- Shell Petroleum Developing Company (SPDC),
- Conoil Producing Limited
- ExxonMobil Producing Nigeria

Senegal

SAPCO (Société d'Aménagement et de Promotion des Côtes et Zones Touristiques du Sénégal) which has the mandate for management and development of the entire tourism component of Petite Cote.

Annex K

Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1.1. Project Inception Phase

A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts and National Focal Points, any co-financing partners, and representation from the UNIDO, WTO and UNEP-DGEF as appropriate.

A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goals and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the project's logframe matrix. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise finalize the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. Individual work-plans will be prepared by the country for the demonstration projects as listed in Appendix A. The Inception Workshop will also review these individual work-plans which will be formally adopted by the Steering Committee.

Additionally, the purpose and objective of the Inception Workshop will be to: (i) introduce project staff to the UNEP-DGEF and UNIDO *team* which will support the project during its implementation and to the Regional Coordinating Unit staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNEP, UNIDO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNEP/UNIDO reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR), Tripartite Review Meetings, as well as mid-term and final evaluations. Equally, the Inception Workshop will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNEP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing.

The Inception Workshop will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed again, as needed, in order to clarify for all, each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase.

This Project will have an extended Inception Phase reflecting the need to capture effective baseline data for M&E, particularly relating to the IW indicators (Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status). Table K1 provides an indicative monitoring and evaluation work plan and Tables K2 to K5 provide a list of appropriate indicators for both the main project components and for the more specific demonstration themes. Baseline data will be collected during the first 6 months of the Project and will be used as a benchmark against which to compare and verify improvements in the reduction of impacts using the same parameters as the baseline.

1.2. Monitoring Responsibilities and Events

The Inception Workshop will present a Schedule of M&E-related meetings and reports. This will have been developed by UNEP and UNIDO in consultation with the Project Coordinator.

Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Tripartite Reviews, Steering Committee Meetings, (or relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms) and (ii) project related Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

Day to day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator based on the Project's Annual Work Plan and its indicators. The Project Team will inform

UNEP/UNIDO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion.

The Project Coordinator will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the Project in consultation with the full Project team at the Inception Workshop with support from UNEP and UNIDO. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this Workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the Annual Work Plan. The local implementing agencies will also take part in the Inception Workshop in which a common vision of overall project goals will be established. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the Project Team, and agreed with the Executing and Implementing Agencies.

Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by both UNEP and UNIDO through the provision of half-yearly reports submitted by UNIDO to UNEP. Furthermore, specific meetings can be scheduled between the Project Team, the UNEP, UNIDO and other pertinent stakeholders as deemed appropriate and relevant (e.g. Steering Committee members, Focal Points, Co-funding partners, etc). Such meetings will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the Project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. A Mission Report will be prepared by the Project Team in coordination with UNEP and UNIDO, and circulated (no less than one month after the Mission) to the Project Team, all SC members, the EA and IA and any accompanying stakeholders.

Annual Monitoring will occur through the **Tripartite Review (TPR)**. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The Project will be subject to Tripartite Review (TPR) at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months following the Inception Workshop. The project proponent will prepare an Annual Project Report (APR) and submit it to UNEP and UNIDO at least two weeks prior to the TPR for review and comments.

The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPR meeting. The Project Coordinator and Team will present the APR to the TPR, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TPR participants. The Project Coordinator and Team also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary.

Terminal Tripartite Review (TTR)

The terminal tripartite review is held in the last month of project operations. The Project Coordinator is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report to be submitted by UNIDO to UNEP as per UNEP's regulation. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the TTR in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TTR. The terminal tripartite review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation of formulation. The TTR should refer to the Independent Terminal Evaluation report, conclusions and recommendations as appropriate.

The TPR has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met as per delivery rates, and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

1.3. Project Monitoring Reporting

The Project Coordinator in conjunction with the Project extended team (PCU staff, UNEP and UNIDO Task Managers) will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. Items (a) through (e) are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while (f) through (g) have a broader function and the frequency and nature is project specific to be defined throughout implementation.

(a) Inception Report (IR)

A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the Project. This Work Plan will include the proposed dates for any visits and/or support missions from UNEP, UNIDO or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the Project's decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months time-frame.

The Inception Report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may effect project implementation, including and unforeseen or newly arisen constraints.

When finalized, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the IR, both UNEP and UNIDO will review the document.

(b) Half-yearly Progress Report (HPR), Annual Project Report (APR) and Project Implementation Review (PIR)

The HPR is a self-assessment report by project management to the UNEP Office and provides them with input to the reporting process as well as forming a key input to the Tripartite Project Review. The PIR is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF, to be conducted by the UNEP Task Manager in consultation with UNIDO. It has become an essential monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. In addition, UNEP Task Manager, based on the knowledge of the project progress, will submit to UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit a annual project report, which is a UNEP self-evaluation tool.

An APR/PIR is prepared on an annual basis following the first 12 months of project implementation and prior to the Tripartite Project Review. The purpose of the APR/PIR is to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's Annual Work Plan and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The APR/PIR is discussed in the TPR so that the resultant report represents a document that has been agreed upon by all of the primary stakeholders.

The items in the APR/PIR to be provided by UNEP GEF includes the following:

- An analysis of project performance over the reporting period, including outputs produced and, where possible, information on the status of the outcome
- The constraints experienced in the progress towards results and the reasons for these
- The three (at most) major constraints to achievement of results
- Annual Work Plans and related expenditure reports
- Lessons learned
- Clear recommendations for future orientation in addressing key problems in lack of progress

UNEP analyses the individual APR/PIRs by focal area, theme and region for common issues/results and lessons. The Reports are also valuable for the Independent Evaluators who can utilise them to identify any changes in project structure, indicators, workplan, etc. and view a past history of delivery and assessment.

(d) Periodic Thematic Reports

As and when called for by UNEP or UNIDO, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNEP/UNIDO and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNEP and UNIDO are requested to minimize their requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

(e) Project Terminal Report

During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the Project's activities.

(f) Technical Reports (project specific- optional)

Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

(g) Project Publications (project specific- optional)

Project Publications will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the Project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the Project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also, in consultation with UNEP, UNIDO, the government and other relevant stakeholder groups, plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Any publications need prior clearance from UNEP and UNIDO. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

2. INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:-

(i) Mid-term Evaluation

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken at the end of the second year of implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring

decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit.

(ii) Final Evaluation

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal tripartite review meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by UNEP-Evaluation and Oversight Unit in line with the GEF evaluation requirements.

Audit Clause

UNIDO will provide UNEP with quarterly financial reports as well as certified annual financial statements with an audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNEP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures to be set out in the project document. The Audit will be conducted by the legally recognized auditor, or by a commercial auditor.

3. LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition:

- ◆ The project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNEP/GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNEP/GEF shall establish a number of networks, such as Integrated Ecosystem Management, eco-tourism, co-management, etc, that will largely function on the basis of an electronic platform.
- ◆ The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned.

The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identify and analysing lessons learned is an on- going process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every 12 months. UNEP shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting and reporting on lessons learned. To this end a percentage of project resources will need to be allocated for these activities.

TABLE K-1: INDICATIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PLAN AND CORRESPONDING BUDGET

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$	Time frame
		<i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNEP UNIDO 	\$40,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNEP UNIDO 	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Initial Baseline and Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost \$175,000	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project GEF Technical Advisor and Project Coordinator Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost \$25,000	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNEP UNIDO 	None	Annually
TPR and TPR report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government Counterparts UNEP UNIDO Project Team 	None	Every year, upon receipt of APR
Steering Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNEP UNIDO 	None	Following Project IW and subsequently at least once a year
Periodic status reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team 	5,000	To be determined by Project team, UNEP and UNIDO
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team Hired consultants as needed 	15,000	To be determined by Project Team, UNEP and UNIDO
Mid-term External Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team UNEP UNIDO External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	30,000 (includes rates, DSA and flights)	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team, UNEP UNIDO External Consultants (i.e. 	40,000 (includes rates, DSA and flights)	At the end of project implementation

	evaluation team)		
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team ▪ UNEP ▪ UNIDO ▪ External Consultant 	None	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team ▪ UNEP ▪ UNIDO 	15,000 (average 3,000 per year)	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNEP ▪ Project team 	5,000 (average \$1000 per year)	Yearly
Visits to field sites (UNEP staff travel costs to be charged to IA fees)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNEP ▪ UNIDO ▪ Government representatives 	15,000 (average one visit per year)	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNEP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$365,000	

INTERNATIONAL WATERS INDICATORS

The following tables (Table K2 to Table K5) list the principal indicators showing improvements in Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status relative to Project activities and deliverables. Process and Stress Reduction tables capture the primary indicators from the LogFrames (Main Project and Demonstrations). The Environmental Status table defines indicators for which baseline data MUST be collected within the first 6 months of the Project before national monitoring/sampling programmes can effectively begin. The Project will arrange for each country to collect such baseline data during its initial 6 month Inception Phase.

These tables and their indicators will be reviewed at the Inception stage and endorsed by each country following any agreed additions or amendments. Following endorsement, the PCU will develop a national monitoring template for Impact Measurement which directly relates to the requirements for IW indicator monitoring and this will be adopted and implemented within the first 6 months so as to allow monitoring to proceed at the national level during or immediately after the Inception Phase. This will provide measured and verified data for the overall M&E plan which will A. confirm Project delivery and B. confirm successful achievement of IW Indicator targets in Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status.

TABLE K-2: REGIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS

REGIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Establishment of regional multi-stakeholder steering committee to engage key stakeholders that may be involved resolving transboundary priority concerns	Comprehensive and representative stakeholder Steering Committee established for region	Within first 6 months	PCU and Steering Committee Reports	Regional
Documentation of Best Available Practices and Technologies (BATs and BAPs) to remove barriers to best practice strategies to limit contamination of the International Waters Environment, with particular reference to waste management strategies and pollution prevention.	Annual Technical Reports and Guidelines on BATs and BAPs addressing general national issues and specific technical solutions available on website and through IW:LEARN	Inception through to Year 4 (on-going compilation of BATs and BAPs)	Annual Reports on BATs and BAPs distributed by RICH to National Project Coordinators and EIMAS	Regional Information Coordination House. IW:LEARN. National Focal Points
Documentation of the incentives and benefits of tri-sector Partnerships for sustainable tourism for all stakeholders (civil, private and public sector)	A Benefits-Analysis Report on Partnership Incentives (including details of potential and agreed national partnerships) finalised for each country and synthesised for entire Project. Report presented and discussed at National Partnership Meetings	Within first 6 months	Partnership Incentives and Benefit Analysis Report at PCU. Minutes from National Partnership Meetings	All Participating Countries
Models for sustainable tourism strategies for addressing land-based activities (under the Global Programme of Action for Land-based Sources of Pollution) that degrade marine waters, developed based on all BATs and BAPs from the global case study reviews and the demonstration lessons.	A selection of models addressing various national needs and more specific guidelines for targeted priority issues distributed to each country and available on website and through IW:LEARN	Year 4	Guidelines from RICH. Draft National Sustainable Tourism Strategies. IW:LEARN	All Participating Countries

REGIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Establishment of Regional Information Coordination & Clearing House (RICH) improving the availability, access and sharing of lessons and BAPS/BATS pertinent to sustainable tourism within the region, and through other projects (e.g. GCLME, WIO-Lab) further afield through IW:LEARN etc	Full regional EIMAS established within a Regional Information Coordination House and hosted within the NEPAD Coastal and Marine Secretariat (COSMAR) in Nairobi with linkages to the Regional Centre on Integrated Coastal Management in Calabar. The regional EIMAS will be linked to National EIMAS nodes will be established within each participating country	First 6 months	PCU reports. Physical presence of RICH. Website and IW:LEARN	RICH - Nairobi. National EIMAS centres as nodes - all countries
Replication of demonstrations and approaches can be utilised by other countries and Implementing Agencies over time for removal of barriers to the adoption of pollution prevention measures	Model guidelines for sustainable tourism approaches that mitigate LBS impacts and contaminants (along with more specific technical guidelines) being distributed by IW:LEARN. Feedback of use through IW:LEARN and Project website. Direct reference to use in GEF (and other donor) project submissions and evaluations	From Year 1 onward	Reference to Project and BAT/BAP reports in other replicatory Projects. Feedback to website and evidence of replication documented through IW:LEARN	Participating countries and other countries beyond Project system boundary.

REGIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Sustainability of Project Objectives (and therefore sustainability of environment and ecosystems alongside economic development and maintenance of livelihoods) captured through Project outputs and deliverables	Project evaluated as having achieved a level of sustainability (endorsed by national and international stakeholders and involved parties) that can be maintained beyond project lifetime. Post-Project evaluation after 2years and 5 years re-confirms sustainability within minimum of 6 participating countries.	Year 5	Terminal Evaluation and Post-Project Evaluation	All Participating Countries
Raised awareness of sustainable tourism issues (threats, impacts, mitigations, BATs/BAPS, etc) across all sectors.	Positive feedback from majority of stakeholders at MTE. Confirmation by Evaluators in particular of raised sensitivity and support at policy level. High level of access to website and requests for information through IW:LEARN	Year 3	MTE (and re-confirmed through Terminal Evaluation). National Policy level stakeholders. IW:LEARN	All Participating Countries
Appropriate IW indicators developed at regional level and adopted at national level to provide monitoring and evidence of improvements in Sustainable tourism practices	Current Indicators (at Project Submission) reviewed and amended if necessary and appropriate after 6 month Inception Phase once Baseline Information gathered	After 6 months	Specific Report from PCU. Minutes of Stakeholder Meetings to review Indicators	All Participating Countries
Appropriate Project M&E processes are carried out during Project lifetime and beyond (where appropriate)	M&E reports to PCU and to PIR/APR. Detailed analyses and discussion of agreed measurable parameters for Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status Indicators included in reports at national level and synthesised into regional level reports	Annual	MTE and Terminal Evaluation review of Indicators. APR/PIRs	Regional and Individual Participating Countries

TABLE K-3: NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Establishment of national multi-stakeholder steering committees to engage key stakeholders that may be involved resolving transboundary priority concerns	Comprehensive and representative stakeholder Steering Committee established in each country	Within first 6 months	PCU and Steering Committee Reports	All Participating Countries
Increased awareness of the incentives and benefits of partnership arrangements and documentation of the stakeholders participating in the national multi-stakeholder partnership meetings, and partnerships identified as a result	Active and representative participation in national partnership meetings. At least 1 effective and active public-private partnership established for each country and for each demonstration location	By year 3	Minutes of National Partnership Meetings. Confirmation of Partnerships through MoUs and confirmed by MTE	All Participating Countries
Partners agree to enter negotiations to build partnerships / joint ventures through reaching consensus on operational structure of partnership (vision, objectives, tasks and responsibilities, contractual arrangements and grievance mechanisms)	Physical record of negotiations - MoUs and LoAs	By Year 3	Record of negotiations with PCU assistance. MoUs/LoAs available from PCU	All Participating Countries
Successful partnerships/ joint ventures established through project with active and willing involvement with Private Sector and Civil Society Organisations.	Partnerships formally captured in MoUs or Letters of Agreement with copies lodged at PCU.	By Year 3	MoUs/LoAs available from PCU and summarised details on websites	All Participating Countries

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Measures are put in place to ensure benefits to all parties in the partnership / joint ventures are maintained over time through a system of regular evaluation and opportunity to review the context (needs, challenges, structure), outcomes (i.e. business benefits, added value, cost benefits etc.) and changes (learning from achievements, outstanding problems, issues, targets etc.).	On-going Partnership meetings and discussions to evolve and fine-tune partnership arrangements and to reach decisions on matters of mutual interest	Partnership meetings every 6 months and on-going beyond Project	Reports to PCU from National Focal Points. Details on websites. Confirmed by MTE and TE	All Participating Countries
Documentation and review of status of partnerships established (information dissemination, consultation, participation) for the project.	Regular annual review of status of Partnerships undertaken by PCU and formally reported	Once a year	PCU records. Reports to Regional Steering Committee. APR/PIRS	National Reporting and regional synthesis
National Demonstrations successfully implemented and completed at selected sites within the participating countries, and delivering valuable and replicable BAT/BAPs for regional synthesis and dissemination	Demonstrations independently reviewed, found to be successful and closed. BATs and BAPs all successfully captured through RICH and disseminated through website, IW:LEARN and direct distribution	8 by end of Year 4. All 11 by end of year 5	Individual review reports for each Demo. Confirmed by MTE and TE. APR/PIR	8 countries with Demos
National requirements for realigning and reforming policy, legislation and institutional responsibilities to support sustainable tourism, along with options for sustainable financial mechanism (identified and approved by national SteerComs) have captured essential needs of the countries in relation to sustainable tourism	Initial Model Guidelines addressing policy, legislation and institutional responsibilities adopted in relevant sectors within every country. Sustainable financing mechanisms to support reforms have been developed and adopted. New policies and legislation are delivering noticeable and measurable improvements at the Stress Reduction and Environmental Status level	Appropriate Model Guidelines in every country by year 3. M&E reports show links between reforms and improvements to mitigation of LBS impacts and contaminants	Annual M&E reports. Confirmation by MTE and TE	All Participating Countries

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
National Sustainable Tourism Strategies and Work-Plans adopted, implemented and functional within each country	National Sustainable Tourism Strategies drafted and reviewed by each country. Formal adoption of Strategies and work-plans by each government	Drafting and agreement in principle by end of year 3. Formal Government adoption by end of year 5	National Stakeholder Committee reports. Government records. Terminal Evaluation. APR/PIRS	All Participating Countries
Effective assessments undertaken in each participating country identifying gaps and needs in training and capacity building for sustainable tourism with national reports provided to the PCU	National Reports on Training and Capacity building completed and synthesised at regional level	Within first 6 months of Project	Reports lodged with PCU and available for review	All Participating Countries
Training and capacity building packages developed and approved (to include work-plans and implementation schedules/guidelines) that are appropriate to national needs and scenarios	Packages developed at regional level for national and sub-regional delivery	Within first 9 months of Project	Packages lodged with PCU	National and sub-regional level
National T&CB implemented successfully and demonstrating a more sustainable approach to tourism	Various packages delivered at national or sub-regional level (dependent on cost effectiveness. Each country has participated in a T&CB workshop pertinent to their needs. Each country has completed a programme of T&CB as defined within their personal or sub-regional packages. Each T&CB package delivery reviewed and deemed successful both by countries and by independent assessors	Within first 18 months of Project	Independent reviewers. National reports on T&CB package effectiveness.	National and sub-regional level

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Data capture and management needs and gaps for each country relating to sustainable tourism identified through a national report and a regional synthesis	Report from each country on data capture and management needs that define a proposed programme for baseline and M&E data collection	Within first 3 months of Project	Reports sent to PCU for review	All Participating Countries
National Environmental Information Management and Advisory System models created that clearly address the needs of sustainable tourism, along with individual national work-plans and strategies for their implementation	EIMAS models defined for each country along with a data capture and monitoring programme. Models approved by governments and by PCU	Within first 6 months	National EIMAS Models and Programmes lodged with PCU	All Participating Countries
Presence of active and functional EIMAS in each country showing a positive improvement in the analysis and distribution of information relating to sustainable tourism and demonstrating effective impact on decision-making at the management and policy levels	EIMAS and M&E programme adopted. Baseline and M&E data available at national level and through RICH. Appropriate indicators being measured and reported to relevant national agencies and to RICH (latter for Project M&E). Data processed and packaged for use by decision-makers	End of Year 1	National reports on EIMAS and data collection programmes (including solid evidence of use by Decision-makers). Regional synthesis of M&E status for all countries through RICH.	All Participating Countries. Regional Information Coordination House
Increase in the number of tourism establishments / organizations adopting new codes of conduct and best practice for tourism enterprises and tourists	Record and collation of formal adoptions of codes of practices and self-regulatory mechanisms by PCU with signed MoUs and LoAs.	End of year 3	Verification of documents by MTE. Selected in-country verification	All Participating Countries but particularly at Demo locations
Tourism industry personnel, professionals, regulatory agency and local authority staff trained in EMS	Initially at least 3 person per establishment as selected through the demonstration (including one senior management person per establishment).	Trained by end of 2nd year.	Training reports from Demo and PCU.	Relevant establishments at demonstration sites

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Capture of EMS training expertise at national level for further replication by training-of-trainers within national expert bodies.	1 agency or body per country fully trained that can specialise in EMS training for further replication	By end of 2nd year	Training reports from Demo and PCU	National level
Increase in the transparency, accountability, democracy, coordination, conflict resolution for hotels and coastal tourism operators	Clear evidence of cooperation and partnerships between various tourism stakeholders. Partnerships established and self-regulatory principles adopted.	End of Year 3	Site visits to Demonstrations and specific establishments	Relevant demonstration sites in particular
Increased participation of community and key stakeholder groups in co-management and benefits from coastal resources	Community Management measures adopted at appropriate sites along with capture of best practices. Co-management measures show comprehensive and fully participatory stakeholder involvement including participatory monitoring programmes. Formal adoption of co-management measures by local and national authorities. Community confirmation of increased benefits from coastal resources related to tourism. Project confirmation (supported by M&E data) of parallel reduction in LBS impacts and contaminants	End of Year 3	Site visits to Demonstrations and specific establishments. Confirmation by MTE. M&E Reports. Local/National authority records. Minutes of community groups	Relevant demonstration sites in particular

NATIONAL LEVEL IW PROCESS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Increased human and institutional capacity at local level to effect participation in coastal tourism.	Local training workshops (documented) at each demo site. Demo level institutional improvements (documented through regular demo reports). Clear evidence of greater and more effective participation of all pertinent stakeholders (from Demo stakeholder meetings)	within 18 months	Site visits to Demonstrations. Confirmation by MTE. M&E Reports. Minutes of demo stakeholder meetings.	Relevant demonstration sites in particular
Increased revenue generation and evidence of benefits to local community derived from changes in coastal tourism practices and strategies.	Evidence of formal revenue generation and financial sustainability mechanisms at demo sites directly sourced from tourism and tourist-related incomes. Direct benefits to communities derived from these revenues and mechanisms (confirmed by communities with physical evidence)	End of Year 3	Site visits to Demonstrations. Revenue generation and sustainability mechanisms lodged with PCU by Demo managers. Confirmation by MTE. Minutes of demo stakeholder meetings. Confirmation from community groups	Relevant demonstration sites in particular

TABLE K-4: NATIONAL LEVEL IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS

NATIONAL LEVEL IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Increase in hotels implementing EMS leading to a reduction in contaminant loading of International Waters.	100% of selected hotels within Demonstrations implementing EMS approached by 2nd year. EMS approach transferred and replicated within a further 10 hotels, resorts and key tourist operations per country at major tourist locations by year 4 .EMS records show clear reduction in pollutants, contaminants and discharges at all demo sites	Selected enterprises by year 2. Replications by end of year 4.	Demonstration reports. MTE and TE. National Stakeholder reports. Confirmation from PCU	Relevant demonstration sites initially, then replication national at key tourist locations
Increase in the effective use of new technology to assess and reduce contaminant loading of International Waters	Adoption of new technologies for sewage treatment to secondary or tertiary level as well as and grey-water, oily wastes and other liquid wastes within major establishments and operations at demonstration sites. Adoption of new technologies to reduce sediment loading from tourism-related industrial and other land-based activities. Adoption of in-house monitoring programmes by individual establishments to ensure reductions in harmful discharge parameters and aiming to reach threshold levels as defined below. Replication of BATs beyond demo sites to other key tourism locations	Demo sites by Year 2 - Replication sites by year 4	Demo reports and verification by MTE	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later

NATIONAL LEVEL IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Increase in the utilizing of technological advances for resolving transboundary priority concerns including improved water management (e.g. water saving appliances, solar water heaters, specific indicators to be determined)	Identifiable new technologies adopted and functional within demo locations that demonstrate water conservation and recycling with water demands reduced by 25% at individual establishments. New technologies replicated outside demo area and also achieving minimum 25% reduction in water demand where applied	Demo sites by Year 2 - Replication sites by year 4	Demo reports and verification by MTE	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later
Increase in % of hotels and other tourism-related operations with effective sewage treatment systems, waste management (solid and liquid) and monitoring systems and responsible purchasing policies	75% of hotels at relevant demo sites with all improvements in place, and further 20% of all other tourism operations showing improved waste management and monitoring. Further 10% of coastal hotels beyond demo location have adopted effective treatment and waste management and M&E systems	By year 4 both within and outside demo locations	Demo reports and verification by MTE. Required reporting from hotels and establishments within the EMS/EMA programme	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later
Reduction of solid and liquid waste production from hotel sector	Waste production from selected demo hotels down by 25% below baseline as defined during inception phase (except where values at baseline already acceptable). Further replication of management techniques beyond demo location sees a further 25% reduction of waste production at a further 10% of hotels nationally	By year 3 at demo locations and by year 5 nationally	Demo reports and verification by MTE. Required reporting from hotels and establishments within the EMS/EMA programme	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later

NATIONAL LEVEL IW STRESS REDUCTION INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Reduction in water consumption and increase in water re-use and grey water recycling from hotel sector	Water demands reduced by 25% at selected hotels within demo locations. Further minimum 25% reduction in water demand by top 5 largest hotels/consumers nationally as part of replication process	By year 3 at demo locations and by year 5 nationally	Demo reports and verification by MTE. Required reporting from hotels and establishments within the EMS/EMA programme	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later
Increase in the use of innovative policies or economic instruments to encourage the adoption of EMS and adherence to new regulations	Innovative policies and new economic instruments adopted (where appropriate) at all establishments involved in the EMS process. Successful replication within at least 5 other non-demo establishments nationally	By year 3 at demo locations and by year 5 nationally	Demo reports and verification by MTE. Required reporting from hotels and establishments within the EMS/EMA programme	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later
Benefits from tourism to host communities improved (e.g. through enhanced alternative livelihoods, secured access and landing rights, etc)	Clearly defined and measurable benefits to communities at each relevant demonstration site. Access to traditional beaches and landing sites re-established and/or secured at each site as appropriate. Alternative livelihoods established with project support and verifiably effective as can be demonstrated through replication elsewhere outside of the Demonstration location.	Access and land sites secured by end of year two. Alternative livelihoods shown to be successful by end of year 3. Alternative Livelihoods replicated outside demos by end of year 4	Demo reports and site visits, particular by Independent Evaluators	Demonstration sites initially. Replication at other key tourism locations later

TABLE K-5: NATIONAL LEVEL IW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS

NATIONAL LEVEL IW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Reduction in the degradation and overall loss of coastal and offshore environments as a result of unsustainable tourism – measured as Km ² of stable coral & mangrove cover	Overall National %ge cover of each critical habitat type (Defined by each country in km ²) has not decreased since project start and remains stable at near-baseline level. Survey undertaken at baseline (Inception) year 2 and year 4.	Baseline at Inception remaining stable throughout project	Satellite imagery. National baseline and M&E plans. National reports (and regional synthesis) on status of coastal environments for each participating country submitted to PCU prior to MTE	All participating countries at selected national monitoring sites (with emphasis on demo locations specifically)
Improvement in coastal water quality (pH, Temperature, Suspended Solids, Dissolved Oxygen, total coliforms, faecal coliforms, nitrate-nitrogen, phosphate, oil & grease, phenols, arsenic, cadmium, cyanide, chromium, copper, lead, total mercury).	Contaminant loadings measurably reduced as confirmed by monitoring of indicator parameters, particularly water quality parameters as defined below . Blue Flag designations given where possible and appropriate. Sampling at selected sites every 6 months minimum	Reduction from baseline values by half (or to threshold levels) by year 3. All parameters at threshold or lower by year 5	M&E data collection programmes at national level (with sites specifically established to provide data at demo locations). M&E reports from each demo and each country. Overall annual M&E report from Project	Selected National monitoring sites

NATIONAL LEVEL IW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Improvement in the condition of coastal habitats in proximity to coastal tourism developments (coral reefs, seagrass beds, mangroves, beaches etc) as a result of limiting contaminant inputs coupled with protection and rehabilitation in degraded areas.	<p>Degraded habitats (as confirmed at baseline) stabilised. Clear evidence of rehabilitation and expansion of habitats (where seen to be degraded at baseline) back toward pre-degradation levels.</p> <p>Losses of habitats reversed along 50% of coastline at Demo locations and 20% of entire national coastlines with defined strategies to expand this to a further 40% of national coastline over 10 year period.</p> <p>Sampling every 6 months</p>	Active rehabilitation taking place at 20% of degraded sites by year 3 and 40% by year 4.	M&E data collection programmes at national level (with sites specifically established to provide data at demo locations). M&E reports from each demo and each country. Overall annual M&E report from Project	Selected National monitoring sites
Populations of Indicator species	<p>Populations of flora and fauna indicator species in selected coastal habitats remain stable or have increased. These species will be selected during the inception phase.</p> <p>Sampling every 6 months</p>	Flora and Fauna inventories	Field sampling. M&E data collection programmes at national level	Selected national monitoring sites
Increase in the number of beaches qualifying for the Blue Flag scheme	At least two discrete Blue Flag beaches established per country initially rising to 20% of recreational and protected beaches by end of Project	2 by year 3; Further 20% by year 5	Project Blue Flag programme established by PCU	Nationally

NATIONAL LEVEL IW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Reduction in development of tourism facilities in sensitive sites of global significance	10% of sensitive sites within system boundary have legal protection from further development, rising to 50% by end of Project. Annual Surveys	10% by year 3; 50% by year 5	MTE and TE confirmation. PCU records National Stakeholder meeting minutes. National PA designations and legal reforms	National sensitive areas of global significance
Economic benefit to the community and to organizations	Measurable increases in economic benefits to communities as a direct result of project activities in improving Processes and in Stress Reduction. E.G. Direct economic benefits overall and per capita, accessibility of micro-financing and capture of tourist spending within community relieving pressure on environment. Annual surveys of communities	Measurable improvements by year 3	Community benefit assessment carried out for selected sites by PCU with specific figures supporting improved benefits	National demo sites
Social benefits	Improvement of health in coastal communities, better waste management defined as measurably less waste discharges and disposal in coastal areas Annual surveys of communities	10% improvement in community health by year 4. 75% of communities at demo sites have significantly improved waste handling facilities leading to 50 % reduction in disposal outside of facilities	Surveys of community health centres. Surveys of traditional disposal sites. Physical evidence of improved waste handling facilities	Selected (at baseline) community sites related to demo locations

NATIONAL LEVEL IW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS				
DESCRIPTION OF INDICATIVE ACTIONS	MEASURABLE PARAMETER	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	LOCATION OF ACTION
Environmental benefits (area under management, specific measures of key ecological benefits such as area protected, area rehabilitated, species conserved)	20% increase in designated and/or formally managed sensitive areas where LBS impacts and contaminants are actively and effectively controlled Annual survey	By year 4	PCU report on sensitive and managed areas. Confirmed by TE	All Participating countries
Poverty monitoring	20% increases in jobs for poorer local communities, 10% higher incomes for local communities engaged in activities related to impact reduction from tourism income, other measurable contributions toward poverty alleviation linked to impact reduction including improved water supplies to 20% of poorer coastal communities at demo sites. Annual Survey	Measurable by year 3 and confirmed again at year 5	PCU report on Benefits of Improved Sustainable Tourism at Demo Locations produced by year 3. MTE and TE confirmation	Selected demo sites
Local ownership in tourism and related enterprises	Number of enterprises totally or partially owned by local people increased by 20% Annual survey	By year 3	PCU report on Benefits of Improved Sustainable Tourism at Demo Locations produced by year 3	Selected demo sites

ANNEX L

RESPONSE TO GEF SECRETARIAT AND IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES REVIEWS AT SUBMISSION

REVIEW COMMENTS	RESPONSE	AMENDMENTS
ALL GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW COMMENTS AND RESPONSES IN YELLOW SECTION		
GEF IW M& E Indicators need to be incorporated to establish process and stress reduction Indicators so that annual PIR will report on progress toward those indicators. Existing Indicators are too general in relation to the current Objective.	A separate set of indicators has now been included within the M&E Plan that incorporates many of the Process indicators from the LogFrame as well as more specific Stress reduction and Environmental Status Indicators. The PCU will use these new Tables of Indicators to develop an IW Indicator monitoring and sampling programme. This will begin with collection of site baseline data in the first 6 months (Inception Phase) of the Project.	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 229 – M&E Plan <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC. SUMM</u> Para. 44 – Monitoring and Evaluation <u>AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES</u> Annex K – M&E Plan
More specific design seems warranted for the demo projects in order to understand how GEF funding would be spent. At Work Program inclusion the full project proposal will clearly indicate and describe in detail each demonstration project (what, where, how). On-the-ground demonstrations will be confirmed as the major project component.	Full demo details are now directly appended to the Project Brief as APPENDIX A - THE DEMONSTRATIONS which explains in detail for each demo what is being done, the location and how it will be done. This Appendix also provides a comprehensive pre-amble on the selection process for the demonstration sites in each location. The Appendix also provides details of the funds that would be allocated to activities within each Demo. Project Brief summary has been revised to reflect major emphasis on demonstrations and their on-the-ground delivery.	Addition of Appendix A <u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Amended Project Brief Summary Para. 107 – Rational and Objective Para. 119 – Output 1.B Para. 184 – Risks –Component 1 Para. 201 – Sustainability Para. 214 – Replication Para. 228. Cost Effectiveness <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC. SUMM</u> Para. 18 – Project Rationale New Para 19 and Table – Outcomes Para. 45 – Cost Effectiveness
Specific legislation/policy reforms to be achieved, not just generic wording. Would be good to introduce some specifics before Work Program inclusion, at least to the types of legislative reforms and policy reforms in the demo projects.	There is more detail in the types of reforms aimed at within APPENDIX A – THE DEMONSTRATIONS. This has been captured and added to the Project Brief and to the Executive Summary as a description of the Reforms that can be expected to have been developed by the end of the Project	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 178 to 180 – End-of-Project Landscape <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC. SUMM</u> Para 20 to 22 – new section on end-of-Project landscape <u>AMENDMENTS TO APPENDIX A</u> Page 1 (other details of reforms already exist within individual Demos and are highlighted now in the Brief as defined above)

Various comments on the need for specific monitoring of outcomes of reduced degradation as a result of the demos and overall project.	Addition of greater details on indicators and verifiable measurements now addressed as a set of IW Indicators in tables appended to Annex K – the M&E Plan (also now referred to in the Executive Summary. This summarises the indicators from the Logframes (Main Project LogFrame and Demo LogFrames) as well as adding some more specific measurable Environmental Status Indicators.	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 229 – M&E Plan <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC. SUMM</u> Para. 44 – Monitoring and Evaluation <u>AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES</u> Annex K – M&E Plan
Several comments referring to inconsistencies in OBJECTIVE and need to link this to appropriate nature of indicators to show ‘reduced degradation’ as per Project title	Project Title altered to Demonstrating and capturing best practices and technologies for the reduction of land-sourced impacts resulting from coastal tourism . This more clearly reflects the aims of the Project and the OP10 eligibility. The project Objective is now standardised throughout the Project as to demonstrate best practice strategies for sustainable tourism to reduce the degradation of marine and coastal environments of transboundary significance .	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Project Title <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC SUMM</u> Project Title Project Objective is now standardised throughout all documents
Various comments on the need to define status of baseline data (missing) and to address the need to capture baseline data through the M&E plan	Project Brief and Exec Summary now recognises fact that there is generally insufficient baseline data upon which to base any realistic M&E monitoring at the Environmental Status level. The Project will therefore have an elongated Inception Phase during which the necessary baseline data will be captured relating to the proposed indicators (see above). This baseline data will be reviewed between 3-6 months into the Project and harmonised with the adopted IW M&E indicators. M&E Plan now amended to include the need to capture baseline data	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 150 – Description of Component 4 Para. 229 – M&E <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC SUMM</u> Page 8 - Component 4. Information Capture, Management & Dissemination Page 20 - M&E Plan <u>AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES</u> M&E Plan – Added text P. 1 plus Increase in budget (\$150,000) for M&E to cover need for baseline data capture. N.B. balanced across Project budget so no overall increase in GEF contribution
IW:LEARN is not involved. Brief should be revised to incorporate into Replicability section that the Project will have a website consistent with IW:LEARN guidelines, will participate in IW:LEARN activities, and will contain funding for 2 country officials to travel to 2 GEF IW portfolio Conference to participate as well as having a Project exhibition booth	This was an unfortunate oversight on the part of the Project Developers and is now rectified as suggested by the GEFSec Reviewers.	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 128 – Component 1. Para. 216 – Replication <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC SUMM</u> Component 1 description
The partnerships, joint ventures, investment incentives	Indicators included in specific LogFrames established and included as	<u>AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES</u>

and award schemes with the private sector need to have indicators established and monitored	part of APPENDIX A = THE DEMONSTRATIONS. These specific LogFrames are now referred to at the beginning of the Main Project Logical Framework	Heading to Annex B – ICA amended And reflected in Both Brief and Exec Summary to draw attention to specific LogFrames for Demos in APPENDIX A – THE DEMONSTRATIONS
As per recommendation of STAP reviewer, more specificity to be included in the demo projects including indicators of success in process and stress reduction	Done – see Responses above relating to indicator requirements	See Amendments above relating to indicator requirements
The Brief will confirm an adequate level of co-financing (including cash co-financing)	The figures are provided in Incremental Cost Assessment and confirmed in the Executive Summary but have not been highlighted in the Brief. This has now been amended	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 228 – Incremental Cost and Project Financing
Stakeholder Participation and M&E Plans will be present for each demo (by time of CEO endorsement)	Stakeholder Participation and M&E are now included for each demonstration through APPENDIX A – THE DEMONSTRATIONS	See APPENDIX A – THE DEMONSTRATIONS
UNDP AND WORLD BANK REVIEW COMMENTS AND RESPONSES IN BLUE SECTION		
There is concern that the linkages to the GEF Seychelles Biodiversity Project ‘Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities’ are not described (the comments provide further detail on agreements reached between the two Projects)	UNDP has requested that the arrangements as defined within the UNDP-GEF BD Project are now similar inscribed within this IW Project in the section on Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs . However UNEP and UNDP Project Documents use different formats and UNEP does not have such a section therefore this has been addressed A. under Regional Context and B. in the Annex – List of SCTSSA-related, GEF supported of funded initiatives in Africa . These arrangements are also captured within APPENDIX A – THE DEMONSTRATIONS	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 58 – Regional Context <u>AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES</u> Annex G - List of SCTSSA-Related GEF Supported or Funded Initiatives in Africa. Page 6 - APPENDIX A - THE DEMONSTRATIONS
The scope of the Project extends outside the boundary of activities permissible under OP10. As currently presented this would seem to overlap with the Strategic Priorities for Biodiversity (particularly Priority 2 – Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Productive Sector and Landscapes). Clarification should be provided on these linkages and assurances given of full integration with activities pursued under the regional Project with national efforts spearheaded under the biodiversity focus area.	Annex J (which it now transpires was not available to the reviewers) provides a detailed discussion of how the Project fits OP10 more appropriately than any of the other OPs. The Project was specifically not co-joined with the Biodiversity portfolio as most of the countries are pursuing related Biodiversity initiatives. This specific IW initiative is, however, focusing on the demonstration of BATS and BAPs that would reduce the impacts of contaminants, and the adoption of practices such as environmental management systems and accounting, cleaner production, adoption of sustainable enterprise strategies, use of public-private partnerships to adopt standards and self-regulation, and the implementation of legislative and policy reforms based on successful demonstrations of these new approaches, technologies and practices. Elements of the demonstrations that may address tourist issues such as impacts of reef recreation focus on the development of more effective	<u>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</u> Para. 105 to 111 – Rationale and Objective Para. 123 & 124 – Output 1.B <u>AMENDMENTS TO EXEC SUMM</u> Para. 17 – project Rationale and Strategy Component 1 description

	<p>zoning and legislation to designate sensitive areas and MPAs that will act to reduce and control allowable discharges and pollutant levels in such areas and reduce impacts from contaminants such as sedimentation both from land-based origins and from on-reef activities. Therefore, although there may appear to be overlap into biodiversity issues the focus and objective of the Project is clearly within OP10 and attempts to partner this Project with the Biodiversity portfolio would expand its mandate and objectives beyond the feasible and sustainable delivery of a single Project. It is, however, recognised that this Project will need to coordinate and even integrate its actions closely with Biodiversity initiatives addressing CZM and watershed management and this has been further clarified within the text. It is noted that such cross-thematic integration of project efforts is now fully supported by GEF and was the subject of much discussion and demand at the Brazil IW Conference in June 2005. All of the main Project deliverables as well as those of the Demonstrations fit within the OP10 requirements as defined under Annex J – Project Conformity with OP10 Requirements. Further clarifications have been made in the text as noted.</p>	
--	--	--