

# Mid-term external evaluation of the PSC

Programme for South-South Cooperation  
on Sustainable Development between  
Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica (PSC)

Financed by the Ministry of Development Cooperation  
of the Kingdom of the Netherlands  
2007-2010

**FINAL REPORT**

## Table of contents

1.	Introduction	6
1.1	Background PSC	6
1.2	Objectives of Mid-term evaluation	6
1.3	Organisation of the mid-term evaluation	7
1.4	Methodology	8
2.	PSC intervention logic	11
2.1	History of the PSC programme	11
2.2	Development of the PSC programme	12
2.3	Time line of the PSC	14
2.4	Clarity of PSC intervention logic	14
2.5	Conclusions and recommendations	16
3.	Project performance	17
3.1	Projects submitted and approved	17
3.2	Projects portfolio	18
4.	Project results	22
4.1	Overview	22
4.2	Analysis	22
5.	PSC sustainable development results	28
5.1	Introduction	28
5.2	Progress	28
6.	PSC management framework	30
6.1	Introduction and general impression	30
6.2	PSC programme management	30
6.3	Internal communication and coordination	36
6.4	Financial management	36
6.5	Project management	37
7.	Conclusions	43
8.	Future perspectives	50
	Annex 1: ToR	52
	Annex 2: Agenda and persons met	59
	Annex 3: Overview of outcomes per PSC objective	64
	Annex 4: Overview table of all PSC projects, in three different rounds	68
	Annex 5: Overview of findings selected projects: Costa Rica	72
	Annex 6: Indicators for project monitoring	81

**List of abbreviations**

CBDD	Centre Béninois pour le Développement Durable
CePED	Centre de Partenariat et d'Expertise pour le Développement Durable
COCA	Checklist Organisational Capacity Assessment
CR	Costa Rica
DGIS	Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation
EEE	Experience Exchange Event
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
JC	Joint Committee
MB	Management Board
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NM	National Mechanisms
PSC	Programme for south-south cooperation on sustainable development
RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
SDA	Sustainable Development Agreements
SDS	Sustainable Development Secretariat
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

## Executive summary

Based on the Sustainable Development Agreements (SDAs), in 2005 a three-year Programme for South-South Cooperation on Sustainable Development (PSC) was proposed, between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica. The PSC started by a first half year start-up phase (May to November 2007), followed by a three years implementation phase (November 2007 to November 2010). This mid-term evaluation covers the period until July 31<sup>st</sup> 2009.

The mid-term external evaluation took place in August 2009. Country visits were made to each of the three countries, largely in parallel. In each country projects were selected to be reviewed in detail, including a visit to the project leading organisation and/or field visit to the project site. Project beneficiaries were also met and/or interviewed. In spite of the limited time available, we believe that the mid-term evaluation has been able to generate good insights.

The following are some of the main conclusions.

In all three countries, the concept of south-south cooperation is considered very relevant and challenging. While all three countries have environmental policies, the policy context is especially favourable in Bhutan and Costa Rica, characterized by the predominance of 'green' economies. The themes supported by the PSC are also relevant, especially sustainable tourism and biodiversity management.

Most supported projects will be effective in realising set objectives. In many cases, there are good potentials to realise impacts, and good potentials for upscaling, especially in Costa Rica and in a lesser degree also in Bhutan. However, several projects are delayed. The remaining time required to realise the objectives is short. Even if most projects are expected to be successfully finalised within the remaining time, this would require some time pressure, which is undesirable.

In most projects reciprocity is an added value. Reciprocity to develop needs time, as partner organisations need to get to know each other and assess whether they have a shared vision on sustainability, and then develop a joint project. In some ongoing reciprocal projects corrective measures should be taken because reciprocity does not seem to work. Many projects still have a challenge to address the higher level objectives of policies and institutional strengthening, although expected results for these levels were identified. This should be a priority issue for the remaining period.

In all three countries, the PSC concept has been promoted, mainly to potential project proponents. Especially in Costa Rica the PSC programme has also been promoted to potential donors, but this could be done more strongly. So far there have been limited support actions by other organisations. One underlying problem is that the PSC concept as such has not been clearly defined.

The PSC programme is characterised by a large set of procedures. There is need to agree upon simplification of some procedures and agreement for flexible application of procedures in specific cases. Most critical now seems to be a simplification of the auditing system. This can help avoid further delays. There is also need to rethink the management model, dissociating the function of National Mechanism and Secretariat from the same organisation. Communication has been a big challenge for PSC (even an extraordinary MB was necessary to tackle that). It is important to identify lessons learned on the subject of communication and coordination efforts to put in practice reciprocity.

Putting in practice reciprocity in a proper way, i.e. assuring two-way exchange based on mutual interests and concrete demands, has costs and benefits. Costs may be high when countries are wide apart, with different languages and different cultures. However, when properly done, there is also a clear added value, in terms of expected and

unexpected benefits for participating partners, aimed at putting in practice sustainable development objectives. There is also an added value for south-south cooperation as compared to north-south cooperation.

A set of recommendations has been given to urgently think about a new programme along based on the same principles as the PSC, rather than a second phase of the existing programme. For a potential new programme, a wide coalition of countries with a clear sustainable development commitment, both in the south and the north, could be envisaged. It could be a global partnership for sustainable development. Identification of the strategic features and lessons learned of the current PSC would be important inputs to such a new programme. A thematic focus is recommended.

Also, a range of recommendations is given to successfully finalise the current programme, and to realize the potentials for concrete impacts and upscaling. It is important that options are explored to extend the timeframe of the PSC, thus to enable projects to finalise their activities without time pressure.

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Background PSC**

During the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held in Johannesburg in 2002, the Republic of Benin, the Kingdom of Bhutan and the Republic of Costa Rica entered into a Strategic Partnership for Cooperation on Sustainable Development, signing an agreement on August 31, 2002. By means of this partnership agreement, open to the participation of other countries willing to join, the three countries reaffirmed their commitment to the pursuit of sustainable development goals. This was the direct outcome of the experience generated from the Sustainable Development Agreements (SDAs) and the collaboration of the three partner countries and the Kingdom of the Netherlands within this framework, between 1994 and 2002. A decade of promoting and supporting hundreds of projects, implemented between two or more of the partner countries, of delivering joint declarations at multilateral forums and debating policies towards achieving sustainable development, demonstrated the potential of an innovative framework of collaboration based on equity, reciprocity and participation, that tried to break with traditional North - South relationships in development cooperation.

In 2005, a three-year Programme for South-South Cooperation on Sustainable Development between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica was proposed (PSC), based on the goals of the Strategic Partnership Agreement (signed between these countries in 2002), and the experiences of the Bilateral Sustainable Development Agreements. The basic architecture, funding and responsibilities of the PSC Programme were agreed in May 2005, at The Hague. The PSC was implemented from November 2007 to November 2010, in line with its Multi-Year Plan, following a half-year start-up phase from May to November 2007.

A component of the PSC Programme is to have a mid-term evaluation in mid 2009. This mid-term evaluation is the subject of the current assignment and report. This mid-term evaluation covers the period until July 31<sup>st</sup> 2009. The ToR for this mid-term evaluation was agreed upon by the Netherlands Embassy in Costa Rica and by the Management Board of the PSC (see Annex 1).

### **1.2 Objectives of Mid-term evaluation**

According to the ToR, the mid-term external evaluation shall determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (achievement of outputs and outcomes), pertinence, impact, sustainability and the gender equity (cross-cutting theme) of the PSC. It shall also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation shall provide recommendations to be considered for a possible continuation of the PSC, although this possibility is not a commitment or stated in anyway in the official PSC Agreement.

More specifically, the ToR lists a number of specific questions to be answered:

- a. To establish the surplus value of this South-South cooperation in comparison with a North-South cooperation
- b. Assess the state of the implementation of the PSC in terms of outputs produced and outcomes achieved as compared to those planned.

- c. Assess results achieved or to be achieved by the projects financed under PSC in the three partner countries.
- d. Provide recommendations for the implementation of the programme and for a possible second phase.
- e. Identify lessons learned that provide information to be considered in the replication or extension the PSC model.
- f. Assess the efficiency in implementation: quantity, quality, cost and timeliness of PSC inputs and activities.
- g. Assess the relevance of PSC model in the three partner countries and as an innovative model in the international cooperation schemes.
- h. Assess PSC in accordance with Regulations, Contribution Agreement and PSC approved procedures.
- i. The prospects for Sustainable Development impacts according to PSC objectives.
- j. Cost-benefit analysis of this South-South cooperation
- k. To establish if this South-South cooperation has a catalyzing effect

The approved proposal for this mid-term evaluation by the consortium of Aidenvironment and MDF underlines that a mid-term evaluation is primarily oriented at providing answers to two questions:

- Is the programme on track (to realise its objectives)?
- What needs to be done (or adjusted) in the remaining period to assure that the objectives will be fully met?

Thus, it was also indicated that it would be too early to say something concrete about impacts, as well as cost-effectiveness.

### **1.3 Organisation of the mid-term evaluation**

The mid-term evaluation of the PSC was carried out by a consortium of MDF and Aidenvironment. The following persons were involved and tasks were specified:

- Jan Joost Kessler: team leader and country visit to Costa Rica, to the PSC Secretariat and review of selected projects
- Frans van Gerwen: country visit to Bhutan and review of selected projects
- Sjoerd Zanen: country visit to Benin and review of selected projects.

The Costa Rica country visit took place from 17-21 August 2009, the other two country visits took place one week later (24-28 August). In view of the very limited time available to undertake this mid-term evaluation, there was no other option than to carry out parallel country studies by three different consultants. One advantage of this approach was the independent appreciation of the PSC by three different evaluators. The overall time available for this mid-term evaluation was quite short (as compared to evaluations of similar programmes). One consequence is that we have not evaluated in detail all PSC projects, but have selected a few (about 50%). However, we believe this has not affected the final results.

The Draft report was submitted on 8 September 2009, and the final draft was submitted on 17 September, after receiving comments from the three National Mechanisms.

The projects to be visited were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- All trilateral projects were visited in Bhutan and Costa Rica, as here reciprocity (the main characteristic of this programme) can be expected to be most fully developed;
- A few bilateral projects were visited, with the country organisation being the lead organisation or not, as well as a few pilot projects if available;
- For each country the focus was at a few themes;
- Emphasis was given to projects that started in the first round of projects.

#### 1.4 Methodology

The country visits were prepared during an inception phase from 10-15 August, including the study of documents, planning of country visits, the selection of projects to be visited (see above), the elaboration of a briefing note for each country, and a checklist for interviews of relevant stakeholders during the country and project visits. This checklist is based on an analysis of the set of detailed questions provided in the ToR, and specified for different stakeholder groups. Also, a few stakeholders were interviewed in the Netherlands. A complete overview of people met and interviewed is provided in Annex 2. Also, a checklist was prepared to review progress of selected projects, in terms of expected outcomes and contributions to the thematic objectives (see Annex 3).

Prior to the country-visit a briefing note was prepared with instructions for preparation of the visit and specific interviews and project visits. Based upon these instructions, a programme was prepared that included the following elements:

Category	Who
<b>National Mechanism, Management Board, Joint Committee, and Secretariat (Costa Rica only)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director and relevant staff of NM and MB</li> <li>- Staff of the PSC Secretariat</li> <li>- Former director and Chairman SDS (Bhutan)</li> <li>- Member of Board of Directors Fundecooperacion (CR)</li> </ul>
<b>Relevant Ministries and (semi)-public institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Agriculture (Bhutan)</li> <li>- Ministry of Planning (Costa Rica, Benin)</li> <li>- Development Cooperation Division, Gross National Happiness Commission (Bhutan)</li> <li>- Minister of Labour and Human Resources (Bhutan)</li> <li>- Ministry of Environment (Costa Rica)</li> </ul>
<b>Other national and or international development partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UN, UNDP and SNV (Bhutan)</li> <li>- FAO (Costa Rica)</li> <li>- Liaison Office of Denmark (Bhutan)</li> <li>- Ambassador or Consul of the Netherlands (three countries)</li> </ul>
<b>For projects: Staff and partners involved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All selected projects for in-depth study: meetings and workshop</li> <li>- All other projects in Bhutan (workshop and project visits)</li> </ul>
<b>For selected projects site visits: local stakeholders and beneficiaries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In Costa Rica four projects were visited, and in all cases beneficiaries were interviewed</li> <li>- In Bhutan only one site visit was possible, while beneficiaries of NMC, TGMI and Puni Gakhil Handicrafts were met</li> <li>- In Benin field visits were made to five selected projects not far from Cotonou.</li> </ul>

A full overview of all projects is provided in Annex 4. From this list a selection of projects was made to focus upon, as it was impossible to undertake in-depth analysis of all 27 projects.

Therefore, in each country some projects were selected to be reviewed in detail, including a visit to the project leading organisation and/or field visit to the project site of operations. In that case project beneficiaries were also met and/or interviewed. The table gives an overview of the projects that were selected in each country for more detailed analysis. The aim was to have a representative selection. Criteria for selection were:

- inclusion of all trilateral projects (being the most desired category of projects in the light of the objectives and principles of the PSC);
- Inclusion of three bilateral projects spread over different themes;
- Inclusion of projects from two different calls for proposals, but with a focus on those of the first call (longer period of implementation);
- Inclusion of two pilot projects, complementary to the selected projects in the other two categories.

<b>List of selected projects</b>		<b>CR</b>	<b>Bhutan</b>	<b>Benin</b>
<b>Number</b>	<b>Title</b>			
01-T-07	Capacity development for biodiversity information management	X	X	
02-T-07	Non-timber forest product use	X	X	
03-T-07	Contributions of national parks and biological reserves to economic and social development	X	X	
05-T-08	Awareness program and development of sustainable energy technologies	+	X	
02-B-07	Sustainable Tourism development in Zhemgang Dzongkhag and Rio San Juan Basin	+	+/-	
04-B-07	Integrated and sustainable system for solid waste management	+	X	
05-B-07	Capacity building on environmental friendly technologies through knowledge management process	X	X	
03-B-08	Organic and fair trade fresh fruits and agro-industrial production of pineapple in Costa Rica and Benin	+		
24-B-08	Sustainable native Costa Rica and Bhutan handicraft production and commercialisation	+	+/-	
32-B-08	Strengthening value chain for traditional and non-traditional agriculture and agro-industrial products		X	X
04-P-07	Generation of sustainable productive projects in production chains in groups of indigenous women	+		
12-P-07	Pilot community based Sustainable Tourism in Phobjikha Conservation Area		X	
16-P-07	Mushroom Promotion and Marketing		X	
05-P-07	Education and socio-professional insertion of girls in school (sub-prefecture of Allada)			X
24-P-07	Conservation in Lama reserve forest through ecotourism development			X
03-B-07	Development of a Technological Package for Organic Pineapple			X
23-P-07	Community based biodiversity management of Mono Couffo region			X
27-B-08	Cultural Music Research & Production Centre to Promote Sustainable Tourism			X

X = selected projects with in-depth visits or interviews with stakeholders

+ = selected projects and discussed during projects workshop;

+/- = not selected but some interviews

For selected projects the initial project document, available progress reports and project summary were analysed. For the selected projects that were not visited in detail (Costa Rica), project representatives participated in a workshop, during which a brief project presentation was given followed by a discussion about project results, constraints etc. In Benin and Bhutan, for most remaining projects that had not been selected project representatives have been met during a workshop. The country visits were finalised by a debriefing and validation session, with the NM as well as (in Bhutan) with project partners.

Unfortunately, in Benin the field visit could not be planned according to the proposed list of projects, and another selection was made. In Costa Rica, there is only one pilot project.

## 2. PSC intervention logic

### 2.1 History of the PSC programme

As a concrete follow-up to the Rio Earth Summit (1992) for implementing Agenda 21, in 1994 the Government of the Netherlands signed bilateral Sustainable Development Agreements (SDAs) with the governments of Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica. The development of these SDAs took place against the background of the criticism from developing countries and international NGOs in particular, on the fact that north-south partnerships promoting sustainable development were basically a type of ‘greenwashing’ and did not take into account the global political context of development. The SDAs between these four countries were seen as a manageable pilot experience which aimed to put in place a new type of partnership for sustainable development, more specifically a new pattern of relationship between North and South. To do so, the SDA cooperation was based on the principles of equality, reciprocity and participation, and were directed towards the involvement of societies at large, not only governments. The SDAs were supposed to inspire similar partnerships and real commitments between other countries, and promote alliances between stakeholders, both within and between these countries (government, civil society, private sector).<sup>1</sup>

To put in practice the SDAs, National Mechanisms (NMs) were founded in each partner country, as principal stakeholders of the agreements and platforms for alliances, to articulate, learn from, accelerate and upscale promising initiatives. Recognising that lasting poverty alleviation would occur only within the context of sustainable development, the SDAs sought to catalyse the transition to sustainability by supporting seeding initiatives, replicating success, and disseminating information. To realize the SDAs, two related channels existed and were financed by the Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation.

1. *Policy dialogue*, to discuss progress in the implementation of treaties and to decide on priority issues or themes as a basis to identify projects. The consultations occurred on a regular basis with representatives from government, private sector and/or civil society.
2. *Projects*, financed by a facility for “calls for proposals” for three types of projects:
  - Type 1 projects: Projects in one partner country (Benin, Bhutan, Costa Rica)
  - Type 2 projects: Projects in The Netherlands
  - Type 3 projects: Reciprocal projects (bilateral, trilateral or quadrilateral), in the Netherlands and one or more partner countries.

From 1994 until 2002 the SDA countries worked mainly on priorities established in bilateral consultations with the Netherlands and one partner country. These priorities included 13 thematic areas. The mid-term review of 2001 of the SDA concluded that the ambitious goals of the SDA were far from being met. The projects being financed and carried out were largely traditional development cooperation projects, with scattered impacts, and too limited attention was given to non-bilateral modes of collaboration, including south-south collaboration. It was also found that reciprocal projects involving two or more partner countries were among the most innovative ones. The Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation (DGIS) therefore decided to phase out Type 1

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on Verhagen et al. (2003) and the PSC Multi-Year Plan.

projects and to discontinue Type 2 projects, and as a consequence the NM in the Netherlands, being the Ecooperation Foundation, was dissolved.

The four countries decided that reciprocal collaboration was the way forward. Common priority themes on national issues of sustainable development were selected to focus upon and achieve greater impact. In the next period of the SDA programme (2002-2005), only reciprocal (Type 3) projects were financed, and the administration was delegated to the new formed Netherlands International Partnership for Sustainable Development, hosted by the Royal Tropical Institute (and partially staffed with ex-Ecooperation staff members).

In 2004 the Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation took the decision to hibernate their active participation in SDAs, following the evaluation of these agreements and the debate on policies for development cooperation by the Netherlands parliament. In line with this decision, the NM in the Netherlands, being the NIPS, ceased to exist on December 31, 2005.

Following above decisions to gradually terminate the SDAs, in the case of Costa Rica it was decided that the remaining funds available for this partner country (€5.7 million), were transferred to the Fundecooperación National Mechanism by means of a special Trust Fund (“Fideicomiso”), under custody of the Costa Rican Interfin Bank, as Fiduciary. This took effect by means of an Addendum of the Contribution Agreement between the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE) in Costa Rica and Fundecooperación, in December 2004. The Trust Fund is administered by an experienced financial institution, independent and separately from Fundecooperación.

For the PSC, the Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation makes use of the above structure. PSC funds are transferred under and in accordance with the Contribution Agreement between the Minister and Fundecooperación on behalf of the three partner countries, to a Fund under the above Trust Fund agreement between Fundecooperación and the Costa Rican Interfin Bank. The Fund may be augmented by donations of third parties, other contracts or sources, or interests from the funds contributed.

## **2.2 Development of the PSC programme**

Following the decision in the Netherlands to withdraw as an active partner in the SDAs, in 2005 a three-year Programme for South-South Cooperation on Sustainable Development (PSC) was proposed, between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, based on the goals of the Strategic Partnership Agreement and the experiences of the SDAs. The basic architecture, funding and responsibilities of the PSC Programme, were prepared by the National Mechanisms of these three countries and were laid down in the PSC Regulations. These were agreed upon in a special meeting of the Joint Committee of the Sustainable Development Agreements, May 2005, at The Hague. A Multi-Year Work Plan 2005-2008 was developed by the NMs, approved by the Management Board and endorsed by the Joint Committee, in October 2005. Moreover, a PSC Handbook of Procedures was worked out.

In November 2005, there was a meeting between representatives of the NMs of Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, during which agreements were reached on promotion policy of the PSC in the partner countries, and translation of defined thematic areas of the programme into concrete priorities for reciprocal (bilateral and trilateral) projects. The outcomes of this meeting were laid down in the Annual Plan 2005-2006. The PSC Multi-Year Plan and Annual Plan drafts were submitted in November 2005 to the Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation (DGIS). These plans were rejected because they did not meet criteria for a good programme document, missing issues like a consistent logframe, criteria for project eligibility and management of overhead costs.

Next, with strong support of an external consultant, a thorough revision of the Multi-Year Plan was carried out in March-April 2006, in Costa Rica, and in close collaboration and feedback with the NMs in the three countries, the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE) in Costa Rica and the Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation (DGIS). The revision took place without affecting the essentials and spirit of the PSC. This new programme document was submitted to the RNE in Costa Rica in May 2006, which was appointed by DGIS as the monitoring agency. The proposal was submitted together with a half-year plan for strengthening the PSC Secretariat and for getting the programme off the ground.

It then took until May 15, 2007 before the PSC Contribution agreement was signed between the RNE in Costa Rica and Fundecooperacion. The same day was also signed the Trust Fund contract between these two parties.

From interviews during this mid-term evaluation, including staff from the RNE in Costa Rica, the following relevant observations can be noted with regards to this preparatory period:

- The initiative for the process of designing the PSC programme as based on SDA experiences was largely with the NM in Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion), while of course in full cooperation and approval by the other NMs (Bhutan mainly, because in Benin for some time there was no NM until August 2007 (becoming fully operational by August 2008).
- The reformulation of the multi-year plan by the external consultant was an intensive process, including a major overhaul and the integration of several new elements in the programme.
- The RNE in Costa Rica was not positive about the potentials of the PSC, and the long time required for approval (from May 2006 to May 2007) was largely due to the need to convince the RNE in Costa Rica and respond to their queries and requirements. For the RNE in Costa Rica, the PSC programme was rather seen as a burden. The RNE even when signing the agreement made clear they did not believe in the PSC concept. The PSC eventually could really start in November 2007, but only through an approbation period with limited funding (see below).
- In the same period, Fundecooperacion underwent a major change in terms of its mission and strategy, as well as staff to be involved in the PSC. This change has been important for further convincing the RNE that the PSC would be well managed (note that RNE staff at the time did not believe in the PSC). It also seems that this change has enabled Fundecooperacion to become a more effective development organisation.

### 2.3 Time line of the PSC

The first half year (May-November 2007) was the PSC start-up phase, while the three following years are dedicated to the implementation of the Multi-Year Plan as such (from the 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2007 until 15<sup>th</sup> of November 2010).

The start-up phase was dedicated to set-up and strengthening of the PSC Secretariat, administration, promotion of PSC, preparation of the annual plan 2008, and alike. In order to implement this phase, an advance payment was agreed. However, the advance payment was received only in August 2007, so that Fundecooperacion had to make use of its own funds for several months. Institutional strengthening of the PSC Secretariat (Fundecooperacion) was based on the results of a Checklist Organisational Capacity Assessment (COCA), which gave positive results and some areas for improvement. These areas for improvement were addressed during the start-up phase.

The execution of (reciprocal) projects being the core of the PSC, the call for proposals to identify and start-up projects has so far been a major focus of the PSC. The following are relevant events in the timeline of the PSC: management board meetings and three rounds of selecting suitable project proposals.

<b><i>Timeline of call for project proposals</i></b>
<p><i>First call for proposals (second half 2007):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MB Meeting #1 (August 2007): agreement on process</li> <li>• Fast track process with deadline September 21, 2007:</li> <li>• MB meeting #2 (November 2007): 12 projects received, of which: 5 approved, 5 rejected, 2 withdrawn</li> <li>• Normal submission process with deadline November 15, 2007</li> <li>• MB meeting # 3 (February 2008): 26 projects received, of which: 5 approved, 9 approved under conditions, 12 rejected</li> </ul>
<p><i>Second call for proposals (2008):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exchange events to stimulate exchange on reciprocal projects: February and June 2008</li> <li>• Deadline for submission: June 30, 2008</li> <li>• MB meeting #4 (September 2008): 37 projects received, of which: 8 approved under conditions, 29 rejected</li> </ul>
<p><i>Third call for proposals (2009):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MB meeting #5 (April 2009): agreement on procedures</li> <li>• Deadline for submission May 30, 2009: 2 received</li> <li>• Extended deadline to July 10, 2009: 6 more received</li> <li>• Virtual MB meeting: 5 approved under conditions, 3 rejected.</li> </ul>

### 2.4 Clarity of PSC intervention logic

The PSC multi-year plan was basically elaborated by an external consultant using a UNDP format for programme management. In the plan is noted that the design of the PSC programme logframe is problematic, because actual projects are still undefined (i.e.

to be identified during PSC implementation based on policy dialogue etc.).<sup>2</sup> The following are the defined development (final) objectives of the PSC:

<b><i>PSC development (final) objectives</i></b>
1. Translate the goals of the PSC into concrete innovative activities and reciprocal projects, with the potential to generate knowledge, impact and empowerment; as building bricks for sector strategies and inputs for policy influencing.
2. Mobilising organisations and institutions (government, civil society, academic sector, private sector) in the partner countries for renewal and reinforcement of multi-stakeholder alliances for sustainable development, with the National Mechanisms as important platforms.
3. Contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction, taking into account the economic, environmental and social dimensions.
4. Explore the potential of PSC as concept to promote international commitments and mutual cooperation for sustainable development; and as channel for “North → South-South” development cooperation and funding.

Next, the PSC is characterised by the following six thematic areas:

1. Sustainable tourism.
2. Sustainable production and consumption chains
3. Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
4. Access to sustainable energy and efficient energy use
5. Gender equity
6. South-south cooperation for sustainable development

For each of these thematic areas, immediate objectives were defined, as follows.

<b><i>PSC immediate objectives</i></b>
1. Contribute to a more sustainable tourism sector in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica; increasing benefits to rural communities, mitigating negative side-effects in the field of culture erosion and deterioration of natural resources; and promoting a stronger pro-poor and sustainability orientation of sector policies and incentives.
2. Contribute to the construction of sustainable and demand-led supply chains in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: by means of strengthening productive and commercial capacities of farmers and producer organisations; adoption of sanitary, phytosanitary and quality standards; enhancement of labour productivity, yields (output) and efficiency; sound management of natural resources and waste; and promoting their articulation with promising market actors.
3. Contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: by means of developing patterns for win-win scenarios for different ecosystems (conserving nature while combating poverty), based on concrete experiences; and by influencing national policies and legislation.
4. Contribute to enhancing access to sustainable energy in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: especially for less endowed families; promoting clean production and efficient use of energy.
5. Promote gender equity and empower women in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, as explicit norm in the generation of results in the four major thematic areas and the sixth conceptual theme of the PSC: by means of pro-active and representative participation of women in all relevant activities conducive to those results.
6. Explore the potential of the South-South partnership between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: as concept for fruitful national and international alliances between civil society actors and

<sup>2</sup> Note that this is not uncommon for large programmes. This does not mean that one cannot define programme objectives to which project objectives should also subscribe. This is sometime referred to as the cascade model.

private sector, research institutions and government institutions; as vehicle for greater international commitments and cooperation between governments of the partner countries; and as autonomous channel for North-South-South development cooperation and funding.

Subsequently, the multi-year plan indicates for each theme or immediate objective: expected results, activities (up to 20 per theme) and some indicators. For each thematic area there are four expected results, oriented at four levels, or dimensions:<sup>3</sup>

- local level (e.g. making an innovative practice work)
- organisational level (e.g. developing self-sufficient and empowered organisations)
- strategic or systems level (e.g. sector strategies or certification systems)
- policy level (e.g. enabling policies or incentives at national or international level).

## 2.5 Conclusions and recommendations

- The PSC has a long history of the earlier SDAs, with the challenging objective of developing new ways of working on sustainable development by new ways of north-south partnerships, and ambitious goals of influencing each others policies. This agreement has been put 'on hold' by the Netherlands. The PSC has continued to work on the concept in a new way, addressing south-south partnerships, with funding from the Netherlands (RNE at Costa Rica).
- Insight in the history of the PSC explains why Fundecooperacion, as the NM in Costa Rica and constituting the PSC Secretariat, was most directly involved in negotiations with the donor to realise the establishment and start-up of the PSC.
- Significant delays have occurred in the start-up of the PSC programme, which are largely due to negotiations with the RNE in Costa Rica (who in fact did not support this programme). Initially only a probation period was approved, which once again emphasises the reticence of the RNE in Costa Rica to approve the PSC.
- Although a good effort has been made to capture the PSC in a consistent logframe, it is difficult to use the logframe of the PSC multi-year plan to assess progress of the PSC, because concrete indicators at the level of general and immediate objectives (impact and outcome indicators) have not been clearly defined. The multi-year plan suggests that the PSC should do so. The PSC Secretariat is aware of that and has started to define indicators. However, there still is some confusion between the different levels of indicators (at the level of outputs, outcomes and impacts).
- The PSC multi-year plan elaborates on the linkages between the PSC development (final) objectives and immediate objectives. It is stated that the results of the immediate objectives are in fact intermediate results to realise the final objectives. Thus, projects are rather means to realise the PSC final objectives, and ways of stimulating processes that will contribute to the PSC final objectives. This is an important element for evaluation of the PSC.

---

<sup>3</sup> We have slightly adjusted this from the multi-year plan, for reasons of clarity.

### 3. Project performance

#### 3.1 Projects submitted and approved

In total, during the first round 38 projects were submitted and 19 were approved. Of these, 11 were pilots, 5 were bilateral projects and 3 were trilateral. Pilot projects were only admitted in the first round of proposals, in order to speed up the selection and start-up of projects, under the condition that they show some potential for reciprocity and develop into reciprocal projects at a later stage.

First round		Number of projects			
		Submitted	Approved	Approved + conditions	Rejected
Type of project	Pilot	25	6	5	14
	Bilateral	9	2	3	4
	Trilateral	4	2	1	1

During the second round 36 projects were submitted and 8 were approved. Of these, 7 were bilateral projects and 1 was a trilateral one. Pilot projects were not anymore admitted in the second round of proposals.

Second round		Number of projects			
		Submitted	Approved	Approved + conditions	Rejected
Type of project	Pilot	0			
	Bilateral	31		7	24
	Trilateral	6		1	5

During the third round 8 projects were submitted, although only after extension of the final date of submission, of which 5 have been approved. All of these projects are bilateral projects and a follow-up on pilot projects of the first round. Some pilot projects of the first round did yet succeed in developing reciprocal follow-up projects.

Third round		Number of projects			
		Submitted	Approved	Approved + conditions	Rejected
Type of project	Pilot	0			
	Bilateral	8		5	3
	Trilateral	0			

Thus, in total, of 82 projects submitted, 32 (39%) have been approved, and 61% have been rejected.

Regarding the reasons for non-approval, details of the second round provide the following reasons for rejection:

- an organization cannot implement more than 2 projects (according to MB #4): 4 projects rejected
- lack of reciprocity / no evidence of knowledge sharing: 4 projects rejected

- poor capacity of the implementing organizations : 4 projects rejected
- technical deficiencies (basic information missing as per the guidelines): 15 projects rejected
- PSC budget constraint: 2 projects (this was because of a PSC budget ceiling in the second round, thus 10 projects has successfully passed the selection criteria).

### 3.2 Projects portfolio

An overview of all PSC projects with some of the main characteristics is provided in Annex 4. Indicated are:

- Type of project: pilot, bilateral or trilateral
- Lead and partner organisations, with name, country and organisation being governmental, private sector, NGO or University / academic
- Theme
- Dates of approval, contract signing (start-up) and last disbursement
- Budget commitment and proportion being disbursed, and the amount of additional co-funding.

In total there 32 projects are listed, of which 4 (of the 3<sup>rd</sup> round) have not have started because contracts were not yet signed. Of the 3<sup>rd</sup> round, 3 projects are also indicated that have not been approved.

Following are some of the main observations and insights, on different perspectives.

#### *On level of reciprocity and lead organisations*

- There are 4 trilateral projects, of which 3 were started in the first round, and are lead by Costa Rican organisations. The 4<sup>th</sup> one (2<sup>nd</sup> round) is lead by a Benin organisation. This last one has run into problems and has in fact not yet formally started (1<sup>st</sup> disbursement pending because of contractual problems). Thus, the proportion of trilateral projects is rather low (13%).
- There are 17 bilateral projects (of which 5 were developed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> round as reciprocal pilot projects, and 4 have not yet started). Of these, 9 are executed by Costa Rica organisations, 5 by Bhutan organisations (1 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> round and not yet started) and 3 by Benin organisations (all 3 from the 3<sup>rd</sup> round and not yet started).
- There are 11 pilot projects, of which 1 in Costa Rica, 4 in Bhutan and 6 in Benin. In Costa Rica, pilot projects were not promoted by the NM because they considered reciprocal projects to be more challenging and in line with the PSC concept. Of the 11 pilot projects, by now 5 have been approved and upgraded as bilateral projects (1 actually started, which is the one from Costa Rica).
- In terms of lead organisations, of 17 reciprocal projects that are actually ongoing, in total 12 are lead by Costa Rica organisations, 4 by Bhutan and 1 by a Benin organisation (the latter has not yet formally started). In the 1<sup>st</sup> round, all lead organisations were from Costa Rica. This is partly explained by the fact that the NM in Costa Rica especially promoted reciprocal projects, while some of these were developed based on historical relations of cooperation, especially with Bhutan.
- *It can be concluded that the trilateral and most bilateral projects during the first round of project selection resulted from previous contacts between organisations in the*

*previous SDAs, in which especially Costa Rican partners apparently already had an active participation.*

*Type of organisations (excluding double-counting for 3<sup>rd</sup> round projects)*

- In Costa Rica, in total 14 different organisations are involved in PSC projects, of which 5 are NGO, 6 are private, 1 is government and 2 are Universities. In total 3 organisations are involved in 2 different projects.
- In Bhutan, in total 12 different organisations are involved in PSC projects, of which 2 are NGO, 3 are private, 7 are government and none are Universities. In total 4 organisations are involved in 2 different projects.
- In Benin in total 11 different organisations are involved in PSC projects, of which 8 are NGO, 1 is private, 1 is government and 1 is University. In total 5 organisations are involved in 2 different projects.
- Private sector organisations are mainly involved in the themes of tourism and sustainable production chains.
- *It can be concluded that the focus in Bhutan is at government organisations, in Benin at NGOs, and in Costa Rica at NGOs and private sector.*

*Themes (excluding double-counting for 3<sup>rd</sup> round projects)*

- Of the 27 projects from 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> rounds, 8 are within the biodiversity theme, 6 in sustainable tourism, and 10 in sustainable production chains. This amounts to almost 90% of the projects.
- There is only 1 project in energy. This is a trilateral project and has reportedly been difficult to design and has still not yet formally started. The project seems to have been somewhat 'constructed', with three rather different components (low level of reciprocity). Several projects proposed for this theme have been rejected, with reasons that according to the Bhutan organisations involved were not clearly communicated.
- There are 2 projects that can be classified as gender equity (05-P-07, 09-B-08) but in fact these projects show little linkages to the overall theme of sustainable development in the PSC programme. On the other hand, most other projects have taken into account gender equity aspects (this is also a criterion for project approval). Gender equity would be more like a cross-cutting issue rather than a theme.
- Note that the 6<sup>th</sup> theme (south-south coordination) seems to have been lost along the way, which is understandable because it is rather a conceptual theme relevant to all projects and the programme as a whole.
- *It can be concluded that sustainable energy receives little attention, which is surprising given the international importance attributed to this theme, as confirmed during the mid-term evaluation in the three countries.*

*Co-funding*

In the PSC projects there are 2 kinds of counterpart funding, in kind and in cash, usually provided by the (partner) organisations participating in the project. The in-kind contribution concerns person-time or a meeting place. Additional payment in cash is expenses of the project. The overview table shows that:

- From the overview in Annex 2, it appears that the greatest proportions of co-funding in cash have been provided in Costa Rica, usually by the CR participating (partner) organisation. The in cash counterpart type is more common in the CR components and not so common in the Bhutanese or Beninese components.

- There are a few cases where an external donor organisation has provided substantial amount of co-funding, such as project 05-B-07 in Costa Rica (FAO funding), project 14-P-07 in Bhutan (WWF and UNDP funding) and project 04-B-07 (GEF and Bhutna Trust Fund).

#### *On approval and progress*

- The time it takes to develop a good project proposal appears to vary, but sometimes takes quite long, especially reciprocal projects. For instance, the trilateral energy project took several rounds of reformulation of concept-notes and draft-proposals. The final approval of the tri-lateral energy programme was more than one-and-a-half year after drafting the first concept note by the Bhutanese partner organisation. Earlier pilot projects submitted within this theme were not approved.
- In the first round, the time between final submission date and approval by the MB took less than 2 months (fast-track) to 3 months. In total 19 projects were approved. The time between approval and contract signing (start-up) took between 2 and 11 months, with an average of 6 months. The projects involving Benin organisations took longest, because the NM in Benin became fully operational only in October 2008.
- In the second round, the time between final submission date and approval by the MB took 3 months. The average time between approval and start-up is 2 months, excluding the case of the trilateral energy project which has formally still not started.
- In the third round, the process has been diffuse, with the deadline for submission being extended twice as very few good projects were submitted. So far only one project has started. The others (approved June, July) have not yet started.
- A significant amount of concept-notes and proposals has been rejected or required several rounds of reformulation. According to some project partners feedback on rejections and reformulations has been limited and sometimes the reasons for rejection were not clear.
- *It can be concluded that the time to get projects approved is about 3 months, while the time to get projects started after approval initially was at average 6 months, now it has reduced to about 2 months. Feedback on rejected proposals has been limited, thus limiting the possibilities for partners to improve quality of proposal or to develop better fitting proposals with the goals of the PSC.*

#### *On proportion of disbursement and progress*

- From the first round of 19 projects (started between February and October 2008), by end of July 2009, 2 projects have received 100% disbursement, of 3 projects 80% has been disbursed, of 3 projects between 50 and 75% has been disbursed, and of 11 less than 50% has been disbursed (sometimes as low as 15%).
- From the second round of projects (all started by December 2008, except for one), the first disbursement has been received (varying from 15 to 50%), but not yet the second disbursement.
- *It can be concluded that of the first round of projects at average 42% of funds has been disbursed, for the second round 25%, and nil for the third round (by 30/07/09, but one disbursement made in August). For the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> round together the average is 36% (including the 3<sup>rd</sup> round would be 34%). Three approved projects in the 3<sup>rd</sup> round have not yet started. This is the situation with about one year of PSC implementation remaining.*

The following table shows the distribution of project funds and disbursement between the three countries, according to the projects in which the countries are involved. These data do not take into account distribution of funds within (bilateral or trilateral) projects. Projects from Bhutan and Costa Rica both take 75% of the total budget allocated to projects. Benin projects take a lower proportion (57%). Disbursement to projects in Costa Rica (as a proportion of total disbursements) is 75%; for Bhutanese projects 83%, and to Benin projects 48%. This indicates that projects with Bhutanese involvement have a slightly better financial performance than projects in which Costa Rica and Benin are participating. Benin shows lowest involvement as well as lowest financial performance.

	<b>Costa Rica</b>	<b>Bhutan</b>	<b>Benin</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Funds allocated total projects (total period)</b>	\$ 7,300 K	\$ 7,300 K	\$ 5,600 K	\$ 9,800 K
<b>Proportion of total</b>	75%	75%	57%	
<b>Funds disbursed as of 30/07/09 (total period)</b>	\$ 2,500 K	\$ 2,800 K	\$ 1,600 K	\$ 3,300 K
<b>Proportion of total</b>	75%	83%	48%	

K = \$ 1,000

## 4. Project results

### 4.1 Overview

A representative set of projects was selected for more detailed study during each country visit (see section 1.4). Of these projects, the following issues were analysed and listed, and are captured and summarised in the overview tables in Annex 5:

- Progress on activities and results (according to plans)
- Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives).
- Problems and constraints
- Is the project expected to finalise on time?
- Indication of expected outcomes, impacts and /or upscaling (this was assessed using the format in Annex 3).

### 4.2 Analysis

From the analysis of information from selected projects, the following insights were obtained.

#### Progress of projects

First, looking at the level of progress in project implementation, the following estimated distribution can be made of selected projects from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> round.

	Level of current progress			
	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
Number of selected projects	05-T-08	04-B-07 02-B-07 24-B-08 03-B-07 32-B-08 27-B-08	01-T-07 02-T-07 03-T-07 05-B-07 24-P-07 05-P-07 03-B-08 23-P-07	04-P-07 12-P-07 16-P-07

It can be observed that while the programme is at 2/3 of its available time, several projects have not yet arrived at 50% of their results. However, progress is definitely higher than the average level of budget disbursement (36%). This can be supported by the following observations during the country visits:

- It has taken quite some time for projects to get started. Reference is made to complex procedures and difficult communications.
- Especially in Benin and Bhutan projects state that it takes long to receive funds. This is especially the case where funds should be received from the leading partner organisation in other countries. Some pilot projects claim they have received very few funds. These projects have therefore pre-financed their activities with own funds.
- Most constraints mentioned relate to other causes of delays, such as purchase of materials, difficult communications, management problems or change of staff.

These possible causes will be further analysed in chapter 6.

### Reciprocity

As regards the level of reciprocity, we have made a four-point scale:

0. No reciprocity (pilot project without exchange)
1. Weak reciprocity (bilateral or trilateral project with exchange but parallel projects)
2. One-way reciprocity (bilateral or trilateral with real one-way exchange)
3. Two- or three-way (balanced) reciprocity at project level (bilateral or trilateral with real two-way exchange)

	Level of reciprocity			
	0	1	2	3
Number of selected projects	04-P-07 12-P-07 05-P-07 23-P-07 24-P-07	04-B-07 16-P-07 27-B-08 05-T-08	01-T-07 03-T-07 02-B-07 05-B-07 03-B-08 24-B-08 32-B-08 03-B-07 04-P2-07	02-T-07

The following are some relevant observations, supported by country studies:

- Most pilot projects indeed show low levels of reciprocity. However, pilot project 16-P-07 is an exception (mushroom marketing), as it works closely together with the trilateral project 02-T-07. Such examples of synergy between projects could be more promoted.
- Four projects have exchange activities, but the projects look rather 'constructed' (i.e. type 1), meaning that projects in different countries are just lumped without much mutual interests.
- The trilateral project on energy (05-T-08) at the moment of this review did not yet take off and limited contacts between the partners have taken place. Given the significant delays in processing of this project and the limited contacts between partners, achieving reciprocity in this project will be a challenge, and we believe that it may be better to support three separate pilot projects with limited exchange.
- By far most projects have good potential of a one-way transfer of knowledge from one country to another, based on well-defined interests. The other way round, the transfer of knowledge is less clear, although project proponents in most cases show great interest in each others activities and claim to have learned a lot.
- There is one project that shows a high level of reciprocity, meaning that each of the three countries has something to offer the other countries, so that there is a balanced way of realising exchange. This project had been designed well before the PSC started, as partner organisations knew each other for some time during the SDAs.
- In terms of themes, most reciprocity has been achieved in the themes of sustainable tourism and sustainable use of biodiversity. In terms of countries, by far most reciprocity occurs between Costa Rica and Bhutan.

An important observation is that partners in reciprocal projects have all appreciated reciprocity. There are clear indications that partner organisations have learned from each other, on expected (planned) project elements, as well as unexpected project elements. Two examples are:

- Project 05-B-07: the Costa Rica delegation unexpectedly learned from Bhutan about the rationale of organic agriculture, and the efficiency of traditional livestock breeds.
- Project 03-T-07: application of the methodology in Benin and Bhutan has been much appreciated by these countries, while in Costa Rica it has urged the researchers to simplify the model, thus making it again more applicable in several other countries.

### Expected progress

As regards whether projects will be expected to finalise in time, the following very rough estimated distribution can be made:

	Expected progress at end of programme			
	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
Number of selected projects		05-T-08	04-B-07 02-B-07 05-B-07 24-B-08 32-B-08 03-B-07	01-T-07 02-T-07 03-T-07 04-P-07 12-P-07 16-P-07 05-P-07 23-P-07 24-P-07 03-B-08 27-B-08

It can be observed that, while two pilot projects are already finalised, several more are expected to finish on time. However, several of the selected projects are not expected to finish on time. In chapter 6 will be discussed ways of speeding up the programme.

### Outcomes, impacts and upscaling

As regards whether projects will have outcomes and impacts in line with thematic objectives, we used our own indicators (see Annex 3) to make a quick assessment. Also, upscaling potentials were discussed, which would be expected to contribute to realise impacts. The following rough estimated distribution can be made:

	Expected level of outcomes, impacts and upscaling			
	nil	low	moderate	strong
Number of selected projects		05-T-08 32-B-08 05-P-07 23-P-07 27-B-08 24-P-07	03-T-07 04-B-07 02-B-07 03-B-08 24-B-08 04-P-07 12-P-07 16-P-07 03-B-07	01-T-07 02-T-07 05-B-07

The following are our observations supported by country studies:

- Most projects will realise outcomes in line with their set objectives. In many cases, there are good potentials to realise impacts, and good potentials for upscaling. This means the projects have been well identified in the national context. In the case of

pilot projects in Benin, it is remarked that the project objectives have so far focused at local level results only, and thus do not appear to be very ambitious.

- It is difficult to say to what extent projects contribute to thematic objectives and expected outcomes, as no such monitoring has so far taken place. Our indication is that many projects do contribute to thematic objectives in a moderate way.
- There is no monitoring of impacts or indication of expected impacts. There also seems to be some confusion about results, outcomes and impacts.
- There are good potentials for upscaling in many projects, and this could be a powerful way of realising greater impacts. Especially in Costa Rica, some reciprocal projects show evidence of effective measures to promote upscaling, including communication (brochures, website, video, logo, etc.), strategic partners (with private sector, local government and other stakeholders, and initial contacts with funding agencies and others. One condition for upscaling would be that the project is well defined within a wider policy setting. Co-funding in capital would be another strong positive indicator (case of FAO in 05-B-07). Bhutan and Benin could learn from effective upscaling strategies to enhance impacts in their countries and reach out to higher (policy) levels. However, in Bhutan, in the areas of national park management (biodiversity) and in eco-tourism, the projects have concrete elements for upscaling. This is much more limited in the sustainable value chain development projects.
- In the three countries the evaluators have found limited evidence of actions in the projects and in the PSC management to address policy issues, while such actions could greatly enhance perspectives for upscaling of projects. In the design of the programme such policy actions were anticipated, but in practice these have not taken place systematically in any of the countries.

### **Participation**

On participation, it seems (from desk studies and field visits) that most projects have done a good job. In Benin, participation is mainly at local level, by involving local stakeholders. In Bhutan and CR local participation is also well taken care of.

The question is to what extent there has been participation by other types of stakeholders, especially at higher levels and aimed at upscaling possibilities. In Benin the private sector seems to be a blind spot. In Bhutan, on the contrary, the involvement of the private sector, which is recently emerging, is a positive factor. The PSC provides a special and unique possibility for support to private sector initiatives, which is otherwise often neglected in support programmes. In CR the private sector is well involved in several cases (see Annex 2), and in some cases there is also strong involvement of national or local government (projects 05-B-07, 03-T-07 and 04-B-07).

### **Equity**

Equity is generally interpreted as gender equity. This is a cross-cutting issue which in most projects receives adequate attention. Typical gender oriented projects are, however, undesirable, as they do not focus at the central theme of sustainable development. The PSC Secretariat has undertaken a survey among beneficiaries of the 13 PSC projects executed in CR (direct benefits or trained people), and found that there is good gender balance, or a positive bias for women (for people trained to be trainers). Indications on gender-balance from Benin and Bhutan are also positive.

### **Exchange events**

According to a summary provided by the PSC Secretariat, so far 19 international exchange events have taken place. These include two experience exchange events involving multiple organisations, as well as 17 exchange events within projects.

### **Capacity building**

Capacity building is the main objectives of several of the PSC projects.

The NM of Costa Rica has surveyed the 13 PSC projects executed in CR, which reveals that about 1,000 people have been trained within these projects. It is also mentioned that about 40 medium and small enterprises have improved their productive capacities, about 10 new products were developed and 40 new services were developed. These findings would still need to be validated.

A similar survey was carried out in Bhutan by SDS. The survey data from Bhutan are not precise for all projects. The survey data shows that close to 700 people have benefited with training and workshops and exposure visits. Visits and training were done in the region mainly, involving 10 international exchanges. According to SDS 9 exchange activities took place between Costa Rica, Benin and Bhutan, only one of them being a visit to Benin. Several other exchange and training visits are scheduled for the remaining period of the programme.

In Benin, it is mentioned that the PSC has greatly contributed to capacity building of some NGOs operating PSC pilot projects (capacity building here appears to focus at the basics of project management).

### **Building multi-stakeholder alliances**

Within the projects it can be observed that indeed several multi-stakeholder alliances have been formed. In CR the projects have lead to an estimated 30+ new alliances (although it is unclear what were the criteria used: are all of these functional?). In Bhutan the PSC has contributed significantly to emerging private sector and NGO's in this country, which are new phenomena's in the Bhutanese democratization process and therefore an important (possibly not entirely planned) positive side-effect of the PSC in this country. An exception may be Benin, where several pilot projects are run by NGOs rather on their own (albeit in close cooperation with local authorities and beneficiaries).

### **Relevance**

Relevance may relate to the PSC concept and the identified PSC projects. As regards project relevance, some criteria might be:

- Do the projects have potential to meet the PSC objectives?
- Are there good potentials for reciprocity?
- Are the projects well associated with national priorities?
- Would projects not have received funding by other sources than PSC?

In all three countries, the concept of south-south cooperation is considered very relevant and challenging. Within government agencies, the PSC concept is probably best known in Bhutan. In Costa Rica, the PSC concept has been most actively promoted by the NM. In Costa Rica, there are no doubts about relevance of the PSC projects. In every case the undertaken activities have a high level of innovation, and would not be financed by other agencies if not PSC. At the same time, many projects are a follow-up on earlier experiences (e.g. models or systems applied elsewhere and further developed), or a

widening of the scope of existing programmes. However, there should be caution to continue funding activities that would normally have to be financed by Government, such as valuation of biodiversity in National Parks, and setting up a biodiversity information system. The PSC initiatives have certainly helped create new insights, with potential upscaling. There is a genuine interest in developing and working on reciprocal projects with personal motivations described as ‘opening new horizons’ and ‘learning from other cultures’.

In Bhutan, there are no doubts about relevance of the PSC projects. Especially the reciprocity with Costa Rica is appreciated, and knowledge from Costa Rica has had some obvious benefits for Bhutan, particularly in national parks, sustainable tourism and biodiversity research and management. PSC also has proven to be very relevant to support the process of emerging private sector and civil society.

In Benin, the projects are generally well appreciated. However, there are comments about the projects being isolated and thus not having great impacts unless they receive good follow-up. This is also related to the fact that identified (pilot) projects do not seem to fit into larger programmes. Also, in one case the project would seem to be able to receive government funding (03-B-07) and in another case it is doubtful whether the project fits in the PSC objectives (05-P-07).

## 5. PSC sustainable development results

### 5.1 Introduction

According to the PSC multi-year plan description, and the logframe, the projects are mainly a means to realise the wider PSC objectives, as outlined in section 2.3., and worked out in terms of indicators in Annex 3. It is also relevant to refer to the four different dimensions in the multi-year plan (see section 2.3), with expected results and activities defined, of which the latter two levels would be at more strategic and policy levels. The PSC workplan at programme level also specifically takes up activities to address the programme level, under the heading of “Promote PSC for sustainable development”. It is also useful to refer to the original objectives of the SDAs, which evolved into the current PSC, which is to set in place a new model for north-south (south-south) cooperation, to promote this model and to make it work elsewhere. It also relates to the 6<sup>th</sup> theme of the PSC, which refers to alliances between civil society, private sector, research and government, as a vehicle for North-South-South development cooperation and funding.

We will now investigate progress at the level of PSC development objectives.

### 5.2 Progress

There is a general observation from all country visits, especially in Costa Rica and Bhutan, that less attention has been given to policy level objectives as compared to specific projects and their local objectives. It is understandable that priority has been given to the identification and implementation of projects, being the core of the PSC to which 80% of funds would need to be allocated.

We will now review progress as classified per PSC development objective.

#### 1. *Meetings with and commitments by other agencies:*

- Meetings were held with the Dutch Embassy in Benin and Costa Rica, on the possibility of financing for PSC II phase. In CR discussions were also held with donors from Great Britain and FAO. In Bhutan some partner organisations have been able to attract funding for other activities and projects.
- While in all countries, especially Bhutan and Benin, donors show much interest in the PSC, none of them has provided any co-funding to PSC projects or has adopted the concept by financing its own projects along these lines. For instance in Bhutan there is a clear interest from UNDP and Danish Government.
- However, in Costa Rica and Bhutan collaborating partners have put in substantial amounts of co-funding in some projects (see section 4.2). In most cases these are national organisations. Co-funding in cash is a good indicator for upscaling potential, as it shows that others have genuine interest in the project.
- In Costa Rica some government agencies show interest in the PSC concept, largely because of their direct involvement in PSC. In Bhutan the interest and support of the Government is substantial. The SDS, as the NM of the PSC, is funded by the Bhutanese Government. For CePED this is also the case in Benin.

#### 2. *PSC promotion events:*

- PSC was promoted during the 2 experience events held in Benin and Costa Rica where more than 40 organizations participated.
- PSC was promoted by the NM Bhutan during the Netherlands Climate Change Assistance Program
- SDS participated in the NCAP and IATUR conferences for sharing of experiences on a south-south basis
- The PSC attended the Carbon Expo to look into opportunities for a II phase on Climate Change. This was supported by the Ministry of Environment in CR.

3. *Promotion materials:*

- 500 units of the PSC folder and the flyer were distributed to each NM for the PSC to be promoted at the global level. These were mainly distributed within the three countries, but much less at international level.
- In the case of Costa Rica, Fundecooperacion works with a communication company EDILEX that facilitates diffusion of radio program, written information in newspapers. More than 10 articles were published in the newspapers in CR about PSC and opportunities with Benin and Bhutan. Radio programs were also diffused as well as TV programs. The II call for proposals was announced in two newspapers. As a result, the PSC is by now relatively well known.
- In Bhutan promotion and diffusion of the programme is done through newspapers, radio and through meetings and conferences. The scale of Bhutan enables such direct marketing. As a result, the PSC is widely known and well appreciated. The same applies to Benin, although somewhat less promotion has taken place so far.
- The PSC website is operational and updated periodically.

The following are some observations and conclusions:

1. Costa Rica has adopted a strong promotion campaign, involving a professional company. Promotion has so far focused at identification of potential project proponents and its partners. While this goes well together with promoting the PSC concept, target audiences would be different when one would aim at promoting the PSC concept for others to adopt.
2. In Bhutan and Benin little promotion has taken place towards the donor community, although both countries accept that this is important and will be carried out soon.
3. Without exception people are interested in the PSC concept. "It trickles the imagination", as someone in Costa Rica mentioned. However, so far there have been limited concrete support actions. Interest and appreciation of the PSC concept in Bhutan is high. This is associated with: a) southern-managed programme; b) exchange and reciprocity and c) attention for sustainable development.
4. There does not yet seem to be a clear promotion strategy of the PSC concept for (any of) the three PSC countries.
5. When the PSC programme is being promoted, the PSC concept is not elaborated. Looking at the brochure and flyer, the PSC concept is mainly understood in terms of countries exchanging experiences and working together on projects. A wider strategic or political meaning is not included. MB meetings have, as far as can be traced back, never discussed the more strategic aspects of the PSC concept.
6. While these had been planned, there have been few cases where PSC partners have participated at international events. This can also be understood by the lack of funds available for this component of the PSC.

## **6. PSC management framework**

### **6.1 Introduction and general impression**

We will now look at the PSC management system, and in doing so try to understand some of the constraints identified in realising the objectives of the PSC, at project and at programme level, as identified in chapters 4 and 5.

In general, the management system and procedures of the PSC are well elaborated. There is a handbook of procedures and guidelines, with formats for projects to comply with. It is our impression that the PSC Secretariat and NMs are all dedicated and responsible bodies, committed to make the best of this Programme. In principle, everyone is willing to respect the agreed-upon procedures. Having said so, it seems there is also need to agree on some flexibility in application of the procedures in specific cases. This would help projects move ahead in specific cases. There is need to agree on some simplification of procedures based upon experiences so far.

### **6.2 PSC programme management**

#### **6.2.1 Planning, monitoring and reporting**

At PSC programme level, including the three NMs and the Secretariat, annual plans and progress reports are made, starting with the 1<sup>st</sup> half year of May-November 2007. These plans and progress reports all have a matrix which is often referred to as a logical framework. It is used to plan activities and assess progress over the given period. Thus, these are rather work-plans for the NMs and the PSC Secretariat, to plan and manage the PSC implementation process. This is different from the logframe which would be used to assess whether the PSC objectives are being realised. So far, progress reports did not elaborate on monitoring progress according to the set objectives – which would also require the aggregation of results of executed projects.

#### **6.2.2 Execution of work-plans**

So far, two periods have been covered by progress reports at PSC programme level. For the current period progress is based on observations by the mid-term evaluation team.

##### *Operative half-year (May 2007 - Nov 2007)*

As regards the two objectives of consolidation of the administrative structure of the PSC at Fundecooperacion, and of providing administrative, financial and operative support to the PSC, all planned activities were carried out. These relate to internal and external communication, visits to the two other countries, planning, reporting and logistics, and activities proposed in the COCA for Fundecooperacion.

As regards strengthening of the PSC as a promoter of sustainable development, various promotional activities were carried out by the PSC Secretariat, especially the web-portal was developed (for Fundecooperacion and for the PSC) and a promotion strategy for Costa Rica was designed with a specialised communication company.

In this period, most efforts were to get projects off the ground, following the delay caused by negotiations with the RNE in Costa Rica. Another weakness during this half year was the fact that the NM in Benin was not yet formally operational.

*First year (Nov 2007 – Nov 2008)*

As regards the management of the PSC, all activities were carried out as planned. Country reports take more time than expected, due to delay in financial audits mainly. All MB meetings were carried out as planned.

The same can be stated for project management. Delays were caused in getting approved projects started, which is mainly caused by delay in signing contracts and lack of compliance to the procedures. The late functioning of the NM in Benin caused delays for some projects in Benin. A framework with indicators for project monitoring and evaluation has not yet been elaborated.

As regards promoting the PSC as a concept for sustainable development, some activities were not fully realised, especially promotional activities, representation at international conference and learning and exchange events. This may be explained by a high workload in identification and management of ongoing projects.

The progress report concludes that it has been a hectic year, mainly due to operational and communication problems. It was concluded that these problems might have been caused and aggravated because of cultural differences between the participating countries. As a result, a communication workshop was organised in Bangkok in June 2008. The first year was also critical in getting approved projects started and implemented, to generate results within the limited time available.

*Second year (Nov 2008 – Nov 2009)*

As regards project management, the main delay perceived is the upgrading of pilot projects to reciprocal projects, which has proven to be more difficult and time-consuming than expected. Also, problems with financial audits caused delays in the execution of some projects as disbursements were delayed. A framework with indicators for project monitoring and evaluation is being developed.

Many programmes started during the first six months of this second year. Some projects have run into problems, and we would like to mention two. One is the tri-lateral project 05-T-08 which that at the time of this review still did not take off. Another is the project 15-B-08 which has limited activities and problems in implementation (in one of the participating countries).

As regards promoting the PSC as a concept for sustainable development, this will probably remain the objective with least progress (promotional activities, representation, exchange and learning events).

### **6.2.3 Organisational development of National Mechanisms**

All National Mechanisms were subjected to a Checklist Organisational Capacity Assessment (COCA), according to the requirements by the RNE in Costa Rica.

In Costa Rica, the NM is Fundecooperacion, which is an NGO that now exists for almost 15 years. Apart from managing the PSC, it basically has one other large programme being a Credit Fund, which provides loans to activities within similar themes as the PSC. The COCA of Fundecooperacion was carried out in February 2006, partly by updating an earlier COCA. The results were discussed and improvements agreed upon. Basically,

Fundecooperación meets the standards and has sufficient capacities to assume this new role. The discussions have led to an important process of change within Fundecooperación. The improvements based on the COCA were fully realized by the end of the start-up phase (end 2007).

In Bhutan, the Sustainable Development Secretariat (SDS) is the NM. It was set up in 1994 for the management of the SDA and since then existed without interruption (although it has shifted between ministries). The Netherlands development cooperation is still managed by SDS, which gives this cooperation a special status as all other bilateral donor relations are managed by the Development Cooperation Division in the Gross National Happiness Commission. The SDS currently resides under the Gross National Happiness Commission and as such it receives high level and significant policy support. The COCA of SDS was carried out in October 2007. The results were largely satisfactory, and there has been good follow-up to the findings and areas of improvement. This is reported upon in annual and half-yearly reports. The report Nov 2008 – May 2008 indicates that most activities are well on track, particularly those related with project-cycle management and reporting and dialogue in the NM and MB. However, much less activity is shown in the area of promotion of the PSC model among other organisations and participation in networking and exchange events.

In Benin, the PSC programme is managed by the Centre de Partenariat et d'Expertise pour le Développement Durable (CePED), resorting under the Ministère du Développement. CePED is the successor of the Centre Béninois pour le Développement Durable (CBDD), which was dismantled due to management failure. This unfortunate history still affects the newly established CePED. The Netherlands has suffered financial losses with this cancellation operation and was sceptical with regard to Benin's capacity to manage development funds. CePED was established in November 2007. The COCA was organised only in May 2008, with a positive result. By July 2008 CePED received authorization to receive funds, and by October 2008 funds were received. The Benin report observes that the recommendations of the COCA have been followed up (cf. report Dumas).

The institutional memory with regards to the PSC and its precursor the SDA, varies between these three NMs. In Bhutan there is reportedly an excellent institutional memory on the SDAs within Government as a whole. In Costa Rica the memory is good within Fundecooperación, even if current staff is new for PSC. In Government circles the PSC is known especially within the Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Environment. In Benin a new NM was established, and the institutional memory seems to be rather weak, even if Government gives the current programme a high importance.

#### **6.2.4 Role of different structures**

##### ***Role of National Mechanisms***

According to the PSC regulations, the tasks of the National Mechanisms include:

- promoting the PSC at national level and coordinating the implementation of projects and activities;
- coordinating with NMs in signatory partner countries on all issues relevant to the planning;

- implementation and evaluation of the PSC, and identification of reciprocal activities;
- facilitating, in partnership with civil society organisations, the identification and formulation of South-South cooperation projects eligible for support under the PSC
- submitting plans and proposals to the secretariat for approval by the MB
- contracting entities in or outside government to implement projects or activities that have been approved by the MB
- supervising the implementation of PSC projects and ensuring proper monitoring and financial administrative accountability and activities at national level
- submitting disbursement requests, annual reports, evaluation and audit reports of approved projects to the PSC secretariat
- carrying out a proper assessment of the administrative and management capacity of the applicant.

Some observations are the following:

- One important task of the NM is to provide training on the PSC procedures to organisations involved in PSC projects in the respective countries, so that they know the procedures and respect these when implementing the project. This has been adequately done in each country, according to our interviews. In Benin, it is stated that changes in procedures have limited the usefulness of these trainings.
- Another important task is to monitor and support projects receiving PSC funds. Again, all three NMS have shown great responsibility in undertaking this task, once in 3 to 6 months per project. In Benin, it is stated that long distances and lack of funds are limiting factors to carry out this task.
- As regards the promotion of the PSC at a national and international level, most activities have so far been undertaken in Costa Rica.
- While NMs in Bhutan and Benin are semi-autonomous government agencies, the NM in Costa Rica is an NGO. Being a government agency assures close relations with government policies, and enables decisions to be easily shared and communicated with government and existing policies. Being an NGO allows for quick decision-making and the possibility of taking an independent position. Although the NM in Costa Rica would currently seem to be the only suitable candidate to run the Secretariat of the PSC (given the flexibility in decision-making and the efficient banking facilities in Costa Rica), there has been confusion with regards to the mix-up of the NM and Secretariat functions within one organisation.
- It is reported that CePED still suffers from the bad reputation of its predecessor, being the CBDD. This may explain why private sector agencies have not yet wanted to embark on PSC funded projects, and why on the contrary several relatively unexperienced NGOs have joined the PSC programme in Benin.

### ***Role of PSC Secretariat***

According to the PSC Procedures, the NM of Costa Rica provides the PSC Secretariat, allowing for coherence with their role and obligations as administrator of the PSC Fund. The tasks of the secretariat include:

- implementing the decisions taken by the MB;
- preparing MB meetings and/or written or electronic conferencing;
- setting dates for MB meetings in consultation with the chair and other members, convening meetings and submitting a draft agenda at least two months in advance;

- preparing documentation for discussion and decision-making by the MB and ensuring it is distributed to the MB members at least one month before the meeting.
- drafting minutes of meetings (for approval by the MB), distributing them to the MB members, and informing Fundecooperacion in their role as PSC Fund administrator about the decisions on the allocation of funds;
- arranging the transfer-of funds for approved projects to the accounts of the NMs concerned, on the basis of disbursement request.
- monitoring progress of PSC implementation;
- preparing consolidated PSC multi-year, annual plans, multi-year and annual reports and ensuring annual auditing takes place;
- keeping documentation, the bulletin and/or website up to date.
- providing support in the organisation of the meetings of the Joint Committee of the PSC.

The mid-term evaluation team has observed that the PSC Secretariat is dedicated and responsible to ensure that the PSC is being properly managed. Reference is made to the fact that the PSC Secretariat is accountable to the RNE in Costa Rica for the entire PSC programme, including the NMs in the other two countries. A strong sense of accountability has been more or less imposed by the RNE in Costa Rica, which during early stages of the PSC expressed serious doubts whether Fundecooperacion could do the job of managing the PSC.<sup>4</sup>

Managing the PSC programme according to the set procedures, with reciprocal projects in three different continents in different cultural settings, is a very tedious job. Human resources inputs by the PSC Secretariat are far more than normal working hours. Likewise, the NMs in Bhutan and Benin also expressed very long working hours.

There has been criticism on the Secretariat, especially in terms of three aspects:

- One is the mix of responsibilities within Fundecooperacion, having a double role of being the Secretariat and the NM with representation in the MB. During MB meetings, this has caused confusion and is perceived as a too powerful position of Fundecooperacion. There is a perception of decision-making being dominated and centralised within the Secretariat;
- The PSC procedures are perceived as being complex and time-consuming. This refers to the time it takes to approve a new project and to get it started, as well as project reporting and financial accounting. Reference is made, for instance, to 10 different tables for financial reporting. In Benin it is claimed that the PSC Secretariat has adjusted and complicated the procedures along the way, which has caused difficulties and has made the training on the PSC procedures useless, as “the rules keep on changing”. This has not been confirmed by interviews from Bhutan. The PSC Secretariat noted that procedures have not changed, but NMs have not fully realised what implementation of the procedures implies. It also noted that some procedures have been applied with flexibility (such as the approved case of Bhutan, with one audit body, the Royal Audit Authority, and annual instead of 6-months audits);

---

<sup>4</sup> The person responsible for monitoring the PSC at the Dutch Embassy in Costa Rica, stated that everyone at the Embassy was convinced that Fundecooperacion could not manage the PSC, and the programme would be stopped after the probation period of 6 months.

- The role of the PSC Secretariat in financial reporting and audit procedures is questioned, as the PSC Secretariat is considered to undertake a double-check (duplication of activities by the NMs). This is perceived as an indication of distrust and is not considered useful.

### ***Role of Management Board***

According to Articles 4 and 5 of the PSC Regulations, the MB is comprised of three members: the directors or the formally appointed representatives of the NMs in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica. While more than one delegate from the National Mechanisms may participate, each NM has one vote. The MB shall decide on the policy governing the PSC and on the allocation of funds to the PSC for projects or other purposes. The MB shall jointly appraise funding proposals against set criteria and policies, and allocate funds to approved projects and activities. The MB meets twice a year.

The specific tasks of the MB are the following:

- to develop and approve priority themes, policies and regulations needed to meet the goals and comply with the principles laid down in articles 1 and 2;
- to monitor and supervise compliance with these regulations, themes and policies;
- to assess and approve or reject project proposals, including pilot project proposals.
- to approve or reject the minutes of meetings of the MB, as referred to in article 4, in which the decisions referred to under points 3 and 4 of this article are specified
- to advise the signatory Parties and the fund administrator on improvements in the deployment of the PSC Fund;
- to approve the multi-year and annual plan, annual report, multi-year and final report;
- to approve PSC progress, monitoring and evaluation reports;
- to evaluate projects and activities implemented under the PSC;
- to report to the Joint Committee of the PSC.

There have been 5 MB meetings so far (see section 2.2), with minutes available. During these meetings, far most time has been allocated at the assessment of project proposals. Also, compliance with the PSC procedures has been monitored, and new procedures have been proposed and discussed. It seems from the MB minutes, limited attention has been given to more strategic issues, such as defining priority themes, policies and regulations to comply with PSC principles and development objectives.

A first extraordinary MB meeting has been held in Bangkok in June 2008 to discuss and solve serious communication problems. An external consultant has facilitated the workshop and provided training on communication matters. Since then, it is reported that communication has much improved. It has been suggested that such communication training should be part and parcel of an inter-cultural programme such as the PSC, and not be applied only in case of communication problems. The workshop brought relief, but some of the bottlenecks seem to persist, which suggests that the issues at stake might not be merely limitations in intercultural communication, but rather related to the PSC management system and application of procedures.

The mid-term evaluation team wonders why some fundamental issues that have come up during this mid-term evaluation, such as criticism on the PSC procedures, have not been earlier discussed during the MB meetings.

### ***Role of Joint Committee***

According to Article 3 of the PSC Regulations, the Joint Committee of the PSC will be comprised of the high level representatives of the partner countries and shall provide political support and policy directions to enhance the implementation of the PSC. The Joint Committee of the PSC meets at least once in two years. Representatives of the government of the Netherlands will be invited to the Joint Committee meeting.

The JC has effectively met once (November 2007). According to the PSC Secretariat the meeting has been instrumental in enhancing ownership in the three countries, especially for Benin, to speed up the process of identifying a new NM. However, the minutes are very brief with hardly any useful observations or action points. From the Bhutan perspective it is observed that the JC has had very limited contribution to the development of the PSC, as almost no issues of strategic direction were discussed and the JC merely performed to affirm the deliberations of the MB.

### **6.3 Internal communication and coordination**

Internal communication remains an issue of concern. This is due to different languages and cultures, different time zones of the three countries, and due to uncertain access to internet in Benin. This causes delays in decision-making, and misunderstandings due to the fact that e-mails and telephone are incomplete communication systems. Most importantly, there were many non-expressed assumptions and a lack of trust between the three NMS and the Secretariat, which lead to the need to organise a special MB meeting in June 2008. Since then agreements have been made about internal communication such as the use of e-mail.

It is reported that since then communications have improved. However, there are still instances of late or incomplete responses, causing delays and corresponding feelings of confusion and frustration.

### **6.4 Financial management**

There are 6-monthly external audits to be carried out of the projects and of the budgets of the NMs. Weaknesses in financial reporting and audits are one major cause of project delays and misunderstandings. There seem to be different opinions about the rigidity and level of detail about financial administration and reporting, which may be partly due to cultural differences. For instance, there are frequent requests for disbursements of the next period while a major proportion of the previous disbursement funds has not yet been accounted for.

One specific problem was directly related to the fact that the RNE in Costa Rica only provided funding of \$ 1 million for a probation period, in stead of the required funding of

about \$ 4 million. This implied that initially there was a shortage of funds for the NMs, as priority was given to funding of approved projects, so that some of the NM related activities had to be pre-financed by the NMs. Apparently, it was not clear to all NMs that the cause for this shortage of funds was directly with the donor.

There is a regulation that a minimum of 80% of the PSC annual budget in any given year should be destined for reciprocal projects, including pilot projects by way of exception (item 1). The remaining 20% can be spent on four issues:

- Reciprocal exchanges, consultations and/or research to determine areas of cooperation and/or positions to be adopted, including those relating to sustainable development at international conferences;
- Programme promotion and evaluation such as PSC publications and their distribution and valuations;
- Operational support, by NMs of Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, for administrative and operational costs at national level and costs for attending MB meetings;
- The PSC Secretariat for costs of administering and accounting for PSC programme implementation and fund administration, preparing MB meetings, communications, documentation, bulletin and/or website (not exceeding 5% of total planned disbursements in a given year).

Meeting this condition poses difficulties, basically for two reasons. One is that spending of the budget on projects has been less than expected, due to late approval and contracting of projects costs and delays in project implementation due to problems of poor financial reporting mainly. Second is that, on the other hand, operational and management costs have been more than expected. For instance, organising MB meetings has been more costly than expected, and to cover additional costs the budget of the PSC Secretariat has been used.

It is expected that the 80/20 rule will be met over the entire programme period, by adopting the following recommendations:

- Spending of some remaining project funds on national workshops to assess results of projects and agree upon additional project activities (which will be at the benefit of the project beneficiaries);
- Spending on these defined additional project activities;
- Flexibility in budget allocation, by accepting that exchange activities are directly at the benefit of the projects themselves, i.e. the overall results and outcomes.

## **6.5 Project management**

### **6.5.1 Identification of reciprocal projects and matchmaking**

Projects have been identified especially through the initiative of the NMs. They have promoted the PSC concept, contacted potential project partners and negotiated with project initiators to improve the project idea. The PSC has also undertaken matchmaking efforts, to bring together potential project organisations and thus support the design of reciprocal projects. Two such experience exchange events (EEEs) were organised, one in February 2008 (in Benin) and one in June 2008 (Costa Rica). Each EEE focused at a limited number of PSC themes. In both cases, potential project organisations were selected within each partner country, and were then supported to participate in the EEE.

Indeed, the second call for proposals generated 37 reciprocal projects (against 13 in the first round). However, of these 37 reciprocal projects, only 8 were approved, while many of the selected projects did not have convincing reciprocity aspects worked out.

The following observations can be made on the process of matching and the resulting partnerships of these processes:

- Where partners already knew each other and had had prior experiences in cooperation during previous phases of the programme, matching was relatively easy and these projects took off with considerable speed (e.g. the three trilateral projects in first round);
- Where the matching was done at a later stage and with strong support from the NMs, these have seldom led to good partnerships;
- In general exchange between Bhutan and Costa Rica has worked well, with active cooperation and joint development and implementation of projects; the exchange with Benin is limited and not very intensive;
- Trilateral exchange in which three partners intensively cooperate and exchange with each other, has been successful in one case (02-T-07). In the two other trilateral projects that took off, there are no direct trilateral relations.
- Reciprocity aspects are not the first priority in the projects. The partner organisations in these projects are in the first place focused on producing results in their own local contexts and secondarily interested in exchange with other countries. Some of the bilateral projects as a result seem more like stand-alone projects realised in parallel in two different countries, rather than joint initiatives.
- The third call for proposals has been very problematic in generating good bi- or tri-lateral projects. This might be because from the beginning the pilot projects did not focus at reciprocity, and it appears to be very difficult to force pilot projects into reciprocal project modes. This seems to be an important lesson learned.

It can be concluded that good reciprocal projects mainly depend upon a shared vision and a long history of (getting to) knowing each other. Conscious efforts (of organising exchange events and matchmaking efforts) have limited results in terms of designing effective reciprocal projects.

### **6.5.2 Project selection**

Projects were selected during three calls for proposals, in 2007, 2008 and 2009 (see timeline section 2.2). Projects must meet a set of criteria and are assessed in a systematic way, in line with PSC Regulations articles 11 to 14. The following are the main elements of the selection process.

1. Three calls for proposals were developed, with clear indication of thematic areas, timetable and deadline, eligibility criteria, budget criteria and procedures for submission. Detailed formats are provided for submission of proposals and budgets.
2. Project proposals must be submitted to the NM of the country where the lead agency is located. NMs of the countries involved all assess the proposal. The assessments are then compiled by the PSC Secretariat and discussed in the next MB meeting, where a joint decision is taken. Three types of decisions are possible: rejection, approval or approval under conditions.
3. The assessment is carried out using two formats. One is a scoring checklist which includes 12 mandatory criteria and 29 other criteria (classified in 4 categories) with a

total possible score of 404 points (of which at least 60% should be reached). Second is a qualitative assessment framework listing implementing organisations, main objectives etc., a summary of key issues for assessment and qualitative observations. These two assessments are summarised in an ‘evaluation format’ which summarises the mandatory criteria, the overall scores on the checklist and the main observations. This final format is input to the MB assessment and object of discussion to obtain a joint decision.

- Maximum budget ceilings varied for the different types of projects, as follows:

Type of project	Length of project	
	2 years	3 years
<i>Pilot project</i>	Not relevant, always \$ 100,000	
<i>Bilateral project</i>	\$ 400,000	\$ 600,000
<i>Trilateral project</i>	\$ 600,000	\$ 1,000,000

- Some additional requirements and criteria were defined, partly along the way, such as maximum of consultancy fees, organisations not liable to submit more than 2 project proposals, and proposals not liable to be submitted more than twice.

The three rounds of calls for proposals had some specifics:

- While reciprocity is the key feature of PSC projects, only during the first round pilot projects were also accepted, situated in one country only, but with demonstrated potential for reciprocity. This option was considered acceptable to gain time, because the development of fully reciprocal project proposals appeared to take much time.
- The third round only considered successful pilot projects from the first round with a fully reciprocal component, thus becoming bilateral or trilateral reciprocal projects.

The following are comments and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation:

- The process of project selection is systematic and the procedures have probably been respected. However, especially in Bhutan and Benin organisations are dissatisfied by the poor feed-back received when a project is rejected. They stated not to know why the project was rejected. One striking case are the energy projects submitted by the Department of Energy in Bhutan, which have all been rejected while the reasons are still not clear.
- The checklists and procedures for project approval and getting projects started are lengthy, thus the assessment process takes much time.
- On the other hand, it seems that principles of reciprocity and upscaling could be highlighted and further elaborated, because they are critical for overall success and impact.
- Formats for project proposals are good, but are not clear on the logframe format especially on indicators. There is a mix up of terminology and definitions. It is therefore not surprising that good indicators have not been defined.
- For pilot projects to be eligible for the third round and reciprocal activities, they must have shown success. Success was not assessed in a systematic way, but in a qualitative way by the NMs concerned.

### **6.5.3 Management**

The time between submission of a project proposal and approval takes about 3 months, while the time between approval and getting the project started has declined from an average of 6 months during the first round to 2 months during the 2<sup>nd</sup> round.

Reciprocal (bilateral or trilateral) projects are in principle managed jointly by the partner organisations involved, with shared responsibilities in terms of its implementation (in line with the equity principle). However, final responsibility lies with the lead organisation. This implies that the lead organisation has final responsibility for all documents to assure approval and signing of the contract, for coordination of the project, and for the technical and financial reporting. To be able to do so, the lead organisation can request for an additional budget, which must not exceed 7.5% of the overall budget. This provision has proved to be a problem in the case of one university in Costa Rica (Universidad Nacional), where a provision for administration of at least 11% was requested.

Lead organisations all mentioned that management of reciprocal projects is very complex. They especially refer to the financial reporting procedures, which are not always respected by partner organisations, so that the whole project is being delayed (this is the case for at least two reciprocal projects). While some lead organisations stated that the financial procedures are normal (referring for instance to UNDP procedures), others mentioned that the procedures are excessively strenuous. If a partner organisation is not able to provide a good financial report (or external audit), the lead organisation is responsible for assuring this is corrected, before submitting the project technical and financial report to the NM. In at least one case, this has lead the lead organisation in Costa Rica into unforeseen problems, of (i) having to communicate with the partner organisation about financial accountability issues, and (ii) not receiving the next disbursement so that the project had to be halted and expectations among beneficiaries could not be met.

Especially in Benin and Bhutan projects state that it takes long to receive funds. This is especially the case where funds should be received from the leading partner organisation (in Costa Rica or Bhutan) – for instance this is the case for projects 03-B-07 (partner in CR). Some pilot projects also claim that they have received very few funds (e.g. 05-P-07). These projects have therefore pre-financed their activities with own funds. One ongoing dispute is project 15-B-08, in which strong involvement of the NMs is required (there are doubts about the proper use of funding by the Costa Rican partner). In the tri-lateral energy programme (05-T-08) the partners in the programme are still waiting for the first transfer of funds. With the Bhutanese partner, the Department of Energy this has caused frustration as this organisation is still waiting for a first sign of support, since late 2007.

### **6.5.4 Monitoring and reporting**

Projects are requested to provide 6-monthly technical progress reports, and to do so a format has been proposed (see PSC Procedures Annex 11). In addition, an external audit must be carried out each 6 months. Based on these reports, the NM approves the reports and forwards to the Secretariat technical and financial semester reports regarding progress of the project, for approval and next fund disbursement.

The NMs are expected to carry out regular monitoring of the projects being executed in their respective countries. In Costa Rica, monitoring visits are made once every 3 months, during which progress is discussed and solutions to constraints are given. There are also frequent telephone contacts with project organisations. This has definitely contributed to good project progress. In Benin an extensive monitoring system has been worked out and is being applied. In Bhutan there are quarterly field visits, regular telephonic discussions and meetings, which has also proven to be quite effective.

The PSC Secretariat has developed a 1- or 2-page progress report summary for quick overview of each project. It gives the main characteristics, and then a matrix with overall objective, specific objectives, expected and then realised outcomes. This is a good initiative. However, the summaries hardly give progress, and it is still not easy to get a quick idea of what the project is about and whether it is 'on track'.

Some other observations from the field visits are the following:

- One of the key features of the PSC, being exchange and reciprocity, is poorly documented in the progress reports. It has been difficult for the evaluators to reconstruct what reciprocal activities had taken place.
- It is not easy to see how projects contribute to thematic immediate objectives and related (outcome) indicators.
- Progress reports are thick and seem to be at places unnecessarily detailed (e.g. listing of all activities).

### **6.5.5 Project evaluation**

So far two projects have been finalised (04-P-07 and 16-P-07) but they have not yet been evaluated. A format is available for project evaluation (Annex 12 of the PSC Procedures), and initiatives have been taken to develop evaluation impact indicators, or adjust this framework. The framework is currently under development .

The following are comments and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation:

- The existing evaluation format (PSC procedures) is complex, while on the other hand misses some important elements (e.g. lessons learned, impacts, upscaling potentials, ...);
- The financial regulations of the PSC stipulate that 20% of funds will only be transferred to the projects, after closure and submission of the reports. However this may cause constraints to partners, particularly those that don't have significant budgets to pre-finance activities. In Bhutan the four pilot projects of 2007 are all at 80% of expenditure. There appears to be some misunderstanding whether this implies that that the project is in fact finished, as (according to the procedures) a preliminary final report should be submitted before remaining funds can be disbursed and the project can be finalised.

### **6.5.6 Lessons learned**

Some lessons learned have been captured during the mid-term evaluation, as follows:

- It takes more time to start a reciprocal project than a 'normal' project;

- Management of reciprocal projects is not easy, and requires higher overhead costs than with normal projects;
- At the ground (working) floor, language is not a barrier as expected;
- Physical contacts between the people involved in a project is essential in order to successfully implement the project.

## 7. Conclusions

### ***Relevance***

While all three countries have environmental policies, the policy context is especially favourable in Bhutan and Costa Rica, characterized by the predominance of 'green' economies. This is less obvious for Benin. This policy context has probably been at the basis of identifying these countries for the SDA partnership. During this mid-term valuation, we found most ownership of the PSC in these two countries as well as motivation to invest in the PSC and a continuation of the PSC. We conclude that the policy context is favourable, and that the PSC has further strengthened this favourable policy context. However, the PSC could have been more effective in addressing and strengthening the policy context (see below under effectiveness).

In all three countries, the concept of south-south cooperation is considered very relevant and challenging. Within government agencies, the PSC concept is probably best known in Bhutan. In Costa Rica, project proponents show sincere interest in developing the concept and relevance of reciprocity within the reciprocal projects. In Bhutan, reciprocity with Costa Rica is considered most relevant. In Bhutan the PSC is also very relevant in supporting emerging initiatives of private sector and NGOs. In Benin, the PSC seems to be mostly interpreted as another interesting type of donor support, i.e. through south-south cooperation. In Benin, most projects have local impacts only, and two selected projects are considered less relevant (23-P-08 and 05-P-07).

The themes supported by the PSC programme are relevant in each country, especially sustainable tourism and biodiversity management.

### ***Recommendations:***

- There is need to reconsider the relevance of the three countries, as well as other possible partner countries, for a possible second phase. This should be done first of all as based on the policy context and a shared vision favouring sustainable development.

### ***Effectiveness of projects, impacts and upscaling***

Most projects will be effective in realising set objectives. Several projects address innovative aspects (which is one reason why they are financed by the PSC). Pilot projects often have less ambitious objectives. In many cases, there are good potentials to realise impacts, and good potentials for upscaling, especially in Costa Rica and in a lesser degree also in Bhutan. This means the projects have been well identified in the national and local context. The remaining time required to realise the objectives is very short. While most projects are expected to be able to finalise within the remaining programme time, this would be possible only with considerable time pressure and therefore an extension of the time frame by at least half a year would be very welcome.

In most projects reciprocity is an added value. However, in some reciprocal projects the issue of reciprocity is a burden rather than an added value. In these projects (see below) corrective measures should be taken immediately to split up the reciprocal projects into pilot projects, which will have much greater chance of succeeding.

In terms of themes, projects in the themes of sustainable tourism and biodiversity management have been most effective. Here, most impacts can be expected. In the theme of chain management, mainly local impacts can be expected, as the projects generally address only a small part of the complex system. The theme of sustainable energy is very relevant in all three countries, and it is a mystery why no good projects have been started on this theme. The theme of gender equity is classified as gender equity, but shows little linkages to sustainable development. On the other hand, most other projects have taken into account gender equity aspects. Gender equity should not be a theme but a cross-cutting issue.

Hardly any project addresses the higher level objectives of policies and institutional strengthening, although expected results for these levels have been identified in the multi-year plan. This should be a priority issue for the remaining period. It is related to upscaling efforts. Especially in Costa Rica there is evidence of measures to realise upscaling, including communication (brochures, website, video, logo, etc.), strategic partners (with private sector, local government and other stakeholders), and initial contacts with funding agencies and others. This would be a useful theme for exchange and learning between the countries.

Benin claims that an overall strategic programme is required to bring together the various (pilot) projects financed under the PSC programme, and thus generate greater results and impacts. We believe this is unlikely to happen.

*Recommendations:*

- Putting reciprocity into practice takes time. An effective time frame of 2.5 years for the PSC is hardly enough to develop reciprocity. Therefore, possible options to be able to extend the timeframe of the PSC should be explored.
- NMs should ensure by all means that projects still pending to get started (approved in 3<sup>rd</sup> round) can get started as soon as possible (4 in total). No new projects should be proposed, nor approved, as it is unlikely that these projects will generate good results in the remaining time. In the remaining time for the PSC programme, the emphasis should be at assuring good results of the ongoing (and approved) projects.
- Corrective measures are suggested for the following two projects:
  - In case of the trilateral project on energy (05-T-08), there is limited potential for genuine reciprocity. The project is a typical example of constructed reciprocity. Now that funding has been made available, it could better be split up as soon as possible in three separate projects, because it is unlikely that in the remaining period reciprocity will work. These three projects can then follow their own planning rather than a forced cooperation between partners. This is particularly relevant, as this is the only energy project in the whole PSC.
  - In the project 15-B-08 accountability problems are faced and involvement of the NMs is urgently required. It may be an option to continue this project as a pilot or with another partner.
- Measures should be taken in the remaining time to address policy levels. This can be done by upscaling successful projects. Upscaling of project successes to greater

scales, in order to realise greater impacts through policy changes, is of great importance. Especially in Costa Rica a start has been made to do so in several projects. Based on successful experiences in Costa Rica the PSC Secretariat should work out guidelines for effective upscaling to be adopted by the other NMs.

- Gender equity will need to become a cross-cutting issue. Projects solely addressing gender equity should be finalised (as a pilot project) or upgraded to better show the relationship with sustainability.

### ***Contribution to PSC goals***

Management of the PSC programme has so far focused at getting projects off the ground. So far less attention has been given to the development objectives of the PSC. This might be partly due to the fact that relatively few funds are available for this objective (20% of total spent funds).

In all three countries, the PSC concept has been promoted, mainly to potential project proponents. Without exception people are interested in the PSC programme and the underlying concept. Especially in Costa Rica the PSC programme has also been promoted to potential donors, but this could be done more strongly. In Bhutan and Benin little promotion has taken place to donors, although both countries accept that this is important and in Bhutan donors have expressed an interest in this programme. So far there have been limited support actions by other organisations. One underlying problem is that the PSC concept as such has not been clearly defined.

### ***Recommendations:***

- There is need to work out the PSC concept: what does it include? What are the main features? What are the differences between S-S and N-S cooperation? What are success factors for managing such a programme? This is a priority issue to be addressed during the upcoming MB #6.
- In the remaining time, the MB should pay more attention to the strategic and political aspects of the PSC concept, and the linkages with sustainable development policies. If funds allow, the PSC concept should be promoted at international events.
- More attention should be given to promotion of the PSC concept to potential donors and interested Governments, at an international scale, once it has been well defined. A promotion strategy would need to take into account different audiences for different purposes of promoting PSC. Emphasis should be given to promotion of the PSC concept, for agencies to adopt for their own programmes or for a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of PSC.

### ***Efficiency***

The PSC programme is characterised by a large set of procedures. These procedures are rather strictly applied by the PSC Secretariat in Costa Rica. Since the Secretariat coincides with the NM in Costa Rica, this is considered a too powerful body, dominating decision-making. Strict application of accountability standards by the PSC Secretariat can be understood by the high level of criticism and scrutiny of the RNE at Costa Rica at early stages of the programme. The high level of accountability and strict adoption of procedures, while understandable and correct, has also been one the main causes for delays of several projects. Another point of criticism is the perceived absence of clear feed-back to project proponents on reasons of rejection of their proposals. This has caused some frustration and the subject should be addressed.

Managing a programme with three countries in different parts of the world, and putting in practice reciprocity, is a very tedious job. If only communications between the countries, and between partners within reciprocal projects, takes very much time and efforts. The PSC management and reciprocal projects involved should therefore be congratulated with realising the current state of affairs. But to successfully finalise the PSC programme, there seems to be need for some flexibility, in order to enable projects to realise their objectives in time.

Note also that the spirit of the PSC programme is to stimulate innovation, in terms of addressing sustainable development challenges and realising new alliances and partnerships. A management system with some flexibility would be in line with this spirit.

Existing project monitoring is focused at results. There is no systematic monitoring of outcomes or impacts. There also seems to be confusion about results, outcomes and impacts, in various templates used by the PSC Secretariat.

*Recommendations:*

- For a possible 2<sup>nd</sup> phase there is need to rethink the management model, dissociating the function of NM and Secretariat from the same organisation.
- There is an urgent need for the MB to agree upon (i) simplification of procedures, being the new norm; and (ii) agreement for flexible application of procedures in specific cases. This is important for the procedures of selection and approval of projects, which are too lengthy. However, it is most urgent for technical and financial reporting of projects. Technical reporting should be more concise, with better distinction of results and outcomes, and attention for key issues such as reciprocity, upscaling and policy level aspects. It is also recommended to reconsider the evaluation format, adding at least elements on reciprocity aspects, lessons learned, outcome and impact indicators, upscaling efforts, new alliances established.
- Most critical now seems to be a simplification of the auditing system, whereby internal audits can be done during project implementation, and one external audit is done at the end of the project. It is important to understand that flexibility is only allowed when circumstances demand so, and where otherwise serious risks of project delays occur. The PSC Secretariat is advised to develop a proposal for the next MB meeting.
- During the country visit by the mid-term evaluation team, some ongoing burning matters regarding the release of funds were discussed and checked. The PSC Secretariat was advised to be flexible and advance disbursements while awaiting some remaining pieces of evidence. Our argument was that if funds would not be released, this would be at the expense of project progress, as well as good relations between NMs and the Secretariat. The mid-term evaluation considers the financial risks rather limited, and is confident that the donor (RNE in Costa Rica) will understand this rationale.
- There is need to set in place a monitoring system to capture results and outcomes, and if possible impacts. To do so, a system has been proposed by the Secretariat and so far applied by the NM in Costa Rica. This initiative needs further improvement before it can be widely applied, especially by: better distinction of result, outcome and impact indicators; better linkages to PSC thematic objectives; strong reduction of the number of indicators; elaboration of a simple methodology. We have worked out an approach, with a limited set of selected indicators, presented in Annex 6.

- The PSC Secretariat is requested to discuss the above issues with the RNE in Costa Rica, and assure that the RNE agrees with the above attitude and proposed changes. The PSC Secretariat is also requested to contact the RNE in case of serious doubts during the remaining PSC period.

### ***Sustainability of impacts***

In a general sense sustainability is at risk due to the short period of project execution that remains for several projects. This has been especially noted for several projects running in Benin. Thus, follow-up or exit strategies should be assured for those projects that have not yet been able to sustain their results. This subject relates to the subject of upscaling, policy advice and advocacy, and building alliances.

#### Recommendations:

- In order to increase sustainability of project results, NMs and projects are advised to investigate and apply the following options:
  - Demonstrate why the project is important (by showing results) or expected to be important
  - Establish alliances with partners who might provide follow-up (based on their own interest)
  - Contact donors who might be interested to finance a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase
  - Adopt principles of upscaling (see above).

### ***Reciprocity***

Five different levels of reciprocity may be distinguished:

0. No reciprocity: pilot project without exchange
1. Weak reciprocity: bilateral or trilateral project with exchange but parallel projects, so that there is little mutual learning and synergy
2. One-way reciprocity: bilateral or trilateral with real one-way exchange, so there is at least one country learning a lot from the other.
3. Two- or three-way balanced reciprocity: bilateral or trilateral with real two-way exchange, so that there is in at least two countries mutual learning
4. Policy level exchange: bilateral or trilateral with real two-way exchange at policy level, with clear potentials of influencing these in a useful way.

Most pilot projects show low levels of reciprocity, as expected. Some reciprocal projects have been 'constructed' (level 1). Most reciprocal projects show reciprocity at level (2), thus particularly with one-way benefits. One trilateral project is at level (3). The fourth level of reciprocity has so far not occurred in the PSC. It is still too ambitious.

An important observation is that partners in reciprocal projects have generally appreciated reciprocity. This is especially the case between Costa Rica and Bhutan. There are clear indications that partner organisations have often learned from each other, on expected (planned) project elements, as well as unexpected project elements.

However, the identification of projects with a high level of reciprocity is difficult and takes time. In fact, successful trilateral projects were identified well before the start of the PSC programme. This partly explains why in Benin few such projects have been identified, since CePED was established only late. Moreover, the management of reciprocal projects is complicated, which does not favour organisations to take the lead. Successful reciprocity mainly depends upon a shared vision and a long history of (getting to)

knowing each other. So-called 'arranged marriages' do not work. This implies that conscious efforts (of organising exchange events and matchmaking efforts) can be effective especially if there is sufficient time for organisations to get to know each other and work out a joint proposal.

*Recommendations:*

- There is need to review procedures of developing reciprocity projects. What are the success factors and procedures? How can this process be simplified and shortened? One measure would be to start out from a shared vision and common problems (demand driven) in stead of matchmaking projects (supply driven). Also, new partner organisations need sufficient time to get to know each other and assess whether they have a shared vision on sustainability.
- There is need to simplify the procedures in managing reciprocal projects, thus stimulating organisations to try it out and take the lead.
- More reciprocity could be created as projects proceed. One example is pilot projects being linked to reciprocity projects (example of pilot project 16-P-07 and trilateral project 02-T-07). Another would be of adding new activities, as opportunities for reciprocity are identified along the way (example of 05-B-07, which identified potentials for exchange on organic farming and livestock keeping).
- Pay specific attention to examples and lessons learned on successful reciprocity, and success factors involved.

**Capacity development**

All three national mechanisms have much benefited from the PSC in terms of their internal capacity building. For instance, Fundecooperacion has developed a new mission and strategy. Capacity building has also been one of the main objectives of several of the PSC projects. It appears that indeed many people have been trained and medium and small enterprises have improved their productive capacities. These findings would still need to be validated and monitored. In Bhutan, emerging private sector organisations and NGOs have also benefited.

**Level of participation**

On participation, it seems that most projects have involved relevant stakeholders, mainly at local level. Most participation concerns local level stakeholders.

*Recommendations:*

- More attention should be given to participation by other types of stakeholders, especially at higher levels and aimed at upscaling possibilities. In Benin more attention could be given to the private sector. In CR the private sector is well involved in several cases, as well as good examples of involvement of national or local government.

**Support to PSC by others**

In Costa Rica and Bhutan, the incidence of co-funding in cash has been important. In the other countries, this has not been the case. The building of new alliances and interests by other organisations in the PSC programme appears to be strongest in Costa Rica (with numerous examples, see Annex 5). In Bhutan, there is high commitment and sense of ownership within Government and at the same time UNDP and the Danish Liaison Office have expressed that they are interested to discuss with SDS some of the

concepts and principles as well as project-activities in the PSC. In Benin, this is also the case. Several donors have shown interest in the PSC concept.

*Recommendations:*

- More attention should be given to monitoring and documentation of the added value of the PSC projects, defining the PSC concept, and then promotion of the PSC concept as supported by project results.
- A promotion strategy should be developed, as was planned.

***Exchange and lessons learned***

Some lessons learned have been mentioned by project proponents during the mid-term evaluation (section 6.5.6). We believe that many more relevant lessons are available to be captured.

*Recommendations:*

- Within the remaining PSC programme period, there is need to identify lessons learned. This exercise should be well structured, and as much as possible be based on evidence.

***Added value***

Putting in practice reciprocity in a proper way, i.e. assuring two-way exchange based on mutual interests and concrete demands, has costs and benefits. Costs may be high when countries are wide apart, with different languages and different cultures. However, when properly done, there is also a clear added value, in terms of expected and unexpected benefits for participating partners. There is also a clear added value for south-south cooperation as compared to north-south cooperation. The main reason is the fact that there is no interference by the culture of a donor-client relation (the donor who needs to spend budgets, and the client who seeks the funds).

However, for the added value of south-south cooperation to generate tangible benefits, it seems there is need for a shared vision on sustainable development within the highest level of government (and therefore probably within society at large). The PSC programme can then build onto this initial willingness, and further expand it. The PSC management model, with some changes and simplifications as proposed, can help ensure good results.

## 8. Future perspectives

It is understood that administratively the PSC programme should be finalised within the agreed time schedule (November 2010). This would imply that projects have to be finalised by around August 2010. However, there may be options of 'closing the books' within the agreed time schedule but using PSC funds after this date. These options should be explored.

It is also understood that the RNE in Costa Rica will definitely not fund a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase.

It should also be kept in mind that south-south cooperation is by now not anymore a new concept. It is already being applied by some donor countries. For instance, the Netherlands has funded a project of Brazil supporting Mozambique in developing a biofuels policy and programme. Thus, the innovative aspects of the PSC programme and concept should be well defined in relation to such existing initiatives.

The uniqueness and added value of the PSC concept is linked to three ambitions: to strengthen sustainable development, to influence policy levels, and to do so through reciprocity between countries. We believe that, as long as donor-client relations do not interfere, the PSC concept has equal potentials for south-south and north-south *cooperation for sustainable development*. Thus, for a potential new programme, a wide coalition of countries with a clear sustainable development commitment, both in the south and the north, could be envisaged.<sup>5</sup> It could be a global partnership for sustainable development.

Thus, we believe that the PSC programme and countries involved should not aim for a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the present programme. Rather, the aim should be to go for a new programme, albeit possibly with some existing partner organizations involved in the PSC. We would propose the following steps to develop new and realistic options for a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase after the programme has finalised in 2010, with some actions required to be taken during the coming MB #6:

- explore the options to be able to extend the timeframe of the PSC, thus to enable projects to finalise their activities without excessive time pressures (to be initiated during MB #6);
- of the current PSC programme, document the lessons learned and results (see below);
- revisit the shared vision on sustainable development by the three countries involved in the PSC, and the expected added value of the PSC model in a possible 2<sup>nd</sup> phase (to be done during MB #6);
- define the key strategic features of the PSC concept, for publication and promotion purposes, including the principles and benefits of south-south cooperation for sustainable development (prepare during MB #6 and then work out by the Secretariat);
- define a joint focus within the theme of sustainable development, for instance climate change (considered a priority by all three countries);
- identify potential partners (prepare during MB #6 and then work out by Secretariat);

---

<sup>5</sup> For instance, including: Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, New Zealand, Norway, Swaziland, Switzerland, ...

- agree on a promotion strategy (prepare during MB #6 and then develop by each NM);
- agree on other strategic issues to be addressed in the remaining period, including: review of reciprocity procedures, review of project selection procedures, revision of PSC management model, identification of lessons learned.

***The following are considered priorities for the remaining PSC programme period, requiring agreement during the MB #6:***

1. Do not approve new projects, and ensure that remaining approved projects get started as soon as possible.
2. Consider corrective actions for projects with important delays or ongoing disputes, such as 05-T-08 and 15-B-08, as proposed above. These measures are aimed to avoid further delays and still produce results in important thematic areas of this programme.
3. Ensure that MB #6 approves simplification of procedures with respect to reporting and monitoring, and agrees on flexibility of applying these procedures in specific cases. This can be prepared by the PSC Secretariat. This is aimed to avoid further delays, and is based on the mutual trust that all NMs will assure good accountability at the end of the programme. Ensure that the RNE in Costa Rica agrees. The PSC Secretariat has already taken certain measures in anticipation of such an agreement, upon advice of the mid-term evaluation team.
4. Develop options to extend the timeframe of the PSC available for projects to finalise their activities, within the existing formal and administrative boundaries as set by the donor.
5. Organise national workshops in each of the three countries (3 full days each), in February-March 2010, with the following elements included:
  - All national project proponents are to participate, as well as other important national project partners;
  - There will be an external facilitator (thus allowing independent participation of all organisations involved, including the PSC Secretariat);
  - Joint application of the monitoring framework to assess results, outcomes and impacts of all projects (see above), including a brief training beforehand;
  - Joint session to identify key features and draw lessons from overall PSC programme experiences;
  - Joint session on principles of project sustainability and potentials for upscaling;
  - Thematic sessions to draw conclusions on thematic results relevant for the country, with recommendations on sector strategies, thus also addressing micro-macro linkages (national sector policy makers can be invited for these sessions);
  - Definition of additional project activities for the period of April – August 2010, to meet the need for gap filling to ensure good results and where possible to influence policy levels and realise upscaling. These additional activities will be funded by remaining PSC project funds. This would only apply to projects that

have good results and outcomes, and which have potentials to further enhance success.

Note that it has been considered to undertake these workshops in an exchange between the three countries, aware of the fact that exchange can have an added value. However, this will be too costly. Also, exchange has proven to be most effective under field conditions and focused at mutual interest themes. Therefore, projects will be encouraged to define as part of their additional activities, relevant additional exchange events between partner organisations within the project.

6. Develop a simple monitoring system with result, outcome and impact indicators, based on the proposal in this report (Annex 6). This can be prepared by the PSC Secretariat, but will only be introduced and applied during the national workshops (see above).
7. Acquire approval of the RNE in Costa Rica on the plan for the remaining period, including above elements, and approval of the budget required to carry out this plan. This might include some flexibility in applying the 80/20% norm for projects versus other costs, by adopting the following recommendations:
  - Spending of some remaining project funds on national workshops to assess results of projects and agree upon additional project activities (which will be at the benefit of the project beneficiaries);
  - Spending on these defined additional project activities;
  - Flexibility in budget allocation, by accepting that exchange activities are directly at the benefit of the projects themselves, i.e. the overall results and outcomes.

## **Annex 1: ToR Programme for South-South Cooperation on Sustainable Development between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica (PSC) Mid-term external evaluation of the PSC**

### **I.- BACKGROUND**

During the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held in Johannesburg in 2002, the Republic of Benin, the Kingdom of Bhutan and the Republic of Costa Rica entered into a Strategic Partnership for Cooperation on Sustainable Development, signing an agreement on the 31 of August 2002. By means of this Strategic Partnership Agreement, open to the participation of other countries willing to join the partnership, the three countries reaffirmed their commitment to the pursuit of sustainable development goals.

This was the direct outcome of the experience generated from the Sustainable Development Agreements (SDAs) and the collaboration of the three partner countries and the Kingdom of the Netherlands within this framework. A decade of promoting and supporting hundreds of projects, implemented between two or more of the partner countries, of delivering joint declarations at multilateral forums and debating policies towards achieving sustainable development, has demonstrated the potential -not fully exploited so far- of an innovative framework of collaboration based on equity, reciprocity and participation, that tried to break with traditional North - South relationships in development cooperation.

#### **I.1 The Bilateral Sustainable Development Agreements and their follow-up**

The outcome of debate on the evaluation of the Bilateral Agreements on Sustainable Development in particular (2001), and of the debate on policies for development cooperation by the Netherlands parliament (2003), led the Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation to the decision, in 2004, to hibernate their active participation in these agreements. In line with this decision, the Netherlands National Mechanism, the Netherlands International Partnership for Sustainable Development (NIPS), hosted by the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), officially ceased to exist as per 31 of December 2005.

Instead, in 2005, a three-year Programme for South-South Cooperation on Sustainable Development between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica was proposed (PSC), based on the goals of the Strategic Partnership Agreement (signed between these countries in 2002), and the experiences of the Bilateral Sustainable Development Agreements.

The basic architecture, funding and responsibilities of the PSC Programme, laid down in the Regulations of this PSC, were agreed upon in a special meeting of the Joint Committee of the Sustainable Development Agreements, 18 and 19 of May 2005, at The Hague.

The PSC started with a six-month Set-up Phase on May, 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007. From November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007 to November 2010, the PSC is being implemented following the Multi-Year Plan. This plan was approved by the Dutch Embassy in Costa Rica, which was appointed by the Dutch Cooperation as the monitoring agency.

## **I.2. PSC thematic areas**

The following are defined as thematic areas or cross-cutting themes for the PSC:

- Sustainable tourism
- Sustainable chains of production and consumption
- Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
- Access to sustainable energy and efficient energy use
- Gender equity and empower women (cross-cutting theme)
- South-South cooperation for sustainable development (conceptual theme)

## **I.3. PSC objectives**

- Contribute to a more sustainable tourism sector in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: increasing benefits to rural communities; mitigating negative side-effects in the field of culture erosion and deterioration of natural resources; and promoting a stronger pro-poor and sustainability orientation of sector policies and incentives.
- Contribute to the construction of sustainable and competitive demand-led supply chains in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: by means of strengthening productive and commercial capacities of farmers and producer organisations; adoption of sanitary, phytosanitary and quality standards; enhancement of labour productivity, yields (output) and efficiency; sound management of natural resources and waste; and promoting their articulation with promising market actors.
- Contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: by means of developing patterns for win-win scenario's for different ecosystems (conserving nature while combating poverty), based on concrete experiences; and by influencing national policies and legislation.
- Contribute to enhancing access to sustainable energy in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: especially for less endowed families; promoting clean production and efficient use of energy.
- Promote gender equity and empower women in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, as explicit norm in the generation of results in the four major thematic areas and the sixth conceptual theme of the PSC: by means of pro-active and representative participation of women in all relevant activities conducive to those results.
- Explore the potential of the South-South partnership between Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica: as concept for fruitful national and international alliances between civil society actors, private sector, research institutions and government institutions; as vehicle for greater international commitments and co-operation between governments of the partner countries; and as autonomous channel for North-South-South development cooperation and funding.

#### **I.4. Beneficiaries / actors of the PSC**

- It is expected that the direct beneficiaries of the PSC projects are inhabitants of the partner countries, they are acting as protagonists in the development of concrete projects and activities, identified, carried out and monitored in a participatory way. Rural communities, women, small tourism firms, consumers, users of energy and actors that depend directly on a sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity, they are being amongst the principal beneficiaries / actors of the PSC. Project activities are orientated towards issues such as capacity building, organisation (enhancing existing social capital), technology development, improving market access, small investments in physical assets, and so on.
- Second, a wide array of intermediate or participant organisations are indirectly benefited. These can be grass-root organisations of the direct beneficiaries (like community organisations, cooperatives, associative enterprises, marketing boards); governmental and non governmental institutions or development organisations; local governments; academic and research institutions; and private sector companies or firms. Institutions and organisations that could play a facilitating role in project formulation, provision of services (like training, technical assistance and business development services), market access, financial services, technology transfer, research, and so forth, in concrete alliances for project implementation. Through their commitment and participation, they strengthen their capacities; accumulating knowledge, improving the quality of future services, and positioning themselves as reliable partners for service delivery.
- Third, the National Mechanisms are being benefited, and also the National Mechanism of Costa Rica that is acting as Secretariat of the PSC. The strengthening of their capacities and professionalisation is producing an enhancement of their role as facilitators for project implementation, and as platform for building alliances for sustainable development, between government, civil society and private sector. Their role is extending beyond the PSC time-span, and succeeding in finding ways as to guarantee their organisational sustainability and financial stability.
- Fourth, the Joint Committee of the PSC benefits from the programme, provided that commitment and effective communication mechanisms are in place. Successful experiences are inputs to share new viewpoints and bring the debate on sustainable development to other levels, both national and international. Successes attributable to the PSC, are fueling arguments for further exploring the potential of South-South partnerships for sustainable development, with a potential role for the Joint Committee as protagonist.
- Fifth, in a later stage, the wider community in the three partner countries is indirectly benefited from the PSC: provided that useful experiences are generated; that best practices are replicable in the partner country or -in a modified way- in other partner countries; or that best practices could be scaled-up in better sector or territorial policies; that stronger alliances for sustainable development and empowerment in the partner countries lead to better policies and strategies; that more people and organisations raise their consciousness and the will to act to bring about changes and innovations favourable to sustainable development; and so on.

### I.5 PSC Budget information

Reciprocal projects USD	General Management USD	Consolidated budget USD 2007 - 2010
10.602.410	2.650.602	13.253.012

For more information about PSC: [www.south-southcooperation.org](http://www.south-southcooperation.org)

## II.- MID-TERM EXTERNAL EVALUATION

### II.1.- Purpose

The purpose of the mid-term external evaluation is to generate input for decision making of the PSC partners:

- a) To establish the surplus value of this South-South cooperation in comparison with a North-South cooperation
- b) Assess the state of the implementation of the PSC in terms of outputs produced and outcomes achieved as compared to those planned.
- c) Assess results achieved or to be achieved by the projects financed under PSC in the three partner countries.
- d) Provide recommendations for the implementation of the programme and for a possible second phase.
- e) Identify lessons learned that provide information to be considered in the replication or extension the PSC model.
- f) Assess the efficiency in implementation: quantity, quality, cost and timeliness of PSC inputs and activities.
- g) Assess the relevance of PSC model in the three partner countries and as an innovative model in the international cooperation schemes.
- h) Assess PSC in accordance with Regulations, Contribution Agreement and PSC approved procedures.
- i) The prospects for Sustainable Development impacts according to PSC objectives.
- j) Cost-benefit analysis of this South-South cooperation
- k) To establish if this South-South cooperation has a catalyzing effect

The evaluation shall provide recommendations to be considered for a possible continuation of the PSC, although this possibility is not a commitment or stated in anyway in the official PSC Agreement.

### II.2. Evaluation methodology

The mid-term external evaluation shall determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (achievement of outputs and outcomes), pertinence, impact, sustainability and the Gender equity (cross-cutting

theme) of the PSC. It shall also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives.

The evaluation will be carried out through analyses of various sources of information including desk analysis, survey data, interviews with counterparts, beneficiaries, national mechanisms, lead and executing agencies, donor representatives and any other relevant stakeholder and cross-validation of data including a counterfactual method to verify that effects observed are due to PSC.

The evaluation will be conducted at five levels:

- The Management Board
- The National Mechanisms in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica
- The Secretariat of the PSC.
- The Joint Committee
- Project level

A detailed methodology and schedule shall be proposed by the offerer.

### **II.3. Reporting**

The evaluation report shall follow the structure given in Annex 1. The reporting language must be English.

A draft report will be shared with the MB and PSC Secretariat. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. The evaluators will take the comments into consideration when preparing the final draft of the report.

A preliminary draft report shall be sent by **September 10<sup>th</sup>** to the PSC Secretariat. If there are comments they shall be included in the draft report and submitted by **Sept. 17<sup>th</sup>**, to be included in the documentation of the MB meeting#6 that will be held in Benin on **Sept. 21<sup>st</sup>**.

The final version of the evaluation report will be submitted 2 weeks after the submission of comments by the MB.

### **II.4. Timing**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place August 2009. The field missions shall start in August. The deadline for submitting the proposals is **July 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009**.

### **II.5. The evaluation team**

The offerer must propose an evaluation team with the following minimum qualifications:

- Demonstrated expertise in the evaluation of International Cooperation Programs in developing countries.
- Expertise in gender equity assessment in development projects and in areas like:
  - Sustainable tourism
  - Sustainable chains of production and consumption
  - Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
  - Access to sustainable energy and efficient energy use
  - Gender equity and empower women (cross-cutting theme)
- Full knowledge of English is a must. French and Spanish knowledge will be a relevant plus.

The experience and qualification of the company and each of the consultants proposed to be in the evaluation team must be included in the proposal. **Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the PSC.**

PSC Secretariat and the National Mechanisms in the 3 countries will support the evaluation team.

The consultant will be contracted by the PSC Secretariat.

**The offerer must submit a complete and detailed technical and financial proposal according to these Terms of Reference, by July 30<sup>th</sup> to:**

**Ms. Marianella Feoli, PSC Secretariat, [mfeoli@fundecooperacion.org](mailto:mfeoli@fundecooperacion.org)**

## Annex 1

### Draft Report content (minimum)

- Executive summary (not more than five pages)
- Introduction
- Political and administrative framework of the PSC
- PSC planning
- Methodology
- PSC and projects implementation
- Assessment
  - **Relevance and ownership** (evolution of relevance over time: MB, the donor, the National Mechanisms in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, target groups)
  - **Efficiency** (quality of management, quality of inputs, are outputs produced as planned?, are synergies with other initiatives sufficiently exploited? Is PSC drawing on relevant in-house and external expertise? Is it management results oriented?)
  - **Effectiveness and impact** (assessment of outcomes and impact, reaching target groups, including changes generated in the communities and beneficiaries)
  - **Sustainability** (the extent to which economical, environmental and organisational sustainability will be achieved beyond PSC funds).
  - **Reciprocity** in the various levels of PSC.
  - **Level of participation** from all stakeholders and beneficiaries of PSC.
  - **Pertinence:** if objectives of projects funded by PSC are: pertinent with the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and communities; consistent with PSC objectives; and coherent with the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals.
  - **Gender equity and empower women** (cross-cutting theme) effective integration of gender equity in all objectives and activities under implementation.
  - If applicable: overview table showing performance by outcomes/outputs
  - **Funds** mobilization and monitoring
- Issues with regard to a possible second phase
- Recommendations: must be based on evaluation findings
- Lessons learned

## Annex 2: Agenda and persons met

### Netherlands

Martin Blok                      International Institute for Social Studies, the Hague  
 Christien Aben                 Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Hague

### Benin

POFAGI Mathias	CePED Director
TCHIWANOU Pascal	Expert en biodiversité - CePED
EZIN Casimir	Expert en ecotourisme - CePED
DOSSA Angéline	Assistante Service Admin et Finan - CePED
MEKPOH Richard	Chargé de Programmes - CePED
AZONVE Patrick	Chef service Admin et Finan - CePED

AIKPE M. Honoré	CeRGET
AMEGANKPOE Claudia	ECO ECOLO
DOSSOU-BODJRENOU S. Joséa	NATURE TROPICALE
DJONDO Maximin	ECO BENIN
ALLAGBE Marcellin	INRAB
TCHIWANOU Mahouna	CIPGEF
HOUNSOU Gilles	CHŒUR D'ENFANTS DU BENIN
NASSI Félix	CHŒUR D'ENFANTS DU BENIN
KOUNOUHO Luc D.	NATURE TROPICALE
ACODJI Abel	OBEPAB
ASSOGBA Claude	OBEPAB
FLOQUET Anne	CEBEDES
DEGUENON Pierrette	GRAD FB
LOUGBÉGNON Toussaint	NPT/FSA/UAC

KOUPAKI, Pascal	Ministre de la Prospective du Développement et de l'Evaluation de l'Action Publique
ASSOGBA, Dieudonné	Dir Adj du Cabinet, idem

Jan VLAAR	H.M. Ambassade in Cotonou, HOS
Carel de GROOT	HMA, 1-e Secr. Expert Eau

COHOUE Corentin	Prefet de Lokossa
DAHAN Pascal	Maire de Djakotomey
TOWEDFE, Justin	Maire de Zogbodomey
	3 village communities (more than 10 persons each)

**Programme Benin**

Date & time table	Agenda items	Remarks
Sunday 23 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
19:30 –	Arrival at the International Airport of Cotonou	
20:30 –	Night at Hotel du Lac (Cotonou)	
Monday 24 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
08:00 –	Pick up at the Hotel	
08:00 – 11:30	Work session at CePED with the National Mechanism (Director and staff)	
11:30 – 12:30	Work session at CePED (continuation), with staff (collecting info for Table)	
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
13:30 – 16:30	Various interviews	
16:30 – 18:30	Study of project documents; info for Table (contnd.); financial info.	
Tuesday 25 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
08:00 –	Pick up at the Hotel	
08:15 – 16:00	Field visit to Project 32-B-08 of CIPGEF in Djakotomey	3 communes
10:00 – 11:00	Meeting with the Prefect of Lokossa	
11:30 – 13:30	Visit to Project 32-B-07; interviews and discussions	
	LUNCH	
15:00 – 16:00	Meeting with the Mayor of Djakotomey	
16:00 – 17:00	Visit to Project 23-P-07 ; with local stakeholders	
17:00 – 17:30	Meeting with the beneficiaries in Djakotomey	20, men and women
19:00 – 22:00	Trip back to Cotonou	
Wednesday 26 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
08:00 –	Pick up at the Hotel	
08:30 – 13:00	Meeting with the Mayor of Zogbodomey; field visit to Project 24-P-07 of ECOBENIN in Koto-Zalimey/Zogbodomey	
13:00 – 15:00	LUNCH	
15:00 – 18:00	Field visit to Project 03-B-07 of INRAB in Allada; and 05-P-07 of GRAD	
18:00 – 19:00	Trip back to Cotonou	
Thursday 27 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
08:00 –	Pick up at the Hotel	
08:15 – 12:30	General meeting with all the promoters at CePED (all present); written survey	20 pers.
12:30 – 13:30	LUNCH	
15:00 – 18:30	Visit to the Ministry – interview with Minister. Visit to the Dutch Embassy	
19:00 –	Arrival in Hotel du Lac	
Friday 28 <sup>th</sup> August 2009		
08:00 –	Pick up at the Hotel	
08:15 – 12:30	Debriefing with the staff of CePED; cont. data collection	
12:30 – 18:30	Supplementary interviews; collect of information; checking of data; written interview/Director; financial data; finalization of tables	
19:00 –	Departure for airport	

## Costa Rica

Date	Agenda Item	Persons
Monday 17 August	Fundecooperacion: Secretariat National Mechanism	Mauricio Castro, director Amélie Jouault Pablo Chacón José Rafael Trejos Marianella Feoli
	Project 05_B-07 Representatives of INTA and FAO	Alan Bojanic, res rep FAO Jorge Morales
Tuesday 18 August	INBIO, project 02-T-07	Rodrigo Gámez, president INBIO Randall García, Director Manuel Zumbado Carlos Hernández Martín Salazar Ilima (beneficiary)
	INBIO, project 01-T-07	Manuel Vargas Randall García Carolina Roldán Cynthia Cordero Cecilia Pineda, National Museum (beneficiary)
Wednesday 19 August	TEC, project 04-P-07	Ana Rosa Ruiz Eugenio Trejos, Rector of TEC Dagoberto Arias, Vice-rector of Research Rosa Aguilar Indigenous group of women through videoconference
	CINPE, project 03-T-07	Mary Luz Moreno Rafael Diaz Mary Luz Moreno Fiorella Salas SINAC/Ministry of Environment: Giselle Mendez (beneficiary)
Thursday 20 August	Dutch Embassy	Ambassador Johannes Van Bonzel Wendy Engelberts
	Focus-group meeting	Project coordinators
Friday 21 August	Representative of the Ministry of Planning	Juan Carlos Pereira
	President of the Consortium of NGOs	Ronald Arias
	Debriefing at Fundecooperacion	Mauricio Castro Amélie Jouault Marianella Feoli

## Bhutan

Date & Time	Activity	Persons met
<b>25<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 Tuesday 9:00 am</b>	✓ Arrival at Paro International Airport	To be received by SDS
<b>10:00 am</b>	✓ Depart for Thimphu	One hour drive
<b>11:30 am</b>	✓ Meeting/discussion with National Mechanism of Bhutan, SDS	SDS Office: Ms Kunzang Chhimi, Officiating Director, Tshoki khandu, Sr. Programme Coordinator
<b>12:45 pm</b>	✓ Meeting with Head, NCD (Project 03-T-07)	Sonam Wangyel Wang, Chief Forestry Officer, Nature Conservation Division, Department of Forests, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>13:15 pm</b>	✓ Working lunch with SDS	Ms Kunzang Chhimi, Officiating Director, Tshoki Khandu, Sr. Programme Coordinator
<b>14:30 pm</b>	✓ Meeting with Head, Environment Unit, UN	Karma L. Rapten, Head of Unit, Energy, Environment & Disaster Cluster, UNDP
<b>15:45 pm</b>	✓ Meeting with Program Director & Project team NBC. Project 01-T-07	Dr. Tashi Yangzome Dorji, Programme Director, Singay Dorji, Sr. Biodiversity Officer and team, National Biodiversity Centre, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>17:00 pm</b>	✓ Meeting Managing Director & project team Bhutan Agro Industries Limited (BAIL) Project 32-B-08	Gyem Dorji, Managing Director Bhutan Agro Industries Limited and team
<b>18:15 pm</b>	✓ Meeting Executive Director, Project Managers of RSPN. Projects 12-P-07 & 04-B-07	Royal Society for Protection of Nature, Lam Dorji, Executive Director, Dago Tshering, Environment Education Officer and team
<b>19:45 pm</b>	✓ Working dinner with SDS	Ms Kunzang Chhimi, Officiating Director, Tshoki Khandu, Sr. Programme Coordinator
<b>26<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 Wednesday 9:30 am</b>	✓ Meeting with Head, Development Cooperation Division (DCD)	Rinchen Wangdi, Chief Programme Coordinator, Development Cooperation Division, GNH Commission (former Director of SDS)
<b>10:15 am</b>	✓ Meeting with SNV, Country Director, Bhutan	Megan Ritchie, Country Director Bhutan & Bangladesh, SNV
<b>11:30 am</b>	✓ Phone interview with Secretary of GNHC and chairperson of SDS, Mr. Karma Tshiteem	Mr. Karma Tshiteem, Secretary of GNH Commission and Chairperson of SDS (member of JC PSC)
<b>12:00 pm</b>	✓ Meeting with Director, Ministry of Agriculture	Chenco Norbu, Director, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>13:00 pm</b>	✓ Lunch meeting Honorary Consul of the Kingdom of the Netherlands	Ms. Anne-Marie Schreven, Honorary Consul, Consulate of the Netherlands,
<b>14:00 pm</b>	✓ Call on Hon'ble Minister, Minister for Labor & Human Resources	Dorji Wangdi, Minister of Labour and Human Resources, Government of Bhutan (former member of SDS)
<b>15:30 pm</b>	✓ Meeting Liaison Office of Denmark (LOD)	Mr. Tek Bahadur Chhetri, Deputy Head and DSr. Programme Coordinator, Liaison Office of Denmark (LOD)
<b>16:30 pm</b>	✓ Meeting with Executive Engineer &	Mewang Gyeltshen, Head/Chief

	Project Team of Renewable Energy Division. Department of Energy Project 05-T-08	Engineer and Sherab Jamstho, Engineer, Renewable Energy Division, Department of Energy, Ministry of Economic Affairs and team
<b>18:00 pm</b>	✓ Informal Discussion with Former Vice Chairman Board of Sustainable Development Secretariat	Dasho Megraj Gurung, Former Vice Chairman Board of Sustainable Development
<b>27<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 Thursday: 9:15 am - 13:30 pm</b>	✓ Focus Group Discussion with all Project Managers of projects not selected for in-depth study	Meeting with 15 participants in Meeting Hall – NBC, Serbithang
<b>14:30 pm</b>	✓ Telephone interview with Project Manager, Project 03-T-07	Ms. Sonam Choden, Project Manager, Nature Conservation Division, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>15:15</b>	✓ Meeting with Program Director & project team from National Mushroom Center (NMC) Project 16-P-07 & 02-T-07	Mr Dawa Penjor, Programme Director, National Mushroom Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and team
<b>16:30 pm</b>	<b>Project Visits:</b> ✓ Visit Project site at Pamtso Project 24-B-08,	Director and team, Puna Gakhil Handicrafts
<b>18:30 pm</b>	✓ Working dinner with all Project Managers and debriefing and discussion of preliminary findings country field visit	Meeting with 26 project representatives and SDS staff at Hotel Kisa
<b>28<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 Friday: 08.00 am</b>	<b>Project Visit:</b> ✓ Visit BioBhutan Project office Project 20-B-08	Dr. Irmela Krug, Executive Director and Ms Karma Yangzom, Managing Director Bio Bhutan and team
<b>09:15 am</b>	✓ Meeting Team Information & Communication Services Division (ICS) Project 05-B-07	Singye Wangmo, Sr, Communication Officer, RNR Information and Communication Services, Ministry of Agriculture and team
<b>11:00 am</b>	✓ Visit to Project office TGMI & meet beneficiaries. Project 27-B-08	Director TGMI and team and a group of artists (beneficiaries)
<b>12:00 pm</b>	✓ Lunch	
<b>12:30 pm</b>	<b>Project Visit:</b> ✓ Meet beneficiaries Genekha Project 16-P-07	Interaction with beneficiaries of NMC projects in Genekha.
<b>17:00 pm</b>	✓ Debriefing session with National Mechanism of Bhutan	Ms Kunzang Chhimi, Officiating Director, Tshoki Khandu, Sr. Programme Coordinator, Rinchen Wangdi, Chief Programme Coordinator, Development Cooperation Division, GNH Commission
<b>29<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 Saturday: 05:30 am</b>	✓ Depart for Paro International Airport	

N.B. Due to visa-problems the programme had to be decreased with one day, but fortunately almost all planned visits and meetings could be organised.

### Annex 3: Overview of outcomes per PSC objective (used during mid-term evaluation)

#### At the level of Development objectives

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Translate the goals of the PSC into concrete innovative activities and reciprocal projects, with the potential to generate knowledge, impact and empowerment; as building bricks for sector strategies and inputs for policy influencing.</p>	<p>§ Development of the project portfolio with reciprocity elements</p> <p>§ Promotion of the PSC concept to influence policy making</p> <p>§ Development of thematic sector strategies</p>	<p>§ Number and quality of reciprocal projects in the different themes</p> <p>§ Quality of the reciprocity aspects (quality of exchange aspects)</p> <p>§ Improved thematic sector strategies based on project results</p> <p>§ Policy influence based on PSC results</p>
<p>§ Mobilising organisations and institutions (government, civil society, academic sector, private sector) in the partner countries for renewal and reinforcement of multi-stakeholder alliances for sustainable development, with the National Mechanisms as important platforms.</p>	<p>§ Promotion / building of multi-stakeholder alliances</p> <p>§ Promotion of PSC concept among multiple stakeholders</p> <p>§ Training / capacity development of national organisations and institutions on sustainable development</p>	<p>§ Number of national alliances strengthened and operational</p> <p>§ Number of organisations / institutions with enhanced capacity on sustainable development and operational</p> <p>§ Number of requests to National Mechanism for advise on sustainable development</p>
<p>§ Contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction, taking into account the economic, environmental and social dimensions.</p>	<p>§ Conduct projects with positive sustainable development impacts</p> <p>§ Promote PSC as a mechanism for sustainable development</p>	<p>§ Sustainable development impacts on projects and themes (= result of evaluation of selected projects)</p>
<p>§ Explore the potential of PSC as concept to promote international commitments and mutual cooperation for sustainable development; and as channel for “North → South-South” development cooperation and funding.</p>	<p>§ Promotion of PSC concept at global level</p> <p>§ Exchange of lessons learned</p>	<p>§ Receptiveness and replication at international level of PSC concept</p> <p>§ Funding by third parties to support PSC concept</p>

At the level of distinct themes

Theme 1: Sustainable energy and efficient energy use

Objectives use	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Contribute to enhancing access to sustainable energy in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, especially for less endowed families.</p>	<p>§ Awareness and promotion of renewable energy technologies and energy conservation technologies</p> <p>§ Development of a toolkit for sustainable disposal of dry-cell batteries</p> <p>§ Introduction in target communities of commercial opportunities for solar-thermal and low-cost photovoltaic uses.</p> <p>§ Initiatives and pilot project that support clean production and efficient use of energy;</p> <p>§ Promotion of bio-mass and solar energy as an alternative source of energy</p>	<p>§ Strengthened capacities on sustainable energy and efficient energy use, dissemination of good practices and public information</p> <p>§ Improved national policies and incentive systems that support clean production and efficient use of energy</p> <p>§ Strategic public-private alliances for investment projects in renewable energy and access improvement (especially in rural areas) created and operational</p>

Theme 2: Sustainable tourism

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Contribute to a more sustainable tourism sector in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, with increased benefits to rural communities</p>	<p>§ Development of a set of community-based tourism products</p> <p>§ Marketing studies and strategies, business development plans</p> <p>§ Drafting and implementation of certification standards</p> <p>§ Mitigating negative side-effects in the field of culture erosion and deterioration of natural resources;</p> <p>§ Promoting a stronger pro-poor and sustainability orientation of sector policies and incentives;</p> <p>§ Research, training, guidelines and dialogue on sustainable tourism</p>	<p>§ Marketing and commercialisation strategies for sustainable and pro-poor tourism products, designed and in a pilot phase of implementation</p> <p>§ Certification procedures designed and in advanced stage of implementation with tourist operators</p> <p>§ Evidence of valuable inputs for policy influencing and design of incentive instruments in tourism sector</p>

**Theme 3: Sustainable chains of production and consumption**

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Contribute to the construction of sustainable and demand-led supply chains in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica.</p>	<p>§ Strengthening productive and commercial capacities of farmers and producer organisations;</p> <p>§ Adoption of sanitary, phytosanitary and quality standards;</p> <p>§ Enhancement of labour productivity, yields (output) and efficiency;</p> <p>§ Sound management of natural resources and waste;</p> <p>§ Promoting their articulation with promising market actors.</p>	<p>§ Strengthened capacities at farm level and of producer organisations, as starting point for associative enterprises and chain development</p> <p>§ Production supply chains established of environmental-friendly produced products that involve less-endowed households and women (special attention to new products and marketing)</p> <p>§ Improved enabling environments and public policies for sustainable production and trade.</p>

**Theme 4: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity**

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica.</p>	<p>§ Develop patterns for win-won scenario's for different ecosystems (conserving nature while combating poverty), based on concrete experiences;</p> <p>§ Influence national policies and legislation</p> <p>§ Implement innovative initiatives and projects that enhance people's participation in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, under "win-win" scenario's (poverty reduction and conservation of natural capital);</p> <p>§ Strengthen capacities of communities</p>	<p>§ Strengthened capacities of a variety of organisations, human resources and institutions that promote biodiversity and conservation of national natural patrimony</p> <p>§ Dissemination of good practices and public information on biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources</p> <p>§ Improved national policies and legislation that support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in line with generated knowledge and practices and international commitments</p>

**Theme 5: Gender equity and empower women**

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Promote gender equity and empower women in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, as explicit norm in the generation of results in the four major thematic areas and the sixth conceptual theme of the PSC</p>	<p>§ Pro-active and representative participation of women in all relevant activities</p> <p>§ Inclusion of gender participation criteria in project assessment tools and PSC project criteria, in training, and as compulsory topic in reports</p> <p>§ Obtain an overview of the major constraints of women in each partner country, in PSC thematic areas; and of opportunities to make progress towards major level of gender equity and empowerment</p>	<p>§ Enhanced gender equity as actor and beneficiary in projects, in policy dialogues, in the Boards and Technical Departments of the National Mechanisms</p>

**Theme 6: South-south cooperation for sustainable development (there is considerable overlap with sustainable development objectives)**

Development objectives	Main activities	Outcomes / indicators
<p>§ Explore the potential of the PSC as concept for fruitful national and international alliances, as vehicle for greater international commitments and cooperation between governments of the partner countries; and as autonomous channel for North-South-South development cooperation and funding.</p>	<p>§ Develop a framework for South-South cooperation</p> <p>§ Promote experiences with PSC in international sustainable development forums</p> <p>§ Joint participation and positioning at international conferences and meetings on sustainable development issues</p> <p>§ Develop for PSC a sound financial status and greater perspectives for sustainability</p>	<p>§ See under sustainable development objectives</p>

**Annex 4: Overview table of all PSC projects, in three different rounds**

CODE	Type	Title of Project	Leading organization	Partner organization/s	Theme	Dates (approval, contract, status)	Bilateral in 3rd round	Budget committed	Co-funding budget	Disbursed 30/07/09 (%)
01-T-07	TRI	Capacity development for biodiversity information management	INBio (CR) - NGO	CERGET (Benin) - NGO; NBC (Bhutan) - Gvt.	BIOD (4)	11/2007 02/2008 3rd disb.		405 K	100 K	70%
02-T-07	TRI	Non-timber Forest product use	INBio (CR) - NGO	FSA Université (Benin) - Univ.; NMC (Bhutan) - Gvt.	BIOD (4)	11/2007 02/2008 3rd disb.		1,000 K	380 K	35%
04-P-07	Pilot	Sustainable productive projects in production chains - indigenous women	TEC (CR) - Univ.		PROD (3)	11/2007 02/2008 closed 03/2009	04-P2-07	100 K	39 K	100%
15-P-07	Pilot	Study of invasive alien plants	NBC (Bh) - Gvt.		BIOD (4)	02/2008 04/2008 ongoing	15-P2-07	100 K	40 K	80%
12-P-07	Pilot	Pilot community based Sustainable Tourism in Phobjikha Conservation Area	RSPN (Bh) - Gvt.		TOUR (2)	02/2008 05/2008 ongoing	12-P2-07	76 K	14 K	100%
14-P-07	Pilot	Development of Royal Botanical Park at Dochula Zone	Royal Botanical & Recreational Parks (Bh) - Gvt.		BIOD (4)	02/2008 05/2008 ongoing	14-P2-07	100 K	55 K	80%
16-P-07	Pilot	Mushroom Promotion and Marketing	National Mushroom Center (Bh) - Gvt.		PROD (3)	02/2008 05/2008 ongoing	16-P2-07	100 K	40 K	80%
04-B-07	BILA	Integrated system for solid waste management (San José + Bhutan)	ACEPESA (CR) - NGO	RSPN (Bhutan) - Gvt.	PROD (3)	02/2008 07/2008 2nd disb.		600 K	278 K	45%
03-B-07	BILA	Development of a Technological Package for Organic Pineapple	ACICAFOC (CR) - NGO	INRAB (Benin) - Gvt.	PROD (3)	02/2008 08/2008 2nd disb. pending		600 K	147 K	20%

05-B-07	BILA	Capacity building on sustainable agricultural technologies through knowledge management	INTA (CR) - Gvt.	ICS (Bhutan) - Gvt.	PROD (3)	02/2008 08/2008 2nd disb.		600 K	316 K	60%
05-P-07	Pilot	Education and socio-professional insertion of girls in school (sub-prefecture of Allada)	GRAD-FB (Be) - NGO		GEN (5)	11/2007 10/2008 ongoing		80 K	20 K	40%
06-P-07	Pilot	Sustainable management and biodiversity conservation mangrove of Gagba channel	Eco-Ecolo (Be) - NGO		BIOD (4)	11/2007 10/2008 ongoing	06-P2-07	84 K	24 k	40%
21-P-07	Pilot	Organic and Fair Cotton	OBEPAB (Be) - Pvt.		PROD (3)	02/2008 10/2008 ongoing		100 K	30 K	40%
22-P-07	Pilot	Community based biodiversity conservation policies and actions	CEBEDES (Be) - NGO		BIOD (4)	02/2008 10/2008 ongoing		100 K	4 K	40%
23-P-07	Pilot	Community based biodiversity management of Mono Couffo region	CIPGEF (Be) - NGO		BIOD (4)	02/2008 10/2008 ongoing	23-P2-07	76 K	23 K	40%
24-P-07	Pilot	Conservation in Lama reserve forest through ecotourism development	Eco-Benin (Be) - NGO		TOUR (2)	02/2008 10/2008	24-P2-07	74 K	19 K	40%
02-B-07	BILA	Sustainable Tourism Development Strategy	COOPRENA (CR) - Pvt.	TCB (Bhutan) - Pvt.	TOUR (2)	02/2008 10/2008 1st disb.		600 K	88 K	35%
06-B-07	BILA	Strengthen Tour Operator Associations for Market Linkages Sustainable Tourism	Ecole Experience (CR) - Pvt.	ABTO (Bhutan) - Pvt.	TOUR (2)	02/2008 10/2008 1st disb.		370 K	136 K	35%
03-T-07	TRI	Contributions of protected areas to economic and social development	CINPE (CR) - Univ.	NCD (Bhutan) - Gvt., CEBEDES (Benin) - NGO	BIOD (4)	02/2008 10/2008 1st disb.		780 K	156 K	40%
<b>TOTAL I call</b>								<b>5,920 K</b>		<b>2,500 K (42%)</b>

CODE		Title of Project	Leading organization	Partner organization/s	Theme	Dates (approval, contract, status)	Bilateral in 3rd round	Budget committed	Co-funding budget	Disbursed 30/07/09
03-B-08	BILA	Organic and Fair Trade Fruits and Agroindustrial Production of Pineapple	PROAGROIN (CR) - Pvt.	OBEPAB (Benin) - Pvt.	PROD (3)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	536 K	15%
32-B-08	BILA	Strengthening of value chain for agriculture and agro-industrial products	Bhutan Agro Industries Limited (Bh) - Pvt.	CIPGEF (Benin) - NGO	PROD (3)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	64 K	40%
09-B-08	BILA	Socioeconomical and socio professional insertion of young people in social risk and girls	Ciudad Hogar Calasanz (CR) - Pvt.	GRAD-FB (Benin) - NGO	GEN (5)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	215 K	15%
20-B-08	BILA	Development of Organic Soap	Bio-Bhutan (Bh) - Pvt.	ACICAFOC (CR) - NGO	PROD (3)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	56 K	30%
24-B-08	BILA	Sustainable Native handicraft Production & Commercialization	Puni Gakhil Handicrafts (Bh) - Pvt.	RSE Consultore SA (CR) - Pvt.	PROD (3)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	56 K	30%
15-B-08	BILA	Rural adventure tourism enhancement and community development	Rios Tropicales (CR) - Pvt.	ABTO (Bh) - Pvt.	TOUR (2)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		400 K	258 K	30%
27-B-08	BILA	Cultural Music Research & Production Center to Promote Sustainable Tourism	TGMI (Bh) - Pvt.	Association Choeur D'enfants (Benin) - NGO	TOUR (2)	10/2008 12/2008 1st disb.		340 K	196 K	50%
05-T-08	TRI	Awareness Program and development of low-cost renewable technologies	Nature Tropicale Benin (Be) - NGO	BUN-CA (CR) - NGO; Department of Energy (Bh) - Gvt.	ENER (1)	10/2008 02/2009 1st disb. Request		600 K	44 K	0
<b>TOTAL II call</b>								<b>3,340 K</b>		<b>830 K (25%)</b>

CODE		Title of Project	Leading organization	Partner organization/s	Theme	Dates (approval, contract, status)	Bilateral in 3rd round	Budget	Co-funding budget	Disbursed
04-P2-07	Pilot II	Standards for micro and small environment friendly businesses run by women	TEC (CR) - Univ.	GRAD-FB (Benin) - NGO	PROD (3)	06/2009 07/2009		100 K	44 K	0
16-P2-07	Pilot II	Mushroom Promotion and Marketing	National Mushroom Center (Bh) - Gvt.	CITA, UCR (CR) - Univ.	PROD (3)	07/2009		100 K	50 K	0
06-P2-07	Pilot II	Sustainable management and biodiversity conservation mangrove of Gagba channel	Eco-Ecolo (Be) - NGO	Fundación Neotropica (CR) - NGO	BIOD (4)	06/2009		100 K	24 K	0
23-P2-07	Pilot II	Community based biodiversity management of Mono Couffo region	CIPGEF (Be) - NGO	Fundación AMBio (CR) - NGO	BIOD (4)	06/2009		100 K	6 K	0
24-P2-07	Pilot II	Conservation in Lama reserve forest through ecotourism development	Eco-Benin (Be) - NGO	Centro de Aprendizaje de Sarapiquí (CR) - Pvt.	BIOD (4)	06/2009		100 K	16 K	0
<b>TOTAL III call</b>								<b>500 K</b>		<b>0%</b>

**Annex 5: Overview of findings selected projects: Costa Rica**

Number	Title	Progress on activities and results	Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives)	Problems and constraints	Is project expected to finalise in time?	Indication of expected outcomes, impacts and/or upscaling
01-T-07	Capacity development for biodiversity information management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity information needs-assessment surveys realised, workshop held;</li> <li>- Hardware acquired</li> <li>- Three visits (including annual coordination meeting)</li> <li>- More user friendly software is being developed based on mutual demands</li> </ul>	Good cooperation and exchange with especially Bhutan but also Benin. The information system has been basically transferred from CR to Bhutan and Benin, but CR has benefited as well by improving and simplifying the system and developing the portal.	This project is running smoothly. The National Museum in CR has invested with their own funds. In Benin information sharing is problematic.	The project was based on initial contacts between CR and Bhutan. Yes, it is expected to finalise in time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The biodiversity information management system (hard- and software) will be operational at the end of the project-period.</li> <li>- The portal has international significance and will also be used within Central America.</li> <li>- The project works with 4 partner organisations in CR who will use the system.</li> </ul>
02-T-07	Non-timber forest product use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training activities were realised in Bhutan, Benin and CR with mutual inputs and benefits.</li> <li>- INBIO has supported taxonomic research on mushrooms in Bhutan, and on insects in Benin.</li> <li>- CR benefited in two ways: mushroom centre at INBIO and pilots with 4 communities on mushroom cultivation (from Bhutan); awareness on potentials of insect collection and consumption (from Benin).</li> </ul>	Most developed and balanced in trilateral reciprocity: Bhutan has advanced knowledge on mushrooms, Benin on insects, CR on scientific methods. Trainings were very much appreciated. Exchange from Benin to CR is so far weakest. Bhutan gave training in CR to INBIO and to farmers.	Financial accounting has been difficult, with partners, and has caused delays. Also, in Benin the purchase of materials for insect inventory field work, has been very difficult. Ultimately, CR brought its own materials. Now this project runs smoothly.	The project was based on initial contacts between CR and Bhutan. Yes, although the project has started in November 2008 with more than six months delay (slow start).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased knowledge (CR and Bhutan) on mushroom taxonomy;</li> <li>- Increased mushroom productivity and incomes by communities</li> <li>- Increased biodiversity protection by communities in buffer zone growing mushrooms</li> <li>- Potentials for upscaling through replication in other buffer zones</li> <li>- In CR the ministry of Agric. Has shown great interest</li> <li>- Replication of mushroom knowledge also in central America</li> </ul>
03-T-07	Contributions of national parks and biological reserves to economic and social development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training and exchange visits in CR and in Bhutan realised</li> <li>- The methodology has been further developed and adapted, with translations in different languages</li> <li>- Survey is now being conducted in three parks</li> <li>- Workshops with stakeholders in parks have been realised</li> </ul>	The methodology has been developed in CR and is being adapted to Bhutan and Benin. CR benefits by knowledge sharing (with Bhutan mainly) and the opportunity to further develop the methodology, and also simplify it.	It has been very difficult for CR to find suitable partners, especially in Benin, and get the project started. The project now runs smoothly.	Yes, this project can be finished according to plan, although the time schedule has been reduced from an initial 30 months to 19 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot application of research in 3 national parks may be up-scaled to other parks;</li> <li>- There is great interest in this project within the Government agency for protected area management, as data on economic value data can convince policy makers</li> <li>- The method may be applied in other countries of central</li> </ul>

05-T-08	Awareness program and development of sustainable energy technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 1<sup>st</sup> disbursement has not yet been made because the required formalities have not yet been finalised by the lead organisation in Benin.</li> <li>- In CR BUNCA has undertaken various activities according to plan, with own funds, but these have now come to a halt.</li> </ul>	The project has been somewhat 'constructed' by compiling three different projects. The level of reciprocity has so far been nil. The conditions for reciprocity are not very suitable.	The logframe of the programme document is weak. The problem in getting started seems to be with the lead organisation in Benin. BUNCA in CR is eager to start and has activities ongoing and planned.	No, the project has not yet formally started. Even if it would start soon, it is likely that relevant results will be generated, beyond three separate projects in three countries.	America It is unrealistic to expect mayor outcomes and impact within the limited time that remains available.
02-B-07	Sustainable Tourism development strategy in Zhemgang Dzongkhag (Bhutan) and Rio San Juan Basin (Costa Rica)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities in CR are well underway. Communities have been involved in sustainable tourism activities, especially in areas with high social vulnerability.</li> <li>- An exchange visit from CR to Bhutan ahs taken place.</li> <li>- Many local communities have been involved so far.</li> <li>- A joint website is under construction.</li> </ul>	The project has three components: one project in CR, one project in Bhutan, and one on exchange. The exchange component has not yet materialised fully. One visit from CR to Bhutan has materialised. The visit from Bhutan to CR is planned for August 2009.	The project has started late but now seems to run smoothly.	Yes, at least in CR the project will be finalised in time, but there will be need to accelerate activities in Bhutan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are initial indications that the project in CR has lead to a 20% increase of incomes from tourism activities.</li> <li>- Several communication materials have been produced.</li> <li>- There are good potentials for upscaling.</li> </ul>
04-B-07	Integrated and sustainable system for solid waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good progress of activities in CR: institutional analysis has been carried out; there is great interest by the District municipality; a separation transfer centre is under construction; there are good potentials for upscaling.</li> <li>- The approach appears to be very thorough, including an institutional and practical approach (micro-macro linkages).</li> <li>- One exchange visit to Bhutan has taken place.</li> </ul>	The project appears to be somewhat 'constructed', i.e. separate projects with a different focus, but the experience in CR of approaching the problem at different levels seems to be highly relevant to Bhutan. The exchange to Bhutan is planned in end of 2009.	The project in CR runs smoothly. However, the reciprocity element has so far not materialised.	It is possible that the project can finalise in time. It will be difficult to realise the reciprocity aspect in the coming year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project in CR is likely to have impact because of its thorough approach.</li> <li>- There are also good opportunities for upscaling, as much attention is being given to aspects of communication, institutional rooting and replication of the pilot to other Districts in San Jose.</li> <li>- However, there are questions about the potential to replicate the major investment in a separation centre.</li> </ul>
05-B-07	Capacity building on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inventory of information needs was made and system soft-wares</li> </ul>	There is potential reciprocity on the exchange of information	Late effective start, but the project	INTA says yes, and there are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Web-site is being developed and will improve information access</li> </ul>

	environmental friendly technologies through knowledge management process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- have been compared</li> <li>- Currently software and website of PLATICAR (platform for technology, information and communication) is being developed</li> <li>- The project is of great interest also for FAO, aimed at closing the digital gap for farmers in remote areas.</li> </ul>	technologies from CR, and communication services from Bhutan. There has been an interesting visit from INTA (CR) to Bhutan, with much mutual learning noted. An exchange visit is planned for November 2009.	seems to be running smoothly in CR No serious administrative problems have been reported.	good potentials for other areas of collaboration with Bhutan. The application of the technology in Bhutan will need to be further developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to farmers in remote areas; it has different languages and can be replicated to other regions;</li> <li>- There are potentials for upscaling given the interest and co-funding by FAO, as well as other strategic alliances (e.g. with Universities).</li> <li>- Other potentials for exchange are on organic agriculture and livestock keeping.</li> </ul>
03-B-08	Organic and fair trade fresh fruits and agroindustrial production of pineapple in Costa Rica and Benin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project in CR is undertaken by a fair trade organisation, and aimed to further develop growing and marketing of organic pineapples;</li> <li>- The main component of the project in CR is building a storage and packing plant for local farmers, which is part of the wider strategy to improve marketing and incomes. The design has been done and the building has started;</li> <li>- It seems that activities in Benin still need to be set up.</li> </ul>	The project is basically about transferring the experience in organic farming and certification of organic pineapples to Benin. Exchange visits will be organised. CR expects to learn about farming field schools in Benin.	The project has started late and especially the exchange component has not yet materialised.	It will be a challenge to finalise the project in the given time, especially up to the situation that in Benin organic pineapples will be effectively produced and marketed by 50% of the farmers (as is the target).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organic pineapple producers in CR are expected to receive higher incomes from diversified products. In C.R, the experience is expected to contribute to further development of organic pineapple chain and certification;</li> <li>- In Benin it is expected that the chain will be just set-up. Outcomes are also expected on improved business plans;</li> <li>- Upscaling of these the chain initiatives is expected.</li> </ul>
24-B-08	Sustainable native Costa Rica and Bhutan handicraft production and commercialisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project document is well structured and addresses underlying problems of the sector;</li> <li>- The project is lead in Bhutan. So far a range of assessment and inventories have been carried out to further plan the activities.</li> </ul>	There is a well defined mutual aspect of reciprocity, as local handicrafts are under stress in both countries, need to develop a system that can guarantee authenticity and reduce risks from imports from China. A first visit to Bhutan has taken place. There is now intensive contact.	The project has started late and slowly, due to various communication and other problems, but at least in CR is now well managed and well underway.	It will be a challenge to finalise the project in time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are good potentials for increased incomes from local handicrafts, and linkages with sustainable tourism;</li> <li>- The focus at an authenticity certificate is very interesting and has great potential for upscaling.</li> <li>- There are also good contacts with various alliances in CR, which will help realise upscaling.</li> </ul>
04-P-07	Generation of sustainable productive projects in production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project has worked in the south of CR and has basically built a community centre and has provided software for access to internet. This has been of great</li> </ul>	A reciprocal project has now been worked out for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase, with Benin. TEC see the exchange as a great opportunity to open up to	It has not been easy to identify a partner organisation from Benin.	This is the first PSC pilot project to have finalised. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase reciprocity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In CR important outcomes are improved access to internet for an isolated area, and thus access to knowledge.</li> <li>- There are good opportunities for</li> </ul>

	<p>chains in groups of indigenous women</p>	<p>importance to this isolated region, opening opportunities for various income generating activities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The beneficiaries expressed great thanks to the project</li> <li>- There have been financial inputs from various other institutions.</li> <li>- Also, attention is given to themes of sustainable agriculture, sustainable tourism and waste management.</li> </ul>	<p>Africa. Technical staff from Benin will visit CR in November 2009, to learn from this project. The reciprocity (benefits for CR) are not very clear (mentioned are making clothes, and sustainable agriculture).</p>		<p>project has just started. It is still unclear what this will generate.</p>	<p>replication to other indigenous communities in CR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The University TEC has learned a lot from this project, and has developed its own strategy on social development of indigenous communities, with wide spin-off.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---	--	---	--

**Annex 5: Overview of findings selected projects: Bhutan**

Number	Title	Progress on activities and results	Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives)	Problems and constraints	Is project expected to finalise in time?	Indication outcomes, impacts and/or upscaling
01-T-07	Capacity development for biodiversity information management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity information needs-assessment surveys realised, workshop held;</li> <li>- Hardware acquired</li> <li>- Software under development</li> <li>- Three visits (including annual coordination meeting)</li> </ul>	Very good cooperation and exchange with INBIO in Costa-Rica (several exchanges realised). No exchange with Benin, but INBIO has. The same system will be applied in Benin. Three mutual visits have occurred	This project is running smoothly. For Bhutan there is no need for direct contact and exchange with Benin.	Yes, it is important to note here that prior to start of project, there were already good contacts between the institutes. The proposal is also based upon an earlier project-idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a strong relation between NBC and INBIO and there is a new idea for cooperation around bio-prospecting as a next stage.</li> <li>- Bio-diversity information management system (hard- and software) will be operational at the end of the project-period</li> </ul>
02-T-07	Non-timber forest product use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training activities were realised in Bhutan, Benin and CR</li> <li>- INBIO has supported taxonomic research on mushrooms in Bhutan,</li> <li>- Design laboratory</li> <li>- Internship in CR</li> <li>- Investments in Mushroom cultivation and post-harvest</li> </ul>	Most advanced in trilateral exchange. Very strong relation between NMC and INBIO. Also exchange between Bhutan and Benin (but no strong link between mushrooms and insects). This is also the only example of an activity in which NMC has provided training to the other partners in the project	This projects runs smoothly and no problems have been encountered	Yes, although the project has started in November 2008 with more than six months delay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased knowledge (CR and Bhutan) on mushroom taxonomy;</li> <li>- Increased lab- and support capacity of NMC to the mushroom sector</li> </ul>
03-T-07	Contributions of national parks and biological reserves to economic and social development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training and exchange visits in CR and in Bhutan</li> <li>- Surveys have been developed and adapted</li> <li>- Survey is now conducted in three parks</li> <li>- Workshops with stakeholders in parks have been realised</li> </ul>	The exchange with CR (CINPE) is highly valued and strategic and there is a constant and intensive exchange and support between the two partners in CR and Bhutan. Although Benin is partner in this project, no active exchange and contacts exist between Bhutan and Benin. The methodology of park-surveys developed in Costa Rica will be applied in Benin. But these activities run parallel without active knowledge sharing	The project runs smoothly and is on track.	Yes, this project can be finished according to plan without limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot application of research in 3 biological reserves will be up-scaled to other parks;</li> <li>- Human settlement and use of resources in national parks knowledge from Bhutan can be applied in Costa Rica</li> </ul>
05-T-08	Awareness programme & development of sustainable energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contract was signed in February 2009, but no further progress</li> </ul>	None achieved thus far. In fact conditions for reciprocity are seriously threatened by the late start and difficult dialogue with partners on this project.	5 projects submitted and none selected. Reformulation requested in three cases. One was matched with unknown	No, the project has not yet started and it is highly unlikely that it will start without problems. Re-design and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is unrealistic to expect major outcomes and impact.</li> </ul>

Number	Title	Progress on activities and results	Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives)	Problems and constraints	Is project expected to finalise in time?	Indication outcomes, impacts and/or upscaling
	technologies			lead partner in Benin. Limited trust in partnership	corrective measures are needed	
04-B-07	Clean Bhutan and Costa Rica: design and implementation of integrated & sustainable system for solid waste management in San José & in Bhutan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- research on waste-development facilities is almost finalised;</li> <li>- first clean up campaign realised in 2008 and follow up is planned (although date has to change)</li> <li>- awareness communication (audio and visual) developed and broadcasted</li> </ul>	<p>Planned exchange activities with CR did not yet materialise and are postponed to end of 2009 and 2010.</p> <p>The projects in Bhutan and CR are very different from design and focus. Although information can be exchanged it does not really seem of strategic use. The activities are planned just as a pilot-project (stand-alone).</p>	Late start of the project and it will be difficult to realise all activities planned for three years in just two years	It is possible that the project can finalise in time, but it is questionable if the exchange activities will produce results (sufficient and on time) to be followed up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information campaign on clean Bhutan is becoming a yearly awareness raising activity</li> <li>- Waste facilities will be developed in five places that will contribute to less pollution in Bhutan</li> </ul>
05-B-07	Capacity building on sustainable agricultural technologies through knowledge management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inventory of information needs was made and system soft-wares have been compared</li> <li>- Currently software and website development is underway. This is done in Costa Rica</li> </ul>	<p>The partners in this project already knew each other prior to this project. There now is an intensive relation of exchange and cooperation, but serious lack of continuity in staffing within ICS has caused slowness and lack of inputs from Bhutan in the process until July 2009. Only from this moment ICS is actively participating. Prior, INTA was sole implementer of activities. This is expected to improve in the near future</p>	Late effective start, but previous contact between partners (through FAO), can enable more speed in the coming months. Delays were caused by changes in ICS management and lack of staff. Only resolved in July 2009	ICS says yes, but due to a late start, considerable stress will be developed towards the end of this programme. It is not likely that all activities can be realised in the time still available for this project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Web-site will be developed, but it is not clear if web-site will have a big audience in Bhutan;</li> <li>- Content on Bhutan and Costa Rica will enable exchange of technologies, such as red rice from and small scale dairy farming from Bhutan in CR</li> <li>- Similar possibilities for exporting CR technologies will be researched in exchange visit in November this year</li> </ul>
32-B-08	Strengthening of the value chain for traditional and non-traditional agriculture and agro-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identification visit to Benin;</li> <li>- investments in the fruit-factory, focusing on increased effectiveness of collection products from farmers</li> </ul>	A visit to Benin was realised and Bhutan Agro-Industries is very motivated to start up a process of support to the partner in Benin. This seems to be one of the few cases in which TA from Bhutan is exported to Benin. However, this support is not well developed and designed and still has to start. Mayor activities thus far are primarily focused on local	Late start-up of the project. Local activities are straightforward, but the exchange activity with Benin does not seem very well thought out	Project started late, but is on track. In 2 <sup>nd</sup> semester 2009 the project will gather speed. Because exchange activities with Benin are vague it is questionable if this	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased access of (fruit) farmers to value chains can be realised through the investments in this project.</li> <li>- Bhutan Agro Industries has increased its productivity and sales and it is making profit (but the contribution of this project to that is minor).</li> </ul>

Number	Title	Progress on activities and results	Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives)	Problems and constraints	Is project expected to finalise in time?	Indication outcomes, impacts and/or upscaling
	industrial products		investments in the fruit processing factory		project can finalise in time and concordant to plan	Impacts in exchange with Benin are unsure.
12-P-07	Pilot community based Sustainable Tourism in Phobjikha Conservation Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training activities (in handicrafts and on park-management);</li> <li>- Improvements in park infrastructure</li> <li>- Enhancement of visitors centres</li> <li>- Campsite development underway</li> </ul>	There was an intention for exchange with Costa Rica, but this did not materialise	Project period was short. No extension, while not all activities were finished. Financial procedures & formats considered too difficult. Although planned no exchange visit with CR was realised (budget-constraints)	Most of the outcomes of the project were achieved, but some investments and works still have to be carried out after formal closure of project. Campsite development is still under-way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A follow-up project with exchange with Costa Rica was developed but not yet approved;</li> <li>- Further development of the Park will take place with support from other funding sources and support organisations</li> </ul>
16-P-07	Mushroom Promotion and Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training of mushroom collectors and cultivators;</li> <li>- Organisation of producers</li> <li>- Market sheds built and value chains developed</li> </ul>	This project is stand-alone, but the NMC is very active in exchange in the framework of project 02-T-07	No significant problems encountered	Yes, this project has finished in May 2009 and all planned results were realised according to plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased access of mushroom collectors &amp; cultivators to markets;</li> <li>- Follow-up is now integrated in local development management plans</li> </ul>

**Annex 5: Overview of findings selected projects: Benin**

Number	Title	Progress on activities and results	Level of reciprocity (potentials, realised, perspectives)	Problems and constraints	Is project expected to finalise in time?	Indication of expected outcomes, impacts and/or upscaling
05-P-07	Project of education and socio-professional insertion of young girls no longer going to school and poor girls in the sub-prefecture of Allada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 60 % of the results achieved.</li> <li>- Girls chosen and trained.</li> <li>- Building activities for the centre are underway.</li> <li>- Commercialisation of woven cloth has started.</li> <li>- It is not obvious that the projects fits in the PSC.</li> <li>- There are sustainability risks as the project is not well rooted in national policies or alliances with partners</li> </ul>	Pilot, no reciprocity	<p>Self-financed so far as no funds obtained due to confusion about procedures and other communication problems.</p> <p>Has had juridical and administrative problems with regard to the building site, but this is solved now.</p>	<p>In spite of the lack of funds, the project has made progress. It will achieve its project purpose within the delays of the project.</p> <p>However, a follow-up will be needed, especially in the field of monitoring.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 14 trained women can earn a living and have revenues, be informed about environmental problems etc. Indirectly, this will have an impact on their future families and communities, but this impact is difficult to quantify.</li> <li>- Only with post-project monitoring, it could be possible to develop a model for such projects on a larger scale (upscaling).</li> </ul>
24-P-07	Supporting conservation in Lama reserve Forest through Ecotourism development in the surrounding communities (Koto and Zalimey)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 60% of the results achieved.</li> <li>- Villages have been sensibilised, forest guards pacified and motivated, young guides have been trained.</li> <li>- Contacts with travel agencies in France established.</li> <li>- The project combines protection with touristical (eco) exploitation of natural resources, associating local communities, authorities and national agencies (forestry service).</li> </ul>	Pilot, no reciprocity	<p>Problems with audits and lack of funds are solved. Prospects are good.</p> <p>No gender policy has been adopted until now and women do not yet play a role. It is quite possible to engage women in the project; ideas are already being developed.</p>	<p>The project will achieve its project purpose in time. A second phase will enable the operation of the new touristical attraction. The project is expected to be sustainable.</p>	<p>This project is likely to achieve to have a positive impact on its physical and social environment. A chain is developed from local village boys trained and employed by the project until international tourist agencies which have already expressed interest. It will be continued as a commercial enterprise. All stakeholders (state, commune, villages, forest department) will profit. Upscaling is desirable but not specifically addressed.</p>
03-B-08	Strategy for Development of a Technological Package for Organic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 60% of the activities have been achieved.</li> <li>- All experimental plots have been installed according to the protocols, monitoring is going on, analysis will start after harvest.</li> </ul>	Transfer of experience for organic farming and certification from CR to Benin. Exchange visits	<p>This project was pre-financed by INRAB, which is now pressing for its money.</p> <p>No problems or constraints in the execution of the research</p>	<p>The project will be 100% achieved at the end of the project period. However, the application of the</p>	<p>Impacts can be realized quickly because farmers are closely associated with the research. The impact could be a 20% increase of revenues from (certified) pineapple production</p>

	Pineapple Production in Costa Rica and Benin	- Doubtful whether the project fits in the PSC. If successful, the results could quickly be adopted by farmers (who are also organized in an association).	will take place. CR is interested in Benin farming schools.		research will need a project follow-up.	by all farmers of the association. For further distribution certain conditions ("clean" soil) must be met first. Eventually the product can be certified.
32-B-08	Strengthening of the value chain for traditional and non-traditional agriculture and agro-industrial products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>About 40% of the activities have been realised.</li> <li>Three buildings are almost finished.</li> <li>The machines have been made and are available; will be installed when the buildings are finished.</li> <li>Communities are involved, and the local authorities.</li> <li>There is now need to test the machines and operate the centres.</li> </ul>	The promoter is enthusiastic about a visit by Bhutan Agro Industries, who advised on intermediate technology for the transformation of tomatoes, manioc and oranges.	Problems with building seem to have been overcome	Good prospects to realise the project purpose before the end of the project period. Follow-up will be necessary to assist in the operation of the transformation units.	If in this first phase the project achieves its aims, then there will be an impact in following phases (increased revenues for a number of communities). If local impact is achieved, the technologies may be exported elsewhere in the country.
27-B-08	Cultural Music Research & Production Center to Promote Sustainable Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% realisation of (many) results.</li> <li>This project fits in a Sustainable Cultural Development programme, its focus is culture. Indirectly it could have an effect on "tourism", or rather cultural commercialization (choirs which perform for money).</li> </ul>	Each country has own objectives and activities. It is not clear how countries have influenced each other, except on general issues. Reciprocity exists of the exchange of enthusiasm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delays in funding. There has been rupture, but the project is expected to restart.</li> <li>No other problems and constraints have been reported.</li> <li>The promoter and crew are a bunch of optimistic (and artistic) actors.</li> </ul>	The project will achieve its project purpose in time, in spite of delays in funding. A follow-up is desirable, in monitoring of organisational aspects, and coaching.	Whether the choir music of Benin becomes a "viable and vibrant tourism product" in the country remains to be proven. The preservation and documentation of such music is also of a lasting national cultural importance.
23-P-07	Community base biodiversity management of Mono Couffo region through promotion of Iroko and Samba sylviculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>69% realisation – introduction of certain plants in sacred forest patches (iroko and samba) which have (traditional) medical pharmaceutical applications.</li> <li>The project is relevant for PSC</li> </ul>	Pilot, no reciprocity	Disbursement problems. Drought (climate factor) has affected the project – replanting of species was necessary	The project will finish in time.	Its impact is non-existent for the time being – and prospects are not too bright. The project must be considered as a pilot in every sense. If successful, it could be repeated everywhere in Benin. Upscaling not obvious.

## Annex 6: Indicators for project monitoring

### At the level of Development objectives

Development objectives	Outcome indicators	Impact indicators
<p>§ Translate the goals of the PSC into concrete innovative activities and reciprocal projects, with the potential to generate knowledge, impact and empowerment; as building bricks for sector strategies and inputs for policy influencing.</p>	<p>§ Number and quality of reciprocal projects in the different themes</p> <p>§ Quality of the reciprocity aspects (quality of exchange aspects)</p> <p>§ Improved thematic sector strategies based on project results</p> <p>§ Policy influence based on PSC results</p>	<p>§ Number of donors and countries showing interest in the PSC concept</p> <p>§ Number of quotes in international for a of PSC concept</p>
<p>§ Mobilising organisations and institutions (government, civil society, academic sector, private sector) in the partner countries for renewal and reinforcement of multi-stakeholder alliances for sustainable development, with the National Mechanisms as important platforms.</p>	<p>§ Number of national alliances strengthened and operational</p> <p>§ Number of organisations / institutions with enhanced capacity on sustainable development and operational</p> <p>§ Number of requests to National Mechanism for advise on sustainable development</p>	<p>§ Number of alliances investing resources in sustainable development initiatives</p>
<p>§ Contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction, taking into account the economic, environmental and social dimensions.</p>	<p>§ Sustainable development outcomes on projects and themes (= result of evaluation of selected projects)</p>	<p>§ Sustainable development impacts on projects and themes (= result of evaluation of selected projects)</p>
<p>§ Explore the potential of PSC as concept to promote international commitments and mutual cooperation for sustainable development; and as channel for “North → South-South” development cooperation and funding.</p>	<p>§ Receptiveness at international level of PSC concept</p> <p>§ Funding by third parties to support PSC concept</p>	<p>§ Replication at international level of PSC concept</p> <p>§ Funding by third parties to support PSC concept</p>

**At the level of distinct themes**

**Theme 1: Sustainable energy and efficient energy use**

Development objectives	Outcome indicators	Impact indicators
<p>§ Contribute to enhancing access to sustainable energy in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, especially for less endowed families.</p>	<p><i>Products / technologies</i></p> <p>§ # of new sustainable or more efficient energy techniques or practices installed (photovoltaic systems, solar cooking, biomass, biodigestors, ...)</p> <p>§ # of new sustainable or more efficient energy techniques or practices operational</p> <p>§ # of clean technologies implemented.</p> <p><i>Capacities / knowledge / awareness</i></p> <p>§ # of communities, companies or institutions applying sustainable energy practices</p> <p>§ # of SMEs with skills to produce sustainable energy techniques</p> <p>§ # of alliances with private sector on investments for sustainable energy products and techniques</p> <p><i>Policy influence</i></p> <p>§ Improved incentives for application of sustainable and more efficient energy use</p> <p>§ Positive change in policies to support sustainable and more efficient energy use</p> <p>§ Improved access to markets of sustainable and more efficient energy products or techniques</p> <p>§ Improved access to knowledge / information on sustainable energy products / techniques</p>	<p>§ Reduced total carbon emissions</p> <p>§ Reduced use of fossil fuels</p> <p>§ Increased use of renewable energy techniques</p>

Theme 2: Sustainable tourism

Development objectives	Outcome indicators	Impact indicators
<p>§ Contribute to a more sustainable tourism sector in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, with increased benefits to rural communities</p>	<p><i>Products / technologies</i></p> <p>§ # of new or improved sustainable tourism products or services</p> <p>§ # of cultural activities that are part of tourism services</p> <p><i>Capacities / knowledge / awareness</i></p> <p>§ # tour operators with improved sustainable tourism skills (technical, management)</p> <p>§ # of tour operators involved in sustainable tourism / certified on sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ # of SMEs involved in sustainable tourism / certified on sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ # of communities with improved sustainable tourism facilities</p> <p>§ # of alliances with private sector on sustainable product chains</p> <p><i>Policy influence</i></p> <p>§ Improved incentives for sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ Positive change in policies to support sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ Improved access to markets of sustainable tourism / existence of marketing strategies for sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ Improved access to knowledge / information on sustainable tourism</p>	<p>§ # of communities benefiting from sustainable tourism incomes</p> <p>§ Quantity of increased incomes from sustainable tourism</p> <p>§ Quantity of incomes from sustainable tourism / % of market sales with sustainable products</p>

**Theme 3: Sustainable chains of production and consumption**

NB: "Sustainable" can also read as: fair trade or organic; Sustainable production techniques also includes waste management

Development objectives	Outcome indicators	Impact indicators
<p>§ Contribute to the construction of sustainable and demand-led supply chains in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica.</p>	<p><i>Products / technologies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ # of new technologies or products of sustainable production developed</li> <li>§ # of new sustainable production chains developed</li> <li>§ # of new products with sustainability certificate</li> <li>§ # of new infrastructures established and supporting sustainable production</li> <li>§ Quantity of sustainable products produced</li> </ul> <p><i>Capacities / knowledge / awareness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ # of producers applying new technologies or products of sustainable production (e.g. following training or exchange visits)</li> <li>§ # of enterprises or centres applying new technologies of sustainable production or waste management</li> <li>§ # of producers in the process of obtaining sustainability certificate</li> <li>§ # of producers with sustainability certificate</li> <li>§ # of producers marketing sustainability products</li> <li>§ # of alliances with private sector on sustainable product chains</li> </ul> <p><i>Policy influence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Implementation of policies supporting sustainable chains of production or consumption</li> <li>§ Positive change in policies to support sustainable chains of production or consumption implemented</li> <li>§ Improved market conditions for sustainable production</li> <li>§ Improved access to knowledge / information on sustainable production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ # of area with sustainable production systems applied</li> <li>§ # of producers with (increased) incomes by sustainable production systems</li> <li>§ Quantity of increased incomes from sustainable products marketed</li> <li>§ Quantity of sustainable products marketed / % of market sales with sustainable products</li> <li>§ Quantity of wastes well managed</li> </ul>

**Theme 4: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity**

Development objectives	Outcome indicators	Impact indicators
<p>§ Contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica.</p>	<p><i>Products / technologies</i></p> <p>§ # of new technologies or products that include biodiversity conservation</p> <p>§ # of new technologies or products that give a value to biodiversity</p> <p>§ # of new infrastructures established and supporting biodiversity conservation</p> <p><i>Capacities / knowledge / awareness</i></p> <p>§ # of communities applying new technologies or products that conserve biodiversity (e.g. following training or exchange visits)</p> <p>§ # of enterprises or centres applying new technologies of biodiversity conservation</p> <p>§ # of people or organisations or institutions with improved skills and awareness on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p> <p>§ # of alliances with private sector on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p> <p><i>Policy influence</i></p> <p>§ Implementation of policies and legislation supporting biodiversity conservation or sustainable use</p> <p>§ Positive change in policies and legislation to support biodiversity conservation or sustainable use</p> <p>§ Improved access to knowledge / information on biodiversity conservation or sustainable use</p>	<p>§ Area with improved conditions for biodiversity (e.g. reforested, well managed)</p> <p>§ Evidence of improved biodiversity conservation due to successful projects</p> <p>§ Evidence of improved awareness on biodiversity conservation</p>