



**National Environment  
and Planning Agency**



Project Number: 00059298

GEF Project ID: 3764  
PIMS #: 3832

**Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the  
National Protected Area System**

**TERMINAL EVALUATION**

October 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

i.	Opening page .....	4
	Acknowledgements.....	4
	Disclaimer.....	4
ii.	Executive Summary .....	5
	Project Summary Table .....	5
	Summary Project Description .....	6
	Evaluation Rating Table.....	7
	Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.....	8
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	11
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	12
	Purpose of the evaluation.....	12
	Scope and Methodology .....	12
	Structure of the evaluation report.....	14
2.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....	15
	Project start and duration.....	15
	Introduction and Problems that project sought to address .....	15
	Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	17
	Baseline Indicators established.....	18
	Main stakeholders Identified at the Design Level .....	20
	Expected Results .....	21
3.	FINDINGS.....	22
3.1	Project Design / Formulation .....	22
	Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) .....	22
	Assumptions and Risks .....	24
	Lessons from other relevant projects (same focal area) incorporated into project design.....	26
	Planned stakeholder participation.....	26
	Replication approach .....	26
	UNDP comparative advantage .....	27
	Management arrangements .....	27
3.2	Project Implementation .....	28

Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) .....	28
Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region).....	29
Feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities used for The adaptive management.....	30
Project Finance.....	30
Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation .....	31
Implementing Partner AND UNDP implementation / execution coordination, and operational issues .....	32
3.3 Project Results.....	34
Overall results .....	34
Relevance .....	43
Effectiveness and Efficiency .....	44
Country ownership.....	45
Mainstreaming .....	46
Sustainability .....	46
4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	49
4.1 Conclusions .....	49
4.2 Lessons Learned .....	50
4.3 Recommendations .....	51
5. ANNEXES .....	55

## I. OPENING PAGE

Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:

'Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System'

UNDP and GEF project ID#::

3832 (UNDP PIMS#) and 3764(GEF PMIS #)

Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report:

July – September 2017 (timeframe) / 6 October 2017 (date of report)

Region and countries included in the project: Latin America and the Caribbean, Jamaica

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

Implementing Partner: National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA), Jamaica

Evaluator: Maria Onestini

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluator would like to acknowledge and thank all who cordially shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of the evaluation process.

## DISCLAIMER

This document represents the analysis of the author and does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Project, the Government of the Jamaica, the United Nations Development Programme, GEF, nor any other person or UN Agency.

## II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System' project				
GEF Project ID:	3764		at endorsement in 2009 (US\$)	at revision in 2015 (US\$)	at completion (US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	3832 Atlas ID 59298	GEF financing:	2,770,585	2,020,585 <sup>1</sup>	2,126,769 <sup>2</sup>
Country:	Jamaica	UNDP	200,000	200,000	91,179
Region:	Latin America and Caribbean	Government of Jamaic <sup>3</sup>	500,000	250,000	250,000 <sup>4</sup>
		Other/TNC	2,750,000	500,000	500,000
		Other/KFW	1,600,000	4,478,554	4,478,554
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	GEF/CBF:	0.00	750,000	750,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF's Strategic Objective One and Strategic Program One	Total co-financing:	5,050,000	6,178,554 <sup>5</sup>	6,069,733
Executing Agency:	National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA)	Total Project Cost:	7,820,585	8,199,139	8,196,502 <sup>6</sup>
Other Partners involved:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forestry Department (FD)</li> <li>• Fisheries Division</li> <li>• Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT)</li> </ul>	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	2 December 2015	12-July 2010(original)	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Feb 2016	Actual: April 2017	

<sup>1</sup> Based on the ProDoc revision in 2015, the project's budget was reduced to USD2,020,585 due to the reallocation of USD750,000 to the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund.

<sup>2</sup> At the end of 2016, the total expenditure from GEF funds was USD1,898,391.79. The balance at the end of 2016 was USD122,193.21. Notwithstanding, the approved budget and the approved spending limit for 2017 was USD247,700.03, of which USD228,377.24 was expended. This reflects an over expenditure of \$106,184.03. This was an oversight from three sides: the project's implementing partner, NEPA, UNDP Country Office and the UNDP GEF Unit in Panama. The various shifts in Budget, including direct payment to CBF may have led the team to lose track of the actual amount available and to overstate the available budget, given the initial slow rate of delivery.

<sup>3</sup> In the project document there are indications of planned USD2,000,000 of in-kind support to be made available by the Government of Jamaica. However, details of actual in kind support has not been provided by the implementing partner.

<sup>4</sup> Other sources indicate that Government of Jamaica's co – financing in cash was of USD 104,067.

<sup>5</sup> While there were reductions in the co-financing amounts by specific donors (e.g., government, TNC), the overall amount was increased to USD6,178,554 due to an increase in KFW's contribution to the CBF. It is important to note that co-financing went directly to the CBF from the donors

<sup>6</sup> Total Project expenditure USD8,196,502.97 is below the revised total budgeted amount of USD8,199,139.00

## SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The *Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System Project* (also known as the NPAS Project) in Jamaica addressed several issues related to protected areas' management and sustainability in the country. The project's goal was to safeguard Jamaica's globally significant biodiversity. This responds to the fact that the country is a global conservation priority spot with more than 1,400 known endemic species. This project's efforts were aimed at delivering the global benefits associated with a national protected area system better equipped to conserve globally significant albeit vulnerable ecosystems and allied species.

The project's objective was to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's national system of protected areas. It was expected that the objective would be achieved through three components:

- (1) Strengthening of planning and revenue generation;
- (2) Rationalizing and integrating the national system of protected areas; and,
- (3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected area management.

The problems and issues that the Project sought to address relate to the variety of threats to Jamaica's biodiversity. Loss of vulnerable habitats and their associated fauna and flora, the reduction of ecological functionality, and the growing insecurity of ecosystem services are some of the impacts that these threats pose. Furthermore, the country's marine and terrestrial ecosystems are increasingly fragmented and development prospects for communities to gather the potential socio-economic benefits accruing from biodiversity are not fully realized. These matters are compounded and accelerated by the current institutional capacity that fails to ensure appropriate site and system level protected area management and the lack of adequate financing sources to administered proactively Jamaica's protected areas.

Implementation of the NPAS was planned for a six-year project that began in July 2010 and had an actual conclusion in July 2017. The GEF-supported project had the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as its Executing Agency and the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) as its Implementing Agency, in collaboration with the Forestry Department, Jamaica National Heritage Trust and the Fisheries Division of Jamaica.

## EVALUATION RATING TABLE

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

Ratings for relevance, performance criteria and sustainability are found in annexes. Accounts of these ratings are imbedded in this report's narrative in each of the pertaining sections.

## SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

The *NPAS Project* in Jamaica addressed operational and financial issues that hinder integrated sustainable management of the country's protected areas. These threats are multiple, from accelerated loss of vulnerable habitats and reduction of ecological functionality of targeted ecosystems to growing vulnerability of the ecosystem services that protected areas provide and can further provide for development. The mentioned matters are compounded and accelerated by institutional capacity that fails to ensure appropriate site and system level protected area management. Not only is there a complex mix of legislation, policies, management authorities, and management actors, there is also a lack of a financial base to properly implement whatever policies are in place. The Project had a series of design deficiencies which were compounded by a succession of implementation issues. This resulted in an excessive delay in delivery, in particular in the first stages of implementation. At the project's mid-point, therefore, a significant restructuring of the project's implementation procedures as well as a log frame reformulation took place in light of the understanding that the project was not advancing as it should and that –without these reforms—the project would fail. Nonetheless, even when products were achieved, there is still a prevailing vision that the Project is just these. There is yet a need to instil that this sort of project is not only a product delivery means but an intervention that should seek results and effects. The immediate next stages of follow up should further advance the adoption of the products and processes that the NPAS Project has achieved (as laid out in the sustainability plan) in order for this intervention to maintain effects and continuity. For instance, if the trust fund does not actually begin to function in the near future it would be truly be a loss, not only for the NPAS Project itself but also for Jamaica, given that this institution could be pivotal for the integrated management of protected areas in the country. The Project concludes with several achievements, mainly at the output and at the local pilots' levels. Although the NPAS evidently has ended, it would greatly benefit the country to channel post – project activities in order to build upon what has been achieved and to truly generate capacity and seek tangible results from these accomplishments.

### SUMMARY LESSONS LEARNED

There are a series of learned lessons that can be assimilated in the future for enhanced project planning and implementation.

- Without a proactive and open participation of relevant national stakeholders in the design process, especially from those agencies which would be implementers, design will not be relevant nor feasible.
- The mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not automatically translate into results.
- The roles of different stakeholders cannot be underestimated and as early as possible they should be clearly defined and assimilated from the onset.

- For a complex intervention, the project management unit needs to be strong, well-funded and adequately staffed.
- Design, inception and project planning are very key aspects of a project, that can have a crucial impact on implementation and obtaining (or not) achievements and results.
- A well-functioning, streamlined, empowered, and proactive board or steering committee is crucial for guiding implementation process and/or drive adjustments
- Collaboration between agencies and relevant institutions is a vital component of a project and in generating buy – in.
- As it relates to UNDP, a lesson learned is that its guidance and supportive role cannot be taken lightly. When UNDP collaborates with the implementation process through whatever means (such as log frame reform, changes in decision – making structures, bilateral meetings with implementing agency, and so on) implementation improves.

---

## SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### *RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW UP*

1. Accelerate the adoption of the sustainability plan in order to fulfil achieving results from the NPAS Project. It would be key to: (a) Fully establish the protected areas trust fund; (b) Endorse completely the planned fund by signing agreements that are still pending to formalize this funding mechanism; (c) Endorse completely the planned fund by signing pending agreements; (d) Assure co – funding in order for this mechanism; (e ) Promote the application of plans drafted within the Project’s implementation process; (f) Promote the adoption of policies and instruments impelled by the Project.

---

### *RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING*

2. Participation in design should be proactive and open from all relevant national stakeholders and in particular from those agencies which would be implementers. Design should begin as early as possible in order to have adequate time to outline a project.
3. Beginning at the design stage, all national counterparts should thoroughly acknowledge what specific commitments they are making, as well as link any of these to a particular agency or institution’s work plans.
4. Given that the mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not automatically translate into results, these should be sought as part of a results-based project. Studies, reports, plans, documents and processes need to be accompanied by clear mechanisms that promote knowledge assimilation, knowledge sharing, and clear-cut mechanisms to inform and promote policy processes for adoption of outputs.
5. The budgeting sections of a project should be realistic at design and should budget sufficiently so that there is enough staff to manage a project and to draw the capacity(ies)

needed for technical and administrative inputs. It should include a proper realistic financial plan with adequate costing of management (management personnel) and technical aspects (including needed technical staff as well as consultancies).

6. The roles of different stakeholders within a project should be clearly defined and assimilated from the onset, generating buy – in, especially the roles of those stakeholders and institutions that should provide strategic direction.
7. Risks within a project should not be underestimated, and a risk management framework should be drawn at design and reviewed continuously.
8. Design as well as project inception and planning stages need to be precise and defined in order to guide the implementation process as well as obtaining achievements, outcomes and overall results.
9. These sorts of projects cannot lose sight that they are development projects after all. Developmental issues should be interwoven as a priority, in the products and outcomes that result and that should result out of a project, including issues of livelihoods.
10. In order for these sorts of projects to truly be developmentally – oriented they should be thorough in their work with communities, not only donating materials in the aim to improve their livelihoods but also to attend to these communities so that they can truly adopt whatever development aim the project is seeking.
11. UNDP needs to work with and assist the countries where interventions take place in order to aid them in applying processes that support projects' technical and implementation capabilities (specially support project implementation and efficient decision – making capacities) and in applying procurement systems to increase capacity to efficiently implement projects aiding in the fulfilment of a project's objective.
12. Project reformulations, changes, reforms and other such alterations need to be precise, and implemented as soon as early signs of failings manifest themselves.
13. When rotation as well as political and institutional turnovers take place, projects should have mechanisms in order to provide transfer of knowledge and information so that institutional knowledge and capacity transfer is assured.
14. A project's communication strategy should be an ongoing process that generates buy – in, generates knowledge about the issues a project deals with as well as acknowledge its visibility.
15. When situations indicate that in – country knowledge base and expertise is not sufficient for generating outputs and there is a need for harnessing expertise from outside of the country, all efforts should be made to generate local capacity as well as introduce national issues in the resulting products. International consultants should be partnered with national consultants.

### III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR/PIR	Annual Progress Report/ Project Implementation Report
BJCMNP	Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBF	Caribbean Biodiversity Fund
CO	Country Office
EA	Executing Agency
EFJ	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica
FACE	Fund Authorization Certificate of Expenditure
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency
JCDT	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
KfW	German Development Bank
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NEPA	National Environment and Planning Agency
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NPAS	National Protected Areas System
NPATF	National Protected Areas Trust Fund
NRCA	Natural Resources Conservation Authority Act
PAC	Protected Areas Committee
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
ProDoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RSC	Regional Service Centre
RTA	Regional Technical Adviser
SGP	UNDP Small Grants Program
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TORs	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The varied purposes of evaluation exercises include monitoring results as well as monitoring effects/impacts and promoting accountability. This evaluation centres, therefore, upon valuating the outcomes, outputs, products, and processes achieved by the “*Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System*”<sup>7</sup> Project in Jamaica. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to determine if and how project results were achieved, and to draw useful lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project as well as to aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. Lastly, this exercise follows general objectives of these sorts of evaluations which have as an overall purpose to assemble lessons learned and best practices to aid projects’ processes in the future.

### SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This final evaluation has primarily focused on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and relevance of the project considering the accomplished outcomes, objectives, and effects. It includes the following scope:

- Assess progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document.
- Assess signs of project success or failure.
- Review the project’s strategy considering its sustainability risks.

The evaluation has centred upon the outcomes, outputs, products and processes achieved or with a perspective of being achieved. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to determine if and how project results were achieved, and to draw useful lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project as well as aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP / GEF future programming. The varied purposes of evaluation exercises include monitoring results as well as effects/impacts and promote accountability. Lastly, this assessment follows general objectives of these sorts of evaluations which have as a purpose assembling lessons learned and best practices to aid projects’ processes in the future.

The approach for the evaluation of the “*Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System*” has been determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this assignment and it follows methods and approach as stated in UNDP guidelines and manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects* and *UNDP’s Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. The analysis entails evaluating distinct stages and aspects of the project including design and formulation, implementation, results, and the involvement of stakeholders in the project’s processes and activities. It has been carried out following a participatory and consultative

---

<sup>7</sup> Also known as the NPAS project.

approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular with the UNDP Country Office, project team, the Government of Jamaica, and other key stakeholders.

The time scope of the final evaluation is for the whole project as such, including its planned implementation period together with the extension period granted. It is noteworthy that the findings, rankings, lessons learned and best practices respond to analysis of the project as a whole. That is, the scope of this evaluation is the whole project.

To carry out this evaluation exercise several data collection tools for analysing information from the principles of results-based evaluation (including relevance, ownership, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability) were used. Following UNDP/GEF guidelines, the relevant areas of the project were evaluated according to performance criteria and prospects of sustainability with ratings as summarized in the tables found in Annexes. The tools chosen for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allowed for in-depth exploration and yielded information that facilitated understanding of observed changes in outcomes and outputs (both intended and unintended) and the factors that contributed to the achievements or lack of accomplishments.

Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

- *Document analysis.* In depth analysis of documentation was carried out. The documentation analysis examined documents prepared during the planning and implementation phases of the project. A list of documents consulted is found in annexes.
- *Key informant interviews/Individual and group discussions:* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, government actors, strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiary groups, other government actors, and local actors. The interviews were carried in person during the evaluation mission. They were either individual interviews or group discussions. Stakeholders to interview were chosen to be the key actors from every single cluster of organizations directly and tangentially involved in the Project. The array of stakeholders, therefore, was a representative sample of actors involved from organizations such as the implementing agency, national government representatives, and local government representatives, project management unit, project staff, as well as representatives from organizations that directly and indirectly participated in different capacities in the Project. Stakeholders consulted are found in annexes with mission information.

A series of site visits were planned in order to visit areas where small grants have been approved and developed, where direct interventions took place, and where interviews, focal groups and direct observation of implemented interventions could take place. The sites were chosen according to several different variables. The main factors being learning possibilities from

the chosen sites, diversity between the local projects, as well as logistics and resources available for site visits.

A first tool developed for this process was an evaluation matrix (which can be found in annexes). This matrix guided the data collection process and, as the evaluation proceeded, the matrix was used to collect and display data obtained from various sources that relate to relevant evaluation criteria and questions. This tool was developed not only as a guide for systematizing data collection but also to make the evaluation process transparent. The matrix contains Evaluative Criteria Questions (that is questions and sub questions related to each of the evaluation criteria enclosed in the evaluation); Indicators; Sources; and Methodology. Furthermore, an evaluation questionnaire is found in annexes. This questionnaire operationalizes the evaluation's guiding questions regarding achievements and criteria. It was mainly a guide for interviews with relevant stakeholders at different institutions and for prospective site visits or interviews with small grants recipients.

As it occurs in most of these sort of evaluations, there are a series of limitations. Although the evaluability was very high given access to inputs (from stakeholders through interview processes as well as from documentation this evaluation had access to), some limitations can be identified. The main limitation identified is the inherent constraint of time and resources which presented limits to the process.

A fourteen-day mission took place, including international travel time, mainly maintaining meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders at the national and local levels, meetings with UN personnel, national government representatives and local councils, as well review of materials with key stakeholders, and the aforementioned field visits. A Mission and Meetings Agenda is found in annexes.

## STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

This evaluation report is structured beginning with an executive summary, an introduction and an evaluation scope and methodology section. A second section contains an overall project description within a developmental context, including an account of the problems the project sought to address, as well as its initial objectives. Furthermore, indicators and main stakeholders involved in the projects are described, as well as what were the expected results. Essentially, this segment of the report deals with the design stage and design concept of the project. A third core section of this report deals fundamentally with the evaluation findings, analytically observing the results framework and its reform, as well as linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector. Furthermore, this segment also deals with findings relating to the actual implementation of the project, including strategic issues such as adaptive management and partnership agreements, and monitoring. This third section concludes with findings on actual project overall results and findings related to the criteria established for evaluations such as relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, ownership at the national level, mainstreaming and sustainability. A fourth core section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues and recommendations. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation support documentation.

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

### PROJECT START AND DURATION

The Project has had an implementation period of nearly seven years with a start on July 2010 and actual finalization in July 2017<sup>8</sup>. It had a total planned project cost of 7,820,585 US Dollars, with planned GEF financing of USD 2,770,585. The rest of the funding was expected co-financing from other sources (Government of Jamaica, UNDP, TNC, and KfW)

### INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEMS THAT PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS

The project's goal was to safeguard Jamaica's globally significant biodiversity. This responds to the fact that the country is a global conservation priority spot with more than 1,400 known endemic species. This project 's efforts were aimed at delivering the global benefits associated with a national protected area system better equipped to conserve globally significant albeit vulnerable ecosystems and allied species.

The project's objective was to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's national system of protected areas. It was expected that the objective would be achieved through three components:

- (1) Strengthening of planning and revenue generation;
- (2) Rationalizing and integrating the national system of protected areas; and,
- (3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected area management.

The Project had three outcomes and ten major project outputs. These are as follows:

---

<sup>8</sup> It was originally planned that implementation would run until mid – 2016, however the Project was granted a no – cost extension.

<i>Outcome 1: Strengthening of financial planning and revenue generation</i>
Output 1.1: Protected Area Trust Fund and Establishment of a Revolving Fund
Output 1.2: Model site-level business plans
Output 1.3: Revenue generation mechanisms in five key protected areas
Output 1.4: Operational plan for Protected Areas (PA) system financial strategy
<i>Outcome 2: Rationalizing and Integrating the NPAS</i>
Output 2.1: National protected areas legislation and supporting legal framework
Output 2.2: New and expanded PA network
<i>Outcome 3: Increasing the effectiveness of PA management</i>
Output 3.1: Eight new and updated protected area management plans
Output 3.2: Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management
Output 3.3: Conservation based economic development established in or near five protected areas
Output 3.4: Communication strategy to raise key stakeholder awareness and build national constituency to support NPAS.

Some of the Project activities that were to be implemented to improve management and help secure the long-term financial sustainability of Jamaica's protected area system were:

- (i) harmonizing management practices to secure cost-effective conservation,
- (ii) building capacity for strategic conservation and financial planning,
- (iii) creating new protected areas to serve as replicable models for improved practices, and,
- (iv) establishing additional income sources for protected area management.

The problems and issues that the Project sought to address relate to the variety of threats to Jamaica's biodiversity. Loss of vulnerable habitats and their associated fauna and flora, the reduction of ecological functionality, and the growing insecurity of ecosystem services are some of the impacts that these threats pose. Furthermore, the country's marine and terrestrial ecosystems are increasingly fragmented and development prospects for communities to gather the potential socio-economic benefits accruing from biodiversity are not fully realized. These matters are compounded and accelerated by the current institutional capacity that fails to ensure appropriate site and system level protected area management and the lack of adequate financing sources to administer proactively Jamaica's protected areas.

Protected areas in Jamaica fall under the management domain of four national institutions: the National Environment & Agency (NEPA), the Forestry Department (FD), the Fisheries Division and the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT). Protected areas in Jamaica are also under the domain of a complex assortment of legislations, policies, management authorities, and management stakeholders. Furthermore, Jamaica has a wide range of protected areas

categorization, which –in turn-- are subject to different regimes for protection and management modalities.

Implementation of the NPAS was planned for a six-year project that began in July 2010 and had a planned conclusion for July 2014. A no-cost extension of time was requested to complete the project work, and implementation was extended until March 2017. It was also allocated additional time to July 2017 to implement the project close-out processes.

The GEF-supported project had the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as its Executing Agency and the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) as its Implementing Agency, in collaboration with the Forestry Department, Jamaica National Heritage Trust and the Fisheries Division of Jamaica.

#### IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The overall goal of the Project was to support Jamaica in safeguarding its globally significant biodiversity. The project's objective was to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's national system of protected areas. Its immediate and long term specific development objectives included securing financial sustainability of the country's protected area systems and harmonizing management practices to secure cost – effective conservation. Tangentially, the development objectives of the Project entailed building human and institutional capacity for sustainable management of protected areas and enhancing opportunities to link protected areas with Jamaica's socio-economic developmental priorities.

## BASELINE INDICATORS ESTABLISHED

In the Project Document (ProDoc) baseline indicators were established for the NPAS Project. These are found in the chart below.

Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline
Project Objective: To consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas	Increase in NSPA operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all PAs based on the following definitions: High (75-100), Medium (55-74), Low (<55).	High: 0 number of PAs Medium: 4 number of PA Low: 28 number of PA
	Increase in NSPA financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Financial Score (Part 2): 53
	Change in area of broad-leaf forest within NSPA  Change in area of living reef within 10 NSPA monitoring sites  Change in population number of 4 key	Broad-leaf: 88,000 hectares  Reef: 3% - 30% living  Number of individuals of: endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly ( <i>Pterouus homerus</i> ),
	indicator species: endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly ( <i>Pterouus homerus</i> ), endemic Jamaican Blackbird ( <i>Nesopsar nigerrimus</i> ), Hawksbill turtle ( <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> ) and Queen Conch ( <i>Strombus gigas</i> ).	Endemic Jamaican Blackbird ( <i>Nesopsar nigerrimus</i> ), Hawksbill turtle ( <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> ) and Queen Conch ( <i>Strombus gigas</i> ).  (Exact figures to be determined at project inception)
Outcome 1: Strengthening of planning and revenue generation	Increase in Protected Area Trust Fund principle and annual disbursement to NSPA	Trust Fund Principle: 0  Annual Disbursement to NSPA: 0
	Increase in the amount of cash received by the Revolving Fund	\$0
	Increase in annual government funding for PAs	US\$ 4,097,000
	Increase in annual non-government resources	US\$ 1,575,987
	Percentage of PAs with business plans that reflect NSPA standards	0 new coastal and marine PA landscapes gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats

Outcome 2: Rationalizing and integrating the NSPA	Number of PAs with clearly designated lead and support entity	METT Scores for 32 PA's: Montego Bay Marine Park - 44 Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park – 72 Negril EPA - 32 Negril Marine Park – 39 Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area – 27 Coral Spring-Mountain Spring – 19 Portland Bight Protected Area – 36 Ocho Rios Protected Areas – 19 Mason River protected Area - 54 Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 14 Bowden Fish Sanctuary - 13 Airport Point Fish Sanctuary - 46 Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary - 34 Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary - 33 Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary - 36 Black River - 21 Spanish Town - 41 Titchfield Hill - 43 Falmouth - 35 Seville - 74 Rio Nuevo - 17 Mountain River Cave – 44 Mason River Reserve - 54 Mountain River Cave – 44 Mason River Reserve - 54
	Number of new PA landscapes gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	One (1) PA contributing to and accessing CBD CHM.
Outcome 3: Increasing PA management effectiveness	Increase in PA management effectiveness measured by METT scores	0 PA's with management plans that reflect NSPA management guideline standards
	Number of PAs that access and contribute to biological information through CBD Clearing House Mechanism.	0
	Percentage of PAs with management plans that reflect NSPA management guideline standards	0 PA's with management plans that reflect NSPA management guideline standards

The baseline indicators were largely fitting to establish a reference point and be able to measure achievement, for the most part. Indicators originating from standard tools in these sorts of projects were used (such as METT scores and financial scorecards). Only in one section were indicators not available (that is in the section “Change in population number of four key indicator species). However, some stakeholders have indicated that several baseline indicators and data that supported them were flawed (for instance in the first objective indicator where it states

number of PA s) and regrettably this was not corrected in subsequent information generated by the project.

### MAIN STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFIED AT THE DESIGN LEVEL

At the design level, a series of specific main stakeholders were identified. These were, at the time of project development, as follows:

- NEPA<sup>9</sup>
- Forestry Department
- Fisheries Division
- Jamaica National Heritage Trust Planning Institute of Jamaica
- Ministry of Finance and Planning
- Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change (Environmental Management Division)
- Institute of Jamaica and the Urban Development Corporation
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
- University of the West Indies
- Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
- Montego Bay Marine Park Trust
- Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation
- Windsor Research Centre
- Portland Environmental Protection Association
- Negril Coral Reef Preservation Society
- Negril Area Environmental Protection Trust.

Other more general stakeholder types were also identified at the design level, such as local forest or watershed management committees, or the more general definition of parties interested in protected areas co-management and concessions, landowners, resource users, recreationalists, business sector, and others with social and/or economic interests within or near protected areas boundaries. This notwithstanding, several key stakeholders and implementing partners have indicated that the stakeholder analysis per se was not as thorough as needed for this sort of project in Jamaica. That is, albeit a thorough list of participants was identified as stakeholders, their real capacities, characteristics, commitments to the Project, abilities to participate in and/or implement parts of the project, or other such issues were not included as thoroughly or as patently as needed in the stakeholder analysis. This, in turn, had an impact on the implementation of the NPAS Project given that several stakeholders were not fully aware of what their role was to be or fully capable nor had the means or capacity to implement and/or fulfil their commitments.

---

<sup>9</sup> Project's Implementing Partner.

## EXPECTED RESULTS

Overall, it was expected that the NPAS Project would result in improved conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources in Jamaica through improved management of protected areas. As the project's title rightly indicates the expected result of the project was to strengthen the management, operational and financial components of Jamaica's national protected areas.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1 PROJECT DESIGN / FORMULATION

##### ANALYSIS OF LFA/RESULTS FRAMEWORK (PROJECT LOGIC /STRATEGY; INDICATORS)

As all projects of this sort, a key aspect of its design is the inception log frame/results framework which includes project strategy and the intervention's logic as well as baseline and target indicators. The NPAS logic and strategy at the design and formulation level was fitting. The formulation documents effectively identify the key issues, threats, and other matters that hinder adequate, sustainable management of protected areas in Jamaica in a developmental framework. The results framework, therefore, bases its logic and strategy upon identified threats and barriers and the ways to act upon them to improve management of PA s.

##### THREATS, BARRIERS, AND UNDERLYING CAUSES SUSTAINING PROJECT LOGIC/STRATEGY

The threats as well as underlying causes that hinder biodiversity conservation and sustainable use (within which protected areas are key components) were properly identified. These threats included accelerated loss of vulnerable habitats and associated species, increasing broken links between natural areas causing increased fragmentation of Jamaica 's marine and terrestrial protected areas. These issues are further compounded and hastened by institutional capacity that does not guarantee fitting protected area management (neither at site nor at the system level). Lack of adequate funding for managing protected areas is also an issue in Jamaica. More recently, climate change is also present as a threat to biodiversity in Jamaica, impacting negatively also on PA s. All-encompassing issues also arise out of the conflict between protected areas and other productive projects together with the lack of opportunities for communities to fully apprehend the potential social and economic benefits that biodiversity (including PA s) can bring.

Underlying and direct causes of biodiversity degradation and unsustainable of natural resources are chiefly results of macro-economic and policy factors. Jamaica's impoverished economy is reliant on the exploitation of natural resources, often unsustainable exploitation. Policies and processes derive in unsustainable practices in mining, fishing, agriculture, forestry as well as in tourism. The latter is closely related to protected areas as well as other natural resources since most tourism is nature – oriented.

Barriers were also specifically identified at project design. Among these were inadequate policy instruments related to efficient and effective management (including financial management) of protected areas; limited capacity for management –institutional, individual, operational and policy related management--; an inadequate funding base and resources to finance management instruments, general limited political and public support of PA s as well as weak understanding of the socio – economic benefits of protected areas. Insufficient as well as inadequate coverage of protected areas throughout the country was also identified as a barrier.

The Project's logic and strategy therefore was to confront these issues through specific outputs and expected outcomes that would, plausibly, deal with threats and barriers for adequate protected area management in a sustainable development context in Jamaica. Therefore, in terms of overall logic and strategy the design responded to an adequate rationale and it was designed as a strategic intervention.

### **LOGFRAME AND INDICATORS**

In general (as previously indicated also for baseline indicators), target indicators used standard tools to measure achievements and results, such as METT and financial sustainability scorecards. The expected results indicators were considered to be overly ambitious, and a reworked log frame with revised target indicators was drawn in 2015 and with minor revisions in 2016, although there were discussions about reforming the results framework early in the implementation process (2012).<sup>10</sup> In general, most of the indicators were SMART<sup>11</sup>, either having all five of these characteristics or a majority of them. They are specific and measurable (for instance, when the indicators are expressed through METT and financial scores). They are relevant given that they deal with pertinent issues related to Protected Areas in the country, such as financial aspects or land coverage protected. Furthermore, after the log frame indicator changes that took place in 2015, it was deemed that the expected results would be more achievable than the original ones which were, early on, deemed as overly ambitious.

Overall, the indicators (and underlying these the overall logic of the intervention) link outputs, products, results with the expected outcomes and objectives to a degree. In retrospect, however, some sections there could have been better calibration of the outputs to the outcomes. For instance, in some cases it is not clear how the products will or would lead to effects, impacts or outcomes. As an example, it is not clear how the products such as management plans or business plans link to improved management since it is not explicit how they would be implemented to have effects or impacts. That is, there are weak linkages between products and expected outcomes, or how outputs/products would result as outcomes in some cases. The indicators are in most cases, therefore, output or product indicators and do not attempt to tally outcome or effect.

Throughout the results framework alterations, however, no changes were made at the objective and outcome levels. Nevertheless, some stakeholders considered that—even with this reform—the expectations were still deemed too high considering resources, capacity, and time scope of the NPAS Project. That is, although in general the revised indicators in the log frame were more attuned to what realistically could be achieved at the product level, still in general the project was deemed too ambitious in what it was expected to achieve at the outcome level and

---

<sup>10</sup> A revised log frame was produced with guidance by the Project Steering Committee and by UNDP in 2015 and some minor adjustments were further made in 2016, although there were discussions about changing the results framework early on in project implementation (as early as 2012) as to adjust the framework's target indicators and be more realistic and attuned to local issues. The revised results framework is also found in annexes.

<sup>11</sup> S: specific; M: measurable; A: achievable; R: relevant; T: time-bound.

to the possibilities to lead change so deep as the Project aimed at given the Jamaican policy context.

### **DESIGN FORMULATION**

Design formulation has been a laborious step for this project. Several stakeholders from different sorts of institutions were not fully satisfied with the design process and subsequent formulation. They have indicated that, as designed, the Project was not viable. This is corroborated by the changes in the log frame that were carried out in 2015. Although these reformulations were made in what can be considered the last tranches of the Project, discussion about needed changes to the log frame began shortly after project approval and when implementation began (in 2012). Furthermore, stakeholders indicate that the design process was not fully perceptive or cognizant of the capacities, needs and possibilities to implement a project such as this one in Jamaica.

Although most consulted stakeholders who did participate in the design process indicated that they provided inputs to some degree, several made a few sorts of appreciations. First, that the national stakeholders (both government and non – government) needed to be more assertive and have more inputs as to what were the national capacities and eventual commitments that such a project would entail and second that the project should have linked better with national agencies' timelines and work plans. Furthermore, it is considered that the design process was rushed since it was carried out in a shorter period of time than initially prearranged, which meant that consultations were hasty and not as thorough as needed.

The timing of the expected results was not specifically set up at design and at formulation. It is assumed by several stakeholders that if a specific timeline would have been set up, the project's outputs could have had a greater effect and could have been more effective. For instance, several baseline studies, plans, and documents were drafted at the very end of the NPAS Project, while interventions at the field level that dealt with some of the aspects of these outputs were done before these documents were finalized. Therefore (in part due to a lack of a planned clear sequential pattern and timeline for the outputs, in part due to the delays in implementation) baseline studies/documents were made available to implementers after the specific onsite interventions took place dealing with the issues in these outputs.

Lastly, budgeting as planned in design formulation was deemed inadequate. First, the planned budget for management (specifically for the Project Management Unit) was insufficient. Second, the costing of outputs (primarily consultancies) was also deemed inadequate to meet with the expected products and to attract the quality needed for these products. This was identified throughout the course of the Project, but there were no attempts to make changes.<sup>12</sup>

### **ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS**

At the design stage, a series of risks and assumptions were identified. This risk analysis included classifications (low (L), medium (M), medium/high (M/H)) as well as basic strategies for

---

<sup>12</sup> National stakeholders indicate that they did not make changes since they were not made aware that they could do so.

mitigation. These and their ranking in severity as perceived at the design stage are indicated below.

**Table 1: Risks, assumptions and mitigation measures as stated in Project Document**

Risk/Assumptions	Rating	Mitigation Measure
Changes in political circumstances and economic priorities affect Government or other stakeholders - including NGO PA managers – financial commitment to NSPA	L	From the outset of the PPG phase, the project has involved relevant institutional stakeholders, such as heads of agencies/Ministries and boards and key NGO's and others to ensure their support for and participation in the project. In addition, the project has high-level political support from the relevant agencies. Decision-makers (national and local) should be poised to support and approve financial commitments to the NSPA. In addition, the project is designed (e.g., financial commitments from cofunders) to be feasible even with increasing decline in global economy.
Weak management and technical capacity undermines project outcomes	M	Increasing management effectiveness is one of the key components of the project. The project will build the capacity of protected area managers and stewards of public and private reserves. Management effectiveness tracking tools will deliver information on progress of project activities.
Climate change, natural disasters, and other environmental impacts beyond national borders exceed current expectations.	M	The project is designed specifically to help build resilience in the NSPA in light of pending climate change impacts.
Critical legal and institutional framework necessary to improve management efficiency – including adoption of protected areas law and consolidation of NSPA management regime - will be resisted and not changed	M/H	During project design, stakeholders unanimously agreed that the legal framework (law, regulations, and charters) concerning NSPA must be improved. The project is designed to provide superior international technical support while building local capacity to insure that draft policy changes reflect best principles and practices. However, there are always risks that government will not take decisive action necessary to overcome potential political barriers.

Several of these risks manifested themselves early on in implementation process, and did have a noteworthy effect. Principally, issues with management and long and sometimes complexed procurement processes from implementing agency mainly in contracting, as well as restricted limited national capacity to carry out some of the components of the projects including consultancies and technical support, some associated to insubstantial budgeting structure. Furthermore, during implementation it was recognized that this risk and assumption analysis was weak and that risk management was not up to par with the issues and problems being encountered by the project throughout implementation. Therefore, risks were redefined and closely monitored by PSC and the implementing agency in the latter part of project implementation.

---

## LESSONS FROM OTHER RELEVANT PROJECTS (SAME FOCAL AREA) INCORPORATED INTO PROJECT DESIGN

The NPAS Project draws from lessons from other relevant projects (either explicitly or tacitly). For instance, project design acknowledges that there were a series of interventions being carried out in Jamaica approximately at the same time as the project from which lessons would be drawn and from which collaborative arrangements would also be sought. The stakeholders involved in these other projects were consulted at planning stages. Among the other projects mentioned at design from which NPAS sought lessons learned, linkages or information include the Natural Resource Valuation Project, the GEF Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem (CLME), the Caribbean Challenge. Furthermore, although not exactly a relevant project, at design it is indicated that lessons would be drawn from other trust funds operating in Jamaica at the time of planning and design. Overall, therefore, the Project had a series of experiences and projects to draw upon for its design and implementation. The aim to build upon these is made explicit in the project design.

---

## PLANNED STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

At the design stage there was a framework of planned stakeholder participation. First in participation in the Project's decision-making processes<sup>13</sup> (PSC) and ad hoc technical committees as the project progressed in implementation. The ProDoc states in a summarized manner what were the expected inputs and expected participation of several stakeholders. This participation framework was not comprehensive. This could have been the cause of having several stakeholders becoming aware of what their role and what it was expected of them as participants in the Project in the latter part of implementation. Also, stakeholders indicate that this could have been the result of the rushed short period of project development, which did not allow for extensive consultations as well as for dissemination and appropriation of information on the participation framework what this truly entailed for several national institutions.

---

## REPLICATION APPROACH

At the design level, the replication approach was not detailed, even though the issue is considered to some extent in the project planning documents. Although some mentions are made of a replication strategy<sup>14</sup>, a full-fledged approach for replicating results was not part of the design. Furthermore, there is no specific concrete approach (at design and planning) to upscale, replicate or expand outcomes and outputs, nor an explicit theory of change.

---

<sup>13</sup> In the ProDoc the decision-making body was called a board, yet throughout implementation the PSC was regarded as the board, following UNDP terminology.

<sup>14</sup> For example, the ProDoc states "A separate set of activities undertaken within the parameters of this output will be the design and implementation of a replication strategy for project activities such as business and protected area management planning . . ." or "Specifically, the project will support the drafting of: . . . (iii) model protected area co-management contracts suitable for national replication. "

---

## UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

Design of the project contemplated UNDP's comparative advantage, in particular as it relates to GEF – funded projects. The design of the NPAS Project acknowledged UNDP's comparative advantage in the areas of capacity building, human resource development, and institutional strengthening. UNDP's Country Office in Jamaica is also recognized for its comparative advantage since it has facilitated the development of strong relationships with the diverse institutional stakeholders (from government and from civil society) that took part in the Project.

UNDP's country office in Jamaica has had a key role in the country in developing and managing capacity building programmes and technical assistance projects for natural resource management, climate risk management and adaptation as well as for other more general environmental issues (at the larger project levels as well as with the Small Grants Programme). UNDP's capital of information, access to expertise, knowledge management capabilities as well as its regional and global positioning and development of similar projects was also part of the agency's comparative advantage. The experience in human resources development, integrated policy support, institutional strengthening, and participation is further enhanced by UNDP's ability to draw on experts (regionally and inter – regionally) to propel capacity in protected area management when is not found in – country.

---

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The management arrangements set out at design and formulation were fairly standard arrangements for GEF – funded UNDP – implemented National Execution (NEX) modality projects. The lead implementing agency was the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA), not only overseeing matters of implementation but also housing the Project Management Unit. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) was set up with the aim of it being a strategic decision-making body for NPAS that would provide overall guidance and direction as well as be responsible for decision making<sup>15</sup>.

Given that protected areas fall under the realm of several different national agencies, these institutions were also partners of the Project, not only at the decision – making process (such as in the Project Screening Committee and eventually in the ad hoc technical committees set up in the latter parts of the implementation process) but also in direct implementation of activities and products. The Project Steering Committee at start-up was quite large, which made the decision-making process slow and cumbersome. As part of its adaptive management strategies, a restructuring of the PSC took place at approximately mid-point of the implementation process where the number of members of the PSC was reduced.

The design also provides guidelines for the functioning of the Project Management Unit (PMU) as well as staffing guidelines. The original management arrangements indicated that the PMU would be responsible for directing, supervising and coordinating implementation and that

---

<sup>15</sup> Some of the planning documents also call this body a board, yet at implementation stages it was always referred as a steering committee.

it be located within NEPA. The PMU was to be composed of a project manager, an administrative assistant and a part-time accountant. By all analysis these arrangements have been deemed as inadequate in order to manage such a complex and substantial project as NPAS. This, together with the percentage of funds allocated and budgeted for staffing, has been one of the causes for implementation issues which will be seen further along this report.

### 3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

#### ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT (CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESIGN AND PROJECT OUTPUTS DURING IMPLEMENTATION)

Adaptive management is defined as the project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (project objective, outcomes, or outputs) during implementation resulting from: (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions that changed, due to which change was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original expectations were overambitious; or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress<sup>16</sup>. If this definition is followed then it can be said that adaptive management thoroughly took place throughout the Project. In particular, after mid-point when the rate of delivery was deemed to be too slow. Adaptive management, the implementation of changes, and several other such components can be considered to be one of the successes of the NPAS project, that impelled execution (particularly in the latter stages of implementation) and the obtainment of outputs and results.

Mainly to make-up for the very significant delays that the Project experienced in its early years of implementation as well as to adjust some design issues, the following adaptive management measures were taken:

- Changes in log frame, reforming the expected output indicators to reflect more achievable results;
- Streamlining the Project Steering Committee composition in order to accelerate decision – making processes;
- Increased frequency of PSC meeting in the latter stages of the Project;
- Holding regular bilateral meetings between UNDP and NEPA in order to accelerate implementation, delivery rate and the obtainment of results;
- Hiring of a technical advisor to ensure the technical quality of products (especially technical quality of consultancies' products);
- Recognition that risk analysis was weak and that risk management was not up to par with the issues and problems being encountered with risks redefined and closely monitored and mitigated as possible.

In general, therefore, adaptive management (broadly defined) showed flexibility yet reflected several underlying design and implementation deficits. Adaptive management was

---

<sup>16</sup> Source: *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. UNDP and GEF. 2014.

thoroughly programmatic yet there was flexibility to adapt to some failings such as the protracted implementation process and delivery rate for most of the initial stages of implementation and design issues. Notwithstanding these positive assessments of adaptive management, it can be seen that they took place mostly at the end of the implementation process. It would have been more effective if these changes and practices would have been adopted earlier in the implementation process, particularly as soon as signs of issues with implementation, delays and other such matters manifested themselves.

---

#### PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS (WITH RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN THE COUNTRY/REGION)

As established in the Project Document and at inception, a broad framework for stakeholder analysis was carried out at Project design. The main partnership arrangements with relevant stakeholders involved in protected areas in Jamaica was between the implementing partner (NEPA) and the other national agencies that deal with protected areas in the country (i.e. the Forestry Department, the Fisheries Division, and the Jamaica National Heritage Trust). Although several stakeholders expressed that the participation of multiple agencies slowed down the decision-making processes, especially until the latter three agencies mentioned generated buy-in into the Project, if NPAS would have been implemented only by one agency it would not have been as relevant nor as sustainable. First, because the very nature of administration and management of protected areas in Jamaica involves all of the agencies mentioned and second because the partnerships worked at the national level once buy-in and expectations were clear. Lastly, in the implementation of specific interventions at the site levels, inter – agency coordination worked quite well between the partners, involving exchanges and valued added with each agency conveying their capacities and coordinating execution.

Also, partnership arrangements were similarly maintained with other non – state actors involved in protected area management in the country. This was particularly the case with non – governmental organizations charged with the mandate of managing particular sites.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the mentioned government agencies as well as other non – governmental organizations and other relevant government institutions partnered in the governance and guiding of the Project through the Project Steering Committee and the ad-hoc technical committees. PSC participation was positive, with some rotation in representation throughout the life span of the project. Attendance and involvement was proactive for the most part. At times, there was delegation and rotation without bringing new participants up to date.

Partnership and linkages were also maintained at the regional level. A key collaboration took place with the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) given that this organization will be the umbrella institution for the financing mechanism that would originate out of the NPAS Project. Several stakeholders have indicated that it would have been desirable to link bilaterally with other countries, particularly in the Caribbean, that have implemented or are implementing these sorts of project and also with those countries that are part of the CBF initiative. Although exchanges have taken place with these countries, it would have benefited the NPAS project to

---

<sup>17</sup> For instance, with the Montego Bay Marine Park and the Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust.

have had deeper linkages, in particular to learn how the issues of protected area management and financial sustainability was dealt with in each case. South-south cooperation would have benefitted the Project through sharing of knowledge, experiences and of best practices.

---

#### FEEDBACK FROM MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES USED FOR THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The implementation of the monitoring/evaluation plan essentially followed the M & E plan set up at design. There were, therefore, frequent opportunities for feedback of M & E activities to be used for adaptive management. In general, fluid feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities were used for adaptive management. With this matter, as with several others as is seen throughout this report, several distinct stages of the implementation process should be taken into account. These would be from 2010 to 2013 (before the mid-term review) where implementation and monitoring underwent serious delays and setbacks, and the period after the mid-point of the Project (including the periods granted as a no-cost extension).

The earlier implementation stage was characterized by a stagnant delivery, and little or no adaptive management. Therefore, feedback from monitoring activities was not used for adjusting management issues. After the mid-point of the project a strong usage of adaptive management instruments took place (as indicated in other relevant section of this report). Much of this was based on monitoring and evaluation activities. The findings from monitoring and evaluation activities were used as a base to redirect whatever needed to be redirected in order to achieve results, albeit in the latter implementation period of NPAS. Other issues that hindered monitoring reside in the fact that UNDP did not have a specific Monitoring and Evaluation position at the Jamaican Country Office until 2014 and, therefore, did not have a specific area to aid the Project in monitoring.

---

#### PROJECT FINANCE

The total planned project cost was of 7,820,585 USD, with planned financing by GEF of 2,770,585 USD and a 5,050,000 USD of planned co-financing from other sources. Of this expected co – financing, 200,000 USD was to be from UNDP and the rest was to be provided by other sources. Actual versus planned financial data for financing and co -financing is provided below in the narrative and in the following table. Further information on financing and co – financing is found in the chart below.

**Table 2: Project financing and co – financing table**

	at endorsement in 2009 (US\$)	at revision in 2015 (US\$)	at completion (US\$)
GEF financing:	2,770,585	2,020,585	2,126,769
UNDP	200,000	200,000	91,179
Government	500,000	250,000	250,000
Other/TNC	2,750,000	500,000	500,000
Other/KFW	1,600,000	4,478,554	4,478,554
GEF/CBF:	0.00	750,000	750,000
Total co-financing:	5,050,000	6,178,554	6,069,733
Total Project Cost:	7,820,585	8,199,139	8,196,502

Based on the ProDoc revision in 2015, the project's budget was reduced to USD2,020,585 due to the reallocation of USD750,000 to the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. At the end of 2016, the total expenditure from GEF funds was USD1,898,391. The balance at the end of 2016 was USD122,193. Notwithstanding, the approved budget and the approved spending limit for 2017 was USD247,700, of which USD228,377 was expended. This reflects an over expenditure of \$106,184. This was an oversight from three sides: the project's implementing partner, NEPA, UNDP Country Office and the UNDP GEF Unit in Panama. The various shifts in budget, including direct payment to CBF, may have led the team to lose track of the actual amount available and to overstate the available budget, given the initial slow rate of delivery. While there were reductions in the co-financing amounts by specific donors (e.g., government, TNC), the overall amount was increased to USD6,178,554 due to an increase in KFW's contribution to the CBF. It is important to note that co-financing went directly to the CBF from the donors.

While some sources indicate co-financing by the Government of Jamaica was USD250,000, other sources indicate that the Government of Jamaica's co – financing in cash was of USD 104,067. In the project document there are indications of planned USD2,000,000 of in-kind support to be made available by the Government of Jamaica. However, details of actual in kind support has not been provided by the implementing partner.

Total Project expenditure was USD8,196,502. This is below the revised total budgeted amount of USD8,199,139.

#### MONITORING AND EVALUATION: DESIGN AT ENTRY AND IMPLEMENTATION

Planned monitoring and evaluation design at entry defines a fairly standard set of tools and methodologies in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures for this sort of project. These included Inception Workshop and Report; Measurement of Means of Verification of project results; Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation; Project Implementation Reports (PIRs); Periodic status/ progress reports; Mid-term Evaluation; Final Evaluation; Project Terminal Report; Audit as well as visits to field sites.

Although some of these tools were not fully well-defined, they do follow a prototype applicable to the sort of project being implemented. Therefore, at entry, the ranking is *Satisfactory (S)* given that it had only minor shortcomings.

The implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework has followed, to a large degree, the M & E plan. The Inception Workshop and Report were set up early in the implementation process (two months after project signature). The mid-term review took place six months before it was assumed it would take place. Given the early signs of implementation and governance stand stills present at that time of the project mid-term review, this was positive since it gave the Project leeway in designing and implementing adaptive management. Other monitoring tools were also applied as planned, yet some had delays. Stakeholders indicate that application of the monitoring plan was difficult and intricate at times since, in addition to the reporting to be done according to the Project's M & E plan, national agencies' reporting was added. This generated extra effort for the PMU and duplication of efforts.

Risk management, and its linked monitoring and reporting, was weak (as stated elsewhere in this report) at design. In the latter stages of implementation, and with specific guidance from the Project Steering Committee, risk monitoring was improved.

Due to some of the shortcomings in the achievement of the monitoring plan at implementation it is considered that implementation of the M & E plan was *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*. A composite ranking that considers monitoring and evaluation design at entry together with the M & E plan's implementation for the overall quality of M&E is *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*.

---

#### IMPLEMENTING PARTNER AND UNDP IMPLEMENTATION / EXECUTION COORDINATION, AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The Project Document sets up coordination and operational issues as well as proposed management arrangements. Although not overtly specified at design, the coordination and management implementation system is set following standard processes for NEX (National Execution)/NIM (National Implementation Modality) projects. Although, NEPA is identified as the implementing agency, collaboration was attained from the other three government agencies that deal with protected areas in Jamaica throughout implementation and execution<sup>18</sup>. By all accounts, this inter – governmental agencies' collaboration worked well, even at the level of implementation and execution in field sites. Although some stakeholders indicated that the involvement of all the agencies might have slowed down the decision – making process (specially before buy – in of the institutions regarding the NPAS Project's), an intervention without all four institutions working together would not have been pertinent since all of the institutions involved have dominion over protected areas in Jamaica.

The Project established a Project Management Unit hosted in the offices of NEPA while a representative from this institution acted as Project Director. The PMU had several personnel

---

<sup>18</sup> As mentioned before in this report, they are the Forestry Department, the Fisheries Division, and the Jamaica National Heritage Trust.

rotations throughout the implementation period, including three different project managers and a period without a project manager where NEPA staff assumed a proactive management role. These rotations hindered continuity of the implementation process. Therefore, this issue can, to some degree be associated with some aspects of the critical delays that the Project suffered throughout its operation. Staffing of the PMU was deficient in many respects. First, since this sort of GEF – funded UNDP-implemented projects management units are set up following guidelines which establish a rather small staffing arrangement<sup>19</sup>, it was assessed that the arrangements were not effective. Considering the periods where this staffing arrangement was not in place (for instance due to leaves of absence), even the minimal arrangement established at design following UNDP/GEF guidelines was many times not met. Furthermore, the salary caps (i.e. percentage of a project's budget that can be used for salaries) resulted in limitations to the salaries that could be paid. Considering Jamaican salary ranges it was deemed that the limited amount available for salaries did not attract personnel with the needed or desired technical capacities and management capabilities required for managing such a large and intricate project as NPAS. This coupled with limited national capacities and lack of responsiveness from government to meeting in due time with the required procurement and decision making for management greatly hindered implementation.

Given that the Project was implemented in a NEX/NIM modality, the role of NEPA was key as it regards to management and operative matters, not only as they relate to the PMU but also in all terms of operational issues (including contracting, procurement, and approvals needed to execute work plans). NEPA has a complexed and long procedure for processing procurement matters which—in turn—caused significant delays as well as set-backs in project implementation. Up to five different administrative processes had to be implemented for decision making and procurement, just from NEPA. It was estimated that hiring of consultants took about eight months on average.

Overall, the above-mentioned deficiencies and issues related to management were some of the causal effects of the very slow start-up, such as not meeting with timelines, substantial postponements in execution, very low delivery until the last stages of the project implementation process. These were also the reasons why two extensions had to be obtained to finalize the project, even while the project had a planned implementation span of six years, and this was also the rationale for the review to the results framework. The latter, although commendable in some respects since it overtook some design issues, the reforms to the log frame, also responded to the fact that—due to implementation issues—the target results were abridged to have a greater likelihood to meeting with them, at the product/output levels.

In summary, the project had several issues regarding implementation processes and severe delays in delivery at its start up. However, adaptive management and an intensified and purposefully accelerated delivery in the last year of implementation resulted in achievements, albeit mostly at the product level. Therefore, as a composite, these aspects are deemed

---

<sup>19</sup> As seen in elsewhere in this report, the PMU was to be composed of a project manager, an administrative assistant and a part-time accountant.

*Moderately Satisfactory (MS)* since there were moderate shortcomings in the achievement of Project results due to management issues.

Working in tandem with UNDP's processes was also difficult since the two administrative procedures overlapped. Notwithstanding these issues, coordination between UNDP and the national implementing partner was positive throughout the operational process. UNDP's role throughout implementation varied. There was a more proactive role after the mid-point. Especially when full realization was made by all parties that the project had a very low delivery rate and was in a serious risk of coming to a standstill, and that UNDP had to provide a more active role if the project would continue to be implemented. UNDP also had a strong role in procuring expertise when technical proficiency was not available in-country. Therefore, the overall quality of UNDP implementation was *Satisfactory (S)* given shortcomings identified in particular in the achievement of effectiveness and efficiency. The shortcomings identified, by many stakeholders, deal with the matter that UNDP could have played a more active role in implementation and execution (evidently without interfering with the country's national implementation matters) early on the implementation process in order to avoid or moderate the serious delays that the Project had, particularly in its initial stages of implementation.

Therefore, as an amalgamated review, the overall quality of implementation and execution, of the executing agency as well as the quality execution of UNDP is *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)* since moderate shortcomings were identified throughout the implementation process as a whole.

### 3.3 PROJECT RESULTS

#### OVERALL RESULTS

In terms of expected results, the overall objective of the NPAS Project was to consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's national system of protected areas. The expected results were articulated through anticipated outcomes and these, in turn, are operationalized through the generation of outputs (products, activities, processes, etc.). In the following section, an analysis is made of attainment of objectives vis – a – vis these various levels.<sup>20</sup> The project's final report of July 2017, as well as other sources, attests to the fact that products/outputs have been achieved to a large degree. However, and as the report rightly affirms, the achieved results have been attained mostly at the output/product level. Following are charts extracted from the Project's final report with an evaluation analysis per expected output. At the end of this section there is a general analysis of results.

---

<sup>20</sup> For this analysis target indicators used are those from the log frame reformulation(s) and not from the original design process (ProDoc) since the original target indicators were adapted throughout the implementation process.

<p><b>Output 1.1 Protected Area Trust Fund (JNPATF)</b></p> <p><b>1.1.1 National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ)</b></p> <p>Baseline: No National Protected Area Trust Fund</p> <p>Targets: Establishment and operationalization of one National Protected Area Trust Fund</p> <p>Indicators: Signing of partnership agreement between the National Protected Area Trust Fund and the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund</p>	<p>Establishment of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ) in November 2014</p> <p>11 members named and endorsed as the Board NCTFJ Board of Directors.</p> <p>Registered as a charitable organization</p> <p>Bank account opened</p> <p>Completed Operations Manual and Articles of Incorporation</p> <p>TEF 5-year proposal and 5 Year business plan prepared</p> <p>NCTFJ eligibility request, pre-financing request and supporting documentation officially submitted to the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund on 5 December 2016. NCTFJ now managing all financial responsibilities including salary payments for Administrator</p> <p>NCTFJ Secretariat Administrator hired in January 2016</p>
--	--

Although this output (1.1) is somewhat completed, the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ) is still awaiting final formalization of this Trust Fund with the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. Formalization would be completed with the signing of the partnership agreement. It is expected that this would take place by December 2017. The establishment of the NCTFJ, if fully operational and capitalized, would be a major achievement of the NPAS Project leading to the consolidation of a financing mechanism for protected areas in Jamaica, a key expectation out of this project as well as key issue in protected area management within a developing country context. The establishment of the fund had a long series of debates within the Project and with key stakeholders at the national, regional, and international levels. After governance issues of such a Trust Fund were modified to fit national priorities, and when formal registration issues were at last carried out, the Trust Fund was formally recognized at the national level. The signing of the official partnership agreement with the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund would be the last formalization step that would need to be taken to formalize the Trust Fund. However, a considerable matter to be contemplated is the issue of co – funding. Although co – funding from the country's Tourism Enhancement Fund was expected throughout the NCTF deliberations, the likelihood of drawing from those funds is deemed doubtful from several key stakeholders at the time of the evaluation. First due to budget limitations, second due to a lack of presentation of robust and solid proposals. Working on having the NCTFJ functioning could be a key aspect of immediate follow up for the NPAS Project.

Output 1.2 Model site-level business plans	Preparation of Management Planning Framework Guidelines	Output completed.
Baseline: No model site-level business plans	Eight model site-level business plans prepared for: - Gourie Forest Management Area - Ocho Rios Marine Park Protected Area - Montego Bay Marine Park - Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park - Seville Heritage Park - Black River Proposed Protected Landscape - Pedro Cays - Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area.	Each protected area management entity has the responsibility of implementing activities from the business plans to facilitate more effective protected area management.
Targets: Preparation of eight model site-level business plans		Protected area management entities may also prepare similar business plans for other protected areas, based on the framework prepared under the NPAS project.
Indicators: Eight business plans		

At the output level, within Output 1.2, the preparation of model site level business plans was achieved.<sup>21</sup> However, several problems were identified with these business plans. First their phasing. The business plans were completed at the very end of the Project. Yet, interventions at field sites that specifically dealt with issues related to the business plans (such as upgrading of facilities or merchandising for the generation of income for the protected areas) were implemented before the plans were available. Therefore, there was no possibility of implementing activities with the guidance of the respective business plans. Other issues with business plans was their quality and their approach. Several business plans were not of the expected quality, and they had to be redrawn. Furthermore, several attempts at drafting business plans were abandoned given that the consultants engaged did not have any knowledge of business planning for protected areas, which is a rather specific area of expertise where not any sort of business plan is applicable. Lastly, all stakeholders consulted regarding the quality of these products agreed that those who drafted several of the plans had no knowledge of the national or even regional context or—if they did—this was not reflected fully in the products. That is, that they had no knowledge of “what it takes” to draw and establish a business plan in a developing country context such as in Jamaica (with its particularities regarding protected area policies and its socio-economic context) and that the proposals in the plans were highly inapplicable in this framework. At the time of the terminal evaluation one business plan was being used for seeking further financing for PA management.

---

<sup>21</sup> There are some discrepancies between what the Project self-reports and findings from the evaluation site visits and field level review. Although the field level review was only carried out fully in three sites and partially in others, some of the ones which the project reports as having had a business plan drawn they indicate that no such document was produced.

<p>Output 1.3 Revenue generation mechanisms in five key protected areas</p> <p>Baseline: No documented revenue generation mechanisms in protected areas</p> <p>Targets: Revenue generation mechanisms in five key protected areas</p> <p>Indicators: Revenue generation activities implemented in key PAs</p>	<p>Preparation of report recommending revenue generation activities for use in key protected areas</p> <p>Implementation of revenue generation activities in Seville Heritage Park, Gourie Forest Management Area, Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area and Montego Bay Marine Park, and Blue and John Crow Mountain National Park.</p>	<p>Output completed.</p> <p>Revenue generation activities may continue in the relevant protected areas based on the initiative of the protected area managers.</p>
---	--	--

Although the baseline for Output 1.3 is inaccurate given that there were documented revenue generation mechanisms in protected areas, the output was completed in several products given that there were activities implemented (such as upgrading of infrastructure) which could *theoretically* increase revenue generation. It is indicated that this is theoretical since at the time of the evaluation no increased revenue had been achieved yet. Furthermore, when local stakeholders who were not protected areas managers were engaged in order to generate mechanisms for income diversification, these have not been sustained and they have been abandoned. Again, many of these activities would have had a linkage with the business plans (see above), but as indicated above, the business plans were finalized after the revenue generation mechanisms were tested or piloted, precluding interchange between these highly linked outputs.

<p>Output 1.4: Operational plan for Protected Areas (PA) system financial strategy</p> <p>Baseline: No operational plan or PA system Financial Strategy documents</p> <p>Targets: Preparation of operational plan for PA system financial strategy</p> <p>Indicators: Increased financial sustainability within the PA system upon implementation of operational plan</p>	<p>PA System Financial Strategy document prepared.</p> <p>Operational Plan for the PA System Financial Strategy prepared.</p>	<p>Output completed.</p> <p>Responsibility for the implementation of the Operational Plan will rest with the Protected Areas Committee (PAC)</p>
---	---	--

Output 1.4 completed only at the product level, as the report from which the above chart is extracted indicates, no effect or outcome can be determined. There is no evidence of beginning implementation of these financial plans at the time of the evaluation.

Output 2.1 National protected areas legislation and supporting legal framework  Baseline: No harmonised protected area legislation and supporting legal framework  Targets: One Overarching Act, Overarching Policy and Co-management Agreement Framework  Indicators: Completed legislative documents	Overarching Protected Areas Act prepared  Overarching Policy prepared  Co-management Agreement Framework prepared  Miscellaneous  Audio visual & Printing	Output completed.  Key elements of the Overarching Act and Policy surrounding governance and legislative implications have been accepted by the Protected Areas Committee PAC and have been placed on the government's legislative agenda. Co-management agreement framework to be adopted by protected area management entities for all future agreements.
--	---	---

One of the main outcomes expected out of the NPAS Project was to streamline protected area management policy in the country, in particular through this specific output/outcome (2.1). A new overarching policy was drafted, also Drafting Instructions for an Overarching Protected Area Legislation (Protected Areas Act for Jamaica), yet they had not been fully adopted by the time of the evaluation. Some stakeholders indicate that this was one of the design failures given that the expected output/outcome was not relevant for Jamaica, it was not feasible nor applicable. Nevertheless, in addition to the already myriad of policies dealing with different protected areas recommendations for drafting instructions for a new protected area Act were drafted. Although it has been placed in the legislative agenda, stakeholders are uncertain as to whether it would be adopted.

Output 2.2: New and expanded PA network  Baseline: No new protected areas declared at the time of project inception  Targets: Two new protected areas declared  Indicators: Declaration of the Black River Protected Area Landscape and sections of the Pedro Cays	Justification documents for the declaration of Pedro Cays and Black River prepared  Training	Output partially completed.  Justification documents will form the basis of gaining approval at the national level for the declaration of the new protected areas. NEPA will lead the process after the end of the project.
--	--	---

The expansion of the PA network as such was not achieved within the Project (as expected for Output 2.2). The base documents for declaring the mentioned areas (Pedro Cays and Black River Protected Area Landscape) have been drafted however. Yet, the process of declaration itself is expected to commence after the Project ended. Although some stakeholders do indicate that this culmination of declaration of new PAs might take place in the near future, there is no indication of how this will be brought about as a result of the project.

<p><b>Output 3.1: Eight new and updated protected area management plans</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No new or updated management plans at the time of project inception which met National Protected Area System (NPAS) standards</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> Eight management plans prepared according to NPAS standards.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> Preparation of management plans which can be implemented in the relevant protected areas.</p>	<p>Eight management plans prepared for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area</li> <li>Black River Proposed Protected Landscape</li> <li>Stephney -John's Vale Forest Reserve</li> <li>Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area</li> <li>Ocho Rios Marine Park Protected Area</li> <li>Mason River Protected Area</li> <li>Windsor Castle Forest Estate</li> <li>Pedro Cays and Surrounding Waters</li> </ul>	<p>Output completed.</p> <p>Each protected area management entity has the responsibility of implementing activities from the management plans to facilitate more effective protected area management.</p> <p>Protected area management entities may also prepare similar management plans for other protected areas, based on the framework prepared under the NPAS project.</p>
---	--	--

Management plans were completed for the targeted protected areas (Output 3.1). Some of these were innovative or pioneering since some areas had no management plans at all. Other areas updated already existing plans. Stakeholders from some protected areas indicate that they are using the new or updating plans for day to day management, which is indicative of effect and likelihood of sustainability of these products.

<p><b>Output 3.2 Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management.</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> Development of one monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management which may be implemented by protected area management entities</p>	<p>One monitoring and Evaluation System prepared for protected area management.</p> <p>Audio visual and Printing</p>	<p>Output completed.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management may be implemented by protected area management entities.</p>
--	--	--

Again, achievements are at the product level for Output 3.2. No indication whatsoever of achieving outcome or if monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management would be implemented as a result of NPAS project.

<p><b>Output 3.3 Conservation-based economic development</b></p> <p>Baseline: No conservation-based economic development in PAs</p> <p>Targets: Conservation-based economic development implemented in five Pas</p> <p>Indicators: Implementation of conservation-based economic development activities in five PAs.</p>	<p>Conservation-based economic development activities implemented for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mason River Protected Area</li> <li>-Seville Heritage Park</li> <li>-Gourie Forest Management Area</li> <li>-Pedro Cays</li> <li>-Black River</li> </ul>	<p>Output completed.</p> <p>Activities may continue in the relevant protected areas based on the initiative of the protected area managers</p>
--	---	--

This output is linked to Output 1.3. As above, the baseline is inaccurate given that there were documented conservation-based economic development activities in protected areas. The output was completed in several areas given that there were activities implemented (such as upgrading of infrastructure) which could theoretically increase conservation-based economic development activities. It is indicated that this is theoretical since at the time of the evaluation no conservation – based economic activities based on the project are reported. Again, as in Output 1.3, many of these activities would have had a linkage with the business plans (see above), but as indicated above, the business plans were finalized after the conservation – based economic development activities would have been piloted, precluding meaningful interchange between these highly linked outputs.

<p><b>Output 3.4 Communication strategy to raise key stakeholder awareness and build national constituency</b></p> <p>Baseline: No communication strategy for raising stakeholder awareness and building national constituency.</p> <p>Targets: Increased stakeholder awareness re: PAs in all protected areas</p> <p>Indicators: Increased PA awareness amongst stakeholders; increased stakeholder feedback and involvement in PA activities.</p>	<p>Development of communication strategy to raise stakeholder awareness</p> <p>Increased stakeholder awareness through workshops and community meetings in approximately 20 protected areas and through social media</p> <p>Development of NPAS webpage</p> <p>Initiation of nation media campaign/media blast</p>	<p>The national media campaign will continue for three months after the end of the project and will raise stakeholder awareness re: protected areas via social media, radio, television and print media.</p> <p>NPAS webpage has been linked to the NEPA website and now be maintained by NEPA.</p>
---	--	---

Although increased stakeholder awareness regarding PAs in all protected areas amongst stakeholders and increased stakeholder feedback and involvement in PA activities is not measured as an outcome just as an output (as expected as of Output 3.4), there have been some

activities carried out. However, the effectiveness of these activities is not being measured. The Project also had a series of issues with communications consultants, and partly based on those problems a full awareness campaign was never implemented as planned. Just some isolated posters and signage. Although the report states that “NPAS webpage has been linked to the NEPA website and now being maintained by NEPA” this is incorrect. The webpage presence is very weak, it only contains an outdated Project Description (Information Sheet) and the Project Document. The workshops and events with communities were very weak methodologically.<sup>22</sup> For the most part, also, the Project and its products did not have thorough visibility.

While embedded above, many of the field site activities were implemented through a grants format (also called small grants processes). The beneficiaries of these funds were some of the organizations which participated in the NPAS Project as implementing agency (NEPA), the Project’s other three partners (Fisheries Division, Forestry Department, Jamaica National Heritage Trust) as well as other stakeholders. At the time of the terminal evaluation a few of the grants’ site-specific interventions were still being implemented. An analysis of the field site interventions indicates that they were implemented at the field level as indicated in project reporting. However, since they were not carried out in the early stages of implementation, the utilization of the produced or implemented field improvements has not been tested. As stated above, this is due to the fact that they were linked to the business plans, yet the business plans were not available to guide implementations or were not of an expected quality. Regarding these products, several key stakeholders and potential end users of the products have indicated that not only were some of the business plans not up to par nor feasible to implement in the Jamaican context, but also that they were more of critiques of the protected areas business model in Jamaica than a true relevant business plans. Some interventions, particularly some with community groups, were not any longer operational at the time of the terminal evaluation, indicating that there has been no sustainability of the intervention. Furthermore, several key stakeholders have specified that they implemented the interventions or generated the products because they were indicated that the particular product was what the project would support, yet they understood that it was not relevant to their work nor important to the management of the protected area they were dealing with. Lastly, the small grants products and processes have the least visibility of the Project as a whole (they are presented without logos and without attribution to the project, for example). A list of all of the small grants projects within NPAS is found in Annexes.

The following is an overall general assessment of results. First of all, the NPAS Project was very much consultancies-oriented, with varied results. Although some, not all, of the consultancies provided information that is practical and operational within the Jamaican protected areas context, some of them were also considered to be impractical and not of high quality. Furthermore, in part due to the lack of suitable expertise in Jamaica and in the sub

---

<sup>22</sup> The methodologies used as expressed by stakeholders were weak in the sense that they were not strategic nor programmatic. For instance, some stakeholders indicated that “they held meetings with communities where the communities were told of the benefits of protected areas” or that communities were invited to events in order for them to generate income. But none of these activities were programmatic and, therefore, effect or outcomes cannot be measured.

region, and in part due to inadequate compensation being offered and hence the lack of ability to attract competent persons or companies, much of this expertise was sought outside the region. This was understandably so, yet this implied that the expertise was often knowledgeable of issues regarding management and financing protected areas operations, yet it was not informed about the local context to make the products created feasible to implement and insufficient to promote the achievements of objectives and expected outcomes. Furthermore, the Project did not fully use the modality of international – local linkages for expertise that would -- expectedly – join both types of knowledge and at the same time promote national capacity building.

Furthermore, very key issues were not taken up by the Project in the way it was expected by an intervention that was to be development oriented (perhaps due to this international consultancy modality or because the NPAS Project decided not to recognize these issues). For instance, the matter indicated in the planning documents that opportunities for communities to realize the potential social and economic benefits accruing from biodiversity are lost or that there are no formal state policies to facilitate mutual benefit opportunities between conservation and tourism (which is one of the main drivers and employment generation activity in Jamaica and which – in the country – is tourism based on natural areas). The opportunities to link protected areas with the country's socio-economic development priorities (also indicated in the project planning documents) were basically lost within the implementation process and when attempts were made to include livelihood aspects for communities that use protected areas, these were rather weak and imprecise.

Furthermore, when results are analysed in comparison to targets or indicators that would supposedly be met at the end of the project, several issues arise. First of all, as indicated in the section on log frame and results indicators, many of these do not deal with outcomes or results but only with outputs. Therefore, whatever analysis that can be made of achievement or not of results, outputs, or outcomes struggles with this issue. At the output level, it can be said that NPAS has achieved several products. Studies, plans, improvement of infrastructure in protected areas, background information for declaring new areas and other such products have been drafted and overall –at the product level—the planned outputs have been achieved for the most part. Furthermore, the basis for what can be a sustained financing mechanism for protected areas have also been laid out. Unfortunately, due to excessive delays and management problems, most of these products were achieved at the very end of the project. Given this, and given the prevailing vision that the Project would generate those outputs with little or no foresight of achieving outcomes, effects and even impacts, the latter were not achieved. A few products are being used for management of protected areas in Jamaica (for instance, the management plans). That is, for the most part the products were achieved but their use, effect and potential impact has not been fully reached and there are some doubts whether these would after all be done in the near future if there is no sustained impulse to do so. This is the case with policy adoption and the trust fund, for example.

As a summary, it can be said that NPAS has been a good project for developing products: reports, plans, studies, background information, and policy proposals. Furthermore, it has implemented a series of on-site interventions. However, at the results, outcomes and effects

levels the Project has been much less successful. That is, the national and sectoral effects that were expected to occur as a result of this baseline work did not emerge as expected. Generally, therefore, two levels of analysis can be made regarding overall results / attainment of objectives. One at the outputs/products/processes level and another at the results/effects/outcome level. While NPAS has been successful to a certain degree (and therefore *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*) at the output level, it has been less successful at the results / effects levels with significant shortcomings in obtaining results at outcome level at the time of the evaluation (and therefore *Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)*). An overall composite ranking for results is *MS (Moderately Satisfactory)*.

### COMMUNICATIONS AND VISIBILITY

A project's external communication not only attends to the visibility of the intervention, it also gives an account of a project's progress and intended impact through communications, outreach and even in some cases through public awareness drives. NPAS has had a random haphazard communication strategy. For instance, although communication was embedded as some of the outputs that were to be achieved, and indeed there were communication drives implemented for some components and a billboard and signage were set up, the effect of those was never measured. Furthermore, visibility of the Project as a whole was very weak. At the time of the terminal evaluation the NPAS webpage was not operational. And, although the Project's final report states that "NPAS webpage has been linked to the NEPA website and now be maintained by NEPA", this is incorrect. The webpage presence is very weak, it only contains an outdated Project Description (Information Sheet) and the Project Document. The workshops with communities were very weak methodologically, which in turn did not generate visibility with the communities surrounding targeted protected areas. For the most part, also, the Project and its products did not have thorough visibility and there was no attribution to the Project in many products or outputs (no indication that this was an international project supported by the UN system, no logos, etc.).<sup>23</sup>

### RELEVANCE

When analysing relevance for the NPAS Project, the scrutiny can be done at two levels. First at the level of needs for Jamaica and second at the level of formal aligning of the Project with development plans and UNDP/GEF corporate mandates. The latter relates as to the extent to which a project and its interventions and activities are suited to local and national development priorities and needs as well as programmatic UN priorities.<sup>24</sup>

Regarding the former, relevance vis – a – vis the country's needs, it can be stated that the Project was relevant to a large degree. First of all, given that this project was positioned in a

---

<sup>23</sup> Although there was a sign put up in roads and a sign added to a bus, most of the products and outputs have no attribution nor marking as a project output.

<sup>24</sup> In a formal sense, relevance is analysed at the time of project planning and design (i.e. if a project is a good fit with national policies current at the design stage). In this case, as indicated here it was. The NPAS Project was also relevant with regard to newer development plans that followed design, such as the Jamaica Vision 2030 plan.

country with a vast vulnerability regarding management of protected areas, issues with natural resource management in general and the lack of opportunities for communities to fully apprehend the potential social and economic benefits that biodiversity (including PA's) can bring. Furthermore, the relation of protected areas and natural resource management with productive sectors is one of divergence in Jamaica with protected areas in conflict with mining and oil exploration/exploitation as well as having a multidimensional relation with tourism. Stakeholders, however, have indicated that some of the expected products or outcomes were not relevant within the policy and administrative protected areas situation in Jamaica, in particular those related to policy that –in theory—would change the protected areas administration patterns in the country.

Regarding alignment with national plans as well as corporate and programmatic UN priorities, NPAS is fully aligned with both mandates. As indicated in the Project Document, the Project is aligned with explicit policies as indicated below, current at the time of design and formulation:

- UNDAF Outcome(s): Outcome 3: Environment and Poverty – By 2011 national capacity to ensure equity and equality strengthened, and the population of targeted vulnerable communities enabled to reduce poverty, improve their livelihoods and better manage hazards and the environment.
- UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: N/A UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: N/A Expected CP Outcome(s):
  - 3.3 Integrated land, coastal zones, water and energy management practices improved
- Expected CPAP Output (s)
  - 3.3.1 Institutional capacity strengthened to efficiently implement policies and plans
  - 3.3.2 Land, water and sanitation management strengthened in targeted communities

Given the relevance of the issue for the country as well as the alignment of the Project with UNDP and national mandates, the rating for the NPAS Project for this criterion is *R* (relevant).

#### EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Effectiveness and efficiency are two very inter – related concepts in project evaluations. The effectiveness of a project is defined as the degree to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved. The valorisation of effectiveness is used as an aggregate for judgment of the merit or worth of an activity, (i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives proficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact). While efficiency is defined as the extent to which

results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.

Regarding effectiveness, the Project has been fairly effective in achieving outputs/products and less effective in achieving outcomes. As some stakeholders indicate, and a valorisation with which this evaluation agrees, the project had issues in harnessing effects of most of the products achieved due to a fragile implementation and due to weak adoption of these outputs, and in resolving issues with the implementation of the products. Although some products are producing outcomes (for example, it can be inferred that the management plans by being applied increasing the effectiveness of protected areas management towards improved operational mechanisms), as a whole not much effect is being determined.<sup>25</sup> Although some key stakeholders indicate that this is the case because the project design lacked guidance on the implementation of products, this evaluation disagrees with that statement since the premise of the project has always been in obtaining outcomes and meeting with its general objective. This project, as all of these kind, was results - oriented and it is implicit and explicit that it should have sought effects.

Therefore, the ranking of effectiveness for the NPAS project at the outcome level is *MU (Moderately Unsatisfactory)* while the ranking of effectiveness of the NPAS project at the output/products level is *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*. Therefore, as a composite the Project's effectiveness is ranked as *Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*.

The efficiency analysis of NPAS Project requires that it be divided into two periods of analysis, keeping in mind that all of the analysis contained in the terminal evaluation is for the whole implementation process. That is the scope of the evaluation is the Project as a whole, from beginning to its conclusion. First an analysis is made from the Project's initial implementation stages to its relative midpoint and then a second phase from midpoint to its conclusion, including the periods in the extension periods. The first stage of implementation was moderately unsatisfactory given the very significant shortcomings experienced indicating slow delivery (basically deficits in producing outputs, products and outcomes but also deficits in having the NPAS Project coalesce as a project). Essentially, this first stage was characterized by a very low level of delivery and even for total lack of mechanisms to implement several of the Project components. The second tranche of the Project was relatively more efficient and therefore more satisfactory, yet many activities, processes and products had to implement in a short period most of what was not delivered in the first years of operation. This undoubtedly has impacted on the efficiency of outputs and on the attaining or not of outcomes. Therefore, a composite ranking of efficiency for the full scope of implementation is *MS (Moderately Satisfactory)*.

---

#### COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

Assessing country ownership for NPAS after completion is somewhat complex. There are elements that indicate that there is ownership in certain aspects and there are also elements that indicate that ownership did not develop in other aspects. Government's explicit involvement

---

<sup>25</sup> These issues are further discussed in the sustainability section.

and support of the Project, and the involvement of different institutions that deal with protected areas, is indicative of high ownership factors in this scope. On the other hand, the low levels of capacity built or assimilated, the lack of enduring policies or incorporation of project outputs into broader plans and policies, are indicative that at some levels ownership of the project as a whole was weak.

---

### MAINSTREAMING

Given that UNDP -- supported GEF -- financed projects are key elements in UNDP country programming, project objectives and outcomes should align with UNDP country programme strategies as well as to GEF-required global environmental benefits. When dealing with mainstreaming, evaluations also explore whether project outcomes are being mainstreamed into national policies. The NPAS Project has created products that, if implemented, could be attuned with UNDP priorities of improved governance and improving natural resource management. Other UNDP priorities, such as sustainable human development, and women's empowerment were not part of the outcomes within the NPAS Project.

---

### SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability of an intervention and its results are examined to determine the likelihood of whether benefits would continue to be accrued after the completion of the project. Sustainability is examined from various perspectives: financial, social, environmental and institutional.

*Financial sustainability:* Financial risks to sustainability relate to the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the assistance ends. Regarding financial sustainability prospects it must be pointed out that the Project had an embedded expected output that would conceivably deal with this issue, which is the trust fund, as well as other activities which --to a lesser degree-- would potentially provide external and internal sources of funding for monetarily supporting the financial sustainability, not only of the outputs but also of management of protected areas in Jamaica in general. The latter were the interventions for the upgrading of infrastructure (as well as marketing matters) in order to leverage more funds from users for PA management. Although upgrading of facilities did take place, since the implementation of these was very late in the implementation process, many of them have not been used as of yet and no increased revenue has been generated. However, it is expected that (although minor) some financial benefits would be achievable, in a sustained manner. Nevertheless, the greatest mechanism to assure financial sustainability of protected areas management would be the trust fund that is being set up as part of the results from this project. If such a fund would indeed be set up and become operational in the near future, there would be likelihood of financial sustainability for management of protect areas in Jamaica. Therefore, the ranking for financial sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*, given that, although there are moderate risks, there are also expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained in time.

*Socio-economic risks to sustainability:* When analysing socio economic risks to sustainability, an examination is made of the potential social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes. The level of stakeholder ownership, as seen in the narrative

of this report, is somewhat strong in some areas and weak in others, and this poses some socio-economic risks to sustainability. Although government does indicate that it is in their interest that the project's benefits continue to accrue, other risks are still identified. For instance, the lack of buy-in from several sectors of Jamaica regarding the true need to sustain management of protected areas vis-à-vis sectors of the economy which are deemed more important (such as tourism and extractive industries). Therefore, the ranking for socio – economic sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*, given that, although there are moderate risks, there are also expectations that at least some outcomes at different levels would be sustained.

*Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability:* At the time of the final evaluation there are no clear institutional and governance changes identified that would indicate the probability of governance sustainability. There are no clear-cut legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes in place attributable to the NPAS Project. Although some policies are expected to be in place (for instance, the declaration of new areas) in the medium term, the adoption of other policy which was impelled by the Project is still doubtful, there have been political changes in the latter part of the implementation process without a full progression of impelling and petitioning to the new political authorities regarding the reforms needed at the policy level to adopt the new acts, etc. Furthermore, the low general buy-in to these reforms, although understandable given Jamaica's situation regarding protected area management processes, are indications that it is not perceived as if all of the generated and proposed policy would be adopted in the near future. Therefore, the ranking for this sort of sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)* given that there is substantial risk that outcomes will not materialize in a manner attributable to the Project or will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.

*Environmental risks to sustainability:* Environmental risks to sustainability conflicts are identified regarding natural resource management and regarding climate change. Regarding the former, conflicts arise out of productive activities that do threaten management of protected areas. Some of these were identified at design and remain relevant to date (encroachment of tourism endeavours, conflicts with extractive industries, etc.). Furthermore, the weather patterns of the Caribbean due to climate change continue to affect protected areas, as well as – of course—the rest of the country. Issues such as increased forest fires, increase in severity of weather events such as hurricanes, coral bleaching and others have been identified as threats and increased environmental risks that can and do increase environmental risks and issues associated to climate change vulnerabilities and, in turn, associated to the management of protected areas. Therefore, given the moderate risks faced, the ranking for environmental sustainability is *Moderately Likely (ML)*.

With regards to sustainability, it is noteworthy to observe that the Project has developed a document called a sustainability plan. It deals greatly with implementation. That is, it mainly deals with what needs to be implemented for the project's outputs to be adopted and have effects, but it profoundly takes into account the above sustainability issues. If the plan would be implemented, then the likelihood of sustainability would greatly increase.

Taking a composite view of the rankings for financial, socio – economic, institutional as well as environmental sustainability probabilities, the overall likelihood of sustainability is ranked as ML (*Moderately Likely*). This is assuming that although there are generally moderate risks expectations there are expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The '*Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of The National Protected Area System*' Project in Jamaica addressed operational and financial issues that hinder integrated sustainable management of the country's protected areas. These threats are multiple, from accelerated loss of vulnerable habitats and reduction of ecological functionality of targeted ecosystems to growing vulnerability of the ecosystem services that protected areas provide and can further provide for development. The mentioned matters are compounded and accelerated by institutional capacity that fails to ensure appropriate site and system level protected area management. Not only is there a complex mix of legislation, policies, management authorities, and management actors, there is also a lack of a financial base to properly implement whatever policies are in place.

The NPAS Project was designed to deal with these issues. Its objective of strengthening the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas was addressed through three components:

- 1) Strengthening of the planning and revenue generation mechanisms for financial sustainability of the system;
- 2) Rationalizing and integrating the national protected areas system; and
- 3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected areas management towards improved operational mechanisms.

The Project had a series of design deficiencies which were compounded by a succession of implementation issues. This resulted in an excessive delay in delivery, in particular in the first stages of implementation. At the project's mid-point, therefore, a significant restructuring of the project's implementation procedures as well as a log frame reformulation took place in light of the understanding that the project was not advancing as it should and that –without these reforms—the project would fail. These reformulations and restructuring can be understood as the NPAS Project's best practice that allowed for achievements, even when facing design and actual implementation problems.

Nonetheless, even when products were achieved, there is still a prevailing vision that the Project is just these. There is yet a need to instil that this sort of project is not only a product delivery means but an intervention that should seek results and effects. The immediate next stages of follow up should further advance the adoption of the products and processes that the NPAS Project has achieved (as laid out in the sustainability plan) in order for this intervention to maintain effects and continuity. For instance, if the trust fund does not actually begin to function in the near future it would be truly be a loss, not only for the NPAS Project itself but also for

Jamaica, given that this institution could be pivotal for the integrated management of protected areas in the country.

The Project concludes with several achievements, mainly at the output and at the local pilots' levels. Although the NPAS evidently has ended, it would greatly benefit the country to channel post – project activities in order to build upon what has been achieved and to truly generate capacity and seek tangible results from these accomplishments.

#### 4.2 LESSONS LEARNED

There are a series of learned lessons that can be assimilated in the future for enhanced project planning and implementation. These lessons are listed below.

- Without a proactive and open participation of relevant national stakeholders in the design process, especially from those agencies which would be implementers, design will not be relevant nor feasible. Without all national counterparts being proactive and straightforward about their technical capacities, their expected involvement in implementation, the relevance of any part of proposed output/outcome within a country's national context design fails and often needs to be adjusted if project is to be implemented at all.
- The mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not automatically translate into results. Studies, reports, documents and processes need to be accompanied by clear mechanisms that promotes knowledge assimilation, knowledge sharing, and clear-cut mechanisms to inform and promote policy processes for adoption of outputs.
- The roles of different stakeholders cannot be underestimated and as early as possible they should be clearly defined and assimilated from the onset, especially the roles of those stakeholders and institutions that should provide strategic direction (such as project director, committees, board members, management unit).
- For a complex intervention, the project management unit needs to be strong, well-funded and adequately staffed. Staff needs to have individual capacity to manage such a project, and also have needed management and technical expertise for such a unit.
- Design, inception and project planning are very key aspects of a project, that can have a crucial impact on implementation and obtaining (or not) achievements and results.
- A well-functioning, streamlined, empowered, and proactive board or steering committee is crucial for guiding implementation process and/or drive adjustments when implementation lags.
- Collaboration between agencies and relevant institutions is a vital component of a project and in generating buy – in.

- As it relates to UNDP, a lesson learned is that its guidance and supportive role cannot be taken lightly. When UNDP collaborates with the implementation process through whatever means (such as log frame reform, changes in decision – making structures, bilateral meetings with implementing agency, and so on) implementation improves.

### 4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations within final evaluations are usually proposed for corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of forthcoming projects as well as for highlighting and reinforcing project benefits in future programming. However, since the NPAS Project has concluded with some pending matters, in this case recommendations are made for immediate tasks and for follow up as well.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW UP**

16. Accelerate the adoption of the sustainability plan in order to fulfil achieving results from the NPAS Project. It would be key to:

- a. Fully establish the protected areas trust fund, with proper staffing, and strengthen board membership with members who have relevant expertise in these sorts of mechanisms.
- b. Endorse completely the planned fund by signing agreements that are still pending to formalize this funding mechanism.
- c. Assure co – funding in order for this mechanism to become operational in the country.
- d. Promote the application of plans drafted within the Project's implementation process, such as management plans and business plans, as relevant.
- e. Promote the adoption of policies and instruments impelled by the Project (such as acts, declarations, etc.) as relevant to Jamaica.
- f. Promote the adoption of sustainable functional institutions to deal with the issues the Project has undertaken.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING**

17. Participation in design should be proactive and open from all relevant national stakeholders and in particular from those agencies which would be implementers. Design should begin as early as possible in order to have adequate time to outline a project. Participation of national counterparts needs to be proactive and straightforward about their technical capacities, their expected involvement in implementation, the relevance of any part of proposed output/outcome within a country's national context design. Inputs from the national counterparts to the design process should be fully recognised and assimilated.
18. Beginning at the design stage, all national counterparts should thoroughly acknowledge what specific commitments they are making, as well as link any of these to a particular agency or institution's work plans. There should be factual capacity assessment of

national partners, not only their ability to manage financial aspects of a project but also assess their technical and managerial capacities. If weaknesses are identified, capacity should be built – in at institutional levels in order to generate enough competence to adequately implement complex projects.

19. Given that the mere production of plans, studies, and processes as outputs does not automatically translate into results, these should be sought as part of a results-based project. Studies, reports, plans, documents and processes need to be accompanied by clear mechanisms that promote knowledge assimilation, knowledge sharing, and clear-cut mechanisms to inform and promote policy processes for adoption of outputs. Design and inception should state (and implementation should follow) a ‘road map’ where not only the achievement of outputs and products are indicated but the timing of such achievements needs to be specified in order to avoid generating most outputs at the end of a project, and consequently not impelling the achievement of outcomes and effects. Furthermore, timing of products indicating which should be produced before others should reflect how they interrelate. A project needs to establish clear links between studies, products or outputs and the expected outcomes (such as policy generation and adoption, policy commitments, public – private partnerships, investments, etc.).
20. The budgeting sections of a project should be realistic at design and should budget sufficiently so that there is enough staff to manage a project and to draw the capacity(ies) needed for technical and administrative inputs. It should include a proper realistic financial plan with adequate costing of management (management personnel) and technical aspects (including needed technical staff as well as consultancies). Attention in budgeting should be paid to the true number of personnel needed to run such a project as well as the number and type of consultancies needed for developing products. National costs should be accurately acknowledged in the budget of a project in order to realistically budget all proposed personnel, products, processes, outputs and investments.
21. The roles of different stakeholders within a project should be clearly defined and assimilated from the onset, generating buy – in, especially the roles of those stakeholders and institutions that should provide strategic direction (such as boards and committees with the appropriate representation and decision-making capabilities of members). If this does not occur, then there should be adequate flexibility to impel buy-in or change mechanisms, including other stakeholders that can assume a proactive role.
22. Risks within a project should not be underestimated, and a risk management framework should be drawn at design and reviewed continuously. Once properly established, risks should be continuously monitored in order to promote whatever mitigation measures need to be implemented.
23. Design as well as project inception and planning stages need to be precise and defined in order to guide the implementation process as well as obtaining achievements, outcomes and overall results. Design needs to be realistic, and log frame tools need to be credibly

developed in order to guide implementation and tally achievements, not only to determine accomplishments but to correct the course of implementation when needed. Indicators as well as output to outcome processes need to be determined and robust measures for seeking results needs to be imbedded from the design and inception stages.

24. These sorts of projects cannot lose sight that they are development projects after all. Developmental issues should be interwoven as a priority, in the products and outcomes that result and that should result out of a project, including issues of livelihoods, and the support that protected areas should sustain for development and wellbeing (issues such as tourism, fisheries, water sources) in Jamaica.
25. In order for these sorts of projects to truly be developmentally – oriented they should be thorough in their work with communities, not only donating materials in the aim to improve their livelihoods but also to attend to these communities so that they can truly adopt whatever development aim the project is seeking. When working with local community groups and local communities a project needs to be aware of the skills, knowledge, and institutional capacity these organizations have. Interventions at the local level should also receive technical support in order for local communities to be able to implement demonstration piloting.
26. UNDP needs to work with and assist the countries where interventions take place in order to aid them in applying processes that support projects' technical and implementation capabilities (specially support project implementation and efficient decision – making capacities) and in applying procurement systems to increase capacity to efficiently implement projects aiding in the fulfilment of a project's objective. UNDP should provide information on project management, financial reporting and other such project requisites in order to avoid misunderstandings as well as to generate capacity for implementation.
27. Project reformulations, changes, reforms and other such alterations need to be precise, and implemented as soon as early signs of failings manifest themselves.
28. When rotation as well as political and institutional turnovers take place, projects should have mechanisms in order to provide transfer of knowledge and information so that institutional knowledge and capacity transfer is assured. New political ministerial personnel need to be brought up to date regarding what a project has achieved and how to sustain results in a new political setting.
29. A project's communication strategy should be an ongoing process that generates buy – in, generates knowledge about the issues a project deals with as well as acknowledge its visibility. A communication strategy needs to be accompanied by clear inputs where the different partners are identified (funders, implementing agency(ies), UN agencies involved). A communication strategy should document and communicate issues, achievements, and challenges.
30. When situations indicate that in – country knowledge base and expertise is not sufficient for generating outputs and there is a need for harnessing expertise from outside of the

country, all efforts should be made to generate local capacity as well as introduce national issues in the resulting products. All key stakeholders should have clear inputs into the calls (terms of reference, etc.) for expertise in order to have products that, first of all, reflect national issues and, second, are useful for the country. International consultants should be partnered with national consultants in order for the outputs to reflect national issues and to transfer capacity to national experts. Also, mechanisms (training materials, workshops, etc.) should be promoted in order that effective generation of capacity takes place in relation to the production of studies or reports.

---

## 5. ANNEXES

## Terms of Reference

## INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the '*Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System*' project (PIMS 3832)

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System' project			
GEF Project ID:	3764		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	3832 Atlas ID 59298	GEF financing:	2,770,585	3,436,947
Country:	Jamaica	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and Caribbean	Government:	500,000	
		Other/TNC:	2,750,000	
		Other/KFW:	1,600,000	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other/UNDP:	200,000	200,939
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	NEPA	Total Project Cost:	7,820,585	8,487,886.00
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	08-July 2010	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Feb 2016	Actual: April 2017

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Government of Jamaica received support through the Global Environment Facility for implementing a 6-year Full Sized Project entitled "*Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System*" (NPAS). The project is being executed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and implemented by the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) in collaboration with the Forestry Department, Jamaica National Heritage Trust and the Fisheries Division.

Jamaica's biodiversity is threatened on a variety of fronts. The cumulative impacts include the accelerated loss of vulnerable habitats and associated species, the reduction of ecological functionality and the growing insecurity of ecosystem services. As links are broken between remaining natural areas, Jamaica's marine and terrestrial eco-systems are becoming ever more fragmented. Opportunities for communities to realize the potential social and economic benefits accruing from biodiversity are lost. These issues are compounded and accelerated by the current institutional capacity that fails to ensure appropriate site and system level protected area management. Protected areas in Jamaica are managed by four (4) entities: the National Environment & Planning Agency (NEPA), the Forestry Department (FD), the Fisheries Division and the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT). The environment within which the Protected Areas operate include a complex mix of legislation, policies, management authorities, and management actors. In addition, there are a wide range of categories of protected areas that are subject to different regimes for protection, based on their management objectives.

The Government of Jamaica (GoJ), through the Protected Areas Committee prepared a Protected Areas System Master Plan (PASMP). This Master Plan outlined a comprehensive and representative road map for coordinated and effective planning and management of the PAs. The PASMP also outlined the lack of financial sustainability of the national protected area system (NPAS) as a significant gap in the system and recognized that urgent action should be taken to ensure a more sustainable approach to financing the activities for the PAs. A financial sustainability plan was therefore developed for the NPAS to outline actions and recommendations to ensure sustainability from an ecological and social perspective. The PASMP was approved by the Cabinet in November 2015.

Implementation of the 6-year project began in July 2010 and ended in July 2016. At the end of July 2016, project delivery was approximately 71%. A no-cost extension of time was requested to complete the remaining 29% of the project work which included the finalization of five key project targets. The project was also given additional time to March 2017 to implement the project close-out processes. The project will be administratively and financially closed-out during that period.

The project was designed to address the following barriers to biodiversity conservation and management of protected areas:

- (1) Inadequate funding sources and financial management mechanisms.
- (2) Limited consolidation of the NSPA at programmatic level; and
- (3) Inadequate capacities and tools for effective PA management.

The project was therefore designed to implement solutions to remove these barriers and to support the implementation of Jamaica's Protected Areas System Masterplan.

The project's objective of strengthening the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas was addressed through three components:

- 1) Strengthening of the planning and revenue generation mechanisms for financial sustainability of the system
- 2) Rationalizing and integrating the national protected areas system; and
- 3) Increasing the effectiveness of protected areas management towards improved operational mechanisms

### **1.1 Major Project Outcomes and Outputs**

There are 3 project outcomes and nine major project outputs. Over the six years of project implementation a total eleven (11) project targets were monitored.

Outcome 1: Strengthening of financial planning and revenue generation

Output 1.1: Protected Area Trust Fund and Establishment of a Revolving Fund

Output 1.2: Model site-level business plans

Output 1.3: Revenue generation mechanisms in five key protected areas

Output 1.4: Operational plan for Protected Areas (PA) system financial strategy

Outcome 2: Rationalizing and Integrating the NPAS

Output 2.1: National protected areas legislation and supporting legal framework

Output 2.2: New and expanded PA network

Outcome 3: Increasing the effectiveness of PA management

Output 3.1: Eight new and updated protected area management plans

Output 3.2: Monitoring and evaluation system for protected area management

Output 3.3: Conservation based economic development established in or near five protected areas

Output 3.4: Communication strategy to raise key stakeholder awareness and build national constituency to support NPAS

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

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

---

### **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

An overall approach and method<sup>26</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the "<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>" A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR see [D](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

---

<sup>26</sup> For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Jamaica, including the project sites (see Annex C). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (see Annex C).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in of this Terms of Reference.

### EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

### PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>27</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 35 days over a time period of 8 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days ( <i>recommended: 2-4</i> )	<i>Date 23 June 2017-</i>
Evaluation Mission	15 days ( <i>r: 7-15</i> )	<i>Date 10 -21 July 2017</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days ( <i>r: 5-10</i> )	<i>Date 4 August 2017</i>
Draft Final Report	7 days ( <i>r: 1-2</i> )	<i>Date: 25 August 2017</i>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: <i>23 June 2017</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Draft Report Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: <i>21 July 2017</i>	To project management, UNDP CO

<sup>27</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: <b>11 August 2017</b>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: <b>25 August 2017</b>	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of (*1 international /national evaluators*). The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

### Academic Qualifications/Education

- Bachelor's degree in Social Sciences or other similar studies from an accredited university
- Training and certification in research methodology, monitoring & evaluation, or results-based management (RBM) is an asset
- Experience with the conduct of Global Environment Facility project evaluation

### Desirable Skills and Experience

- Practical knowledge and experience of evaluation (evaluation of at least 4 projects)
- Technical knowledge in biodiversity would be an asset
- Experience in research analysis
- Strong report-writing skills
- Good oral and written communication skills
- Familiarity with UN and GEF programming and evaluation principles and guidelines.
- Experience with national and project stakeholder engagement using participatory methodologies (including quantitative, qualitative methods)
- Knowledge of protected areas management, natural resources management or environmental management preferably through country experience in Jamaica or the Caribbean is required
- Language skills**
- Excellent working knowledge of English

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(%)	Milestone
20%	Following submission of Inception report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report and presentation
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply by 17 May 2017. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English, with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

Please submit the following to demonstrate your interest and qualifications by explaining why you are the most suitable for the work:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position.
- **Completed P11 form** (Personal History Form) for Service Contracts and Individual Contracts, including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees. A resume or CV should also be included.
- **Technical Proposal** – should include (a) detailed proposed strategy or methodology, work plan timeline; risks or limitations; consideration of a gender approach for assignment; (b) detailed profile of the expertise of the consultant, especially as it relates to experience in the evaluation; (c) an evaluation matrix that describes what the most appropriate questions and feasible data collection methods are for each of the questions identified in your evaluation plan. **N.B.** Do not copy and paste the TOR.
- **Financial Proposal** - specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days and any other costs such as per diems, travel and incidental expenditures in project sites). It should include all potential expenditures to complete work. This financial proposal should include costs to deliver the work plan. **N.B.** Do not put the cost of your financial proposal in your cover letter or technical proposal.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested documents.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that would take into account both the technical qualification of Individual Consultants as well as their financial proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores. UNDP retains the right to contact references directly. In cases where a large number of applications are received, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

## Evaluation of Applicants

Individual consultant will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicant's qualifications and financial proposal.

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

- Responsive/acceptable
  - Having received the highest score out of a predetermined set of weighted technical and final criteria specific to the solicitation
  - Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.
1. *Technical Criteria* - 80% of total evaluation – max points: 80
  2. *Financial Criteria* - 20% of total evaluation – max points: 20

**UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.**

### Evaluation Criteria for Applicants

Criteria	Weight	Max. Points	Guidance on Scoring
Technical	70%	70	
Bachelor's degree in Social Sciences or other similar studies from an accredited university;	20%		17 points allocated if candidate has a Bachelor's degree or higher in Social Sciences, 10 points if candidate has a Bachelor's degree or higher in another area outside of social sciences;
Training and certification in research methodology, evaluation, or results-based management (RBM)			1 additional point each awarded if candidate has training or certification in one of the specified areas
Academic Qualifications (Total)	20%	20	Total – Academic Qualifications
Experience with the conduct of Global Environment Facility (GEF) project evaluation	5%		Full points awarded if candidate has conducted GEF evaluations; 0 points if no indication of experience
Experience with national and project stakeholder engagement using participatory methodologies (including quantitative, qualitative methods)	10%		Full points allocated if 3 or more experiences/use of participatory methodologies with national and/or project stakeholders. 3 points for 2 experiences, 2 points for 1 experience; 0 points if no indication of experience
Practical knowledge and experience of evaluation (evaluation of at least 4 projects)	10%		2.5 points allocated for each relevant evaluation experience, up to 4 projects (10 points for 4 projects)
Years of relevant experience (Total)	25 %	25	Total Score – Relevant Experience
Proposed methodology for conducting the assignment	15%		Points awarded according to: (3) clarity, (3) feasibility, (3) specificity of proposed approach to scope of work, (2) proposed instruments, tools or materials required, (2) explanation of risk and limitations, (2) clear work plan and proposed use of time
Knowledge of protected areas management, biodiversity; natural resources management or environmental management preferably through country experience in Jamaica or the Caribbean	5%		Full points allocated if candidate demonstrates knowledge of protected areas management, biodiversity; natural resources management or environmental management in the Caribbean; 0 points if no indication of experience in these areas
Experience in research analysis	2.5%		Points awarded related to number of years/experiences with the conduct of research analysis. Full points if indication of 5 or more years/experiences; 1 point per year up to 5 years
Strong report-writing skills	2%		Full points allocated if candidate has 5 or more first authored publications or reports ; 4 points if 4 first authored publications or reports; 3 points if have 3 or less; 0 points if no indication of report writing
Familiarity with UN and GEF programming and evaluation principles and guidelines.	.5%		Full points if have 1 or more experiences with UN Agency projects or programmes
Total – Competencies	25%	25	Total Competencies Score
Total Technical Score	70%	70	Total Technical Score

**Itinerary/Mission and Meetings held as part of the Evaluation  
Process**

**MEETINGS AND MISSION ITINERARY**

DATE	TIME	MEETINGS	PERSONS ATTENDING	LOCATION or INSTITUTION
Jul 5	10:30 AM	Online meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shelly Trim</li> <li>• Kenisha Thom</li> </ul>	UNDP
Aug 6	11:00 PM	Departure	Terminal Evaluation Consultant	Buenos Aires, Argentina
Aug 7	2:00 PM	Arrival from Airport	Terminal Evaluation Consultant	Norman Manley International Airport Flight CM 418 Copa Airlines
Aug 8	8:00 – 9:00 AM	Security Briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gonzalo Ramos, Security Advisor</li> </ul>	UNDP
	9:00 – 9:30 AM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bruno Pouezat Resident Representative</li> </ul>	UNDP
	9:30 – 10:30 PM		<p>UNDP Programme Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Kelly Programme Specialist, Policy Advisory Services</li> <li>• Shelly Trim Programme Analyst, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</li> </ul>	UNDP
	11:30 - Noon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leonie Barnaby - GEF Small Grants Programme</li> </ul>	UNDP
	2:30 pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vivienne Williams-Thompson Director, Planning, Projects, Evaluation and Research</li> <li>• Anne Donaldson, NEPA</li> </ul>	National Environmental Planning Agency (NEPA)
	4:00pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Kelly Programme Specialist, Policy Advisory Services</li> </ul>	UNDP
Aug 9	11am - Noon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marilyn Headley Executive Director/Conservator of Forests</li> <li>• Davia Carty Manager, Strategic Corporate Planning</li> </ul>	Forestry Department
	12:30 - 1:30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheries Simpson</li> </ul>	Former NPAS Project Manager
	2:00 – 3:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorrick Gray, Executive Director</li> </ul>	Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT)

DATE	TIME	MEETINGS	PERSONS ATTENDING	LOCATION or INSTITUTION
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otmar Melhado – Director of Estate Management</li> <li>• Kadine Campbell - Legal Officer</li> </ul>	
	3:00-4:45		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gillian Guthrie GEF Operational Focal Point</li> </ul>	Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation (MEGJC)
Aug 10	11:00 – 11:30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul Wright, CEO, Fisheries Division</li> </ul>	Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries
	1:30-2pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alison Foster</li> </ul>	Former staff of NPAS Project
	3pm-3:30pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ngozi Christian</li> </ul>	Former staff of NPAS Project
	9:30am – 11:30	Site Visit		Hollywell (Blue and John Crow Mountain National Park)
Aug 11	1:30pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Susan Otuokon Executive Director</li> </ul>	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
	9:30 – 10:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elaine Fisher Chairperson</li> </ul>	National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ)
Aug 14	ALL DAY	Site Visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hugh Shim Executive Director/Park Manager</li> </ul>	Montego Bay Marine Park
Aug 15	9am		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saskia Frater Smith Manager   Multilateral Technical Cooperation Unit External Cooperation Management Division</li> </ul>	Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)
Aug 16			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clara Gordon</li> <li>• Anthony McKenzie Environmental Management and Conservation</li> </ul>	National Environment and Planning Agency
	12:00pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bruno Pouezat</li> </ul>	UNDP
	12:30pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shelly Trim</li> <li>• Kenisha Thom</li> </ul>	UNDP
	2pm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renelle Aarons-Morgan Senior Project Analyst</li> </ul>	Ministry of Finance and Public Service Public Expenditure Division
Aug 17	All Day	Site Visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Davia Carty</li> <li>• Nastacia Brown</li> <li>• Rochelle Johnson</li> <li>• Almarie Francis Forestry Department</li> </ul>	Gourie Forest Management Area Bryce, Manchester
Aug 17		Departure		Kingston
Aug 18		Arrival		Buenos Aires
Aug 28		Online meeting	Mel Turner	Consultant
Aug 30		Online meeting	Vivienne Williams-Thompson	NEPA
Sept 7		Online meeting	Elsie Laurence-Chounoune	UNDP
Sept 27		Validation meeting	UNDP and national stakeholders	Online

## Small Grants Processes within NPAS

Grantee	Purpose & Main Activities	Main Output(s)
1. Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust (JCDT)  The Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park	Provide tents and other equipment for rent to campers Produce useful branded souvenirs for sale to visitors Increase promotion of the coffee and other tours Operate a Tuck Shop at Holywell for the sale of food, beverages and other refreshment	Tents and Equipment (for rental purposes) Flyers and Gift Bags Construction of Tuck Shop
2. Montego Bay Marine Park Trust (MBMPT)  Montego Bay Marine Park	Design and procure branded merchandise for sale Implement membership/volunteer program Market merchandise Monitor recruitment and sales	Merchandise and sales
3. Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT)  Seville Heritage Park	Phase 1  Plan and implement Seville Heritage Tours – script writing, designed signs and storyboard Seek local and international funding aid Layout design of a farm food nursery and plant nursery Lay river stone road/pathway where necessary Do landscaping Redo overall estate site plan Plan and provide security for property Plan restoration of site ruins and planned archaeological work. Plan craft and souvenir entrepreneurship activates with community stakeholders Train Tour Guides	Radio and television advertisements Trade shows Incorporating informal settlers and local community into product Diversification of products Marketing plan Locating a Seville sign at Fort Charles Reinforce perimeter fencing and gate Create a Taino garden and revamp African garden Installation of signs and storyboards Establish gift shop with souvenirs unique to Seville Heritage Park Negotiate Lease agreements with vendors for snack/refreshments
	Phase 2  Plan and implement Restaurants, Water Park, New Museum Plan re-enactment activities Upgrade Seville marketing image and plan	Improved marketing image for Seville Heritage Park

Grantee	Purpose & Main Activities	Main Output(s)
4. Alloa Fisherman's Cooperative Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area	Procurement of 33ft fiberglass boat and outboard motor Procurement of motor for boat Obtain licenses from Maritime Authority of Jamaica. Obtaining Jamaica Tourist Board (JTB) Watersports license: this will include employing 5 persons to function as tour guides Begin tour operations	33ft fiberglass boat and outboard motor Commencement of Tours Conservation Base Activity
5. Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM)  Pedro Cays	Locate and purchase two units of a manual plastic crushing device and Provide strong and durable plastic bags in which to store the crushed materials that can withstand the storage on the cays and movement from the Cays to a landfill on mainland Jamaica. Contract three to four persons whom will amongst other duties collect, crush and bag the waste plastic packaging material	Garbage Crusher Durable Plastic Bags Hiring of personnel
6. Institute of Jamaica (IOJ)  Mason River Protected Area	To identify community members interested in receiving training to prepare for long term income generation in the craft industry Identify and contact craft item trainers Hold training workshop facilitated by Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo.) Assist with sourcing materials for creation of souvenirs Draft a marketing plan for souvenirs Launch souvenir items at World Wetlands Day 2016 (Feb. 2) at MRPA.	Community members trained in souvenir production Souvenir Items
7. St. Elizabeth Parish Council (PC)  Black River	To revitalize agricultural production potential and ensure the growth of the Middle Quarters diverse tourism product To increase support in the local economy and reduce the unemployment rate.	Construction of 60 ft. bridge Farm tours Construction of Picnic Area/ Eco Park
8. The Forestry Department  Gourie Forest Management Area	Improve the conditions of the existing public restrooms at the Gourie Forest Management Area: Refurbishing of bathrooms flooring and wall surface Install liquid hand soap and hand towel dispensers Install tissue holders Install cubicle door locks Replace damaged windows Repair deteriorated roof Install signs and symbols in bathroom areas Install handrails Improve the conditions of the main gazebo on the property: Repair deteriorated roof Replace and repaint rotten pillars/columns Improve the condition of the two (2) cabins: Repairs to damaged walls Repairs to damaged floor boards Repairs to selected bathroom fixtures Repairs to selected kitchen fixtures	Renovation of public bathroom Renovation of Gazebo 3. Renovation of two cabins
	1. Increasing Protected Areas management effectiveness by: a. Implementing conservation based economic development activities in the Gourie Forest Management Area	

Grantee	Purpose & Main Activities	Main Output(s)
	b. Implementing the communication strategy in the Four (4) Forest Regions managed by the Agency Communication strategy: Activity – 30 second Forest Fire Advertisement Airing of Radio Advertisement	
9. The Fisheries Division	To hire a public relations firm, Jamaica Information Service (JIS), within the third quarter of the financial year of 2015/2016 to coordinate and execute media strategies. To produce and air two 5-minutes radio feature: "Get the Facts"; targeting the general public with basic but relevant information on SFCAs. To produce and air three "Calling Farmers" drama programmes targeting fishers with information on the success, benefits, opportunities, and threats within SFCAs. To produce and air a 30-second jingle targeting the general public providing information on the function and the importance on SFCAs. To design and print 2016 calendars that target teachers, parents, and high school students. Which identify locations of, and outline roles of SFCAs. To design and produce memorabilia with information highlighting the project sponsors and encouraging support of SFCAs.	
Support to the Protected Areas Branch for the implementation of activities within the Palisadoes – Port Royal Protected Area and Ocho Rios Marine Park	To increase awareness of the value of the resource of both Protected Areas. To enhance protected of the resources within the ORMPPA and the P-PRPA through the implementation of biodiversity conservation activities.	

List of consulted documents

- Government of Jamaica and UNDP. Country Programme Action Plan between Government of Jamaica and UNDP. 2012-2016.
- Jamaica PASMP MTR Report Final. August 2013.
- Jamaica Vision 2030.
- Management Response MTR Jamaica
- Minutes of joint NCTFJ and NPAS PSC Meeting 7 June 2016 - Draft Rev 5-7-16 (3)
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 13 July 2016 FINAL
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 14 December 2016
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 14 September 2016
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 25 May 2016 (FINAL)
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 27 July 2016 FINAL (3)
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 3 November 2016
- Minutes of NPAS PSC Meeting 4 Fe - FINAL
- NPAS and UNDP. Project Implementation Report. 2012.
- NPAS FINAL PROJECT REVIEW REPORT. July 2017.
- NPAS Project Sustainability Plan. Project Name: Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the Protected Areas System (NPAS). March 2017
- NPAS PSC ACTION SHEET from 14 September 2016 (3) (2)
- NPAS PSC ACTION SHEET from 27 July 2016 (2) (3)
- NPAS PSC ACTION SHEET from 3 November 2016
- NPAS PSC ACTION SHEET from 4 February 2016 FINAL
- NPAS Small Grants Information within NPAS
- NPAS. Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings (March 2011- 2 meetings, Apr. 2011, Sep. 2011, Jan. 2012, May 2012, Sep. 2012, Dec. 2012, Feb. 2013, April 2013)
- NPAS/UNDP Revised Strategic Results Framework.
- NPAS/UNDP. 2011. Project Inception Workshop Report.
- NPAS\_2016\_ANNUAL\_CDR
- NPAS\_2016\_JULY\_PSC\_MINUTES
- NPAS\_2016\_Q1\_QPR\_NOASSET
- NPAS\_2016\_Q2\_QPR\_NOASSET
- NPAS\_2016\_Q3\_QPR.zip
- NPAS\_2016\_Q4\_QPR.zip
- NPAS\_2017\_AWP\_SIGNED
- PIR-2014-GEFID3764-PIMS3832
- Remarks to NPAS End of Project Forum by UNDP Resident Representative
- Strategic Results Framework March 2015 Revised
- Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System - Project Document.

- UNDP and Government of Jamaica. 2008. Project Identification Form. Strengthening the operational and financial sustainability of the national Protected Area System.
- UNDP. *UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results*.
- UNDP/GEF. *Project-Level Evaluation: GEF Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-Financed Projects*.
- UNDP and GEF. *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. 2014.
- UNDP\_NPAS Bilateral Meeting Notes\_August 2016
- United Nations. UNDAF Jamaica 2012-2016.

### Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
<p>Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level?</p> <p>Does the project address needs of policy makers, state and non-state practitioners active in the field of protected areas management?</p> <p>Were the project indicators relevant to the designed outputs?</p> <p>Were the intended results (outputs and outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?</p> <p>To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?</p> <p>Does the project address needs of policy makers, state and non- state practitioners active in the field of protected areas management?</p>	Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.  Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities  Addressing gaps in capacity framework.	National policies  Project Document	Document analysis
<p>How relevant the project's intended outcomes?</p> <p>Were the project indicators relevant to the designed outputs?</p> <p>Were there gender disaggregated indicators?</p> <p>Were the intended results (outputs and outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?</p>	Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	Government of Jamaica, UNDP, Project Management	Interviews
Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?	Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities	Project partners and relevant stakeholders UNDAF, UNDP/GEF Programming statements	Interviews Document analysis

<p>Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Jamaica?</p> <p>To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs</p>	<p>Coherence UNDP and GEF operational programming</p>		
<p><b>Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results:</b> To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p>			
<p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</p> <p>Are there any success factors for the achievement or reasons for non-achievement of project outputs?</p> <p>What were the major challenges, opportunities and obstacles encountered by the project generally?</p> <p>To what extent has the project achieved its intended and unintended objectives and results?</p> <p>What are the positive and negative, long term effects of the project on direct beneficiaries?</p> <p>What, if any, progress has been made toward the achievement of the agreed project outcomes?</p> <p>What adjustments and changes have been made as part of adaptive management? Which of these have result of monitoring and evaluation processes?</p>	<p>Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators</p>	<p>PIR 2016 Interviews</p>	<p>Document analysis Site Visits Interviews</p>
<p>Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in PA management in general and in the sites in particular?</p>	<p>Indication of policy guidance in project outputs, documents, products.</p>	<p>Project outcomes</p>	<p>Document analysis</p>
<p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to PAs?</p> <p>Were there gender issues taken into account from the design stage?</p>	<p>Changes in policy attributable to project</p> <p>Involvement of beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, etc.).</p>	<p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p> <p>Project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Stakeholders interviews</p> <p>Interviews Site visits</p>

	Effect of project aspects implemented at sites		
Were there delays? Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'?	Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of mid-term and actual achievements	Findings in project documents, achievement indicators	Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially) Site visits observation Stakeholder interviews
Partnerships for implementation	Working relationship between PMU, UNDP, and other strategic partners  Board functions	Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings)  Indications in interviews	Document analysis  Stakeholder interviews
In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project? How does the project impact gender equality in the local context?  How does the project engage with women?  Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men?  What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits? Why are the issues addressed by the project particularly relevant to or important for women?  How are women and girls benefiting from project activities (even if these are unplanned/unintended results)? Is there any potential negative impact on gender equality and women's empowerment? What can the project do to mitigate this?	Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach  Role of committees in guidance  Harness effectiveness by analysing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives  Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis

<p><b>Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:</b> Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?</p>			
<p>Were project risks identified during project development? Were other risks identified during the course of the project and were mitigation measures implemented?</p> <p>Were management arrangements appropriate and to what extent did they support the efficiency of the project? What financial management barriers or challenges were experienced during the project period?</p> <p>Was project funding spent as planned? Were all activities addressed with the respective budget?</p> <p>Did the project M&amp;E systems and practices allow for in-time corrective actions and tracking of the progress towards the expected results (outputs)?</p> <p>Issues that caused delays/procurement processes, etc.</p>	<p>Policies adopted / enacted Policies implemented Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn</p>	<p>Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented)</p> <p>Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Documentation analysis Stakeholder interviews</p>
Adaptive management	Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues	Project documents
	How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?	Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP
<p><b>Sustainability:</b> To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>			
Sustainability possibilities	In what way may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?	See indicators in project document	Project documents and reports

		results framework and log frame. <sup>28</sup>	
Financial Sustainability	Processes implemented to sustain financial means for management of protected areas in Jamaica.	Indicators in revised log frame	Project documents and reports, in particular minutes of board/steering committee
Social sustainability factors	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages would be sustained	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP
Political/financial sustainability	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Evidence that particular practices would be sustained	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP; tourism endeavours
Replicability	Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices would be sustained	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP
Has a sustainability plan been developed? Was this plan implemented?  Is there a sustainability programme for the sites that received grant funding under the project? Were the grants effective as a tool for sustainability at the relevant sites?  Are the beneficiaries committed to continuing working towards project objectives after the project ended?  Are services developed under the project likely to continue, be scaled up or replicated after the project funding ceases?		Project documents  Interviews with local stakeholders	Government of Jamaica, Project team, UNDP  Stakeholders receiving grant funding at sites
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/ improved ecological status?</b>			
Is there any evidence of project impact? If not, does the project have the future potential in impacting the relevant sector(s)? In what ways? How should it be measured?			

<sup>28</sup> According to several documents (midterm evaluation, Terms of Reference for this terminal evaluation, etc.) indicators have changed throughout the implementation process. How these changes came about and how they have aided in implementation will be addressed by this evaluation as relevant, in particular when dealing with adaptive management.

## EVALUATION GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

- (1) How relevant is the project for Jamaica?
- (2) What have been the project's achievements (at the output, outcome, results levels)?
- (3) How were these results achieved?
- (4) What adjustments and changes have been made as part of adaptive management?
- (5) What planning instruments were designed, adopted and / or implemented to deal with institutional and financial upgrading of protected areas in Jamaica as a result of the Project? Management plans status?
- (6) What effects or impacts (change) have occurred due to the project (policy, investments, etc.)?
- (7) Were the relevant country stakeholders, from government and civil society, as well as the private sector involved in the project preparation and execution?
- (8) How did the partnership and management arrangements between different institutions work and when it did not (institutions such as UNDP, GEF, Government of Jamaica, etc.)? Was it effective? Efficient?
- (9) What have been the issues or problems encountered in the implementation of the project? How were they dealt with? What adaptive management has occurred in dealing with these issues? Resulting from monitoring/midterm evaluation?
- (10)What have been the projects weaknesses, if any?
- (11)What were the hiring/procurement process issues that caused delays in implementation?
- (12)What are the probabilities that results would be sustained over the medium/long term? In particular, financial mechanism (establishment and operationalization of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ)
- (13)If something could have been done different, in hindsight what could this have been (lesson learned)?
- (14)What would be the recommendations for sustainability, follow up and future programming?

## Ratings (relevance, performance criteria and sustainability)

### *Performance criteria ratings.*

Rating	Explanation
R	Relevant
NR	Not relevant

Rating	Explanation
Highly satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

In a similar way, the sustainability of the project's interventions and achievements will be examined using the relevant UNDP/GEF ratings guideline as indicated in the table below.

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

## Project Results Framework

**Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Areas**  
**Revised Project Results Framework Document**  
**Changes indicated in Columns titled **Revised Indicators** and **Revised Targets End of Project****

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
Project Objective: To consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of Jamaica's National System of Protected Areas	Increase in NSPA operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all PAs based on the following definitions: High (75-100), Medium (55-74), Low (<55).	NPAS operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all PAs based on the following definitions: High (75-100), Medium (55-74), Low (<55).	High: 0 Number of PAs Medium: 4 Number of PA Low: 28 Number of PA	High: Number of PAs -2 Medium: Number of PAs - 6 Low: Number of PAs -24	High: 2 number of PAs Medium: 9 number of PAs Low: 21 number of PAs	The system has recognized that the scores for the Forest Reserve areas were already at a high level based on interventions. We therefore reduced the number of PAs with low scores and increased the number of PAs for medium scores	METT scorecard applied at MTE and FE
	Increase in NSPA financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard	NPAS financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Financial Score (Part 2): 53	Financial Score (Part 2): 122 (Note: The highest score possible is 225)	Financial Score (Part 2): 122 (Note: The highest score possible is 225)	No change in target only the name of the system	Financial Sustainability Scorecard applied at MTE and FE
	Change in area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest within NSPA sustained  Change in area of living reef within 10 NSPA monitoring sites sustained	Area of closed broad-leaf forest within NSPA  %area of living reef within 10 NPAS monitoring sites  Population of 4 indicator species in proposed PAs: Endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly ( <i>Pterourus humerus</i> ),	Broad-leaf: 88,000 hectares  Reef: 3% - 30% living  Number of individuals of: endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly ( <i>Pterourus humerus</i> ),	Broad-leaf: 88,000 hectares  Reef: 3% - 30% living  Status of 3 key indicator species: endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly ( <i>Nesopsar nigerimus</i> ) and Hawksbill Turtle	No change in area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest: 88,000 hectares  Increase in area of Reef: 3% - 30% living  The Country currently does not collect species data for the Indicator Species endemic Jamaican BlackBird ( <i>Nesopsar nigerimus</i> ) and Hawksbill Turtle	PA reports  Closed Broad-leaf: Forestry Department annual report submitted to FAO  Annual —Status of the Reef Report submitted by Jamaica Coral Reef Monitoring Network (JCRMN) to NEPA.	

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
	<p>Change in population number of 4 key indicator species: Endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly (<i>Pterouus humerus</i>), endemic Jamaican BlackBird (<i>Nesopsar nigerimus</i>), Hawksbill Turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>), and Queen Conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>).</p>	<p>(<i>Pterouus humerus</i>)</p> <p>Queen Conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>)</p> <p>Black Bill Parrot (<i>Amazona agilis</i>)</p> <p>Yellow Bill Parrot (<i>Amazona collaria</i>)</p>	<p>endemic Jamaican BlackBird (<i>Nesopsar nigerimus</i>), Hawksbill Turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>), and Queen Conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>) (exact figures to be determined at project inception)</p>	<p>(<i>Pterouus humerus</i>), endemic Jamaican BlackBird (<i>Nesopsar nigerimus</i>), Hawksbill Turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>), and Queen Conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>) (exact figures to be determined at project inception)</p>	<p>Distribution and Density of endemic Swallowtail Butterfly same as baseline data</p> <p>No change in Queen Conch: Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 – 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 – 165 conch/hectare Biomass estimate – 12,214 metric tonne</p> <p>Distribution and Density of Black Bill Parrots same as baseline data</p>	<p>(<i>Eretmochelys imbricate</i>) outlined in the Project Document. The Biodiversity authorities within the country have indicated that the indicator Species should be modified to reflect those for which data is collected and be representative of plants and animals. Therefore, in addition to the Conch and the Swallowtail Butterfly, Jamaica will use Black Bill Parrots and Yellow Bill Parrots</p>	<p>NEPA's reports on the Black-Billed and Yellow-Billed Parrots</p> <p>Windsor Research Centre Reports on the Giant Swallowtail Butterfly</p> <p>Queen Conch Annual Reports</p>

Objective and Outcomes	<u>Original Indicator</u>	Revised Indicators	Baseline	<u>Original Targets End of Project</u>	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
					Abundance of Yellow Bill Parrots same as baseline data		
Outcome 1: Strengthening of planning and revenue generation	Increase in Protected Area Trust Fund principle and annual disbursement to NSPA	Increase in Protected Area Trust Fund principal and annual disbursement to NPAS	Trust Fund Principle: 0 Annual Disbursement to NSPA: 0	Trust Fund Principle: US\$ 3.35 million Annual Disbursement to NSPA: US\$300,000	Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) Principal: US\$ 3.35 million Disbursement to NPAS: US\$100,000 – US\$250,000	Annual disbursement to NPAS of US\$300,000 will not be achievable as the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund has indicated that they will not be ready to disburse funds to the local Trust Funds until early 2016. The project would have ended by then.  As per the CBF vertical agreements which will be finalized in 2015, the principal for the Trust Fund should be shunted to the CBF where the principal received on behalf of participating countries will be placed in an	Trust Fund reports  Project Reports  Trust Fund bank statements

Objective and Outcomes	<u>Original Indicator</u>	Revised Indicators	Baseline	<u>Original Targets End of Project</u>	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
						Endowment Fund. Local trust funds in the relevant countries will then benefit from the interest earned (not exceeding US\$250,000 annually)	
	Increase in the amount of cash received by the revolving fund	Amount of funds generated locally by the Local PA Trust Fund  % of the Trust Fund principal generated locally	\$0	US\$3 m	US\$100,000-300,000	The term "Revolving Fund" was changed to "Local Trust Fund" and this is the universal term being used by all countries as well as the CBF.  Additionally we have changed the target from US\$3M to a range of US\$100,000-300,000 as the CBF has adjusted its mechanism for the transfer of funds, i.e. countries will receive interest earned on their relevant principal. Again it should be	Trust fund reports

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
						noted that the CBF will not be ready to commence disbursements to local trust funds until early 2016.	
	Increase in annual government funding for PAs	Increase in annual government funding for PAs	US\$4,097,000	US\$4,916,400 (20% increase)	US\$4,500,000-\$4,900,000 (12%-20% increase)	Based on value of the Jamaican dollar over years we feel that we will be able to fall within a range instead of a <u>set</u> target of US\$4.9M (20% increase)	Financial Scorecards
	Increase in annual non-government resources	Increase in annual non-government resources	USD 1,575,987	US\$ 1,892,935 (20% increase)	US\$1,650,000-\$1,891,184 (15%-20% increase.)	Based on value of the Jamaican dollar over years we feel that we will be able to fall within a range instead of a <u>set</u> target of US\$1.8M (20% increase)	Financial Scorecards
	N/A	Local Protected Area Trust Fund 100% established and operational by 2016	0 Protected Areas Trust Fund existing locally	N/A	Establishment of the Local Trust Fund by 2014  Operationalization of the Local Trust Fund by 2016	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined.	Trust Fund reports

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
	Percentage of Protected Areas with Business Plans that reflect NSPA standards	Number of Protected Areas with Business Plans that reflect NPAS standards	0 PAs with business plans that reflect NSPA standards	8 PAs with Business Plans that reflect NSPA Standards (25%increase)	8 PAs with Business Plans that reflect NPAS standards	Target refers to a number and indicator changed accordingly	Business Plan documents
	N/A	Number of Protected Areas with mechanisms to generate revenue at the site level	1 PAs with mechanisms to generate Revenue (BJCMNP)	N/A	Revenue generation in 5 PAs	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined.	Revenue Generation Reports
	N/A	Extent to which operational plan for the PA system financial strategy developed	No such strategy available	N/A	Operational Plan for the PA system financial strategy developed	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined.	Operational Plan for PA Financing strategy
Outcome 2: Rationalizing and integrating the NSPA	Number of PAs with clearly designated lead and support entity	Number of PAs with clearly designated lead and support entity	One (1) PA within NSPA legal agreement designating PA management authority	32 of PAs within NPAS with legal agreements designating PA Management authority (100% of PAs)	4 Protected Areas within the NPAS with legal agreements designating PA Management Authority	The end of project target was revised based on agreement by the managers of the PA System as:  The nomenclature of 32 PAs is incorrect. There are actually 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions accounting for over 230 Protected	

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
						Areas. To have 100% of them with legal agreements is not realistic. Many of the PAs have overlapping jurisdictions (as they fall under more than one of the governing Acts – i.e. Fisheries, NRCA, JNHT or Forestry). It therefore becomes complicated to have clearly designated leads/support entity for EACH of the 230 PA.	
	N/A	Status of developing drafting instructions for umbrella PA legislation and the supporting legal framework	0 Umbrella Legislation for NPAS	N/A	Drafting Instructions for umbrella PA legislation and supporting legal framework developed	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined.	Drafting Instructions/Regulations/Co-management agreements
	Number of new PA landscapes gazetted and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seasca	Number of new PA landscapes <u>declared</u> and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seasca	0 new coastal and marine PA landscape gazetted and implementing	One (1) new coastal and one (1) new marine PA landscape gazetted and implementing management	1 new coastal and one (1) new marine PA landscape declared and have	The project document speaks to the “gazetting” of the 2 new PAs. The process towards	Official Declaration document PA management plans Project reports

Objective and Outcomes	<u>Original Indicator</u>	Revised Indicators	Baseline	<u>Original Targets End of Project</u>	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
	integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	wide approaches to combating PA threats	management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	management plans prepared that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats	<p>gazetting includes external forces outside of the control of the project. We suggest that we have the areas "declared" then allow for the gazetting afterwards (which may take years to be achieved)</p> <p>Additionally, areas identified in the document (Pedro Bank and Black River) have complicated usages and no clear management structures. Therefore under the project we will prepare the management plans instead of implementing them as the defined institutional framework to implement may have to</p>	

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
						be dictated at higher levels.	
Outcome 3: Increasing PA management effectiveness	Increase in PA management effectiveness measured by METT scores	Increase in PA management effectiveness measured by METT scores	METT Scores for 32 PA's: ② Montego Bay Marine Park - 44 ② Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park – 72 ② Negril EPA - 32 ② Negril Marine Park – 39 ② Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area – 27 ② Coral Spring-Mountain Spring – 19 ② Portland Bight Protected Area – 36 ② Ocho Rios Protected Areas – 19 ② Mason River protected Area - 54 ② Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 14 ② Bowden Fish Sanctuary - 13 ② Airport Point Fish	METT Scores for 32 PA's increase an average of 25%: ② Montego Bay Marine Park - 55 ② Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park – 90 ② Negril EPA - 40 ② Negril Marine Park – 48 ② Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area – 34 ② Coral Spring-Mountain Spring – 23 ② Portland Bight Protected Area – 45 ② Ocho Rios Protected Areas – 23 ② Mason River protected Area - 67 ② Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 18 ② Bowden Fish Sanctuary - 16 ② Airport Point Fish Sanctuary- 57 ② Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary - 42	25% overall increase in METT scores for 50% of the 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions of NPAS	The project document speaks to 32 PAs but there are 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions. Based on the information which exists for the NPAS, the PSC agreed that we can see a change in 50% of the targeted areas.	METT Scorecard

Objective and Outcomes	Original Indicator	Revised Indicators	Baseline	Original Targets End of Project	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
			Sanctuary - 46 <input type="checkbox"/> Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary - 34 <input type="checkbox"/> Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary - 33 <input type="checkbox"/> Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary - 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 30 <input type="checkbox"/> Salt Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 36 <input type="checkbox"/> Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 32 <input type="checkbox"/> Three Bays Fish Sanctuary - 32 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Northeast - 58 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Southeast - 56 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Northwest - 40 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Southwest - 45 <input type="checkbox"/> Port Royal and Palisadoes - 52	<input type="checkbox"/> Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary - 41 <input type="checkbox"/> Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary - 45 <input type="checkbox"/> Galeon Bay Fish Sanctuary - 37 <input type="checkbox"/> Salt Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 45 <input type="checkbox"/> Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 40 <input type="checkbox"/> Three Bays Fish Sanctuary - 40 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Northeast - 72 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Southeast - 70 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Northwest - 50 <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry Southwest - 56 <input type="checkbox"/> Port Royal and Palisadoes - 65 <input type="checkbox"/> Black River - 26 <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish Town - 51 <input type="checkbox"/> Titchfield Hill - 53 <input type="checkbox"/> Falmouth - 43 <input type="checkbox"/> Seville - 92 <input type="checkbox"/> Rio Nuevo - 21 <input type="checkbox"/> Mountain River Cave - 55 <input type="checkbox"/> Mason River Reserve - 67			

Objective and Outcomes	<u>Original Indicator</u>	Revised Indicators	Baseline	<u>Original Targets End of Project</u>	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
			☒ Black River - 21 ☒ Spanish Town - 41 ☒ Titchfield Hill - 43 ☒ Falmouth - 35 ☒ Seville - 74 ☒ Rio Nuevo - 17 ☒ Mountain River Cave - 44 ☒ Mason River Reserve - 54				
	Number of PAs that access and contribute to biological information through the CBD Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).	Number of PAs that contribute to and/or access biological information through the CBD Jamaica Clearing House Mechanism (JACHM).	One (1) PA contributing to and accessing CBD CHM	32 PA's contributing and accessing the CBD CHM. (100% of PAs)	28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions contributing to the JACHM. Accessing of database and website by end users to include PA managers (100% of PAs)	The project document speaks to 32 PAs but there are 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions. This is not a change in target but a correction in wording.	Project reports  Biodiversity CHM reports
	Percentage of PAs with management plans that reflect NSPA management guideline standards	Number of PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards	0 PAs with Management Plans that reflect NSPA management guideline standards	8 PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards	8 PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards (25% of PAs)	No change	PA management plans  Project reports

Objective and Outcomes	<u>Original Indicator</u>	Revised Indicators	Baseline	<u>Original Targets End of Project</u>	Revised Targets End of Project	Justification for Change	Mean of verification
	N/A	Extent to which the M&E system for NPA management developed	0 M&E system for NPA Management	N/A	Monitoring and Evaluation system for protected area management developed	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined	M&E Document
	N/A	Number of PAs with conservation-based economic activities	0 PAs with conservation based economic activities	N/A	3 PAs with conservation-based economic activities implemented	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined. The number indicated in the framework document was 5 but given the limited budget allocated for the activity, the PSC has recommended 3 instead	Project Reports
	N/A	Status of implementation of Communication Strategy for NPAS		N/A	Communication Strategy for NPAS implemented in 20 Key PAs	This was listed as an output in the original framework document but a target and indicator were not defined	

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>29</sup>****Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System****Name of Consultant:** Maria ONESTINI**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**Signed at *Buenos Aires, Argentina* on *July 23 2017*Signature: <sup>29</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)