

REPORT

FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR) OF THE CONSERVING
BIODIVERSITY AND REDUCING HABITAT DEGRADATION IN PROTECTED
AREAS AND THEIR BUFFER ZONES PROJECT

IN ST. KITTS AND NEVIS

PIMS 5088

EVALUATION TEAM LEADER: MARIA ONESTINI

EVALUATION TEAM EXPERT: MELVIN TURNER

April 12 2017

I. OPENING PAGE:¹

TITLE OF UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECT:

CONSERVING BIODIVERSITY AND REDUCING HABITAT DEGRADATION IN PROTECTED AREAS AND THEIR BUFFER ZONES PROJECT IN ST. KITTS AND NEVIS

PROJECT ID#S:

ATLAS AWARD ID: 80909
ATLAS PROJECT ID: 90420
PIMS: 5088

EVALUATION TIME FRAME AND DATE OF EVALUATION REPORT

Time frame: December 2016 to March 2017
Date of Evaluation Report: March 10th 2017

REGION AND COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT:

Latin America and the Caribbean, St. Kitts and Nevis

GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM/STRATEGIC PROGRAM

GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1: "Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems"

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Cooperatives, Environment and Human Settlement, through the Department of Environment

EXECUTING ENTITY/IMPLEMENTING PARTNER:

Ministry of Sustainable Development - Department of Physical Planning and Environment

IMPLEMENTING ENTITY/RESPONSIBLE PARTNERS:

Department of Physical Planning, Environment and Natural Resources (Nevis); Department of Marine Resources; Nevis Department of Fisheries

¹ The source of the information indicated here is the official Project Document. Changes, in particular changes in partners, and of institutions are reflected in the sections of this report dealing with implementation since they occurred during the implementing process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The mid-term review team would like to acknowledge and thank all who graciously shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of this process.

DISCLAIMER

Be stated that the analysis and recommendations contained in this document only represent the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the analysis, views and opinions of the United Nations Development Programme, GEF, any other UN Agency, nor any of the donors or parties involved in the *Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Buffer Zones Project*.

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| i. Opening page: | 2 |
| Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project: | 2 |
| project ID#: | 2 |
| Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report | 2 |
| Region and countries included in the project: | 2 |
| GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program | 2 |
| Implementing Partner | 2 |
| Executing Entity/Implementing Partner:..... | 2 |
| Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners: | 2 |
| Acknowledgements | 3 |
| Disclaimer..... | 3 |
| ii. Table of Contents | 4 |
| iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations | 7 |
| 1. Executive Summary | 8 |
| Project Information Table | 8 |
| Project Description..... | 9 |
| Project Progress Summary | 9 |
| MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table | 10 |
| Concise summary of conclusions | 11 |
| Recommendation Summary..... | 11 |
| Recommendations at the design level..... | 11 |
| Recommendations for remaining implementation period | 11 |
| Recommendations for an extension request..... | 12 |
| 2. Introduction..... | 13 |
| Purpose of the MTR and objectives | 13 |
| Scope and Methodology: Principles of Design and Execution of the MTR, MTR Approach and Data Collection Methods, Limitations to the MTR..... | 13 |
| Structure of the MTR Report..... | 15 |
| 3. Project Description and Background Context..... | 16 |
| Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope | 16 |
| Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted | 18 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites..... | 18 |
| Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements..... | 20 |
| Project timing and milestones..... | 20 |
| Main stakeholders: summary list | 21 |
| 4. Findings | 23 |
| 4.1 Relevance-Project Strategy | 23 |
| Project Design | 23 |
| Results Framework/Logframe..... | 24 |
| 4.2 EFFECTIVENESS-Progress Towards Results | 25 |
| Progress towards outcomes analysis..... | 25 |
| Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective..... | 31 |
| 4.3 EFFICENCY-Project IMPLEMENTATION and Adaptive Management..... | 32 |
| Management Arrangements | 32 |
| Work planning | 32 |
| Finance and co-finance | 33 |
| Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems | 34 |
| Stakeholder engagement..... | 35 |
| Reporting | 35 |
| Communications | 35 |
| 4.4 Sustainability | 35 |
| Financial risks to sustainability..... | 36 |
| Socio-economic RISKS to sustainability | 36 |
| Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability | 36 |
| Environmental risks to sustainability | 37 |
| 5. Conclusions and Recommendations..... | 38 |
| 5.1 Conclusions | 38 |
| Lessons Learned..... | 39 |
| Best Practices..... | 40 |
| Extension Request | 40 |
| 5.2 Recommendations | 41 |
| Recommendations at the design level for future programming of GEF funded – UNDP implemented projects | 41 |
| Recommendations for remaining implementation period | 41 |
| Recommendations for an extension request..... | 43 |

6. Annexes 44

Annex 1: MTR Terms of Reference For Team Leader 45

Annex 2: Rating Scales 55

Annex 3: MTR Mission Schedule and Names of Stakeholders Interviewed and sites visited 57

Annex 4: Sample Interview Guide used for data collection 62

Annex 5: List of Documents Reviewed 64

Annex 6: MTR Evaluative Matrix 66

Annex 7: Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form For Team Leader 71



III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------|--|
| BHFNP | Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park |
| CFRNP | Central Forest Reserve National Park |
| DEA/PSIP | Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning |
| DMR | Department of Marine Resources (St. Kitts) |
| DPPE | Department of Physical Planning and Environment (St. Kitts) |
| DPPNRE | Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (Nevis) |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| METT | Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool |
| MoSD | Ministry of Sustainable Development |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| NCEMA | National Conservation and Environmental Management Act |
| NCEPA | National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act |
| NDF | Nevis Department of Fisheries (Nevis) |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| NHCS | Nevis Historical Conservation Society |
| NIM | National Implementation Modality |
| NPDP | Nevis Physical Development Plan |
| OECS | Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States |
| PA | Protected Areas |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report |
| PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| RBVNP | Royal Basseterre Valley National Park |
| RTA | (UNDP) Regional Technical Adviser |
| SCNT | St. Christopher National Trust |
| SKN | St. Kitts and Nevis |
| SKSTMN | St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network |
| TNC | The Nature Conservancy |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WSD | Water Services Department (St. Kitts) |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Project Title: | Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Areas of Influence ² | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | | at endorsement (US\$) | at mid – term (US\$) |
| UNDP Project ID: | | GEF financing: | US\$ 3 371 630 | US\$ 545 236 |
| Country: | St. Kitts and Nevis | UNDP: | US\$ 300 000 | US\$ 104 000 |
| Region: | Latin America and the Caribbean | Government | US\$ 16 840 027 | US\$ 1 882 809 |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | | | |
| GEF OP/SP | GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1 | Total co-financing: | US\$ 16 840 027 | US\$ 1 882 809 |
| Implementing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | US\$20 511 630 | US\$ 2 532 045 |
| Implementing Partner: | Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Cooperatives, Environment and Human Settlement | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | November 2014 ³ |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: November 2018 | |

² Some documents indicate that the project title is “Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Areas of Influence” while others state that the title is “Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Buffer Zones”. Both titles are used throughout the report.

³ Project signature date.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The *Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Buffer Zones Project* in St. Kitts And Nevis has an overarching aim to improve ecosystem representation in the country's Protected Area (PA) system, establish/strengthen PA management at key sites, as well as strengthen institutional, policy, legal/regulatory, information, and financing frameworks at the PA system level. All of these specific and general aims are to be achieved within a development context framework.

The Project tries to address a series of problems that relate to protected areas (current and planned areas) in St. Kitts and Nevis within a development context framework. Through the design there was an identification of several of the threats to protected areas, divided by terrestrial and marine ecosystems – related threats. These were: habitat destruction and fragmentation as well as habitat degradation, overexploitation of biological resources, and climate change. The barriers identified were two. First, a lack of systematic approach and lack of adequate mechanisms for protected areas management in the country. Second, an insufficient geographic coverage of key biodiversity areas and inadequate management of protected area units as well of sources of degradation in areas adjacent to or upstream of protected areas (i.e. buffer zones).

The Project's objective is to expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning.

The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes:

- Component 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities; and,
- Component 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas.

The Project formally started in November 2014 and it has a planned duration of four years. The planned total project cost is of US\$ 20 511 630, with GEF financing of US\$ 3 371 630, UNDP financing of US\$ 300 000, and planned co – financing from government of US\$ 16 840 027.

PROJECT PROGRESS SUMMARY

The *Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence* project has achieved a few expected outputs and many products are nearly attained or in process at the time of the mid-term review. The delays present are due to a series of factors, among them government reorganization, unclear roles for some of the stakeholders, contracting delays as well as problems in obtaining quality products for some areas of work. Although a few products have been efficiently and effectively produced to date (and some processes are best practices) a number of expected outputs are in a process of being achieved or planned for the near future. While this is expectable of a project which is in its relative midpoint, this also calls for a sort of reorganising and rationalising implementation in the Project's remaining tranche. Nonetheless, even if products are being planned and sought, there is still a prevailing vision that the Project terminates in these. There is yet a need to instil in implementation and through all partners and stakeholders that this sort of project is not only a means for product delivery but an intervention that should seek results and effects. Some standstills have been identified which should quickly be acted upon if products, results and effects are to materialize thoroughly in the rest of the implementation period.

MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

TABLE 1: MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE PROJECT⁴

| Measure | | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|--|---------|--|--|
| Progress Results | Towards | Objective Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS | As a composite, there are a few moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objective in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Although some outputs have been achieved in an effective and efficient manner, several other outputs, expected processes and outcomes that make up and articulate the objective have not been met at the expected mid-point levels. No shortcomings in terms of relevance. |
| | | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS | Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness at the results levels. Minor shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of efficiency at the products level. Although with delays, some outputs/products have been achieved, some are near completion, and some are planned for the near future. Significant shortcomings in terms of seeking effects and results-based planning thus far. Severe shortcomings regarding the set up and implementation of policy and administrative structures to manage current and future protected areas, as well as critical delays in the declaration of new areas to be protected in marine and in terrestrial ecosystems. No shortcomings in terms of relevance. |
| | | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS | Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness at the results levels. Minor shortcomings in achievements in terms of efficiency at the products level. Significant shortcomings in terms of seeking effects and results-based planning thus far. Severe shortcomings regarding the set up and implementation of policy and administrative structures to manage current and future protected areas, as well as critical delays in the declaration of new areas to be protected in marine and in terrestrial ecosystems. No shortcomings in relevance. |
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | | Rating: Satisfactory S | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to reasonably efficient implementation. Some shortcomings in terms of effectiveness. Several adaptive management processes underway or already implemented. |
| Sustainability | | Rating: Moderately Likely ML | At the midpoint, and as a composite assessment, there are moderate risks regarding the sustainability of some components, but there are expectations that at least some of the outputs and outcomes will be sustained and carry on after project closure. Although some outputs and activities should carry on after closure, a series of them are at risk of not being fully sustained if no further work is carried out in seeking sustainability from the mid-term review onward. In particular, sustainability factors regarding maintaining in government(s) staff hired and trained by the Project; drawing a realistic financial strategy for the management of protected areas and the implementation of management tools being obtained within the Conserving Biodiversity project, as well as the promotion of needed policies that sustain the declaration of new areas and the management of all protected areas within the country. |

⁴ Reference: The ratings for performance follow a six – point scale (Highly satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)). The rating for sustainability follows a four – point scale (Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U); Highly Unlikely (HU)). The ratings explanations are found in annexes (see Annex 2: Rating Scales).

CONCISE SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The Project as designed takes into account the development framework that this sort of UNDP implemented projects tend to have. That is, it is acknowledged within design that protected areas play an important role for development in St. Kitts and Nevis due to their close link to the country's most important productive sectors such as tourism, fisheries, and agriculture as well as for safe water provision to the islands. The project relevance therefore lies also within a tacit and explicit acknowledgment that protected areas (managed, well administered, etc.) are key factors for sustainable development. At the design level a major gap has been the lack of incorporation of the intricate issues that arise out the implementation of a Project in both islands (in St. Kitts and in Nevis) without fully taking into account the administrative and political issues germane to the Federation.

This is a first national UNDP implemented – GEF funded project for the country. Therefore, it is a learning process for the country in implementing these sorts of projects. The Project is significant for St. Kitts and Nevis in many ways. It presents support so that the national and sub – national governments can basically lay the foundation for integrated protected areas administration and policy, reinforced by the individual and institutional capacity that the Project is trying to generate. The tools, methodologies, policies, studies, individual capacity that the Project is driving, with the right implementation and institutional capacity building, can generate the methods and processes to lay the foundations to sustainably manage protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis and to promote crucial aspects of development in the country as they relate to protected areas. St. Kitts and Nevis, as a Small Island Developing State that bases much of its economic and social development on tourism and fisheries, the protection, conservation and sustainable use of its terrestrial and of its coastal and marine ecosystems is a strategic issue.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL

1. Consider intensely the political, policy, and governmental issues and structures of the country where a project will be implemented and incorporate whatever policy or governmental issues are present in the country where a project would be implemented.
2. Realistically budget all proposed products, processes, outputs and investments.
3. Improve the design of indicators, keeping in mind that they should be SMART⁵ and require that the indicators are to be results – based, reflect effects, and that results indicators should reflect effect as attributable to project.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

4. Work at the highest level to improve the relation between the St. Kitts and the Nevis implementation processes by creating protocols, letters/memorandums of understanding, and other relevant documents, with meaningful exchanges at the political and at the line ministry levels between the two islands.
5. Within Nevis there should be an extra and renewed effort to disseminate information about the workings of the project, the implementation modality, the role of the

⁵ SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound.

implementing agency of Nevis, the vertical relations within the Nevis government vis-à-vis a project of this type.

6. Within St. Kitts there should be an increased effort to have the different line areas of government work in a coordinating matter within the realm of the project, avoiding duplication of efforts, concerting areas of work, and building upon other interventions and projects.
7. Review the log frame to bring up to date language and incorporate changes that the project has borne in its implementation period thus far, updating indicators in the log frame and formally streamline the financing process and administration of the Project.
8. Start to generate mechanisms and processes, in order to move the project from an emphasis on products to one that seeks outcomes, objectives, and effects.
9. Generate a deliberation and examination (with relevant events/workshops/discussions etc.) on what should and what could be a government(s) entity(ies) that administer(s) protected areas of different sorts in the country.
10. Interweave developmental issues as a priority, in the products and outcomes that result and should result out of the Project, including issues of livelihoods, gender, prevention of natural resource use conflict with local communities.
11. Commence to generate a sustainability plan/exit strategy where what is needed for sustaining products, outcomes, and effects is made explicit.
12. Connections with other projects should be fostered.
13. Improve, enhance, and strengthen communication, awareness and visibility as a priority.
14. Enhance UNDP / GEF roles, in particular in technical support, quality control of products, facilitating information and knowledge.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

15. It is recommended that a no - cost extension, should one be requested, be granted for the Project considering the delays it had in set up as well as other delays in implementation.

2. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE MTR AND OBJECTIVES

As indicated in the monitoring and evaluation plan contained in the Project Document (PRODOC) the *Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Buffer Zones Project* in St. Kitts and Nevis is to undergo an independent Mid-Term Review at the mid-point of project implementation. This was originally planned for February 2016, yet due to start up delays it has taken place from December 2016 to March 2017. The MTR has as its purpose to determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and to identify course correction if needed. It focuses on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; highlights issues requiring decisions and actions; and presents initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review also lead to recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term.

Scope and Methodology: Principles of Design and Execution of the MTR, MTR Approach and Data Collection Methods, Limitations to the MTR

This mid-term review has focused primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the project in light of 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 in light of its sustainability risks.

The approach for the evaluation of the *Conserving Biodiversity And Reducing Habitat Degradation In Protected Areas And Their Buffer Zones Project* is determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this assignment and it follows methods and approach as stated in UNDP Manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and UNDP's *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. The analysis entails evaluating different 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 approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Team and UNDP's Sub Regional Office for the OECS, project team, and other key civil society stakeholders.

In order 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. Activities and results were evaluated for their (i) *Relevance*; (ii) *Effectiveness*; (iii) *Efficiency*; and (iv) *Sustainability*. Following UNDP/GEF guidelines, the relevant areas of the project are evaluated according to performance criteria and prospects of sustainability with ratings as summarized in the tables found in annexes (Annex 2: Rating Scales).

The tools chosen for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data sources as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected in order to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allow for in-depth exploration and yield

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 scrutiny of documentation was used as an instrument of analysis. The analysis examined documents formulated during the preparation and implementation phases of the project (i.e. the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic documents, monitoring reports) as well as technical documents produced within the Project and by other stakeholders/projects. A list of consulted documents is found in annexes (see Annex 5: List of Documents Reviewed).
- *Key informant interviews:* 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 governments actors, project staff, local actors, civil society representatives. The interviews were carried out in person during the evaluation mission. A list of consulted stakeholders is found in annexes (see Annex 3: MTR Mission Schedule and Names of Stakeholders Interviewed). Stakeholders to interview were chosen to be the key actors from every single group directly and tangentially involved in the Project. The array of stakeholders, therefore, was a representative sample of actors involved such as the implementing agencies, national government representatives, other levels government representatives, project management unit, and representatives from civil society stakeholders directly and tangentially involved with the Project. (See Annex 4: Sample Interview Guide used for data collection)
- *Site visit/direct observation.* During the mission to St. Kitts and Nevis a series of site visits took place, allowing for interviewing national and local stakeholders as well as to carry out direct observation at the Project's actual and proposed field sites, buffer zones, and other protected areas in the country. Information on sites, buffer zones, and protected areas visited are found in Annexes (see Annex 3: MTR Mission Schedule and Names of Stakeholders Interviewed).

A first tool developed for the review process was an evaluation matrix (which can be found in ANNEX 6: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (Evaluation Criteria With Key Questions, Indicators, Sources Of Data, And Methodology)). This matrix guided the data collection process and, as the evaluation proceeded, the matrix was used to collect and display data obtained from different sources that relate to relevant evaluation criteria and questions. The matrix contains Evaluative Criteria Questions (that is questions and where relevant sub questions related to each of the evaluation criteria contained in the evaluation); Indicators; Sources; and Methodology.

A seventeen-day mission took place (with fifteen days in-country), mainly for the evaluation team to maintain meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders at the national level and sub – national level, meetings with the Project Coordinating Unit, meetings with UN personnel, review of materials with key stakeholders, and interviews with local stakeholders and with civil society representatives. As part of this mission site visits took place as planned (see Annex 3: MTR Mission Schedule and Names of Stakeholders Interviewed).

STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT

The evaluation report is structured beginning with an executive summary, with project summary and project ratings tables, and with project progress, conclusions and recommendations of this report summarized. A second section introduces methodologies, scope and information of the execution of the mid-term review. A third 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. A fourth core section of this report deals principally with evaluation findings relating to the actual implementation of the project. The fifth section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues such as recommendations for future actions and future projects. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation support documentation. The author of Sections 1, 2, 3 and of Section 5 is the Mid-Term Review Team Leader (Maria Onestini). The author of Section 4 of the report is the Mid-Term Review Team Expert (Melvin Turner).

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL, AND POLICY FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Protected area management presents a noteworthy intersection for St. Kitts and Nevis (SKN) given that PAs bear on protection of natural resources and also on key development issues for the insular nation. Although St. Kitts and Nevis ranked seventh in the Human Development Index among Caribbean countries and third in the OECS sub-region at the time of Project preparation (2011), there was a poverty level of 22 percent and a large percentage of the population (nearly 36 percent) is considered vulnerable and adversely affected by economic shocks. SKN is directly and indirectly dependent on natural resources for its socio-economic development. This includes productive sectors with a key relation to protected areas such as agriculture, tourism, and fisheries.

Agriculture has been the traditional primary productive sector of the country until recently. Yet in the last decade this sector has experienced a very radical transformation due to deep changes in sugarcane exploitation, the main crop until 2005 (although falling for several decades until then). Government closed down the state-run sugar industry in 2005, which practically ended sugarcane cultivation in SKN. Due to the decline of the sugar industry, government promoted non-sugar agricultural production as a national goal (i.e. the promotion of part-time farmers operating smallholdings cultivating and raising livestock for the local market). The conversion of sugarcane lands to other uses has created land degradation issues, with impacts on both terrestrial and marine biodiversity. About 80 percent of the land in the island of St. Kitts is owned by Government while in Nevis 70 percent of the land is under private ownership.

In the last decade, there has been a sharp increase in the economic significance of the tourism sector. The sector is broad in the country, going from cruise ship tourism to ecotourism. The expanding tourism sector is accompanied by increased construction of tourism facilities (infrastructures, hotels, vacation homes, etc.) which – in turn – has had clear negative impacts in coastal and marine ecosystems as well as terrestrial ecosystems, water sources and other natural resources, as well as in urban areas. Although the negative impacts of the rapidly expanding tourism sector are borne in the islands, there is also an understanding, even by tourism authorities as well as private operators, that the natural environment is an essential part of the tourism industry for the country.

Fishing is an important source of activity and employment in SKN; there are nearly 500 registered fishing vessels in the country, with the majority of fishing done on reefs within two miles of the coastline. Fishermen on both St. Kitts and Nevis are not territorial and move freely around to where the fish are known to be congregating. Trap fishing and hand-lining is carried – out all around both islands. Unsustainable fishing practices, including overfishing, in near shore areas has resulted in the decline of some targeted species, including high valued like lobster and conch.⁶

The environmental context is, evidently, closely linked to the socio-economic context very briefly portrayed above. The twin island Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis comprises two islands located in the Eastern Caribbean. The physical landscape of St. Kitts includes three volcanic ranges with a number of peaks reaching heights up to nearly 1000 meters. Most of the slightly sloped or flat land in this island is near the coast and, therefore, it is where most urban as well as rural development has occurred. While

⁶ Sources: Project Document and “*Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their Areas of Influence. Technical Report*”

cultivated land has dropped from the 1940s to the year 2000, developed/urbanized land has grown pointedly in this same time period. The island has five types of natural forest classes (classified by elevation and type of forest growth – such as secondary growth--). Nevis Peak towers Nevis island at an elevation of 985 meters with other hills of lesser height. Six vegetation types are found in the island, including rain forest and humid forest, thickets and montane forests, as well as dry scrub woodland and evergreen forests.

Coastal and marine ecosystems are also rich in biodiversity. These include (as the Project Document indicates) “coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves, freshwater lagoons, rocky shores and salt ponds, all of which support a rich variety of reef and pelagic fish species, lobsters, conch, sea turtles, algae, and resident and migratory birds”. Several coastal habitats have been defined: freshwater lagoons, coral reefs, and sea grass beds. Of course, these habitats and ecosystems are key to the health of fisheries. Regarding coastal and marine ecosystems and associated natural resources, it is documented that they are threatened by climate change, pollution, and human factors. For instance, mangroves only remain in patches and wildlife and fisheries resources are declining (sea turtles, objective fisheries species, etc.).

Within this environmental and socio-economic background, issues regarding protected areas arise. This not only in terms of the natural resources that would or should comprise protected areas in the country, but also regarding institutional and policy factors which are relevant to the project’s objective and scope.

The project design documents correctly indicate that the St. Kitts and Nevis protected area system is small and has weak management structures for the most part. Although some parts of the Project Document and subsequent outcome indicators disagree as to the number of protected areas vis-à-vis other analyses⁷, all sources agree that management from a biodiversity viewpoint is very weak at best or non – existent. Overall, the protected areas are small and either have no management structures or very limited management and financial resources for this. As the Project Document indicates, there are three park units⁸ within the terrestrial landscape legally established. Of these three areas, only the Central Forest Reserve National Park (CFRNP), has as among its aims management based on integrated ecological conservation which includes biodiversity conservation; protection of water catchment and other ecosystem services; ecotourism and recreation activities. The Royal Basseterre Valley National Park (RBVNP) is managed by the Water Services Department with a goal to preserve and protect the aquifer which supplies the capital city of Basseterre and surrounding areas’ drinking water. The Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park (BHFNP) is a colonial-era fortress managed by a civil society organization as a historical and cultural site and is not managed for biological conservation purposes. Existing (albeit outdated) managements plans for the Royal Basseterre Valley National Park and the Central Forest Reserve National Park are not being implemented, staffing is limited for these sites, nor do they have a set budget. Similar situations are present in Nevis. At the time of design there were no protected areas in the island, and there was no active management. Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area were considered to be protected areas under relevant Acts, with the aim of having the Nevis Peak area classified as a National Park, while the Camps River (watershed used for human water supply) area is classified as an Area of Special Concern.

Regarding marine protected areas, at the time of project design, government had under consideration the creation of a St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area (SKNMMA), which would extend for two miles out from the shoreline of both islands. Mainly involving a planning / zoning process

⁷ For instance, *WDPA Data Status Report, Saint Kitts and Nevis. January 2015.*

⁸ Royal Basseterre Valley, Central Forest Reserve, and Brimstone Hill Fortress

that identifies “conservation zones”, (at the time of design) there were little or no specific norms or management formats associated with this marine protection areas nor a plan for providing a resource base for their management.

Overall, therefore, this is a brief depiction of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis and what is their natural resource and management context. Background to the project took into account this framework as well as the environmental and socio-economic conditions for the set up and design of the *Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Buffer Zones Project in St. Kitts And Nevis*.

PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS: THREATS AND BARRIERS TARGETED

The Project tries to address a series of problems that relate to protected areas (current and planned areas) in St. Kitts and Nevis within a development context framework. Through the design there was an identification of several of the threats to protected areas, divided by terrestrial and marine ecosystems – related threats. These were: habitat destruction and fragmentation as well as habitat degradation, overexploitation of biological resources, and climate change. The barriers identified were two. First, a lack of systematic approach and lack of adequate mechanisms for protected areas management in the country. Second insufficient geographic coverage of key biodiversity areas, and inadequate management of protected area units and of sources of degradation in areas adjacent to or upstream of protected areas (i.e. buffer zones).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY: OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND EXPECTED RESULTS, DESCRIPTION OF FIELD SITES

The above is a contextual introduction to the Project. As the design well indicated the existing protected areas system in the country is limited, both in representation and in active management. It is with this framework that the Project was designed and is being implemented. The Project’s objective is *to expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system, and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning*.

The intervention has been organised into two expected outcomes:

Component 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities; and,

Component 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas.

These, in turn, are articulated through a specific set of expected outputs. The expected outputs (and sub outputs) for Component 1 were at the time of design as follows:

Output 1.1: Strengthened Protected Areas Laws and Regulations

Output 1.2: Strengthened Policy and Institutional Framework for PA System Management

1.2.2 Establishment of Protected Areas Agency (PAA) and Capacity Building of PAA Staff

1.2.3 Establishment and operation of National Environmental Committee (NEC)

1.2.4 1.2.4 Support for NGO Involvement in PA Management

Output 1.3: Financial sustainability framework for Protected Areas System

1.3.1 Development of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for PA System

1.3.2 Financial Management Systems to support cost-effective PA management

Output 1.4: Consolidated information system supporting PA management objectives

1.4.1 Development and operation of a Protected Areas Information System:

Output 1.5: Increased Awareness and Support for Protected Areas

1.5.1 Public Education and Awareness Programs regarding the national system of protected

The expected outputs (and sub outputs) for Component 2 were at the time of design as follows:

Output 2.1: Establishment and Operationalization of Terrestrial Protected Areas

2.1.1 Establishment and Zoning of Terrestrial Protected Areas

2.1.2 Development and Implementation of Terrestrial Protected Area Management Plans

2.1.3 Updating, Approval and Implementation of Nevis Physical Development Plan (NPDP)

2.1.4 Development and Implementation of Site-based Financing Mechanisms for Terrestrial PAs

2.1.5 Operationalization of Terrestrial Protected Area Units

2.1.6 Community Participation and Development in and around Terrestrial PA Sites

2.1.7 Ecological Conservation and Management Programs at Terrestrial PA Sites: The

Output 2.2: Establishment and Operationalization of Marine Protected Areas

2.2.1 Establishment and Zoning of Marine Protected Areas

2.2.2 Development and Implementation of Marine Protected Area Management Plans

2.2.3 Development and Implementation of Site-based Financing Mechanisms for Marine Protected Areas

2.2.4 Operationalization of Marine Protected Area Units

2.2.5 Community Participation and Development in and around Marine PA Sites

2.2.6 Ecological Conservation and Management Programs at Marine PA Sites

2.2.7 Fisheries Production and Pressure Reduction Strategies

The field sites (as indicated in the project planning documents) are basically the current (Central Forest Reserve National Park, the Royal Basseterre Valley National Park) and the proposed protected areas. Proposed areas for potential field site interventions are The Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area (in the island of Nevis), the Booby Island Nature Reserve, Sandy Point Marine Park, The Narrows Marine Park, and the Keys Marine Park.⁹

In summary, the Project aims at improving ecosystem representation in the PA system; establish / strengthen PA management at key sites; as well as strengthen institutional, policy, legal/regulatory, information, and financing frameworks at the PA system level. At the site level (at the design stage) it

⁹ This section deals with a description of planned activities and objectives. Some of the nomenclature has changed since the original planning of the project took place. These changes are incorporated in the sections dealing with actual implementation, where relevant.

was expected that the Project would enable the establishment of new protected areas (three marine and two terrestrial) as well as to propel management of the two-existing terrestrial protected areas. Furthermore, the aims also included assisting the country in revising and/or updated key norms and policies to further support the management of protected areas, establishing and strengthening stakeholder/institutional coordination and information, as well as the creation and operation of sustainable financing mechanisms to ensure appropriate long-term funding support for management of the PA system.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS: SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT BOARD, KEY IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ARRANGEMENTS

Project implementation arrangements have been dynamic and changing given the changes in the Saint Kitts and Nevis government which took place early in the Project’s implementation process. At the time of design the designated implementing partner of this National Implementation Modality (NIM) project was the Ministry of Sustainable Development - Department of Physical Planning and Environment (of Saint Kitts and Nevis). Since government reorganising the environmental line area of national government is no longer a part of the Ministry of Sustainable Development, yet the Department of Environment¹⁰ remains as executing agency, with the Ministry of Sustainable Development (MoSD) also overseeing implementation due to the fact that international cooperation in this area is under its realm and that this Ministry has been designated as the official counterpart of UNDP in the country. Acknowledging the multi layered nature of government in the Federation of Saint Christopher (St. Kitts) and Nevis, the project documentation also indicates that the Department of Physical Planning, Environment and Natural Resources (Nevis); the Department of Marine Resources; Department of Fisheries Nevis are also indicated to be Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners. UNDP is the Project’s Implementing Agency in a partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as funder.

Related to management and governance, the Project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC) which serves functionally as the project board. The PSC was to be co – chaired by UNDP and MoSD according to the project design documentation. However, after government reorganization the Department of Environment co -chairs instead of MoSD. The PSC includes representation from a number of institutions and stakeholders. According to the Project Document, the PSC would include representation (in addition to the mentioned institutions) from Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (Nevis) (DPPNRE); Department of Marine Resources (St. Kitts) (DMR), the Department of Fisheries Nevis (NDF), the Water Services Department on St. Kitts, the St. Christopher National Trust (SCNT), the Nevis Historical Conservation Society (NHCS) and the St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network (SKSTMN). The design level indications also specified that representatives of other stakeholder institutions may also be included in the PSC, “as deemed appropriate and necessary”. Throughout the implementation process, consequently, other stakeholders and institutions have been added to the PSC.

PROJECT TIMING AND MILESTONES

The Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence Project in St. Kitts and Nevis started in November 2014 and it has a planned duration of four

¹⁰ Now a part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Health, National Health Insurance, Human Settlement, Community Development, Gender Affairs, Social Services, Co-operatives and Lands.

years.¹¹ The planned total project cost is of US\$ 20 511 630, with GEF financing of US\$ 3 371 630, UNDP financing of US\$ 300 000, and planned co – financing from government of US\$ 16 840 027.

MAIN STAKEHOLDERS: SUMMARY LIST

At the design level an in-depth stakeholder analysis took place. The purpose of this analysis was to identify main potential stakeholders and to consider their potential roles and responsibilities in the implementation and guidance of the Project. Following are the potential stakeholders as identified by their recognised type in the project planning documents, noting that the names of several of these and their organizational incorporation may have changed (in particular those government administrative and institutional units that have undergone reorganization).

National Government:

- Ministry of Sustainable Development (MoSD), including the Department of Physical Planning and Environment (DPPE) and the Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning (DEA/PSIP)
- Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources (MAMR), including the Department of Marine Resources

Stakeholders

- Nevis Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (DPPNRE)
- Nevis Department of Fisheries (NDF)
- Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs (MJLA)
- Water Services Department (WSD)
- Ministry of Tourism and International Transport (MTIT), including the St. Kitts Tourism Authority (SKTA)
- Environmental NGOs
- St. Christopher National Trust (SCNT)
- Nevis Historical Conservation Society (NHCS)
- St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network (SKSTMN)

Local Stakeholder / User Groups

- Sandy Pointers Inspiring Real Improvement Throughout (SPIRIT)
- Fahies Agricultural Women's Cooperative Society (FAWCS)
- Community Upliftment & Empowerment Team (CUET)
- Sandy Point Agriculture
- Stakeholders
- Cooperative Society Ltd (SPACS) St. Kitts – Nevis
- Agricultural Youth Forum (SKNAYF)
- Tourism operators
- Fishermen
- Private developers

¹¹ Formally the project commenced upon signature (November 2014).

Although there is a fairly thorough analysis and listing of actual and potential stakeholders, it is of note that the tourism sector at the different government levels is not included fully as a potential stakeholder. Mentions to tourism operators are made in the Project Document as relevant stakeholders. But a very weak inclusion is mentioned regarding government administrative areas that deal with this productive sector which, as seen in other sections of this report, it is the most important driver in today's economy and development for St. Kitts and Nevis and is intimately related to protected areas and their buffer zones. Considering the important role and impact that the tourism industry has vis – a – vis natural resources (including protected areas) in St. Kitts and Nevis, and the role that they would potentially play in the implementation of management tools and financial sustenance of these PA s, it is a considerable gap that they have not been included in some strong capacity in the stakeholder analysis.

The main stakeholders' analysis not only identified institutions or typologies of institutions to be involved in the Project. It also carried out for the most part a robust analysis of their anticipated roles and responsibilities in project implementation.

4. FINDINGS

This section of the Mid-Term Evaluation reflects the findings on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Project.

4.1 RELEVANCE-PROJECT STRATEGY

The findings of the project strategy are related to the extent that the strategy is relevant to the national priorities of the Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis. The findings also address the importance placed on the Project by the implementing agencies and associated stakeholders and the expectations and completeness of the Project Document.

PROJECT DESIGN

The establishment of protected areas on the islands of St. Kitts and Nevis is in its infancy. The Project design, as outlined in the Project Document and the Project's work plan, reflects, in content, the general legislative, policy, management, financial and communication needs expected for an emerging, small island developing state's protected area system where there is significant competition for land and marine use.

The Project design, based on similar protected area projects elsewhere in the Caribbean, provides a structured method of project implementation and participatory decision-making, including the recognition that Nevis has co-ordination and control over implementing the project outputs directly affecting Nevis, output preparation and stakeholder consultation and engagement to meet the Project's objective to expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact protected area ecological functioning. The design also respects the Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis' documented national conservation and overall societal goals, priorities and plans and its international conservation commitments associated with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Caribbean Challenge Initiative.

Once completed and fully implemented, the Project will contribute to a sustainable and viable protected area system; providing for the protection of biodiversity and assisting in meeting the economic goals of the country.

The Project's two outcomes and their associated outputs are basic requirements for any protected area system.

Based on the Mid-Term Review, two components of the Project design could have been strengthened.

Firstly, the historic governance angst between St. Kitts and Nevis could have been addressed in the design. The Project design acknowledged the regulatory land use responsibility of Nevis Island Administration on implementing the Project but the design of the Program Co-ordination Unit and the Steering Committee could have been addressed more fully to lessen the angst. For example, the structure of the Program Coordination Unit in the Project Document may have considered a part-time Nevis co-ordinator, seconded from an arm of the Nevis Island Administration, to assist in project co-ordination and the structure of the Steering Committee may have considered designated St. Kitts/Nevis co-chairs and alternating meeting venues.

Secondly, the Project Document's Indicative budget estimates for outputs has, in some instances, not been reflective of the actual, current costs for project delivery. For example, the Project Document envisaged and budgeted infrastructure such as visitor/ranger stations and associated equipment such as vehicles and vessels as a legacy of the Project. However, the costs, when tendered, were substantially higher. This could be a result of changing capital and equipment specifications or inflation between the time the Project Document was prepared and its implementation or simply an

initial miscalculation of the expense or a combination. In any event, when a project reaches the preliminary approval stage, the budget should be updated to ensure the project can deliver what it proposes.

As a result, budget pressures between outputs have occurred, resulting in decreases, to date, in other outputs including community participation, ecological conservation and management and support for site-based financial mechanisms. Further decreases may emerge as other outputs are initiated.

In addition, the Project, for reasons uncertain, did not include Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park as part of the Project. The National Park is a stonewall example of a fully and well managed protected area and would be the heritage flagship of the protected area system. Recognizing that the Project is focussed on conservation, the inclusion of the National Park would also capture some biodiversity in the undeveloped portion of the National Park and serve as a model for societal involvement, support and awareness in the protected area system.

By and large, gender issues do not occur on protected area initiatives as these initiatives are gender neutral. On this project, that recurrent theme is extended.

RESULTS FRAMEWORK/LOGFRAME

As noted, the design of the Project, in both content and structure, is in keeping with a standard approach to the evaluation of existing or emerging protected area systems.

However, the Indicator Framework table could be improved.

The initial column in the table only lists the Project's two outcomes. The Project has seven outputs and 24 components (sub-outputs) of those outputs. As a result, the outputs become generalized in their description and more difficult to measure and, thus, demonstrate the progress of their components and the overall Project.

The indicators for measuring the progress and completion of the Project are referenced in two locations in the Project Document. Section 1, Part II provides significant detail on the indicators for each of the outputs. The same outputs in Component (Outcome) 1 and (Outcome) 2 referenced in the Indicator Framework in Section II of the Project Document are less descriptive and less complete. For example, under Output 1.2.1 (Strengthening Protected Area Policies), Section 1 describes the need for specific policy on operating procedures, private property, collaboration, monitoring and evaluation and so on. By contrast, Section II, which is duplicated in the PIR review, offers a more general indicator: "Consolidated and effectively functioning institutional management of protected areas". By listing each of the policies, the overall output becomes more measurable. Public awareness, so critical to developing support for the Project during its start-up phase, is not referenced.

For Outputs 2.1.3, updating of the Nevis Physical Development Plan, and Output 2.2.7, Fisheries Production and Pressure Reduction Strategies, no indicators are reflected in the Indicator Framework table.

Notwithstanding the Project Document, consideration should be given to itemizing each output, reviewing their indicators and, where needed, more specifically describing the indicators, or in the case of Outputs 2.1.3 and 2.2.7, describing indicators, in the Indicator Framework table. The annual and consolidated work plans include a more complete description of the outputs.

Other than establishment and demarcation of protected areas, the number of trained staff and estimates for increased funding, the remaining targets in Component 2 are not achievable as there is no indicated baseline from which to work. Consideration should be given to amending these targets to studies, inventories and mapping initiated and completed to address these conservation management issues.

Overall, these improvements would allow the Project's Outcomes to be more fully described and more fully monitored and measured.

4.2 EFFECTIVENESS-PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES ANALYSIS

The Project's overall stated objective is to expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact protected area ecological functioning. That objective incorporates two outcomes:

Outcome 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities

This outcome includes 5 outputs:

Output 1.1: Strengthen protected area laws and associated regulations

Output 1.2: Strengthen policy and institutional framework

Output 1.3: Development of a financial sustainability framework

Output 1.4: Consolidation of information systems supporting protected area management

Output 1.5: Increased awareness of and support for protected areas

Outcome 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas

This outcome includes 2 outputs:

Output 2.1: Establishment and operation of terrestrial protected areas

Output 2.2: Establishment and operation of marine protected areas

Although approved in late 2014, the four-year Project experienced several delays including a change in government in February, 2015 and subsequent and associated changes in government personnel and agencies as well as administrative complications, including Project implementation. As a result, the Project did not formally start until May, 2015 with the initial Project Steering Committee meeting and was not fully staffed until October 2015: in reality, this is an early midterm review.

Although the Project received technical support from the UNDP regional and sub-regional offices, the Project was hindered by not having the benefit of continuous and dedicated technical advice from a chief technical advisor. During the review, it was noted that the retention of a technical advisor was imminent.

Despite these complications, significant progress has been made over the last 15 months but challenges remain.

Figure 1 charts progress towards results as achievement of outcomes against end-of-project targets.

FIGURE 1: PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX (ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES AGAINST END-OF-PROJECT TARGETS)

| Project Strategy | Indicator | Baseline Level | PIR | Midterm Level | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment | Achievement Rating | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| Objective: Expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine PA system and reduce habitat destruction in areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning | Terrestrial area protected | 5260 ha | Discussions have begun with government officials and stakeholders about proposed protected areas and their operation and work has begun towards getting areas under official protection. | | 8810 ha | | MS | All of the marine and terrestrial areas proposed have resulted from previous plans and consultations conducted prior to the preparation of the Project Document. There is sufficient time to prepare a detailed protected area proposal, including a boundary and conduct further consultations leading to a legal description within the initial second year target. |
| | Marine area protected | 0 | Discussions have commenced with government officials and stakeholders about the proposed marine protected areas. This will process will aid in attaining buy-in and consensus in the operation of the MPAs. | | 11693 ha | | | |
| | Capacity development indicator score: | | | | | | | |
| | Systemic | 50% | | | 65 | | | |
| | Institutional | 38% | | | 55 | | | |
| Individual | 48% | | | 65 | | Scoring will occur once training has been finalized. | | |
| | Improved METT scores: | | | | | | | |
| | Central Forest | 39 | | | 60 | | | Scoring will occur once the areas are under active management |
| | Royal Basseterre | 28 | | | 40 | | | |
| | Nevis Peak | 30 | | | 60 | | | |
| | Booby Island | 6 | | | 40 | | | |
| | Narrows | 14 | | | 60 | | | |
| | Keys Marine | 25 | | | 60 | | | |
| | Sandy Point | 15 | | | 60 | | | |
| Component 1: Strengthened PA system framework and capacities | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline | PIR | Mid-Term | End of Project Target | | Achievement Rating | Justification for Rating |
| | Legal authority in place for the collection and retention (within the PA system) of visitor / user / concession | Only 1 PA unit (Brimstone Hill NP) has authority to collect or retain fees | Draft NCEMA bill was updated, and Regulations, Management Authority Act and Management Plan | By end of year 2, legal authority established (under existing NCEPA and/or new NCEMA and | | | MS | Bills drafted or in the process of being drafted but not finalized however it is not yet end of Year. 2. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|----|--|
| | fees and other financing mechanisms for protected areas, including the proposed National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF) | | prepared and are currently being reviewed by a selected technical committee. After review, they will be presented to the Cabinet for approval by August 2016. Please see attached news article link under communicating impact. The Marine Resources Act was reviewed in 2015 by another entity and was enacted in January 2016. The project will carry out public consultations in the last quarter of 2016 to inform the public about the Act | Marine Resources Act) for all official PA units to collect and retain fees and receive allocations from the NCTF | | | | Consideration should be given to reviewing the draft legislation to ensure best practices. |
| | Consolidated and effectively functioning institutional management of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis | Existing PA units and sites of proposed new P A units currently are managed by multiple government agencies and non-governmental organizations | A Protected Area Committee was formed in the interim, and have met twice to discuss pertinent matters with regards to the immediate functioning of PA staff and how to maximise on resources.. | | Protected Areas Agency (PAA) formally established and actively implementing functions across PA system (planning; financing; monitoring, enforcement) by end of year 3 | | MU | <p>Current direction is to not establish a single agency which is a core reason for the Project.</p> <p>A draft Bill has been prepared for an authority rather than an agency of government. It may be useful to also consider a government agency</p> <p>Consultancy awarded on the development of policy on standard operating procedures and management plan policy.</p> <p>Sufficient time to address other issues such as private land within protected areas, assessment procedures for proposed protected areas and mechanisms for NGO participation.</p> |
| | Effective coordination between institutions / personnel responsible for protected areas and for adjacent / upstream areas of influence on PA | No coordination or information sharing mechanisms among resource management agencies are current functional in | The formulation of the NEC will take place in the fourth quarter of 2016. The proposed members have been identified and will be invited to a meeting on both | National Environmental Committee (NEC) overseeing protected areas management throughout the country by | | | MS | Committee proposed in legislation so timetable is attached to the NCEMA. |

| | units | St. Kitts and Nevis | St. Kitts and Nevis. | end of year 1 | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|---------------|----|--|----|---|
| | Number of PA staff with specialised training and/or skills development in planning process, creation and enforcement of regulations, ecotourism development, business and financial planning, database management and decision support tools. | 2 | 5 Park Rangers and 7 PAC (Protected Area Committee) members are currently engaging in a series of training which includes : First Aid, Law Enforcement, Fire and Rescue, Ethics and Professionalism, Identification of Artifacts, Botony, Forestry, Climate Change, and Conflict Resolution. The training concludes in July 2016 with an official ceremony under the auspices of the Minister of Agriculture, Marine Resources etc. Please see attached training schedule and photos. Also please see attached news article link under communicating impact. The Park Rangers are also undergoing a certification training in Automatic Weather Station Instrument Installation and Maintenance, facilitated by the Department of Environment from 11th July to 22nd July 2016. This group will also partake in additional training in the 3rd quarter of the year which includes Trail maintenance and Radio Communications. Current Staff of the Department of Environment, Protected Area Committee members and the 5 Park Rangers will be engaged in a Communication Training in the 3rd quarter of the year | | 11 | | HS | Substantive progress on hiring and training of rangers and staff and procuring equipment and additional training is scheduled for staff over the course of the Project. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|---|----------------|---|--|--------------------|---|
| | | | which will be conducted by the project's communication consultant. | | | | | |
| | Increased funding support for protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis through the National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF) and Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) (US\$/year) | \$0 | No progress has been attained for this period. | | Annual \$US \$429,000 (50% from the NCTF and 50% from the CBF) | | MS | Consultancy awarded for Sustainable Financing Mechanism and Strategy. Sufficient time to prepare the PA System Business Plan It should be noted that the CBF contribution is based on 1:1 financing. |
| Outcome 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New PAs | Indicator | Baseline | PIR | Mid-Term Level | End of Project Target | | Achievement Rating | Justification for Rating |
| | # of Protected Areas legally established and demarcated in St. Kitts and Nevis Terrestrial Marine | 3 0 | Discussions have begun with the relevant personnel about the proposed protected areas. A series of meetings have been held to engage Ministers of government who have direct oversight of issues related to the proposed protected areas as a means of getting their full support. Initial management of the existing PAs has begun. 5 Park Rangers are employed and are directly supervised by a newly transferred and trained Forestry Officer, and will form part of the PA Units. Presently the team is making regular visits throughout the PAs to determine what needs to be done. After the assessment has been carried out relevant changes will be made. Please see attached photos of Rangers in a PA (CFR) | 5 3 | | | MS | It was expected that the areas would be established and signed by mid-term. This is still achievable but this work would need to be initiated immediately to meet that timing target, specifically the work on statusing, mapping, potential surveying, describing and demarking. It is unlikely that the ecosystem inventory will make a significant difference to a boundary. Monies have been allocated for signage based on the ProDoc but the amount would appear inadequate for the sites identified. It would appear that the PIR reporting on this Indicator is amiss as this involves mapping, describing and delineating the boundary in the field through signage. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|--|---|--|---|--|----|---|
| | | | conducting assessments. | | | | | |
| Conservation of critical habitat within the Protected Areas targeted by the project: | | | No direct progress has been attained for this period. | | | | | |
| Forest health at 4 terrestrial PAs, as measured by # of hectares | 8790 | | | | No net loss | | MU | Inventories are time consuming and the indicators for this have yet to be defined. As noted, the indicators should be re-evaluated and consideration given to redefining them to completion of studies and monitoring programs. |
| Coral reef health at 3 MPA sites as measured by: | | | | | | | | |
| % live hard coral | TBD Year 1 | | | | No decrease | | | |
| % dead hard coral | TBD Year 1 | | | | No decrease | | | |
| # coral recruits | TBD Year 1 | | | | No decrease | | | |
| Seagrass bed health as measured by # ha | TBD Year 1 | | | | No net loss | | | |
| Health of selected reef fish stocks as measured by: | | | | | | | | |
| Abundance/m3 | TBD Year 1 | | | | No decrease | | | |
| Species diversity | TBD Year 1 | | | | No decrease | | | |
| Increased PA management funds for PA units targeted by the project from visitor, user and concession fees | \$0 | | TOR completed for a consultant to devise a sustainable financial mechanism for all PAs. Regulations are currently being revised that would give authority for the collection of fees. | | Annual US\$200,000 for 3 marine PA sites and US\$35,000 for 2 terrestrial PA sites (targets will be validated and possibly revised during the first year of the project) | | MS | Consultancies for developing and implementing site-based financing and preparing management plans are in preparation. Sufficient time remains to complete the work. |
| Number of site-level PA staff, with specialised training in P A | | | The preparatory work for this process was advanced during | | | | HS | Significant training has occurred at the staff level and more is anticipated and |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|-----------|---|
| <p>management</p> <p>Terrestrial PA Sites (enforcement; conservation, monitoring; community empowerment, outreach, etc.)</p> <p>Marine PA Sites (ecological monitoring; deploying mooring buoys and FADs; enforcement; boat safety and navigation; extension / stakeholder engagement, etc.)</p> | <p>0</p> <p>0</p> | <p>the year. 5 Park Rangers and 7 PA Committee members were recently engaged in a series of training in law enforcement, monitoring and community empowerment, first aid, ethics and professionalism, introduction to botany and forestry, map reading, climate change, fire safety and rescue and tour guiding. The procurement of the work boat that will be used for data collection, monitoring and enforcement within the MPA has been started. Similarly, the recruitment of boat captains was advanced during the year, with TORs developed and personnel engaged, and subsequent training planned.</p> | | <p>At least 5 trained staff managing 2 terrestrial PA sites</p> <p>At least 6 trained staff managing 3 Marine Parks</p> | | | <p>training is scheduled for community capacity building</p> |
| <p>Reduced impact of invasive species (lionfish) at targeted PA units</p> | <p>TBD Year 1</p> | <p>No progress has been attained for this period.</p> | | <p>25% reduction in lionfish population at targeted sites</p> | | <p>MU</p> | <p>As noted, the indicators should be re-evaluated and consideration given to redefining them to completion of studies and monitoring programs.</p> <p>The Project has budgeted for developing and implementing invasive species management programs.</p> |
| <p>Conservation of priority endemic species at terrestrial protected areas (Central Forest Reserve NP and Nevis Peak NP)</p> | <p>Targeted species to be determined through biodiversity inventories during years 1-2 of project</p> | <p>The terrestrial ecological inventory is expected to commence by September 2016, with the TOR developed and procurement underway by the end of the period..</p> | | <p>No net decline in populations of selected species</p> | | <p>MS</p> | <p>The terrestrial ecological inventory has been awarded and will serve as a basis for conservation programs</p> <p>The marine inventory is scheduled.</p> |

REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The Moderately Unsatisfactory rating in Component 1 is based on the indication that the Project does not intend to establish a core component of the Project during the life of the Project: a single agency focussed on protected areas.

The Moderately Unsatisfactory ratings in Component 2 are entirely the result of absence of a baseline and of unachievable end-of-project targets that are measurable and not the Project-identified development and implementation of conservation monitoring outputs and species control programs. As noted in the Logframe comments, consideration should be given to better describe the indicators and ensure that all the expected outputs are recognized.

RATING FOR PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS-Moderately Satisfactory

4.3 EFFICENCY-PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The management arrangements envisioned in the Project Document are standard organizational provisions for implementing protected area projects. A government agency with a conservation mandate is charged with implementing the project and oversight is provided by the UNDP Country Office.

Initially, the Department of Environment in the Ministry of Sustainable Development was responsible for implementation of the Project. Government reorganization, brought about by a federal election in early 2015 at the expected start of the Project, resulted in, as with all government reorganizations, a change in ministerial responsibilities. As a result, the Department of Environment was reassigned to the Ministry of Agriculture but retained the responsibility to implement the Project. Under the Nevis Island Administration, the Ministry of Communications, Works, Public Utilities, Posts, Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Environment assumed implementation.

In keeping with the Project Document, a Project Steering Committee, made up of 15 government staff and non-government and institutional representatives was struck to provide direction to the Project. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the UNDP and the Department of Environment. A Project Co-ordination Unit, composed of a national project coordinator and a financial/administrative assistant, was established to deliver the Project. A technical advisor was to assist the Project Coordination Unit. This position is to be filled as soon as possible. UNDP Barbados and the OECS provides support as needed and retains overall Project oversight.

The implementation, as initially referenced in the comments on Project Design, has been problematic. There is a definitive lag in the implementation of the outputs on Nevis compared to the outputs on St. Kitts. Despite the Project being operational and focussed for 15 months and support from the UNDP, the Ministry responsible for the implementation on Nevis has yet to get Nevis Cabinet approval for implementation. As a result, the overall project implementation is uneven and work planning hampered.

As noted previously, management arrangement adjustments could be considered to the administration of both the Steering Committee and the Project Co-ordination Unit to address the issue of the Project's current timing on Nevis.

The lack of consistent, dedicated technical support from a technical advisor has also affected the Project. It is understood that recruitment is underway to address this.

All these issues need to be addressed in a timely fashion.

WORK PLANNING

The Project benefitted from the preparation of an initial, 2015 work plan which itemized the outcomes, their timeframes and an associated budget drawn from the Project Document. Subsequently, a 2016 work plan, a 2017 work plan and a consolidated, multi-year work plan to Project end were prepared. There have been some inconsistencies in the work plans that should be addressed including congruency on timing and completeness between the annual plans and the consolidated plan and interpretation of outputs in the Project Document.

In addition, it appears that there are output expectations in the Project that have not been captured in the consolidated work plan. These include:

- Output 1.2 Strengthen Policies-Support for NGO Involvement in PA management. The Project Document references the establishment of general mechanisms and protocols to facilitate NGO participation in protected area management. These mechanisms usually include policy on co-management or partnerships including agreement templates. To date, the work plan only recognizes supporting livelihood opportunities as an activity for this output: this activity would more appropriately be part of the Community Participation and Development in and around protected areas component in Outcome 2;
- Output 1.3 Financial Sustainability Framework-the Financial Management System sub output is missing from the work plans. This includes a business plan for the protected area system.

To ensure all expected outputs and their associated activities referenced in the Project Document are addressed, a thorough review of the outputs should be conducted.

To ensure that all resultant outputs are adequately funded, a review of the line budgets for each should be completed.

Additionally, some outputs that ideally would be implemented in the first phase of the Project, such as public awareness, have been delayed. These outputs are necessary for public support for the Project. Similarly, the establishment output, which is intended for completion in Year 2 of the Project, has made significant progress in the marine areas with conservation zones identified but the terrestrial component is still wanting.

As noted, due to the lag of Project approval and support on Nevis and the lack of consistent availability of technical advice, the overall project implementation is uneven and work planning hampered.

There is a clear need to address these issues, for the Nevis lag at a government-to-government level, and through finalizing the procurement of a technical advisor, to ensure the Project’s objective, as well as budget efficiencies, are met within the time remaining in the Project.

The Project Co-ordinating Unit has adopted adaptive measures to deal with this lag as well as the internal “budget overruns” brought about by activity underestimates in the Project Document. These measures include further reliance on Ministry staff to support activities and reallocating internal financial resources at the same time as remaining committed to the global funding provided.

FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE

At the time of this mid-term assessment, 16 % of the Project’s financing amount has been received by the Project from the GEF. Table 2 shows the status of the allocated co-funding to date as provided by the Project Co-ordinating Unit.

Table 2: Co-Financing Table for UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$000's rounded) | Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$000's rounded) | Actual % of Expected Amount |
|---|---|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| GEF | GEF | Grant | 3,372 | 545 | 16 |
| UNDP | UNDP Barbados | Grant | 300 | 104 | 35 |
| Government of St. Christopher and Nevis | Ministry of Agriculture | Grant | 4,000 | 567 | 14 |
| | Department of Physical Planning and Environment | Grant | 3,240 | | |
| | Ministry of Sustainable Development | Grant | | 236 | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------|--------|-------|----|
| | Land Management Unit | Grant | 260 | | 0 |
| | Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs | Grant | 100 | 51 | 51 |
| | Ministry of Health and Environment | Grant | 1,760 | | 0 |
| | St. Kitts Water Services Department | Grant | 6,000 | 302 | 5 |
| Nevis Land Administration | Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Environment | Grant | 1,100 | | 0 |
| | Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing, Cooperatives and Fisheries | Grant | 380 | | 0 |
| | | TOTAL | 20,500 | 2,532 | 12 |

Based on Table 2 and the Project Document Co-Financing Summary, the unreported co-financing to be provided by the Department of Physical Planning (now listed in the Table 2 as the Department of Environment and Ministry of Sustainable Development due to government reorganization) was expected to be \$3,240,000. Assuming this unreported amount is still intended, the Table is indicative of the Project Document. The overall co-financing totals \$17,140,000 which is also reflective of the Project Document.

Table 2 is reflective of the fact that the Project has struggled, for the reasons stated, in reaching its mid-term.

These reasons have resulted in a compressed time for Project completion with planned expenditures of US\$2.7 million¹², currently almost 80% of the Project's planned expenditures, over the remaining duration of the Project. This poses an inherent risk of hasty financial decision making.

Several outputs in the Project Document budget have come in over budget and adjustments to initiated activities have been made to accommodate these overages. However, several outputs have not been initiated and their adherence to budgeted allocations is unknown. This poses a risk to activities scheduled in the final year to be cancelled as monies will have been fully expended.

All budgeted activities need to be reviewed and pro formas prepared to ensure that there is a full realization of budget risk.

The Ministry of Sustainable Development was initially responsible for the Project through the Department of Physical Planning and the Environment; this responsibility has transferred to the Department of Environment as it moved under the Ministry of Agriculture. However, the Ministry of Sustainable Development has retained financial control of the Project, which is a typical part of its role within the country's administration of external development funds and coordination of the Public Sector Investment Program. Close communication and collaboration between the two ministries is key to ensuring smooth transfer of funds and processing of payments.

PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

The Project has initiated a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation program. The program includes:

5. Project Steering Committee Inception Meeting and Workshop
 - Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings

¹² There is a lag between Table 2 reporting and current work plan budgeting.

- Quarterly reports starting April, 2016
- 2016 Year End Project Report
- Project Implementation Review Report, November, 2016
- Field visits

For the last 15 months, the monitoring and evaluation systems; in particular, the quarterly and annual reports have been both detailed and appropriate, providing the necessary information to key partners.

As noted, there are some inconsistencies in completeness of reports: though minor, they do reflect a standard-of-care.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder engagement was a fundamental component of the preparation stage of the Project and included site visits, workshops and a town hall meeting with government and non-government organizations, the private sector and local residents.

The Project has a significant, continued stakeholder involvement including both government and non-government representation on the Project Steering Committee and direct involvement in the various Project outputs including contributing to the gathering of baseline information about in-Country knowledge and attitudes concerning protected areas which, in turn, will be used as a basis for the communication plan part of the public awareness output.

Of particular note, the Project has already established formal partnerships with the Caribbean Youth Environment Network and the Ripple Institute.

Additionally, a number the consultancies have stakeholder engagement components.

However, due to issues associated with the consultancy for public awareness, the engagement of the public with the Project has been delayed. The necessary steps have been initiated to address this delay and ensure the public awareness component is re-started at the community and national level with programs, events and education.

REPORTING

Reporting for the Project has been consistent with respect to meeting timelines-indeed the mid-term review is occurring at month 16 of a 48 month Project- but, as noted in Work Planning, has been somewhat inconsistent as it relates to completing and maintaining the log frame. It is expected that the Project Co-ordination Unit will review the suggestions proposed in this review and take appropriate measures.

The Project Co-ordination Unit, at its quarterly meetings the Program Steering Committee, reviews issues needing decisions and the progress of the Project.

COMMUNICATIONS

Communications associated with the Project is addressed both internally between the Project Co-ordination Unit and those associated with project delivery as well as externally between the Project and the public. The comments on stakeholder engagement stressed the significance that communication has played in the Project design and now in its implementation.

Direct stakeholders reported satisfaction with the communication between them and the Project. Overall, the lack of progress on a public awareness strategy and implementing associated programs due to difficulties with a consultancy has hampered communication on the Project with the general public as there appears little knowledge about the Project and its objective. As noted, the Project Co-ordination Unit has recognized this issue and undertaken steps to address it.

RATING FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION-Moderately Satisfactory

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

These findings address the potential financial, institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks to the sustaining the results of the Project into the future. These organizational, financial, environmental, regulatory and strategic risks were identified as low, with the exception of the financial risk which was rated as moderate, in the Project Document and the risks remain so. Almost any protected area system in the world has at least a moderate risk of having adequate financing.

FINANCIAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

With very few exceptions worldwide, the protection and management of protected area systems are dependent on continued government funding. Priorities of governments are varied and, in small island developing states, commonly focus on societal needs other than conservation.

Generally, financial support for Caribbean protected areas comes from government funding and international, institutional and private donors. More recently, the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund offers limited reciprocal support for participating countries depending on their accounts within the overall Caribbean Biodiversity Fund.

For this Project, as with most small Island developing states, the risks of continued financial support are significant as the recognition that protected areas enhance livelihoods is neither well understood nor believed. It is expected that the financial strategy consultancy will identify the necessary government support and other funding sources to ensure that the protected area is adequately funded and able to support the country's overall goals, particularly as they relate to the protection of biodiversity and the support for tourism.

It is worth noting that the Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park does not rely on government support for its operation and maintenance.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

The Project design and the resultant outputs have recognized the important role that communities, the private sector and the individual public will play if the existing and proposed protected areas are to be sustainable contributors to both the economy of St. Kitts and Nevis and conservation of the rich marine and terrestrial biodiversity. The Project has identified a prime example of protected area co-management with the Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park and World Heritage Site and the Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park Society. Other opportunities for private sector and society involvement have been identified: they simply need to be formally implemented.

As noted, the Project has, as yet, to fully implement the public awareness output due to consultancy issues.

It is critical that the Project continue to factor in the socio-economic needs in the outputs to ensure that associated livelihoods are enhanced by the establishment and management of protected areas, particularly during the implementation of the Project.

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

Bureaucratic and institutional inertia is an inherent and incipient risk to the implementation of the Project as it is worldwide in dealing with protected areas.

This Project envisioned one agency to be responsible for all the protected areas. In keeping with the Project, a draft *Protected Areas Management Authority Act* has been prepared. However, the reported direction is not to support the establishment of a statutory agency at this time or during the duration of the Project based on the reasoning that protected area officers would need time to be trained, despite having existing government officers devoted to components of a protected area system including conservation, protected area management, tourism development, finance and administration and stakeholder support.

Others expressed a concern that there may not be enough to do on protected areas. This comment reflects a significant lack of understanding on the management needs of protected areas and their contribution to biodiversity nationally and internationally and to the tourism economy of the Federation.

This output was one of the main outcomes of the Project and intended to move from the business-as-usual model that has, as noted in the Project Document, led to the diffusion of authority, the lack of coordination between current agencies with responsibilities related to environmental management, the lack of community and private sector participation, the

limit of visibility and public awareness, the constraining of limited resources for training and the creation of uncertainty regarding the objectives and management for new protected areas to a model that was intended to address these limitations.

If a statutory agency is of current concern, perhaps an agency of government-the Protected Areas Branch encompassing existing staff transferred from other government agencies- should be considered.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

There are no environmental risks associated with the sustainability of the Project's outcomes. There is a distinct environmental risk, at both the national and international level, if the outcomes are unsuccessful.

RATINGS FOR SUSTAINABILITY-Likely

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The *Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence* project that is being implemented in St. Kitts and Nevis has an overarching aim to improve the overall status, representation, and management of current and proposed protected areas within a developmental framework. Within this context a few expected outputs have already been achieved and many products are nearly attained or in process at the time of the mid-term review. The delays present are due to a series of factors, among them government reorganization, unclear roles for some of the stakeholders, contracting delays as well as problems in obtaining quality products for some areas of work.

The Project as designed takes into account the development framework that this sort of UNDP implemented projects tend to have. That is, it is acknowledged within design that protected areas play an important role for development in St. Kitts and Nevis due to their close link to the country's most important productive sectors such as tourism, fisheries and agriculture as well as for safe water provision to the islands. The project relevance therefore lies also within a tacit and an explicit acknowledgment that protected areas (managed, well administered, etc.) are key factors for sustainable development. The link with development however has been somewhat missed in implementation and there is a need to interweave development factors in the products and expected outputs/outcomes including issues related to livelihoods, to gender, and other social issues as they relate to development and protected areas as well as how protected areas are and can be a keystone in development. At the design level a major gap has been the lack of incorporation of the intricate issues that arise out the implementation of a Project in both islands (in St. Kitts and in Nevis) without fully taking into account the administrative and political issues germane to the Federation.

Although a few products have been efficiently and effectively produced to date (and some processes are best practices) a number of expected outputs are in a process of being achieved or planned for the near future. While this is expectable of a project which is in its relative midpoint, this also calls for a sort of reorganising and rationalising implementation in the Project's remaining tranche. Nonetheless, even if products are being planned and sought, there is still a prevailing vision that the Project terminates in these. There is yet a need to instil in implementation and through all partners and stakeholders that this sort of project is not only a product delivery means but an intervention that should seek results and effects.

Some standstills have been identified which should quickly be acted upon if products, results and effects are to materialize thoroughly in the rest of the implementation period. First of all, the halt in implementation that has been a result (to a certain degree) of the lack of clear understanding of how the Federation and the Government of Nevis will act together within the realm of the Project. Second, the ongoing miscellaneous understandings on what sort of an administrative and political structure or structures the country needs to adequately manage protected areas within a development context. Although this is an expected output¹³, there is also a design failure involved given that the feasibility of establishing such an agency as indicated in the project planning documents ("an independent, statutory body to manage all terrestrial and marine protected areas"¹⁴) is deemed not to be practicable within the

¹³ Expected output 1.2.2 Establishment of Protected Areas Agency (PAA) and Capacity Building of PAA Staff.

¹⁴ Source: Project Document.

country's political domain and it was considered in the same way when the Project was being designed. Yet, this continues to be explicitly considered an output and many other products are contingent upon this. In short, there is a circular reasoning that causes a standstill which hinders not only implementation but also the possibility of sustainability if the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes are not established that can guarantee continuity of the achievements. It is of course for the country to decide what sort of policy and administrative framework it needs and will implement. Yet, without a discussion regarding this, most expected results will present socio-economic, political, and governance risks to sustainability.

This is a first national UNDP implemented – GEF funded project for the country (all other ones that were implemented by UNDP and funded by GEF in the country were regional or sub regional interventions, with Saint Kitts and Nevis as one of several countries involved). Therefore, it is a learning process for the country in implementing these sorts of projects. Although UNDP and GEF are considered as significant partners and not overly officious in the administrative and procedural perspectives, from the country perspective there is deemed to be a need to receive further complement of technical and specialized nature from both agencies.

The Project is significant for St. Kitts and Nevis in many ways. It presents support so that the national and sub – national governments can basically lay the foundation for integrated protected areas administration and for policy, supported by the individual and institutional capacity that the Project is trying to generate. The tools, methodologies, policies, studies, and individual capacity that the Project is driving, with the right implementation and institutional capacity building, can generate the methods and processes to lay the foundations to sustainably manage protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis and to promote crucial aspects of development in the country as they relate to protected areas. St. Kitts and Nevis, as a Small Island Developing State that bases much of its economic and social development on tourism and fisheries, the protection, conservation and sustainable use of its terrestrial and of its coastal and marine ecosystems is a strategic issue.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Design should not underestimate the political complexities of a country where a project will be implemented. The lack of incorporation of the intricate issues that arise out the implementation of a Project in both islands (in St. Kitts and in Nevis) without fully taking into account the administrative and political issues germane to the Federation has, to a great degree, slowed and at times hindered the implementation process. A strong design implies a thorough knowledge of a country where a project would take place, and therefore needs to be realistic in terms of what can be achieved in a particular national context.
- If design is not realistic and it involves expectations, processes, attainments, policies and structures which are not feasible to achieve within a particular country context, it is highly doubtful that these would be achieved and, in some degree, this lack of realistic design can encumber the whole implementation process and the attainment of outcomes.
- When projects are implemented with the participation of multiple stakeholders and different levels of government, each one's role, functions, partnership arrangements, and responsibilities should be clearly delineated before project starts and adhered to throughout project implementation.

BEST PRACTICES

- *Adaptive management:* Notwithstanding delays, standstills, and other issues that the Project has confronted, there have been solid efforts to adapt to changing conditions and move the implementation process forward.
- *Park rangers:* The hiring, training, and equipping of park rangers without postponing the process until other products or outputs are achieved is a good practice not only in terms of adaptive management but also in order to promote obtaining tangible effects early on in the intervention.
- *Incorporating local personnel:* The incorporation of local personnel in consulting teams that generate products and outputs is a good practice given that it engenders and builds local capacity.
- *Project Steering Committee:* The incorporation into the Project's steering committee of a large number and array of stakeholders from governments and from civil society who have an indirect or direct interest in the Project (although it could have slowed down the Committee's processes) is a good practice in order to involve a wide range of parties in the decision making and to generate ownership and buy – in at different levels and within different institutions.

EXTENSION REQUEST

Although not all parties and stakeholders agree on whether or not an extension request would be requested, several stakeholders are considering a no – cost extension request while others indicate that the project would be able to close on time as planned. However, this evaluation ascertains that it is unlikely that the Project can be completed in the remaining implementation timeframe.¹⁵ The Project has had a series of setbacks in implementation processes. Hiring of staff was done nearly a year after project formally began, with little or no activities in unstaffed period. The Project also sustained changes brought about by government reorganization, organizational and implementing standstills, and problems with the successful completion of products due to issues with contractors. All of this, in turn, generated setbacks in implementation and programming, in obtaining products and, of course, in obtaining results and achievements.

Therefore, it is considered that a no cost extension request ought to be granted, if requested. The request can also be an opportunity for the Project (including all relevant stakeholders) to bring up to date and clear-out several implementation, planning and programming issues that hinder to some degree a successful implementation process. Several of these include language and phrasing issues that are not minor. For instance, when the project materials refer to outdated language for the country regarding marine protected and marine management zones, or when project material still contain several expected products and expected results which are not going to be pursued. Although it is to a certain extent the prerogative of the Project and its stakeholders to streamline and change products implementing adaptive management methods, it should be specified that the products that are being abandoned are done so in a programmatic manner and not by happenstance. The extension request process, if an extension is indeed requested, is a good point for taking care of these matters and other arrangements as necessary. Specific suggestions regarding these matters are part of the recommendations section of this report.

¹⁵ The project's formal timeframe considers that the Project should end in November 2018 given that it was signed at the end of 2014.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations presented here reflect corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, proposals for future directions underlining main objectives as well as actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project. Furthermore, they also include recommendations should the *Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence Project* present an extension request.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

1. Consider intensely the political, policy, and governmental issues and structures of the country where a project will be implemented and incorporate whatever policy or governmental issues are present in the country where a project would be implemented. Take into account successful architecture of cooperation agreements from other donors as guidelines.
2. Realistically budget all proposed products, processes, outputs and investments.
3. Improve the design of indicators, keeping in mind that they should be SMART¹⁶ and require that the indicators are to be results – based, reflect effects, and that results indicators should reflect effect as attributable to project. Indicators should be drawn with the purpose of determining what are a project’s impacts and effects. Baseline indicators should be sought or set for all expected outputs and outcomes given that without baseline data impact or effect cannot be measured nor attributed to an intervention.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

4. Work at the highest level to improve the relation between the St. Kitts and the Nevis implementation processes by creating protocols, letters/memorandums of understanding, and other relevant documents, with meaningful exchanges at the political and at the line ministry levels between the two islands. Use models from other cooperation processes and agreements that have worked more efficiently as examples.
5. Within Nevis there should be an extra and renewed effort to disseminate information about the workings of the project, the implementation modality, the role of the implementing agency of Nevis, the vertical relations within the Nevis government vis-à-vis a project of this type. An integrated effort to disseminate information and amalgamate work should be made, as well, between and within the Nevis Implementing Entities/Responsible Partners and other line agencies within the Nevis administration.
6. Within St. Kitts there should be an increased effort to have the different line areas of government work in a coordinating matter within the realm of the project, avoiding duplication of efforts, concerting areas of work, and building upon other interventions and projects that are taking place or that have been implemented regarding protected areas (terrestrial and / or marine) within national and regional projects.

¹⁶ SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound.

7. Review the log frame to bring up to date language and incorporate changes that the project has borne in its implementation period thus far. Update also, as relevant, the indicators in the log frame. Formally streamline the financing process and administration of the Project; streamline the products expected to meet with outputs but keeping within budget, time, and policy limitations. Re visit ProDoc to see what is currently not being considered as a product (formally or not), and ascertain that what is still being considered is done through a programmatic way and not by happenstance. This review and its formal acceptance by the steering committee and relevant partners should accompany and be an integral part of an extension, if requested.
8. Start to generate mechanisms and processes, in particular with the support of diverse actors including civil society stakeholders, in order to move the project from an emphasis on products to one that seeks outcomes, objectives, and effects.
9. Generate a deliberation and examination (with relevant events/workshops/discussions etc.) on what should and what could be a government(s) entity(ies) that administer(s) protected areas of different sorts in the country. The discussion should include and generate organizational charts, lines of authority, what already existing entity would this administrative division respond to, what management tools and capacity –personal and institutional—it would need, what enabling norms and policy it would need to function, as well as what financial resources it would need to operate (and where they would arise from).
10. Interweave developmental issues as a priority, in the products and outcomes that result and should result out of the Project, including issues of livelihoods, gender, prevention of natural resource use conflict with local communities, and the support that protected areas should sustain for development and wellbeing (tourism, fisheries, water sources) in the country.
11. Commence to generate a sustainability plan/exit strategy where what is needed for sustaining products, outcomes, and effects is made explicit. This strategy or plan should make overt which stakeholder(s) would assure sustainability and by what means (for example, through budget incorporations, work plan incorporations, hiring of staff, maintenance of infrastructure and other materials provided directly and indirectly by the Project.)
12. Connections with other projects should be fostered. For example, other marine and terrestrial protected areas projects in the region / sub region; in particular, learning their issues, how they were handled, what were the lessons learned, and what were their results. Formally linking with other projects in country in the same subject area should also be strongly promoted.
13. Improve, enhance, and strengthen communication, awareness and visibility as a priority.
14. Enhance UNDP / GEF roles, in particular in technical support, quality control of products, facilitating information and knowledge of other projects [globally, regionally, and sub regionally] that have dealt with the same subject area and had similar challenges.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

15. It is recommended that a no - cost extension, should one be requested, be granted for the Project considering the delays it had in set up as well as other delays in implementation. The extension request should be accompanied by bringing up to date the log frame of the project as well as formalizing the streamlining and adaptive management that has taken place in the implementation and planning process (see recommendation 5 above).

ANNEX 1: MTR TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TEAM LEADER
(EXCLUDING TOR ANNEXES)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNDP-GEF MIDTERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Areas of Influence (PIMS 5088) implemented through the Ministry of Sustainable Development. The project started on the 19th of November, 2014 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to improve ecosystem representation in the protected area (PA) system, establish or strengthen the PA management operations at key sites and strengthen institutional, policy, legal/regulatory, information, and financing frameworks at the PA system level. At the site level, the project will enable the legal establishment of five new PAs (two terrestrial and three marine) and the operationalization of these sites as well as the two existing terrestrial PAs that currently have no management. The project will specifically support assessments of the current state of the proposed PA units, creating the necessary framework for establishing the new PA units, develop management plans for each PA Unit and strategic business plan for the overall PA system, and carry out capacity building for PA staff. Project activities also include the establishment of a Protected Areas Agency and the revising and updating of key laws and regulations to support PA management.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the [Project Document](#), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹⁷ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.¹⁸ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Programme Manager, Energy and Environment, Project Coordinator and Project Assistant; executing agencies, senior officials and task

¹⁷ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

¹⁸ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to St. Kitts and Nevis, including the following project sites: The Central Forest Reserve National Park, the Royal Basseterre Valley National Park, Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area (proposed), the Booby Island Nature Reserve (proposed) Sandy Point Marine Park (proposed), The Narrows Marine Park (proposed) and the Keys Marine Park.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

| Project Strategy | Indicator ¹⁹ | Baseline Level ²⁰ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ²¹ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ²² | Achievement Rating ²³ | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable): | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: | Indicator 1: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2: | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | Indicator 3: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4: | | | | | | | |
| | Etc. | | | | | | | |
| Etc. | | | | | | | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quantity and quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

¹⁹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

²⁰ Populate with data from the Project Document

²¹ If available

²² Colour code this column only

²³ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions and Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.²⁴

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

²⁴ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and Their Areas of Influence

| Measure | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Project Strategy | N/A | |
| Progress Towards Results | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Etc. | |
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 27 working days over the course of 6 weeks starting on the date of final contract signature, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| ACTIVITY | Expected Number of Days for Completion | DEADLINE | Responsible Party |
|--|--|---|--|
| Application closes | | <i>TBD</i> | |
| Select MTR Team/contract issuance and signature | <i>10</i> | <i>10 days after the application closure date</i> | <i>Commissioning Unit</i> |
| Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) | <i>1</i> | <i>2 days following contract signature</i> | <i>Commissioning Unit Project Team</i> |
| Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report | <i>3</i> | <i>5 days following contract signature date</i> | <i>MTR Team</i> |
| Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report; latest start of MTR mission | <i>1</i> | <i>7 days following contract signature</i> | <i>MTR Team/ Commissioning Unit</i> |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|--|----------------------------------|
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | 14 | <i>30 days following contract signature</i> | <i>MTR Team</i> |
| Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission | 1 | <i>31 days following contract signature</i> | <i>MTR Team</i> |
| Preparing draft report | 5 | <i>38 days following contract signature</i> | <i>MTR Team</i> |
| Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report Finalization of MTR report | 3 | <i>42 days following contract signature</i> | <i>MTR Team</i> |
| Preparation and issue of Management Response | 2 | | <i>Commissioning Unit</i> |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

| | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | MTR Inception Report | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week before the MTR mission | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| 3 | Draft Final Report | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 1 week of the MTR mission | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 4 | Final Report* | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Barbados and the OECS Sub-Regional Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants while the Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities. These two consultants will be required to work closely together and will be jointly responsible for the deliverables outlined in Section 7 above.

The consultants will be evaluated against the following criteria:

| | Team Lead | Maximum Score | Team Expert | Maximum Score |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Education | A Master's degree in environmental science, natural resource management, agriculture, rural development, economics, management, planning, statistics or similar | 15 | A Master's degree in Environmental Science, Natural Resource Management, or other closely related field. | 15 |
| Experience | Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years; | 10 | Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 8 years | 20 |
| | Experience using result-based management evaluation methodologies | 15 | Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations; | 15 |
| | Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations; | 15 | | |
| | Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | 10 | | |
| | Experience working in the Caribbean | 10 | Experience working in the Caribbean | 15 |
| | Experience with national, multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement | 10 | Experience with national, multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement | 15 |
| | Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 5 | Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 5 |
| | Excellent communication skills | 5 | Excellent communication skills | 5 |
| | Demonstrable analytical skills; | 5 | Demonstrable analytical skills; | 10 |
| | Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | | | |

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

ANNEX 2: RATING SCALES

| Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |
| Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

ANNEX 3: MTR MISSION SCHEDULE AND NAMES OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED

| Name | Post/Entity | Date, Time |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| St. Kitts | | |
| Ms. Claudia Drew | Project Coordinator | Monday 30 th January 9:00am |
| Ms. Phynora Ible | Administrative Assistance, Project Coordinating Unit | |
| Ms. June Hughes | Senior Environment Officer/Project Director | Monday 30 th January 10:30 am |
| Ms. Claudia Drew & Ms. Phynora Ible | Project Coordinator Administrative Assistance, Project Coordinating Unit | Monday 30 th January 1:00pm |
| | | |
| Mr. Marc Williams | Director – Department of Marine Resources | Tuesday 31 st January 9:00am |
| Ms. Tricia Greaux | MMA and Habitat Monitoring officer | |
| Ms. Marcia Stubbs | Education and Compliance Officer | |
| Ms. Claudia Drew and Ms. Phynora Ible | Project Coordinator Administrative Assistance, Project Coordinating Unit | Tuesday 31 st January 10:30am |
| Mr. Dennison Paul | Water Department | Tuesday 31 st January 1:00pm |
| Mr. Charles Parris | | |
| Mr. Alistair Edwards | Permanent Secretary Ministry of Agriculture et al/Assistant Permanent | Tuesday 31 st January 2:30pm |

| Nevis | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr. Ernie Stapleton Ms. Renee Walters Mr. Denzil Stanley Hon Mr. Troy Liburd | Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communications et al Minister of Communications et al | Wednesday 1 st February 9:00am |
| Ms. Nicole Liburd Ms. Pauline Ngunjiri | Director, Nevis Historical and Conservation Society | Wednesday 1 st February 11:00am |
| Mr. Randy Elliot Mr. Walcott James Mr. Eric Evelyn Mr. Randy Morton | Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries Director -Fisheries Permanent Secretary of Agriculture Fisheries Officer | Wednesday 1 st February 1:30pm |
| Mr. Joel Williams Ms. Thema Ward | Acting Director of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Environment Physical Planning Officer | Wednesday 1 st February 2:45pm |
| | | |
| Site visits Mr. Wentworth Smithen, Park Ranger Ms. Rhosyll Jeffers, Physical Planning Natural Resources and Environment Department | Camps River Watershed (Nevis Water Department Pump Station for St. James) Wetlands down stream of Camps River Golden Rock Inn Rawlins Village Bath Hotel Bath Hot Springs Bath Boggs | Thursday 2 nd February 10:00am |
| St. Kitts | | |
| Mr. Erden Woodley | Supervisor – Sky Safari | Monday 6 th February 9:00am |
| Ms. Ryllis Percival | St. Kitts National Trust | Monday 6 th February 10:30am |
| Ms Kimberly Stuart | St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network | Monday 6 th February 1:00pm |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Ms. Racquel Ezquea | Park Ranger's Supervisor | Monday 6 th February 2:00pm |
| Mr. Nigel Thom | Park Rangers | |
| Mr. Wentworth | Park Rangers | |
| Site visit | Terrestrial Parks | Tuesday 7 th February 8:00am |
| Ms. Rachel Ezquea | Sandy Point | |
| Mr. Nigel Thom | Central Forest Reserve Watershed | |
| June Hughes | Senior Environment Officer/Project Director | Tuesday 7 th February 2:00pm |
| Ms. Claudia Drew | Project Coordinator | Wednesday 8 th February 9:30am |
| Ms. Phynora Ible | Administrative Assistance, PCU | |
| Mr. Percival Hanley | Brimstone Hill Fortress | Wednesday 8 th February 1:00pm |
| Mr. Schneidman Warner | | |
| Ms. Lavern Queeley | GEF Operational Focal Point & Director of Economic Affairs/Public Sector Investment Planning (PSIP) | Thursday 9 th February 9:00am |
| Ms. Karen Douglas | Project Accountant, Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP | |
| Ms. Rena Warner | Senior Project Analyst, Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP | |
| Ms. Fiona Francis | Project Analyst, Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP | |
| Site visit | Marine Areas | Thursday 9 th February 2017 |
| Ms. Marcia Stubbs | | |

| First Findings Presentation | | Friday 10 th February 9:00am |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Mr. Mizushi Satoh | UNDP Barbados and the OECS | |
| Ms. Claudia Drew | Project Coordinator | |
| Ms. Phynora Ible | Administrative Assistance, PCU | |
| Mr. Sylvester Belle | Senior Environmental Officer | |
| Visit Brimstone Hill Fortress | | Friday 10 th February 11:00am |

ANNEX 4: SAMPLE INTERVIEW GUIDE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

- (1) How relevant is the project?
- (2) What have been the project's achievements (at the output, outcome, results levels)?
- (3) How were these results achieved? What issues have arisen that hinder the achievement of results?
- (4) What planning instruments were designed, adopted and / or implemented to deal with effective Protected Area management in the site-specific areas and in St. Kitts and Nevis as a whole?
- (5) What effects or impacts (change) have occurred due to the project (policy, investments, etc.)?
- (6) Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, as well as the private sector and universities, NGOs, CBOs, Associations, etc., involved in the project preparation and execution? What has been the effective role of the steering committee?
- (7) How did the partnership and management arrangements between different institutions work and when it did not)? Was it effective? Efficient?
- (8) What have been the issues or problems encountered in the implementation of the project?
- (9) What have been the projects weaknesses, if any?
- (10)How is the work with the communities carried out? With stakeholders (NGOs, private sector, etc.?)
- (11)What are the probabilities that results would be sustained over the medium/long term?
- (12)If something could have been done different, in hindsight what could this have been (lesson learned)?

ANNEX 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- ✦ Communication Inception Report
- ✦ Conserving Biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their Areas of Influence. Technical Report. 2014
- ✦ EASTERN CARIBBEAN MARINE MANAGED AREAS NETWORK (ECMMAN) PROJECT Fact Sheet. The German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB)/TNC
- ✦ ECMMAN – Eastern Caribbean Marine Managed Areas Network Report. German Government / TNC
- ✦ Inception Meeting Minutes held 9 Oct 2015
- ✦ Inception Report - Preparation of a Sustainable Financing Plan for Protected Areas in St Kitts and Nevis
- ✦ Inception Report Standard Operating Procedure
- ✦ KAPB Analysis Report – Summary Findings
- ✦ Marine Zoning in Saint Kitts and Nevis a Path Towards Sustainable Management of Marine Resources. TNC/USAID, 2010
- ✦ National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA) Bill 2nd Revised Draft 2016
- ✦ National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA) Bill Protected Area Regulations 2016 draft
- ✦ Project Annual Work Plan 2017
- ✦ Project Implementation Review
- ✦ Project Multi Year Work Plan
- ✦ Project Quarterly Report April to June 2016
- ✦ Project Quarterly Report July to September 2016
- ✦ Project Quarterly Report October to December 2016
- ✦ Project Steering Committee Minutes held 14 May 2015
- ✦ Project Steering Committee Minutes held 16 Aug 2016
- ✦ Project Steering Committee Minutes held 19 April 2016
- ✦ Project Steering Committee Minutes held 8 Dec 2015
- ✦ Protected Area Management Authority Act 2016 draft
- ✦ Protected Area Management Plan 2016 draft
- ✦ Report and the World Database on Protected Areas, Saint Kitts and Nevis. January 2015. WDP/UNEP
- ✦ Report on Legislative Review Committee Meetings
- ✦ Report on Public and Stakeholder Consultation - NCEMA
- ✦ Stakeholder Consultation Report - Preparation of a Sustainable Financing Plan for Protected Areas in St Kitts and Nevis
- ✦ Standard Operating Procedure 1st Draft
- ✦ Sustainable Financing & Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project (P103470). Public Disclosure Copy. World Bank. 2016.
- ✦ Terrestrial Ecological Inventory – Inception Report and Workplan
- ✦ Terrestrial Ecological Inventory – Literature Review
- ✦ The World Bank Implementation Status & Results Report
- ✦ Year End Project Report Nov 2016

ANNEX 6: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX

(EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA,
AND METHODOLOGY)

| 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>To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?</p> | <p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.</p> <p>Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities</p> <p>Addressing gaps in capacity framework.</p> | <p>National policies</p> <p>Project Document</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> |
| <p>How relevant the project's intended outcomes?</p> | <p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives</p> | <p>Project documents and evaluations</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> |
| <p>Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?</p> | <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</p> | <p>Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, UNDP, Project Management</p> | <p>Interviews</p> |
| <p>Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?</p> <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 St. Kitts and Nevis?</p> <p>To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs</p> | <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Coherence UNDP and GEF operational programming</p> | <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>UNDAF, UNDP/GEF Programming statements</p> | <p>Interviews</p> <p>Document analysis</p> |

Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>What expected outputs have been achieved thus far?</p> <p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</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>Changes in policy attributable to project regrading climate change adaptation in the tourism sector</p> | <p>Project outcomes</p> <p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p> | <p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholders interviews</p> |
| <p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to Pas?</p> | <p>Involvement of beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, etc.).</p> <p>Effect of project aspects implemented at sites</p> | <p>Project outputs and outcomes</p> | <p>Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p> |
| <p>What is causing delays in implementation in particular outputs for the Conserving Biodiversity project?</p> <p>Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'?</p> <p>How can these issues be solved?</p> <p>What changes need to be implemented?</p> | <p>Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of mid-term and actual achievements</p> | <p>Findings in project documents, achievement indicators</p> | <p>Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)</p> <p>Site visits observation</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 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 St. Kitts and Nevis, Project team, UNDP | Interviews |
| Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project | 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 |
| Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: 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? | | | |
| Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | Policies adopted / enacted Policies implemented Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn | Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented) Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes | Documentation analysis Stakeholder interviews |
| | 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 St. Kitts and Nevis, Project team, UNDP |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| 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 results framework and log frame | Project documents and reports |
| Social sustainability factors | Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? | Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained | Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, 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 will be sustained | Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, Project team, UNDP; tourism endeavours |
| Replicability | Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? | Evidence that particular practices will be sustained | Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, Project team, UNDP |

ANNEX 7: SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM FOR TEAM LEADER

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Maria ONESTINI

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at Buenos Aires, Argentina (*Place*) on December 1 2017 (*Date*)

Signature: 