



## PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION

“Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected areas and their Buffer zones project in St. Kitts and Nevis”

UNDP PIMS 5088

GEF ID: 00080909

GEF FOCAL AREA: BIODIVERSITY

STRATEGIC PROGRAM OF GEF 5

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

### **EXECUTING ENTITY/IMPLEMENTING PARTNER:**

Ministry of Sustainable Development - Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning

### **IMPLEMENTING ENTITY/RESPONSIBLE PARTNERS:**

Department of Physical Planning and Environment (Nevis); Department of Environment (St. Kitts)

REGION: CARIBBEAN

COUNTRY: ST KITTS AND NEVIS

Evaluation conducted by:  
Mrs. Stephanie Hodge (International consultant)  
from June 2020 to September 2020  
Report submitted September 11, 2020

## Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	4
<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
- Project summary table .....	6
- Project description .....	6
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons .....	6
- Purpose of the evaluation.....	18
- Scope & methodology.....	19
- Structure of the evaluation report .....	21
<b>2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>21</b>
- Project start and duration.....	21
- Problems that the project sought to address.....	22
- Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	23
- Baseline Indicators established .....	24
- Main stakeholders at Project Inception .....	25
- Expected Results.....	27
<b>4. FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.1 RELEVANCE/FORMULATION/OWNERSHIP / DESIGN (MS).....</b>	<b>30</b>
- Country ownership.....	30
- Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators .....	31
- Assumptions and Risks.....	34
- Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.....	35
- Planned stakeholder participation and partnerships arrangements .....	35
- Replication approach .....	39
- Linkages between the Project and other interventions within the sector .....	40
<b>4.2 EFFECTIVENESS (MANAGEMENT, IMPLEMENTATION AND FACTORS INFLUENCING RESULTS) .....</b>	<b>41</b>
- Project Management and Coordination, Implementation/Execution (MU*).....	41
- Work planning .....	44
- Cofinancing .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

-	Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (MU *) .....	44
-	Gender and Mainstreaming .....	45
<b>4.3</b>	<b>EFFECTIVENESS - RESULTS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
-	<i>Overall results (attainment of objectives) *Moderately Satisfactory (MS) .....</i>	<i>46</i>
-	<i>Overall Assessment of Project Objective: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) .....</i>	<i>47</i>
-	<i>Expected Outcomes via Outputs (See Assessed Log frame indicators in Annex) .....</i>	<i>48</i>
-	<i>Overall Assessment of Results from Component One: Moderately Satisfactory MS .....</i>	<i>50</i>
-	<i>Overall Assessment of Component Two: Moderately Satisfactory MS .....</i>	<i>53</i>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>EFFICIENCY (MS) .....</b>	<b>54</b>
-	Adaptive Management/Capacity Building Approach .....	55
<b>4.</b>	<b>SUSTAINABILITY (Moderately Likely) .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>IMPACT .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>LESSONS .....</b>	<b>63</b>

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<b>APR</b>	<b>Annual Progress Report</b>
<b>AWP</b>	<b>Annual Work Plan</b>
<b>BFNP</b>	<b>Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park</b>
<b>BI</b>	<b>Booby Island</b>
<b>BINR</b>	<b>Booby Island Nature Reserve</b>
<b>CARICOM</b>	<b>Caribbean Community</b>
<b>CFRNP</b>	<b>Central Forest Reserve National Park</b>
<b>CCF</b>	<b>Country Cooperation Framework (UNDP)</b>
<b>CBD</b>	<b>Convention on Biological Diversity</b>
<b>CITES</b>	<b>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (UNDP)</b>
<b>CO</b>	<b>Country Office</b>
<hr/>	
<b>CTA</b>	<b>Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation</b>
<b>CTA</b>	<b>Chief Technical Advisor</b>
<b>DEA-PSIP</b>	<b>Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning</b>
<b>DOE</b>	<b>Department of Environment</b>
<b>DMR</b>	<b>Department of Marine Resources (St. Kitts and Nevis)</b>
<b>DPP</b>	<b>Department of Physical Planning (St. Kitts)</b>
<b>DPPE</b>	<b>Department of Physical Planning and the Environment (Nevis)</b>
<b>EBD</b>	<b>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</b>
<b>ESSP</b>	<b>(UNDP's) Environmental and Social Screening Procedure</b>
<b>GEF</b>	<b>Global Environment Facility</b>
<b>GOSKN</b>	<b>Government of St. Kitts and Nevis</b>
<b>IUCN</b>	<b>International Union for the Conservation of Nature</b>
<b>IBA</b>	<b>Important Bird and Biodiversity Area</b>
<b>KBA</b>	<b>Key Biodiversity Area</b>
<b>LPAC</b>	<b>Local Project Appraisal Committee</b>
<b>MAB</b>	<b>Man and Biosphere Programme (UNESCO)</b>
<b>MCSS</b>	<b>Marine Conservation Society of Seychelles</b>
<b>MCZ</b>	<b>Marine Conservation Zones</b>
<b>METT</b>	<b>Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</b>
<b>MMA</b>	<b>Marine Management Area</b>
<b>MPA</b>	<b>Marine Protected Area</b>
<b>MOU</b>	<b>Memorandum of Understanding</b>
<b>MAMRCE</b>	<b>Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources and Constituency Empowerment</b>
<b>MoSD</b>	<b>Ministry of Sustainable Development</b>
<b>M&amp;E</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>
<b>MEA</b>	<b>Multi-lateral Environmental Agreement</b>
<b>MTR</b>	<b>Mid Term Review</b>
<b>NBSAP</b>	<b>National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan</b>
<b>NCEMA</b>	<b>National Conservation and Environmental Management Act</b>

<b>NCEPA</b>	<b>National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act</b>
<b>NCTF</b>	<b>National Conservation Trust Fund</b>
<b>NEC</b>	<b>National Environmental Committee</b>
<b>NDF</b>	<b>Nevis Department of Fisheries</b>
<b>NEV</b>	<b>Nevis</b>
<b>NIA</b>	<b>Nevis Island Administration</b>
<b>NIM</b>	<b>National Implementation Modality</b>
<b>NHCS</b>	<b>Nevis Historical and Conservation Society</b>
<b>NPDP</b>	<b>Nevis Physical Development Plan</b>
<b>NPD</b>	<b>National Project Director</b>
<b>NPNPCRWA</b>	<b>Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area</b>
<b>NGO</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Organization</b>
<b>OECS</b>	<b>Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States</b>
<b>OPAAL</b>	<b>OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods Project</b>
<b>PAs</b>	<b>Protected Areas</b>
<b>PAA</b>	<b>Protected Area Agency</b>
<b>PCU</b>	<b>Project Coordinating Unit</b>
<b>PERB</b>	<b>Protecting the Eastern Caribbean Region's Biodiversity</b>
<b>PIR</b>	<b>Project Implementation Report</b>
<b>Prodoc</b>	<b>Project Document</b>
<b>PSC</b>	<b>Project Steering Committee</b>
<b>RAPPAM</b>	<b>Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management</b>
<b>RBVNP</b>	<b>Royal Basseterre Valley National Park</b>
<b>RCU</b>	<b>(UNDP) Regional Coordinating Unit</b>
<b>RTA</b>	<b>(UNDP) Regional Technical Advisor</b>
<b>SCNT</b>	<b>St. Christopher National Trust</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>Sustainable Development</b>
<b>SGP</b>	<b>Small Grants Programme</b>
<b>SK</b>	<b>St. Kitts</b>
<b>SKN</b>	<b>St. Kitts and Nevis</b>
<b>SKSTMN</b>	<b>St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network</b>
<b>SLM</b>	<b>Climate Change and Sustainable Land Management Project</b>
<b>TBW</b>	<b>Total Budget and Work Plan</b>
<b>TE</b>	<b>Terminal Evaluation</b>
<b>TE</b>	<b>Terminal Evaluator</b>
<b>ToR</b>	<b>Terms of Reference</b>
<b>TNC</b>	<b>The Nature Conservancy</b>
<b>TPA</b>	<b>Terrestrial Protected Area</b>
<b>USAID</b>	<b>United States Agency for International Development</b>
<b>UNDAF</b>	<b>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</b>
<b>UNDP</b>	<b>United Nations Development Programme</b>
<b>WSD</b>	<b>Water Services Department (St. Kitts)</b>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### - Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Conserving biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence			
GEF Project ID:	00080909		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	Atlas ID 00090420 PIMS 5088	GEF financing:	3,371,630.00	
Country:	St. Kitts Nevis	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	17,140,000.00	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	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	Total co-financing:	17,140,000.00	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives	Total Project Cost:	20,511,630.00	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Sustainable Development Ministry of Communication et al	ProDoc Signature (date project began): 19 November 2014		Original Closing Date: 19 May 2018
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 19 November 2018	Actual: 30 November 2020

### - Project Description (brief)

The project aimed to expand the existing PA system through the establishment of two new terrestrial PAs and three new marine PAs (the first marine PAs in the country). In addition, the Project aimed at addressing systemic issues by implementing key elements of SKN's Protected Areas System Plan, including the establishment of a centralized agency for protected areas management, the introduction of user fees to offset PA management costs, the creation and revision of PA site management plans and the implementation of key conservation actions (biodiversity inventories, coral reef conservation) within specific PA sites, thereby strengthening PA management capacities and the ability to reduce or eliminate threats to biodiversity including habitat destruction and over-exploitation of marine biodiversity resources. The *proposed project originally aimed to implement measures to reduce habitat degradation in PA buffer areas which are having an adverse impact on the ecological integrity of protected areas*. Finally, the project intended to assist St. Kitts and Nevis to achieve the Aichi targets, in particular target 11, by 2020: at least 17 percent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. It supported the following goals of the CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas: 1.2 To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors to maintain ecological structure and function; 1.4 To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management; 1.5 To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas; 3.1 To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas; and 3.5 To strengthen communication, education and public awareness.

### - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

#### Conclusions

##### Relevance

- The Project is highly relevant and consistent with the Government's priorities as set out in the national policy documents at the start of the Project, and remained the case. The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis

ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 7 January 1993. The Project has contributed to assisting St. Kitts and Nevis in achieving the following goals of the CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA): 1.2 to integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors to maintain ecological structure and function, 1.4 to substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management, 1.5 to prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas, 3.1 to provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas and 3.5 to strengthen communication, education and public awareness. The Project's focus on biodiversity conservation and protected area management supported both the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2004), which sought to promote the conservation and management of the country's biodiversity and the Protected Areas Systems Plan for St. Kitts and Nevis (2010), which identified some "highest priority" actions that will be addressed by this Project. These included the enactment of the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA), declaration of the Nevis Peak Forest Reserve as a National Park and creation of a Management Plan for the new Nevis Peak NP. The Project was also consistent with the National Environmental Management Strategy and Action Plan (2005–2009), which defined key strategies and interventions for environmental management in the context of sustainable development, including Prevent and Manage the Causes and Impacts of Disaster, Ensure the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Protect and Conserve Biological Diversity.

- The Project concept supported mainstreaming of the PA work in the National Physical Development Plan (NPDP), which provided an overall strategic planning framework to guide development and capital infrastructure investment decisions in the country over the next fifteen years. This framework arranged, among its main policy interventions, to "protect and sustain long-term use of mangroves, seagrass beds, coral reefs, ponds and beaches," "declare areas with unique terrain, flora and fauna and high recreational potential as national parks," "establish marine reserves to protect biodiversity in coastal habitat reserves [that] are proposed at Sandy Point and the Southeast Peninsula" and "develop and implement conservation-oriented farming technologies specifically adapted to local conditions." However, the Project did not work on the National Physical Development Plan.
- The Nevis Physical Development Plan similarly included policies and guidelines for sustainable development and sought to guide the location of housing, industry, parks/conservation areas and hotel and tourism development regarding land suitability and other physical and environmental attributes. One of the activities helped to update and revise the draft plan, including consideration of protected areas to be established on the island.
- The Project provided a supportive contribution to SKN to achieve one of the nine objectives identified in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (2015–2016), namely "reducing the risk to Saint Kitts and Nevis of environmental, climatic and other related natural disasters, and particularly to those who are the most vulnerable." Finally, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis was a signatory to the regional Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI), which aimed to set a new course for conserving and sustainably managing the marine and coastal environment across the Caribbean. The CCI entailed a commitment from the countries to effectively conserve at least 20% of their near-shore marine/coastal environment by 2020 and to support and put in place a new sustainable finance architecture to generate long-term funding for the marine and coastal environment. By supporting the establishment of the first marine protected areas in the country and the development of sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas, the proposed Project would play a critical role in helping the Government of SKN to meet these commitments.
- In terms of **project formulation, logical framework and design**, the project had overambitious targets and lacked a theory of change (this was not a requirement in design at the time of formulation) that might have supported stronger implementation towards results. In general the monitoring was conducted through the steering committee and its deliberations concerning the work plan. The lack of smart indicators and targets was not useful as a monitoring tool. This challenged the final evaluation. The TE evaluator was to define 'contributions' to unclear end targets that were not formally adapted. This was unfortunate especially as the project had a lengthy and costly MTR and the ME framework was left uncorrected. Additionally, this

project did not set baseline and benchmarks for gender mainstreaming. UNDP at the time did not have its safeguard policy. This left the gender mainstreaming baseline and goals vague and unsupported by strong monitoring checks and balances.

### *Effectiveness*

- The project obtainment of the overall results against the outputs is assessed by respondents to be at 60%. The general consensus is that the intervention has provided a readying effort for an improved and financial stable PA system. The country became more cognizant of the need to declare and operate PAs, and the staffing and management of the areas have increased. However, the targeted PAs were not declared, and the finance model nor the operational institutional structure were not achieved. The newly agreed "interim structure" was not formally adopted by the Cabinet or operationalized during implementation. A good result is that the country has become more aware of the need to declare the sites, and there is increase in management knowledge of gaps and what to do (especially clear in terrestrial PAs).
- In general, the Project has met 60% of its expected outcomes. The Project interventions focus were on sensitization and knowledge inputs, through many steering committee deliberations. The Project provided significant contributions to the enabling environment through key knowledge products including legal and financial reviews. In terms of the targets, it was recognized early that the ProDoc targets were overambitious, especially regarding the assumption that the government would financially support an independent authority and/or financing coordination during implementation.
- The project design was approved well before implementation started. The Project strategy along with the supportive work of the chief technical advisor was adapted by stakeholders during the steering committee meetings. The PSC communicated that the strategy outlined in the project document would not be sustainable. As a result, it was recommended that the vision /target be "virtual," drawing on the existing expertise from the DMR, Department of Environment and Department of Planning and Environment (Nevis) and other stakeholders to form a more coordinated approach to PA management as opposed to the creation of a new entity. The monitoring approach became an iterative exercise. While not the ideal approach in terms of project implementation and monitoring for results, it was necessary given the context. In this regard, respondents shared consensus that if the steering committee meetings had been more organized and managed (as well as PSC adaptive management decision recorded) including for collaborative work, coordination and joint work planning purposes, there may have been more significant and sustainable results by the end. There are many lessons learned about project implementation and particularly about the projects management ability to undertake adaptation and to record changes during the implementation including during the MTR.
- DMR is very used to working with stakeholders and having their buy-in during the decision-making process was critical to the success of this Project. The DMR has been highly successful toward the project goals, but this was not as a result of the Project per se. This was not the case for DOE and its work on terrestrial PAs.
- The implementing arrangements were set before the DMR gained more experience implement the MCA project and once against demonstrated the importance of timing the project start after conceptualization and agreements. The DMR with more experience and 'influence' in PA management, might have been made the IP in a changed content.
- In terms of upstream work, the project registers success as the Ministry of Legal Affairs et al is currently amending the documents by adding the recommendations of the legal consultant to present the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill for its second reading. Meanwhile, the Department of Environment has already begun work on financing and project-related products to move forward in their plans. The legislative revisions have been contributed to by the project outputs and including decisions on the financing mechanisms. The issue mentioned above was more in the monitoring that the envisioned

pathway ( target remained in the documentation ) for a single financing mechanism for PA management was not taken forward as laid out in the project document, yet the work on financing is advancing but in a dual sense, with two operational leads instead of one national authority.

- The Project nonetheless raised the bar on the science-to-policy nexus and set the stage for more work on the management system. However, the Project goals were overambitious and in hindsight needed government focus on “readiness” to work on a coordinated systems approach. The cross-sectoral work was especially important as the consensus and vision for a common PA system needed to be in place. Additionally, while undertaking joint work on inventory and scientific baseline was a key output, it was only moving toward a full inventory near the Project end. Such work is key in terms of knowing what was at stake. This inventory is a key knowledge input for the PA system in the country. This work is essential, and it is not complete. The TE assessed the view on the marine inventory and learned that some baseline information was missing. This information still needs to be unified and included in a consolidated economic, social policy and legal document as a final report with a summary of what was done, what was learned and what is the way forward. The CTA reviewed the final outputs, but the DMR did not find them to be in line with their Department’s direction.
- The TE provides the following explanation why there was divergence about the science-based inventory. There was a disconnect surrounding the PSCs expectations and the delivery. For example, component two included work on terrestrial and marine inventories. However, there were problems with the methodologies and results counts which went unresolved. For instance, due to the inaccessibility of some of the areas, the consultants were reported by key interviewees, to have not had delivered the full picture. Researchers needed to go off trail (with military-for safety, in places to be avoided) and needed support for trail clearing to key areas with possible unique biodiversity. For those species which were unlikely to be found in the more accessible areas, drones or military interventions were needed for support. The CTA helped draft the marine assessment ToR in consultation with the DMR to bring them in line with the needs of the DMR. CTA did not have input in the terrestrial ToR.
- The TE noted that the recommended changes were not formalized in the MTR; however, interviewees reported they understood what was expected, prioritized and possible and had commented on it through the deliberation of the steering committee.
- Outstanding but critical key results to be accomplished by the end of the extended project in October i include the following:
  - During TE the Project was granted one more extension until November 2020 due to COVID-19 delays and adjustment to implementation. The outstanding results, expected to be completed by October 2020 (2,3,4 depend on government will), include:
    1. Development of the Marine Species Rehabilitation Center on St. Kitts;
    2. Getting clarity on direction and the PA management authority agreements, for which the legal work is drafted but needs to be presented and enacted. It may also need further benchmarking by an international GEF technical advisor;
    3. The financial work plans and recommendations are there but need to be addressed in line with the Finance Administration Act (2007) of the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis and be championed by the Departments of Environment on both St. Kitts and Nevis. It is in the view of the TE evaluation that the country may better move into a landscape/seascape approach/Ridge to Reef as opposed to an MPA vs TPA approach. The former makes the case for the need of integrating both types of PAs for the sake of the sustainability of both areas (fisheries, terrestrial biodiversity, ecosystem services, etc.);
    4. The declaration of two terrestrial protected areas.

*Efficiency*

- Cost-effectiveness is a measure of efficiency and expected results. Concordant with the ProDoc, the PA system project was designed to be a catalytic investment through the development of key partnerships and cost-sharing approaches to expand the Protected Areas estate in St. Kitts and Nevis and to ensure that new PA sites are effectively managed for biodiversity conservation and the preservation of ecosystem functions. According to the project document, the Project was cost-effective by design for the following reasons:
  - The estimated initial capital expenditure and operating costs (during four years of the Project) to establish effective PA management at the seven targeted PA sites was US\$ 2,534,630, or approximately US\$ 634,000/year. Once basic infrastructure, equipment, baseline information collecting and capacity building are in place, however, the ongoing capital and operational costs to maintain basic PA management are significantly reduced to an estimated level of US\$ 245,000/year. Thus, a catalytic investment by the GEF in the initial start-up costs to operationalize these seven PA units was to have substantially reduced the recurrent costs of managing them over the long term.
  - The project's investment in PA business planning and development of financial sustainability mechanisms was to contribute to increasing and stabilizing the funding of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis. As a result of project investments (see GEF Tracking Tool, Financial Scorecard, Annex 1), it was projected that by project end, the revenues for the newly created Protected Areas System (excluding Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park (managed by an NGO and funded independently) would increase from a baseline of US\$ 0/year to approximately US\$ 250,000/year with significant new income from user and visitor fees. This was not planned or monitored. Also, it was envisioned that once the National Conservation Trust Fund is operational, financing from that fund and the regional Caribbean Biodiversity Fund would channel another US\$ 429,000/year to protected areas (and possibly climate change adaptation activities) in the country. This estimate is conservative in that it does not include any estimate of increased donor funding although the establishment of a Protected Areas Agency and the formal declaration of new protected areas, including the country's first marine protected areas, can be expected to increase donor interest in and support for PA management.
  - The ProDoc was premised on the idea that by improving the quality of baseline information on ecological conditions and establishing a Protected Areas Information System, the Project will help PA managers to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of their management decisions. The Project was to support cost-effectiveness by jointly implementing ecological baseline studies and conservation programs for PA sites on both St. Kitts and Nevis, thereby avoiding any duplication of effort and promoting the sharing of equipment, materials and other resources. Project capacity building of protected area management staff will ensure that the productivity and effectiveness of the human resources available to support each PA site are enhanced and optimally organized. Overall, the concurrent establishment and operationalization of the seven PA units would produce significant benefits in terms of the sharing of resources and expertise among the different sites. In general the project has supported the institutional capacity through catalyzing the recruitment of rangers and conservation officers in MOE and DMR and this has been a significant input for the country in terms of changing the business as usual. Such recruitments need to be supported with standards and guidelines on what is their role and how to co-manage across departments.
  - While the Project has been somewhat cost-effective and efficient against its stated expected outcome, this statement and the perception of the efficiency per the ProDoc as a catalytic investment toward income gains has to be measured against the fact that, although the Project has had some notable successes, it has not fully benefited from the greater structural changes envisaged in terms of its stated goal to establish a coordinated or management "independent" authority with clear management protocols for financing PA and coordination of conservation staff across sectors.

The Project has been somewhat efficient in that it implemented cost-efficient measures throughout its life. Such measures are as follows:

- Procurement of services and goods: To ensure the Project received value for money, detailed terms of reference were developed, published and advertised as widely as possible and then evaluated by counterparts with the expertise in the subject matter. Bids were evaluated and awarded following full

compliance of policies and procedures. Items of lower value were procured by using the three quotes method, and the best quality and lowest price were selected. The Project team negotiated lower prices when possible.

- The Project Coordinating Unit was housed within the Department of Environment and used their in-house resources (printer, copier, etc.), which reduced the cost incurred by the Project as part of the Government co-financing arrangement. This also included the cost of office space and utilities.
- Experts and specialists within the various Government departments were utilized at no additional cost to the Project when necessary instead of procuring the services of such experts (such as architectural services for the Nevis Interpretation Centre and the Central Forest Reserve National Park Public Restroom) for procurement and financial management.
- Some communication materials were created by the Project Team, the Department of Environment, and the Department of Marine Resources staff to reduce expenses. (e.g. Graphic design of public awareness benches).
- Cost estimates: Request for information were carried out when necessary to provide accurate budgeting. Constant comparisons of forecast and actual costs, usually followed by reforecasting (or reprioritizing when necessary), were practiced, ensuring that the Project stayed within budget and received value for money.
- The use of the Royal St. Kitts Nevis Defence Force Coast Guard vessel helped transfer staff between St. Kitts and Nevis and assistance with marine assessment and conservation monitoring activities saved the project's cost on a few occasions.

#### *Sustainability*

- The sustainability is moderately likely, due to the absence of supportive evidence to show that the intervention unchanged (at MTR) targets to support the institutional, legal and structural changes or to operationalize the interim PA institutional coordination mechanism designed by the Project was met. This fact is somewhat countered by the fact that the government has indeed hired conservation officers and these new staff will have to be jointly guided and managed.
- The ProDoc set forth ambitious expectations for sustainability and outlined a dynamic plan based on the assumptions of the Project pathways including the legal and structural changes (legal and policy upgrades, etc.) expected to be initiated during implementation. The Project's strategy and results were premised on the institutional and financial sustainability that were to be achieved by establishing the Protected Areas Agency (PAA) as an independent statutory body during implementation and the revision and strengthening of financial mechanisms and resources so that the PAA could provide at least "basic" management functions for all PA sites. Relying only on its revenue sources (as opposed to ongoing government budget allocations), the Project was to create for the first time in the country an agency dedicated specifically to PA management and sufficiently funded to ensure its effectiveness. That was not the broader results but changed significantly between the conception of the idea and the start of implementation. While the original strategy and target around an independent authority was not met an interim agreement on coordination has been reached and now needs to be operationalized with DOE and DMR leading.
- Next, environmental sustainability was expected to be promoted through the Project by developing and implementing a coordinated, multi-stakeholder approach to expanding and strengthening the system of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis, set within the existing overarching strategies articulated in the St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area Plan and the Protected Areas Systems Plan. The assumption was that by establishing a Protected Areas Agency with dedicated staff enabled with sufficient financial and technical resources, facilities and equipment to actively manage, monitor and conserve seven PA sites, the Project would greatly increase the country's ability to protect critical marine and terrestrial habitats and preserve ecosystem functioning in areas that currently had no effective protection. Furthermore, by carrying out assessments and monitoring of key habitats and species and implementing conservation and protection programs based on that work, the Project would allow PA managers to greatly increase their

ability to focus resources on the most important habitats and species and respond to the most urgent threats. This work is advancing, and there is indication is that it will pass.

- Additionally, social sustainability was to be achieved/primarily enhanced in the Project through the processes to plan for and implement conservation and sustainable development initiatives at protected area sites. Decisions about the zoning and resource use restrictions within terrestrial and marine protected areas, including zoning for tourism and fisheries activities, would involve numerous stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, CSOs and other community groups. In addition, private sector stakeholder groups, such as commercial fishermen, marine sports operators, tour guides and outdoor adventure operators, would be able to participate in decisions about PA boundary setting and zoning and the regulations adopted for conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources within terrestrial and marine PAs. The Project was expected to support PA managers in working with fishermen, tourism operators, farmers, and other residents to collaboratively seek solutions that balance the needs of these groups and the biodiversity conservation and ecosystem functioning objectives of the designated PA sites. The involvement of stakeholders in the ecosystem-wide processes and the operational protected area planning would be guided by stakeholder engagement plans, which would include provisions for conflict management with different user groups. This important component two work never advanced. However, it can be advanced in a possible phase two of GEF support to SKN on biodiversity.

### *Impact*

- In terms of the verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress that can be linked directly to project interventions, the project has made a limited contribution to improved ecological conditions including through reduced, expanded and improved management of protected areas mostly in terms of component one knowledge projects and upstream work. For example, in terms of project overall impact level results, this Project concretely supported the following policies/legal arrangements:
  - o Nevis Physical Development Plan, June 2020
  - o Protected Areas Management Authority Act (draft), June 2020
  - o National Conservation and Environment Management Act (draft), June 2020
  - o Protected Areas Standard Operating Procedures, July 2017
  - o Protected Areas Financing Mechanism, February 2020
  - o Protected Areas Institutional Structure, April 2018.
- Two, three and six above relate to the institutional structure and are not formally approved or operational by the Government. While the Project drafted an alternative institutional structure, and it was approved by the Permanent Secretaries on Nevis and St. Kitts, all this requires will, operationalization and capacity building (key follow-up) especially initiated by DOE. (See results of work on organizational structure and fiscal projections in annexes). The TE believes that the adoption of these items has to come from a recognized need at the leadership of the environment departments on both islands, and the Project can then consolidate this work (see list of consultancies Annex) and make the socioeconomic and policy case in a compelling, readable way. The related fiscal recommendations are outlined in the Financing Strategy on how to staff and operationalize the parks and to make them fiscally viable. The will to move forward on this post-project must come from the lead agencies involved.
- The impact on the readiness and enabling environment has been relatively substantive. However, the research and knowledge work for decision-making needs to be consolidated and more cleverly packaged for a higher policy audience. The impacts on education and public awareness are unquantifiable but seem to have been lasting. One indication is that young people are coming more to volunteer and inquire about the work of marine conservation according to the head of the marine resources. This is a significant indication of the occurrence of mind-shift changes. Impacts on the natural environment have been nominal. The impact on environmental change will come much later in this process after a management system is firmly established, more community stewardship and education, and a fiscally viable management model is established.

## Lesson Learned

- The seriousness of recognizing the time lag and differences between concept at formulation and project implementation and the awareness that things can radically change requires that the Project must have some flexibility to change targets at that point. In this case, the assumption was the establishment during the implementation of legal and institutional foundations for a single management authority with financial oversight and control of funds for PA management. Alternative pathways were necessary.
- The project has clearly brought to light the following key lessons:

Design	This project was clearly designed with overambitious targets. The project document presented poorly informed design of indicators and baselines/M&E framework for the task at hand. The strategies and the PA model also lacked strong socio-political analysis and situational baseline especially in terms of the local knowledge and situations. The linkages between outcomes should have been stronger and the addition of cross cutting areas would have helped project management make the linkages in work plans. In the future, strategies towards results need to be better presented and a theory of change required. For new PA projects with near baseline zero knowledge, a PA systems project should be designed in phases to utilize the benefit of having a good vision but allowing for the time and care needed for learning pathways toward transformative changes; This country lacked 'readiness' for a coordinated systems approach. Additionally, the work on inventories and setting scientific baselines was under budgeted.
	For new projects on biodiversity, it is critical that scientific, financial and social change and policy level indicators and baselines are well established and the implementation pathways are written into the project design research at the onset and that stakeholders are thoroughly assessed to make sure that new projects are not duplicating projects, functions, etc. already in process;
	This project clearly shows the issue of a substantive time lag between implementation and design. The model and financing strategy was found not to be feasible/financially viable at start and so a new project plan was needed from inception. This needed agreement from UNDP, SKN and GEF partners.
	For NIM plus UNDP support projects, it is a good idea to have a third component to support project implementation learning, results-based monitoring and knowledge management to enable learning/communications for results during implementation and sustainability and for results; Governments normally do not include budgets and strategies for this important softer work which is critical to results.
	All future UNDP-GEF-NIM projects require more incorporation of guidance on SES safeguards and knowledge/learning and as such will enable focused attention on working and implementing through women's participation and communities and for biodiversity project -possibly on future co-management in project implementation.
Implementation	Steering committees in GEF projects are intended for high-level partner (UNDP, SKN, and GEF) discussions and decision-making on technically vetted work plans. The projects might use other platforms for technical work planning and deliberations;
	This project clearly shows the disadvantage of having limited stakeholder engagement in implementation. The mechanism provided in the UNDP/GEF project were not used including technical committee for broader stakeholder engagements. Additionally, stance, tourism and education were key partners and not actively involved or engaged. The project relied much too heavily on steering committee for monitoring and decision making which has shown to be to broad a forum for decision making and technical work plan planning. Optimally a technical committee (s) might/may have been set up for broader work planning and debates/solutions on implementation.
	This project shows the importance of clarifying the rules in a NIM plus UNDP support project. The coordination between role and clarification of what is required and what is possible in a GEF project implementation required strengthening (UNDP execution of the project) rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
	This project shown a failure to document the financial and policy case clearly for the changes in institutional and operational structures during the ME and in PIMs.

## Recommendations

- During TE, the Project was granted one more extension until November 2020 due to COVID-19 delays. The outstanding results that can be completed by then include:
  - ✓ The development of the Keys Marine Species Rehabilitation/interpretation Center on St. Kitts;
  - ✓ The PA management authority agreements, for which the legal work is drafted, presented and enacted. All need to be taken forward by the Government. The project contributed to policies and draft agreements but cannot do legislative approvals. This will depend on the processes that will not depend on the project. There were elections in June 2020 and changes in Government. The new Government will need a final brief on all types of legislation, not only PA legislation. TE suggests the completed work needs final vetting by the international chief GEF or CTA technical advisor;
  - ✓ The financial work plans and recommendations, which are there, but UNDP-GEF/DOE/DMR must take them forward undertake discussions with the Ministry of Finance;
  - ✓ The declaration of two terrestrial protected areas.
- **UNDP-GEF Finalize the outstanding outputs by November 2020**
  - Outstanding outputs not yet finalized due to COVID-19 but are anticipated:
  - ✓ The Department of Marine Resources and the St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network were anticipating the operationalization of the Keys Marine Species Rehabilitation/Interpretation Center which was halted by closures. The completion of the Center was viewed by stakeholders as highly beneficial to the Federation because it created a base for the treatment and rehabilitation of endangered marine species. This will be a first in St. Kitts Nevis and the wider Caribbean region and will provide education and training opportunities in the marine sector that were not previously available. The St. Christopher National Trust was in high gear with implementing its outreach and public awareness in the schools and to the public in conjunction with the Project, but this was also halted by the closure of schools. The completion of these public awareness activities will vastly help citizens to take a more active role in the conservation of their biodiversity.
  - ✓ Plans were underway for the second reading of the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill in Parliament. This is now secondary to the urgent need for the development and revision of COVID-19 legislation. The automatic declaration of Booby Island Nature Reserve would have been covered in the passing of this Bill, which is a critical foundation for the implementation of many environmental protection activities.
  - ✓ The Department of Physical Planning and Environment within the NIA, along with other stakeholders on Nevis, was looking forward to validating the Nevis Physical Development Plan. Travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders delayed the plan's finalization. Many draft policy guidelines for the island of Nevis have been on hold for years due to the lack of an updated approved Physical Development Plan. The completion of the plan will aid in better protection of the island resources. To ensure that the plan is completed at TE, the Department of Physical Planning and Environment within the NIA agreed to a series of online meetings to cover all policy areas. The consultancy had planned to wrap up in mid-May with the overall theme of planning for increased resilience to natural (and health) hazards, climate change impacts and economic vulnerabilities and challenges across all the topics.
- **UNDP/RTA/CTA can vet the work completed for technical quality and produce a final fiscal policy and socioeconomic-oriented summary report.** The Project's support to enabling work needs consolidation in good form for policy and decision-making. All the contributions need a final technical vetting report completed by the CTA for quality and benchmarking with global good practices to be consolidated and presented in a short and a longer form (executive summary and short report) in terms of the socioeconomic and institutional case. This final project report is needed by the end of the Project for UNDP-GEF to showcase the project support to upstream results and all the enabling work completed as well as to point out any remaining gaps, and including,

to make the sound fiscal, institutional and social business case and to provide concise recommendations for policymakers.

- SKN Government to follow up project results after November 2020 (Project End).** This Project’s work and results can be viewed as a phase one “readiness project” toward the longer-term work that needs to be done to firmly establish a working PA management system for the benefit of St. Kitts and Nevis for national sustainable development. The vision is sound. This Project has helped establish the institutional and project implementation readiness and contributed significantly to the upstream enabling environment for the longer-term work. As it is in phase one of the Project, the way forward is to operationalize and continue to build capacity for a dual management approach as discussed during implementation. A second phase might, therefore, focus on operationalizing the coordination mechanism agreed and attending to the downstream needs for change through operationalizing the work with communities (livelihoods), experimenting with co-management approaches (communities and private sector) and including broader engagement with productive sectors. This would focus on small holder farming and enable connection of the reasoning of links from terrestrial (agriculture) to marine (drainage/pollution from agricultural practices). So, the focus is not so strong on conservation but on “sustainable use of resources,” making a case to incorporate small-scale farmers and private sector within PA models. The natural IP would be the Ministry of Agriculture, with the fisheries and department of environment within it. However, institutional coordination of an SLM/EBD project will be key. A follow-up phase might also focus on systematic education work.

**Evaluation Summary and Rating Table <sup>ii</sup>**

Main criteria	Rating	Explanation
Project Strategy	MS	<p>Broadly, the Project’s objective was 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 Government of SKN had committed to putting a business plan in place for the PA system through this project and to mainstream the needs of PA financing into national development planning by increasing budget allocations and visitor fee collections and involving new private sector partners in tourism facilities to increase concession revenues from recreation activities.</p> <p>Through early implementation, this project strategy and PA institutional model proposed by original document was found to not be feasible to the context. Interviewees shared consensus that priority should have been given to design of the need to protect critical areas, such as Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area as before the start of this initiative. The Project functioned in an institutional environment that was new to PAs. The Project strategy along with the supportive work of the chief technical advisor was duly adapted by stakeholders during the steering committee meeting however more could have been done at MTR to adapt the project indicators and targets. By not doing so set the project up for rough implementation and unrealistic targets. While the scale of the project design was found to be ambitious, the interviewees agreed the project design and intervention were organized toward an ambitious but correct “systems”-oriented, transformative and holistic goal, including a fiscally viable Protected Area management system.</p>
Progress toward Objective-level Results MS	MS	<p>Overall output level results obtainment is assessed at about 60%. The focus of implementation has been on component one more upstream “coordination and readiness” results. There is general consensus is that the intervention has provided a good first effort at aims in particular for the project upstream-expected results. The country became more cognizant of the need to declare and operate PAs, and the staffing and management of the areas in design have increased. However, the structural changes including the additional PAs were not declared, and the finance model and the institutional structure were not achieved. The newly agreed “interim structure” has also not been formally adopted by the Cabinet or operationalized during implementation. While the country has become more aware of the need to declare the sites, there is minimal increase in management (especially clear in terrestrial PAs) which is insufficient to adequately manage the sites, both at the institutional and the site levels. This pertains only to terrestrial PAs. Key informants stated that the Marine MMA-CZ including the new staff were well managed.</p> <p>The Project provided a general focus on PA upstream legal work and sensitization and, through many steering committee deliberations, increased understanding of what a PA management and system coordination can be. The Project provided significant contributions to the overall enabling environment through knowledge products. In terms of the targets, it was recognized early that the ProDoc targets were overambitious, especially an assumption that the government would financially support an independent authority and/or financing coordination during implementation.</p>

		<p>In terms of upstream work, the project registers success as the Ministry of Legal Affairs et al is currently amending the documents by adding the recommendations of the legal consultant to present the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill for its second reading. Meanwhile, the Department of Environment has already begun work on financing and project-related products to move forward in their plans. The legislative revisions have been contributed to by the project outputs and including decisions on the financing mechanisms. The issue mentioned above was more in the monitoring that the envisioned pathway ( target remained in the documentation) for a single financing mechanism for PA management was not taken forward as laid out in the project document, yet the work on financing is advancing but in a dual sense, with two operational leads instead of one national authority.</p> <p>Additionally, while undertaking joint work on inventory and scientific baseline was a key output, it was only moving toward a full inventory near the Project end. Such work is key in terms of knowing what was at stake.</p> <p>Outstanding but critical key results to be accomplished by the end of the extended project in Octoberiii include the following:  During TE the Project was granted one more extension until November 2020 due to COVID-19 delays and adjustment to implementation. The outstanding results, expected to be completed by October 2020 (2,3,4 depend on will), include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development of the Marine Species Rehabilitation Center on St. Kitts;</li> <li>2. Getting clarity on direction and the PA management authority agreements, for which the legal work is drafted but needs to be presented and enacted. It may also need further benchmarking by an international GEF technical advisor;</li> <li>3. The financial work plans and recommendations are there but need to be addressed in line with the Finance Administration Act (2007) of the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis and be championed by the Departments of Environment on both St. Kitts and Nevis. Key technical level interviewees stated the country might better move into a landscape/seascape approach/Ridge to Reef as opposed to an MPA vs TPA approach. The former makes the case for the need of integrating both types of PAs for the sake of the sustainability of both areas (fisheries, terrestrial biodiversity, ecosystem services, etc.);</li> <li>4. The declaration of two terrestrial protected areas.</li> </ol>
Outcome 1	MS	<p>The Project provided significant knowledge contributions to the enabling environment (Annex) and has increased the capacity for public servants and broader stakeholders through active steering committee deliberations, a training plan and a public awareness campaign. It failed to demonstrate and document the financial and policy case for the changes in the institutional and operational structures as related to the longer-term economic and social benefits of an improved PA management and systems approach to the country. The operationalization of regulations is the supporting mechanism to operationalize an Act. This is done by the responsible Minister, not by an Act of Parliament. This Protected Areas Agency model presented in the project document was modified in keeping with the limitations of the GSKN. From the inception period, it was indicated by the steering committee that, based on GSKN's fiscal limitations and the size of the country, it would be impractical to establish a Protected Areas Agency/Unit. Therefore, it was recommended that a mechanism be established by which existing personnel within the Department of Environment, the Department of Marine Resources and the island of Nevis could collaborate to execute the required duties and facilitate cross-institutional coordination in the advancement of the goal foreseen by the proposed Agency/Unit. The Project has achieved this, creating the ground for a systemic approach.</p> <p>In terms of impact and upstream level results, this Project concretely supported the following policies/legal arrangements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Nevis Physical Development Plan, September2020</li> <li>2) Protected Areas Management Authority Act (draft), June 2020</li> <li>3) National Conservation and Environment Management Act (draft), June 2020</li> <li>4) Protected Areas Standard Operating Procedures, July 2017</li> <li>5) Protected Areas Financing Mechanism, February 2020</li> <li>6) Protected Areas Institutional Structure, April 2018.</li> </ol> <p>Two, three and six above relate to the institutional structure and are not yet formally approved or operational by the Government. While the Project drafted an alternative institutional structure, and it was approved by the Permanent Secretaries on St. Kitts and Nevis, making it functional requires will, operationalization and capacity building (key follow-up) especially initiated by DOE. (See results of work on organizational structure and fiscal projections in the annexes). The adoption of these items has to come from a recognized need at the leadership of the environment departments on both islands. The related fiscal recommendations on how to staff and operationalize the parks and to make them fiscally viable are outlined in the Financing Strategy. The will to move forward on this post-project must come from the lead agencies involved.</p>
Outcome 2	MS	<p>The progress of the objective can be described as moderately satisfactory: In general, the Marine MMA-CZ work was started through another project before the Project start and was continued in part through the Project though mostly independent of it (i.e. efficient institutional consolidation of DMR with Nevis). In terms of the changes expected, i.e. the level of PA sites established, while there were increases at the Marine Conservation Areas, they were established at the beginning of the Project through another project. The Project benefitted the DMR stakeholders through capacity building and inputs, including the provision of a monitoring vessel, to demonstrate better coordination and enforcement. In terms of the marine and terrestrial targets, these were unknown due to the</p>

		<p>Project's lack of a monitoring baseline. Proper monitoring, insofar as increases in PA finances, might have been met by DMR as they might have collected user fees, but this information was not shared with TE. The additional terrestrial areas were not established as PA sites, and the Project did not conduct a Project PA financial implementation plan with targets on raising the U.S. dollar amounts. On a positive note, the capacity-building and public awareness toward outcome level is an excellent result of this Project. The testimonial provided by stakeholders on the broader mindset changes said it was evident that more children and youths were seeking jobs in marine conservation and asking for training in this area. Many stakeholders agreed that the learning was substantive. The Project provided excellent inputs through training to the new conservation staff instated by project inputs at the DOE and DMR. The targets around lionfish were met even before the Project started, and the numbers had become insignificant since the 2012 culling exercise.</p>
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	MU	<p>The Project is the first national executed NIM UNDP-GEF full-sized project on biodiversity in SKN. Interviewees expressed that there was a steep learning curve while implementing. The initial project management had start-up setbacks. The project design/ProDoc validation happened a year before the start of implementation and the context changed. GEF regulations on design are extremely strict, and it is not up to UNDP to change the design of expected outcomes and the partnership agreement. The first CTA was replaced a year into implementation. The Project was audited, and this was found to be good. The TE also made note of the efficiency and effectiveness (drive for results) of the project financial officer. Together with the design to implementation time lag and context changes, the need for learning about implementation and UNDP-GEF standards and code of conduct all affected the momentum and coordination of activities. The Project Coordinator needed time to learn about project context and logical framework before starting to implement the inception meeting where significant design gaps could have been picked up. In hindsight, the inception meeting is an especially important GEF milestone which required a thorough walk-through of the project implementation strategy and expected results. At the inception workshop phase, the document had already been validated by the Government and all stakeholders and signed by the Government, so no changes were possible at this stage. The MTR was conducted but the project did not adapt formally the indicator framework and set the project up for failure by TE. This is a lesson learned about using the mechanism in the project framework for adaptive management and monitoring.</p>
Sustainability	ML	<p>The sustainability is moderately likely, due to the absence of supportive evidence to show that the intervention unchanged (at MTR) targets to support the institutional, legal and structural changes or to operationalize the interim PA institutional coordination mechanism designed by the Project was met. This fact is somewhat countered by the fact that the government has indeed hired conservation officers and these new staff will have to be jointly guided and managed.</p> <p>The ProDoc set forth ambitious expectations for sustainability and outlined a dynamic plan based on the assumptions of the Project pathways including the legal and structural changes (legal and policy upgrades, etc.) expected to be initiated during implementation. The Project's strategy and results were premised on the institutional and financial sustainability that were to be achieved by establishing the Protected Areas Agency (PAA) as an independent statutory body during implementation and the revision and strengthening of financial mechanisms and resources so that the PAA could provide at least "basic" management functions for all PA sites. Relying only on its revenue sources (as opposed to ongoing government budget allocations), the Project was to create for the first time in the country an agency dedicated specifically to PA management and sufficiently funded to ensure its effectiveness. That was not the broader results but changed significantly between the conception of the idea and the start of implementation. While the original strategy and target around an independent authority was not met an interim agreement on coordination has been reached and now needs to be operationalized with DOE and DMR leading.</p> <p>Next, environmental sustainability was expected to be promoted through the Project by developing and implementing a coordinated, multi-stakeholder approach to expanding and strengthening the system of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis, set within the existing overarching strategies articulated in the St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area Plan and the Protected Areas Systems Plan. The assumption was that by establishing a Protected Areas Agency with dedicated staff enabled with sufficient financial and technical resources, facilities and equipment to actively manage, monitor and conserve seven PA sites, the Project would greatly increase the country's ability to protect critical marine and terrestrial habitats and preserve ecosystem functioning in areas that currently had no effective protection. Furthermore, by carrying out assessments and monitoring of key habitats and species and implementing conservation and protection programs based on that work, the Project would allow PA managers to greatly increase their ability to focus resources on the most important habitats and species and respond to the most urgent threats. This work is advancing, and there is indication is that it will pass.</p> <p>Additionally, social sustainability was to be achieved/primarily enhanced in the Project through the processes to plan for and implement conservation and sustainable development initiatives at protected area sites. Decisions about the zoning and resource use restrictions within terrestrial and marine protected areas, including zoning for tourism and fisheries activities, would involve numerous stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, CSOs and other community groups. In addition, private sector stakeholder groups, such as commercial fishermen, marine sports operators, tour guides and outdoor adventure operators, would be able to participate in decisions about PA boundary setting and zoning and the regulations adopted for conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources within terrestrial and marine PAs. The Project was expected to support PA managers in working with fishermen, tourism operators, farmers, and other residents to collaboratively seek solutions that balance the needs of these groups and the biodiversity conservation and ecosystem functioning objectives of the designated PA sites. The involvement of stakeholders in the ecosystem-wide processes and the operational protected area</p>

		planning would be guided by stakeholder engagement plans, which would include provisions for conflict management with different user groups. This work never advanced. However, it can be advanced in a possible phase two of GEF support to SKN on biodiversity.
--	--	---

Evaluation Ratings (Annex–Scales)			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	Rating
M&E design at entry	MU	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MU
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution, Executing Agency	MS
The overall quality of M&E	MU	Overall quality of Implementation, Execution	MS
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	R	Financial resources:	ML
Effectiveness	MS	Sociopolitical:	ML
Efficiency	MS	Institutional framework and governance:	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental:	ML
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	ML

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### - Purpose of the evaluation

Under UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. The terms of reference (ToR) (Annex) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of conserving biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence project (PIMS 5088). The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

#### Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Conserving biodiversity and reducing habitat degradation in Protected Areas and their areas of influence		
GEF Project ID:	00080909		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)
			<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)

UNDP Project ID:	Atlas ID 00090420 PIMS 5088	GEF financing:	3,371,630.00	
Country:	St. Kitts Nevis	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	17,140,000.00	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	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	Total co-financing:	17,140,000.00	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives	Total Project Cost:	20,511,630.00	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Sustainable Development Ministry of Communication et al	ProDoc Signature (date project began): 19 November 2014		Original Closing Date: 19 May 2018
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 19 November 2018	Actual: 30 November 2020

Key considerations will include potential impacts and sustainability of the interventions' expected outcomes and outputs, consideration of project inputs and outputs contribution to enabling policy and regulatory framework, developing local-level capacity and garnering increased public awareness and education. The objectives of the evaluation are to do the following:

- Assess the outcomes and outputs achieved through the interventions,
- Evaluate the effectiveness of activities in contribution to key objectives,
- Evaluate the impact and sustainability of activities on the target communities,
- Evaluate the effectiveness of management and interventions,
- Provide recommendations based on the evaluation findings, particularly on the exit strategy and sustainability measures,
- Document the lessons learned,
- Study the project's contribution to corporate alignment.

This evaluation has an additional purpose of drawing lessons, identifying good practices established that may help for improving the selection and enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country upon project completion.

#### - **Scope & Methodology**

The Terminal Review has focused primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the Project considering the accomplished outcomes, objectives and effects. 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 (Annex: Rating Scales). Its scope included the following:

- assessment of progress toward achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document (ProDoc),
- assessment of signs of Project's success or failure,
- review of the Project's strategy considering its sustainability risks.

The approach for the evaluation is determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (ToR) provided to the consultant. The implementation and criteria follow methods and approach as stated in UNDP Manuals, relevant tools and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including Guidance for Conducting Reviews of UNDPs Supported, GEF-Financed Projects and UNDP's Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The evaluation also took into account the guidance for UNDP evaluation under COVID-19.

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 was carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Coordinator, government counterparts, UNDP project support team located within the Sub-regional Office for the Eastern Caribbean and other key civil society stakeholders.

To carry out this evaluation exercise entirely by Zoom, Skype and desk study due to the COVID-19 pandemic, data collection tools (matrixes, questionnaires), interviews with the Project Coordinator and the evaluator's constant availability were used for clarification while analyzing information from the principles of results-based evaluation (including relevance, ownership, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability). Snowballing or learning from informants on best informants was employed, and the evaluator interviewed several people outside the original list provided.

The tools for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data sources as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allow for in-depth exploration and yield information that facilitated the 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 included 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 (Annex) raised with the stakeholders, directly and indirectly, involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as the Government's actors, project staff, local actors, and civil society representatives. A list of consulted stakeholders is found in the Annex. Stakeholders to interview were to be the key actors from every 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 of government representatives, project management units, and representatives from civil society stakeholders directly and tangentially involved with the Project. (Also see Inception Report and sample Interview Guide used for data collection).

#### Limitations

This evaluation was limited by the COVID-19 pandemic. The work was modified to accommodate this new reality. The phases of the evaluation were rather to be home-based: planning, desk study, data collection and interviews conducted by Skype and Zoom (see list of interviews in the Annex). During planning in mid-February, news of the spread of COVID-19 indicated that a global pandemic was imminent if the virus were not contained. The Project Steering Committee discussed the ramifications in March 2020 (minutes attached) and raised the question of how the Project could successfully close on 19 May 2020, including holding the TE, with the threat of the virus becoming more evident to the region.

Upon further analysis of the threat posed to global travel, it was also highlighted that two ongoing consultancies would be adversely affected as their work included stakeholder engagement missions in March/April to finalize the Legal Alignment and the Nevis Physical Development Plan. Both critical consultancies were due to end in mid-May and both had organized Zoom online meetings with the Ministry of Legal Affairs and Department of Physical Planning within the NIA and Environment, respectively. The levels of active engagement/input were no doubt lower than in-person meetings. Due to COVID-19, during the TE, the Project was granted an extension until November 2020. This is taken into consideration in this report. The limitation has been mitigated by doing interviews online and by taking the recent project extension into consideration around these outstanding outputs that are critical to results.

- **Structure of the evaluation report**

The evaluation report is structured according to the criteria as set in the evaluation Terms of Reference (see annex 1). These are Efficiency, Effectiveness and Relevance, Sustainability and Lessons Learned. The report starts with an executive summary, project summary, and project rating tables and project progress, conclusions by criteria 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 according to the evaluation questions and the relating to the finding of the actual implementation of the Project. Some of the original questions were no longer relevant as the project was implemented according to criteria for success defined by the steering committee and not according to the original design and or log frame. A major finding has been the absence of monitoring by logical framework indicators. This is duly recorded as a negative result as many of the normal criteria set for good project management for example were no longer relevant. 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.

**2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

- **Project start and duration**

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 with an initial planned duration of four years. It was granted one extension in 2018 and a second from June 2020–November 2020 due to COVID-19. The planned total project cost is US\$ 20, 511, 630, with GEF financing of US\$ 3, 371, 630, UNDP financing of US\$ 300, 000, and planned co-financing from the Government of US\$ 16, 840, 027.

**Table: Milestones: Conserving Biodiversity Project**

Concept/PIF
Oct 10, 2012 Technical Clearance before PIF/PPG Submission
Oct 2, 2012 PIF Clearance to WPI
Nov 15, 2012 PIF Council Approval_PIF/PPG
Nov 1, 2012 PPG Approval
Nov 21, 2012 Trustee commitment (Fee)
Mar 20, 2013 Financial Clearance before DoA Issuance, Migrated from PIMS2
Mar 21, 2013 PPG DOA Signature
Apr 10, 2013 PPG IP Signature
Dec 31, 2014 PPG Operational Closure
Mar 30, 2017– Dec 31, 2015 PPG Financial Closure FULL GEF Barbados
May 16, 2014 Technical Clearance before Submission
May 16, 2014 Financial Clearance before Submission
May 15, 2014 Expected Date of CEO Endorsement Request Submission
Jul 1, 2014 CEO Endorsement
Jul 24, 2014 Trustee commitment (Fee)
Sep 1, 2014 Expected Date of LPAC Meeting
Sep 10, 2014 Financial Clearance before DoA Issuance - Migrated from PIMS2
Sep 15, 2014 DOA Signature
Nov 19, 2014 Actual Date of ProDoc Signature
Apr 21, 2015 Actual Date of First Disbursement in Atlas
Jun 9, 2020 Actual Date of Last Disbursement in Atlas
Sep 1, 2015 Start date of Administrative and Finance Officer
Oct 5, 2015 Start date of Project Coordinator
Oct 9, 2015 (Actual Date) Feb 19, 2015 (Planned Date) Inception Workshop
Sep 1, 2019 PIR date
Sep 19, 2017 Mid-Term Review Inception Mission
Apr 12, 2017– Nov 19, 2016- Mid-Term Review
Sept 30, 2020 - Revised Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation

Nov 20, 2020- Revised Expected Date of Operational Closure
Nov 7, 2018 Project Extension Approval
Jun 5, 2020 Project Extension Request CEO Endorsement Request
Jun 21, 2020 Project Extension Approval

- **Problems that the project sought to address**

- Protected area management presents a noteworthy intersection for St. Kitts and Nevis (SKN) given that PAs bear on the protection of natural resources and key development issues for the island 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.<sup>iv</sup> 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.
- Monocrop agriculture was the traditional primary productive sector of the country until recently. In the last decade, this sector has experienced a very radical transformation due to deep changes in sugarcane exploitation. Sugar cane was the main crop until 2005 although falling for several decades until then. The Government closed the state-run sugar industry in 2005, which practically ended sugarcane cultivation in SKN. Due to the decline of the sugar industry, the Government promoted non-sugar agricultural production as a national goal (i.e. the promotion of part-time farmers operating small holdings cultivating and raising livestock for the local market). The conversion of lands formerly dedicated to sugarcane to other uses has created land degradation issues with impacts on both terrestrial and marine biodiversity. About 80 percent of the land on the island of St. Kitts is owned by the Government. On 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 and includes cruise tourism to ecotourism. The expanding tourism sector is accompanied by increased construction of tourism facilities (infrastructures, hotels, vacation homes, etc.). This has had clear negative impacts in coastal and marine ecosystems as well as in terrestrial ecosystems, water sources, other natural resources and urban areas. Although the negative impacts of the rapidly expanding tourism sector are borne in the islands, it is also understood, even by tourism authorities and 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. Most of the fishing is 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 are carried out all around both islands.
- The environmental context is intricately linked to the socio-economic context. The 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 several peaks reaching heights up to nearly 1000 meters. Most of the slightly sloped or flat land on this island is near the coast and, therefore, it is where most urban, as well as rural, development has occurred. While cultivated land has dropped from the 1940s to the year 2000, developed/urbanized land has grown pointedly in this same period. The island has five types of natural forest classified by elevation and type of forest growth, such as secondary growth. Nevis Peak towers over the island of Nevis at an elevation of 985 meters with other hills of lesser height. Six vegetation types are found on 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, seagrass 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 seagrass beds. Of course, these

habitats and ecosystems are key to the health of fisheries. It is documented that coastal and marine ecosystems and associated natural resources are threatened by climate change, pollution and human factors. For instance, mangroves remain only in patches, and wildlife and fishery resources are declining (sea turtles, objective fisheries species, etc.).

- Within this environmental and socioeconomic background, issues regarding protected areas arise, 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 that 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 ProDoc and subsequent outcome indicators disagree as to the number of protected areas vis-à-vis other analyses, all sources agree that management from a biodiversity viewpoint was weak or nonexistent. Overall, the protected areas are small and have either no management structures or limited management and financial resources. As the ProDoc indicates, there are three park units legally established within the terrestrial landscape. Of these three areas, only the Central Forest Reserve National Park (CFRNP) has 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 to preserve and protect the aquifer that supplies drinking water to the capital city of Basseterre and surrounding areas.
- The Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park (BHFNP) is a colonial-era fortress managed by a civil society organization as a historical and cultural site. It is not managed for biological conservation purposes. Existing (albeit outdated) management 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, and they do not have a set budget. Similar situations are present in Nevis. At the time of design, there were no protected areas on 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 to have the Nevis Peak area classified as a National Park, while the Camps River (a 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, the 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. A planning/zoning process existed that identifies the "conservation zones" with little or no specific norms or management formats associated with these marine protection areas (at the time of design) and no plan for providing a resource base for their management.
- The Project thus considered the above situation and attempted to address a series of problems that relate to protected areas (current and planned) in St. Kitts and Nevis within a development context framework. Through the design, there was an identification of several 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. Two barriers were identified: a lack of systematic approach and adequate mechanisms for protected areas management in the country and insufficient geographic coverage of key biodiversity areas as well as inadequate management of protected area units and sources of degradation in areas adjacent to or upstream from protected areas (i.e. buffer zones). TE makes note, however, that in all new GEF projects, SLM and EBD are integrated as an approach and model. It is found to be good for a focus on both aspects since the problem stems from overexploitation of natural resources and unsustainable resource management in buffer zones. Working with these stakeholders in co-management may potentially be a good way forward for a second phase, for instance in a Ridge-to-Reef approach. This is also discussed in the text as highlighted by technical interviewees and in recommendations for the way forward.
- **Immediate and development objectives of the project**

- **Objective**

The project was to expand the existing Protected Areas (PA) system through the establishment of two new terrestrial PAs and three new marine PAs (the first marine PAs in the country) and to address systemic issues by implementing key elements of St. Kitts and Nevis' Protected Areas System Plan, thereby strengthening PA management capacities and the ability to reduce or eliminate threats to biodiversity. To achieve this overarching objective of expanding and strengthening the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reducing habitat destruction, the Project focused on the following components and outputs.

- **Baseline Indicators established**

Objective		
To expand and strengthen the terrestrial and marine protected area system and reduce habitat destruction in the areas of influence that negatively impact PA ecological functioning		
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level
Area of terrestrial ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	5,260 hectares at 2 existing sites	8,810 hectares (3,550 ha. added at 2 new sites) by end of project
Area of marine ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	0 hectares	11,693 hectares (11,693 ha. added at 3 new sites) by end of project
Capacity development indicator score for protected area system: • Systemic • Institutional • Individual	50% 38% 48%	65% 55% 65%
Improved management effectiveness of protected area units as measured by METT: • Central Forest Reserve National Park • Royal Basseterre Valley Park • Nevis Peak Forest Reserve National Park • Booby Island Nature Reserve • Narrows Marine Park • Keys Marine Park • Sandy Point Marine Park	39 28 30 6 14 25 15	The 2020 METT Scores: 47 30 35 37 63 58 60
Outcome 1		
Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities		
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level
Legal authority in place for the collection and retention (within the PA system) of visitor/user/concession fees and other financing mechanisms for protected areas, including the proposed National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF)	Only 1 PA unit (Brimstone Hill NP) has authority to collect or retain fees.	By end of year 2, legal authority established (under existing NCEPA and/or new NCEMA and Marine Resources Act) for all official PA units to collect and retain fees and receive allocations from the NCTF
Consolidated and effectively functioning institutional management of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis	Existing PA units and sites of proposed new PA units are currently managed by multiple government agencies and nongovernmental organizations.	Protected Areas Agency (PAA) formally established and actively implementing functions across PA system (planning, financing, monitoring, enforcement) by end of year 3
Effective coordination between institutions/personnel responsible for protected areas and adjacent/upstream areas of influence on PA units	No coordination or information-sharing mechanisms among resource management agencies are currently functional on St. Kitts and Nevis.	National Environmental Committee (NEC) overseeing protected areas management throughout the country by end of year 1
Number of PA staff with specialized training and/or skills development in the following PA management functions: • PA planning processes and tools • Creation/enforcement of PA regulations • Ecotourism development • Business and financial planning	0 2 (specific to fisheries) 0 0 0	Staff of PAA, as well as partner institutions (DPPE, DPPNRE, DMR, NDF) trained by end of project: 6 6 6 6

• Database management and decision support tools		6
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)	US\$ 0	US\$ 429,000/year (50% from the NCTF and 50% from the CBF) by end of project
<b>Outcome 2</b>		
<b>Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas</b>		
<b>Description of Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline Level</b>	<b>End of project target level</b>
# of Protected Areas legally established and demarcated in St. Kitts and Nevis • Terrestrial Protected Areas • Marine Protected Areas	3 existing PA units 0 existing PA units	2 additional PA units by end of year 2 3 additional PA units by end of year 2
Conservation of critical habitat within the Protected Areas targeted by the Project: • Forest health at 4 terrestrial PAs, as measured by # of hectares Coral reef health at 3 MPA sites, as measured by: • Percent live hard coral cover • Percent dead hard coral cover • Number of coral recruits (per m2) • Seagrass bed health, as measured by # of hectares Health of selected reef fish stocks, as measured by: • Abundance per m3 • Species diversity	8,790 hectares (forest)  TBD during Year 1  TBD during Year 1 TBD during Year 1 TBD during Year 1  TBD during Year 1 TBD during Year 1	No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project  No decrease by project end  No increase by project end No decrease by project end  No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project  No decrease by project end No decrease by project end
Increased PA management funds for PA units targeted by the Project from visitor, user and concession fees	0	US\$ 200,000/year for 3 marine PA sites and US\$ 35,000/year for 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of project (targets will be validated and possibly revised during the first year of the Project)
Number of site-level PA staff with specialized training in PA management • Terrestrial PA Sites (enforcement; conservation, monitoring; community empowerment, outreach, etc.) • Marine PA Sites (ecological monitoring; deploying mooring buoys and FADs; enforcement; boat safety and navigation; extension/stakeholder engagement, etc.)	0  0	At least 5 trained staff managing 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of Project  At least 6 trained staff managing 3 Marine Parks by end of Project
Reduced impact of invasive alien species (lionfish) at targeted PA units	Baseline population of lionfish (tbd in year 1 of project)	25% reduction in lionfish population at targeted sites by end of Project
Conservation of priority endemic species at terrestrial protected areas (Central Forest Reserve NP and Nevis Peak NP)	Targeted species to be determined through biodiversity inventories during years 1-2 of project	No net decline in populations of selected species by end of Project

- **Field Sites**

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

- **Main stakeholders at Project Inception**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Anticipated Roles and Responsibilities in Project Implementation</b>
<b>National Government</b>	
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)	The DPPE, acting as the lead Executing Agency for the Project, will coordinate the inputs of Government agencies and other stakeholders in strengthening the legal, policy, institutional and financial framework for a national system of protected areas (Component 1 of the project). The DPPE also will take direct responsibility for managing two of the PA sites targeted by the Project (Central Forest Reserve National Park and Booby Island Nature Reserve) until the Protected Areas Agency is formally established. The DEA/PSIP, which functions as the GEF focal point office for the country, will work to ensure the collaboration of co-financing agencies and other national and international partners with the proposed project. The DPPE and the DEA/PSIP will collaborate on the monitoring and evaluation of the day-to-day progress of the Project.
Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources (MAMR), including the Department of Marine Resources (DMR)	The DMR will play a key role in the updating/strengthening of laws, regulations and policies related to the management of marine resources and the establishment of official marine protected areas. The DMR, together with the Nevis Department of Fisheries (NDF), will take lead responsibility for marine monitoring and conservation activities, including the establishment and management of three new marine protected areas in the country (Keys, Sandy Point and Narrows Marine Parks) until the Protected Areas Agency is formally established.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	
Nevis Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (DPPNRE)	The DPPNRE will oversee the implementation of all site-specific terrestrial activities on the island of Nevis and will coordinate with their national-level counterparts on the development of plans, policies and laws/regulations at both the national level and specifically for the island of Nevis. The DPPNRE also will take direct responsibility for managing the Nevis Peak Forest Reserve National Park until such time as the Protected Areas Agency is formally established.
Nevis Department of Fisheries (NDF)	The NDF will contribute to the updating/strengthening of laws, regulations and policies related to the management of marine resources and the establishment of official marine protected areas, particularly regarding the marine environment around the island of Nevis. The NDF, together with the DMR, will engage in marine monitoring and conservation activities, including the establishment and management of three new marine protected areas in the country (Keys, Sandy Point, and Narrows Marine Parks) until the Protected Areas Agency is formally established.
Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs (MJLA)	The MJLA will share responsibility for ensuring that policy and legislative frameworks are in place to support all aspects of the Project, in particular the creation and strengthening of laws such as the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA), the Marine Resources Act and the detailed regulations associated with those acts.
Water Services Department (WSD)	The WSD will be a key stakeholder in providing technical information on the status of watersheds and information and water quality at sites where rivers and streams feed into the marine and coastal environment.
Ministry of Tourism and International Transport (MTIT), including the St. Kitts Tourism Authority (SKTA)	The MTIT and the SKTA will help to develop a branding and marketing strategy for the PA system and to raise awareness among tour providers, cruise ships and tourists themselves of the ecological, adventure and cultural attractions of the terrestrial and marine protected areas and the new national system of protected areas.
<b>Environmental NGOs</b>	
St. Christopher National Trust (SCNT)	The SCNT will be a key partner in conservation activities at the newly established Keys Marine Park (which includes the core marine zone of the MAB), and the Project will work to ensure clear modalities for collaboration between the PAA and SCNT. The SCNT will be an active participant on the St. Kitts PA Committee (subcommittee of the NEC) and will likely participate in other project activities focused on education and outreach as well as biodiversity inventories.
Nevis Historical Conservation Society (NHCS)	The NHCS is expected to be a key partner in the management of the Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area, in particular through active participation on the Nevis PA Committee (subcommittee of the NEC) and education and outreach programs to local communities and schools, building on their experience with similar programs related to wetlands, beach and turtle monitoring, invasive species (lionfish) and recycling.

St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network (SKSTMN)	The organization will continue to have lead responsibility for turtle monitoring at the Keys Beach and other turtle nesting sites in the country; it will also participate in awareness-raising campaigns regarding the value in protecting turtles and in training local tour guides in safe methods for accessing and "watching" turtle nesting.
<b>Local Stakeholder/User Groups</b>	
Sandy Pointers Inspiring Real Improvement Throughout (SPIRIT)	This group will participate in community education and awareness, identifying local knowledge useful to the project (traditional uses of plants) and working with the Project to identify specific benefits to communities from the Project.
Fahies Agricultural Women's Cooperative Society (FAWCS)	This group will participate in small-scale reforestation initiatives and planting/cultivation of species used traditionally for medicine and food for potential processing and promotion of small businesses.
Community Uplifting & Empowerment Team (CUET)	This group will participate in community education and awareness, identifying local knowledge useful to the Project (traditional uses of plants) and working with the Project to identify specific benefits to communities from Project.
Sandy Point Agriculture Cooperative Society Ltd (SPACS)	This group will participate in community education on natural resource management, contribute knowledge on how forest assets were traditionally harvested and promote sustainable harvesting of resources.
St. Kitts- Nevis Agricultural Youth Forum (SKNAYF)	The groups will engage in awareness-raising of local youth on the value of natural resources (focusing on issues relevant to the protection of the Basseterre Valley aquifer) and in working with the DPPE to develop a strategy to address the problem of the invasive Vervet Monkey.
Tourism operators	Tour guides/companies operating at terrestrial PA sites and dive/snorkel and yachting companies operating at marine PA sites will play an active role with government agencies in developing rules and protocols for their operations within PA sites as well as promoting visits to the sites and safe practices among visitors.
Fishermen	Fishermen will be involved in MPA planning and management decision-making, including the siting of fishery no-take zones and/or restrictions on gear, practices and seasons; fishermen associations (such as the Sandy Point Fishermen's Society and various groups in the village of Newcastle) will be encouraged to participate in the monitoring of fishing activities.
Private developers	The company Kittitian Hill Properties will act as a partner in promoting visitation and encouraging low impact behaviors in and around the Central Forest Reserve National Park and sharing information with residents on commercial organic food production techniques. The developers of the Christophe Harbour Marina/Villa development will be sought out as partners in marine conservation and public education and outreach in support of the PA system.

**- Expected Results**

**Component 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities**

Under this outcome, the PA laws and regulations will be strengthened through update and approval of the draft National Conservation and Environment Management Bill, strengthening of Protected Areas Policies, the establishment of Protected Areas Agency (PAA) and Capacity Building of PAA Staff, the establishment and operation of the National Environmental Committee (NEC) and the provision of support for NGO Involvement in PA management. Under this outcome, the financial sustainability framework for the Protected Areas System will also be strengthened through the development of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for the PA system and the development of financial management systems to support cost-effective PA management. In support of data-driven decision-making, the project focus was on the consolidation of an information system supporting the PA management objectives through the development and operation of a Protected Areas Information System. Under

Outcome 1, the Project will seek to increase awareness and support for Protected Areas through a series of structured public Education and Awareness Programs regarding the national system of protected areas.

**Output 1.1: Strengthened Protected Areas Laws and Regulations**

- 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 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

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

To achieve the terrestrial objectives under Outcome 2, the Project will support the establishment and operationalization of terrestrial protected areas including the terrestrial protected area units, the development and implementation of terrestrial protected area management plans, updating, approval and implementation of the Nevis Physical Development Plan (NPDP), development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for terrestrial PAs, support for the development of systems for community participation and development in and around terrestrial PA sites and support for the development and deployment of ecological conservation and management programs at terrestrial PA sites.

The marine-related interventions under Outcome 2 will take a similar course, including the establishment and operationalization of marine protected areas to include marine protected area units, the establishment and zoning of marine protected areas with attendant development and implementation of marine protected area management plans and the development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for marine protected areas. The Project will also support increased community participation and development in and around marine PAs, ecological conservation and management programs at marine PA sites and fisheries production and pressure reduction strategies.

**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

**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

### **3. The Project Execution, Implementation, Management and Coordination Arrangements at Project Inception**

- The Project was to be executed under National Implementation Modality (NIM), with execution by the Ministry of Sustainable Development, following UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, per its role as implementing agency. Execution of the Project was subject to oversight by a Project Steering Committee, detailed below. Day-to-day coordination was carried out under the supervision of a Project Coordination Unit and corresponding staff.
- According to the ProDoc, the Project implementation would be carried out under the general guidance of a Project Steering Committee (PSC), co-chaired by UNDP and MoSD, and would meet at least twice per year to review project progress and approve upcoming work plans and corresponding budgets. Other members of the PSC would include DPPNRE, DMR, 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). Representatives of other stakeholders would also be included in the PSC as deemed appropriate and necessary (the membership of the PSC will be reviewed and recommended for approval at the Project Inception Workshop).
- The National Project Director (NPD), a senior staff member of MoSD, was to be responsible for oversight of the Project and carried the overall responsibility and accountability. The NPD was to keep the PSC updated on Project advances and challenges as needed and would report to the PSC on progress made and issues to be resolved. The NPD would establish and provide overall guidance to the PCU and be responsible for overseeing the work undertaken by the PCU team.
- The NPD was to submit relevant documentation to the PSC for endorsement. The Project's day-to-day management and coordination were supervised by the Project Coordinator (PC), who reported to the NPD (Project Director). The PC, supported by an Administrative Assistant, was to be responsible for the general management actions of the Project, such as the preparation of consolidated annual work plans and technical and financial reports to be presented to the PSC to ensure that advances concerning the Project's goals and key milestones were achieved as planned. Additional responsibilities of the PC included overall integration and follow-up of studies, research and project technical activities, assisting in the supervision of Project implementation (liaising directly with the NPD), undertaking quarterly operational planning, providing guidance on day-to-day implementation and ensuring institutional coordination among the Project partner institutions and organizations.
- In addition to the Project Coordinator, Administrative Assistant and the staff of various partner institutions who would participate in specific activities, a series of short- and medium-term consultancy contracts were employed to implement technical aspects of the Project. Contracted companies and consultants were to carry out targeted Project activities under the technical supervision of the PCU and MoSD and in coordination with relevant partners for different activities. Terms of reference would be developed jointly by the PCU and MoSD and approved by the PSC following approved work plans. The relationships between the main institutions involved with Project implementation and the bodies were to be established by the Project as per UNDP project requirements as follows:
  - Executive (UNDP): individual representing the Project ownership to chair the group,
  - Senior Supplier (Ministry of Sustainable Development): Individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned that would provide funding for specific cost-sharing projects and/or technical expertise to the Project. The Senior Supplier's primary function within the Board was to guide the technical feasibility of the Project.
  - Senior Beneficiary (to be determined): individual or group of individuals representing the interests of the ultimate beneficiaries of the Project. The Senior Beneficiary's primary function

within the Board is to ensure the realization of Project results from the perspective of Project beneficiaries.

- Project Assurance member (UNDP): support person for the Project Board Executive who carries out objective and independent Project oversight and monitoring functions. The Project Manager and Project Assurance roles were never to be held by the same individual for the same Project. A UNDP Staff member would typically hold the Project Assurance role.
- Additionally, the GEF-OPF ensures proper Public Financial Management as outlined in the Finance Administration Act (2007) and provides oversight as it pertains to proper Project and procurement procedures.

#### 4. FINDINGS

##### 4.1 RELEVANCE/FORMULATION/OWNERSHIP / DESIGN (MS)

- **Country ownership**
- The Project was relevant and consistent with the Government's priorities as set out in the national policy documents at the start of the Project, and this remains the case. The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 7 January 1993. The Project has contributed to assisting St. Kitts and Nevis in achieving the following goals of the CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA): 1.2 to integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors to maintain ecological structure and function, 1.4 to substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management, 1.5 to prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas, 3.1 to provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas and 3.5 to strengthen communication, education and public awareness. The Project's focus on biodiversity conservation and protected area management supported both the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2004), which sought to promote the conservation and management of the country's biodiversity and the Protected Areas Systems Plan for St. Kitts and Nevis (2010), which identified some "highest priority" actions that will be addressed by this Project. These included the enactment of the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA), declaration of the Nevis Peak Forest Reserve as a National Park and creation of a Management Plan for the new Nevis Peak NP. The Project was also consistent with the National Environmental Management Strategy and Action Plan (2005–2009), which defined key strategies and interventions for environmental management in the context of sustainable development, including Prevent and Manage the Causes and Impacts of Disaster, Ensure the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Protect and Conserve Biological Diversity.
- The Project concept supported mainstreaming of the PA work in the National Physical Development Plan (NPDP), which provided an overall strategic planning framework to guide development and capital infrastructure investment decisions in the country over the next fifteen years. This framework arranged, among its main policy interventions, to "protect and sustain long-term use of mangroves, seagrass beds, coral reefs, ponds and beaches," "declare areas with unique terrain, flora and fauna and high recreational potential as national parks," "establish marine reserves to protect biodiversity in coastal habitat reserves [that] are proposed at Sandy Point and the Southeast Peninsula" and "develop and implement conservation-oriented farming technologies specifically adapted to local conditions." However, the Project did not work on the National Physical Development Plan.
- The Nevis Physical Development Plan similarly included policies and guidelines for sustainable development and sought to guide the location of housing, industry, parks/conservation areas and hotel and tourism development regarding land suitability and other physical and environmental attributes. One of the activities was to help update and revise the draft plan, including consideration of protected areas to be established on the island.

- The Project provided a supportive contribution to SKN to achieve one of the nine objectives identified in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (2015–2016), namely “reducing the risk to Saint Kitts and Nevis of environmental, climatic and other related natural disasters, and particularly to those who are the most vulnerable.” Finally, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis was a signatory to the regional Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI), which aimed to set a new course for conserving and sustainably managing the marine and coastal environment across the Caribbean. The CCI entailed a commitment from the countries to effectively conserve at least 20% of their near-shore marine/coastal environment by 2020 and to support and put in place a new sustainable finance architecture to generate long-term funding for the marine and coastal environment. By supporting the establishment of the first marine protected areas in the country and the development of sustainable financing mechanisms for protected areas, the proposed Project would play a critical role in helping the Government of SKN to meet these commitments.
- **Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators**
  - *Ambitious Targets, Weak Strategies:*
  - The scale and scope of the Project plan was found to be ambitious, the interviewees agreed the Project intervention was organized toward an ambitious but correct “systems” transformative and holistic goal, including a fiscally viable Protected Area Management System. The key issue with the design was reported as generally in the strategies for implementing that were weakly presented in the ProDoc. TE agreed the document might have included stronger theories of change and the UNDP-GEF standard operating procedures that needed to be imparted to new partners at the beginning of the implementation. The strategy presented in the document required a more robust rationale between the Development Challenge, assumptions, interventions and results.
  - TE learned that UNDP-GEF is currently looking into landscape developments. This new focus enables all new projects to focus on more realistic approaches, which include land management and PAs, so there is more engagement with relevant sectors and stakeholders.
  - Based on the problem analysis of the ProDoc, unsustainable land practices are an issue. However, this barrier to conservation was not duly addressed since this is an EBD project. The requirements back in 2014 were to focus strongly on biodiversity and setting up PA systems, not so much focus in design went to livelihoods or SLM. It is the TE’s view, based on interviews with key stakeholders, that the more work on livelihood would have better tackled this issue of stakeholder engagement and sustainability of buffer areas.
  - As the design problem statement indicated, the existing protected areas system in the country was limited, both in representation and in active management. Broadly, the Project’s objective was 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 Government of SKN had committed to putting a business plan for the PA system in place through this Project and to mainstream the needs of PA financing into national development planning by increasing budget allocations and visitor fee collections and involving new private sector partners in tourism facilities to increase concession revenues from recreation activities. In fact, through implementation, the strategy and model were not found to be feasible. Stakeholders generally put forth that the project strategy was deficient in the readiness for the work which was the precursor institutional requirement, first for environmental coordination strengthening and then for strategies that might better support showcasing a workable PA financing system, using the social and economic baseline work that helped make the socioeconomic case for change. The approach to stakeholder engagement around the fiscal and socioeconomic case was critical to the strategies for showcasing results or benefits of a coordinated PA system and joint management approach.
  - Interviewees suggested that the ProDoc was, however, a good overall framework for the dynamic context with a broad complete vision. However, the Project needed a strong, flexible project management approach to come alive and adapt to reality.

- In other parts of this report, the TE discusses the fundamental bottleneck that the Project implementation context changed twice. Initially, the project implementation partner was the Ministry of Sustainable Development (MoSD), with the director/DMC within the Department of Environment. Then the Government moved the Department of Environment to the Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Cooperatives, and the Environment. Recently, in June 2020, it moved again to the Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives. The funding stayed within the MoSD, so approvals of any procurement by June/Department of Environment, once under the Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives, still required the signature of the authorized staff of Sustainable Development (in addition to the signature of authorized staff of Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives). This delayed procurement substantially.
- One lesson is that a good document has a theory of change backed up by excellent baseline research, in this case, the recent political, social and economic situation. The project strategy suggested a series of enabling institutional elements in place by year two which were the precursor to other important PA establishment work, including strategies for work on sustainable financing and expansion of PAs. It was an incorrect assumption that a new independent PA management institution could be established so quickly during implementation when the baseline was zero knowledge. Additionally, many interviewees report, it was equally presumptive to expect that the Government would introduce so much co-financing on staffing since doing so was also ambitious. Surprisingly, this had worked, and it showed the excellent Government commitment to the conservation ideals put forth. The demonstration of sustainable financing and the economic and social benefits of a functioning PA system remain a gap. The staff contingent of conservation officers was picked up by the respective sectors. This was a good result.
- *Strategies/PA model lacked a strong sociopolitical analysis and situational baseline.*
- To reiterate the MTR findings, the interviewees also shared consensus that 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 the Nevis Island Administration on implementing the Project, but the design of the Project Coordination Unit and the steering committee could have been addressed more fully to lessen the anxiety. For example, the structure of the Project Coordination Unit in the ProDoc might have considered a part-time Nevis coordinator seconded from an arm of the Nevis Island Administration to assist in project coordination and the structure of the steering committee might have designated St. Kitts/Nevis co-chairs and alternating meeting venues. The change in institutional context drastically changed the implementation context by the start of the Project. In the four years between design and start of implementation, priorities changed, and the project document strategy and key outcome targets were deemed not fiscally viable.
- *Internal factors affecting the early implementation changed the spirit, tone and buy-in.*
- These were factors outside the control of the project team. Priorities and legal arrangements had advanced and changed. At the time of inception in 2015, there was a federal election and, in 2016, changes occurred in the ministerial portfolios that affected the Project. These events altered the implementing context drastically and became relevant factors soon after starting implementation. The Project Coordination Unit was situated in the Department of Physical Planning and Environment under the Ministry of Sustainable Development. The Department of Environment was separated from planning and moved under the Ministry of Agriculture together with the Department of Marine Resources DMR. While this seemed optimal, there were a few issues. First, the GEF Operational Focal Point and budget holder remained in the MoSD. Additionally, the DMR did not necessarily have the same perspective as the DOE on the vision of the system for PAs. There was a need for diagnosis and work to bring everybody on the same page regarding the vision of a PA system. Adaptive management was used for implementation bottlenecks caused by internal institutional changes. TE is of the view that the DMR seems to have more clout (MPA) than the department of Environment (TPA). Such realities affected implementation as the DMR did not necessarily have buy-in on the “one financial management arrangement” model. So, more understanding of the connections between terrestrial land uses and the impacts on the sea ecosystems needed to be promoted by the project management team to the marine sector for an understanding of the win-win. The change in the implementation partner to several areas, however, significantly affected the results. Two protected areas were delayed midway. The PA system needed a strategy change that would require time to make decisions. On a good note, the Finance Associate at the PCU became the go-between and established the need to spend from the budget and rationalize arguments. Through planning, this move was able to advance

the Project and get consultancies and procurements signed and passed, supporting results. The inter-ministerial will to make the declarations needed sharpening. With the enactment of the legislation, the declaration might have been automatic.

- *Changes in the implementation strategy and model were required once the agreed implementing arrangement shifted with recent institutional changes.*
- The establishment of environmental coordination was a necessary precursor for the PA system coordination being modeled and for prompting the coordination and management options for the future. TE found that the environment department had been recently upgraded in status as a unit. This Project was the first GEF NIM Biodiversity Project implemented in the country. It was to support the structure for the environmental coordination and then focus on building conditions for the protected areas system, including contribution to the PA legal framework and the PA financing plans as well as the interim and future institutional arrangements. The institutional coordination between the partners and stakeholders in the original document had changed with context, and the implementation strategy was “more to build bridges” than to implement and scale up by doing through the established environmental coordination function. The implementation, however, was to continue along the lines of the original design and work plan, focusing on making contributions to the enabling environment to set the ground rules for sectors and stakeholders to work together. The legal work included the provision for protection and partnerships, including financial partnerships. This was a critical baseline work that would then need operationalization and capacity building. The proposed NCEM Bill would have established the environmental coordination function.
- The Project lacked sufficient resources and astute management ability to identify synergies with co-financing for all activities, especially those that required socioeconomic consultation to build a workable downstream implementing component with communities and livelihoods. The TE learned that the work plan was adapted by the steering committee to focus on the legal and financial enabling aspects, capacity building through training and concrete procurement, i.e. monitoring a vessel and construction. While the work plan had a component on financing, it lacked a strategy for testing the financial viability of an improved PA approach to working in sites with the community and private sector involvement.
- The project design had an unrealistic end target on the complete PA systems approach with complete legislative, staffing and management system changes. According to interviewees, the approach might have been more phased or rethought as a “proof of concept” with a focus on the demonstration of the “fiscal viability” aspects and scaling-up good management practices from the sites. Related were incongruities in the original concept of a system. For instance, while the ProDoc argued for a focus on the national system, Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park was not included. In retrospect, interviewees stated that its inclusion might have supported a persuasive scale-up within a model, taking account of the lesson of a good PA Approach. As such, it might have included some co-management and livelihood work in the buffers. Brimstone Hill had been referenced as a stand-alone protected area but not recommended to be part of the PA system. It had a working management system that might have benefited from the Project in terms of mainstreaming biodiversity and showcasing an ecosystem services approach. It might also have provided a flagship for the other PAs to learn from. The Project was not designed this way, so it was a lesson learned. The original project budget underestimated the cost of work expected. Moreover, stakeholders said it was somewhat unrealistic to expect government co-financing in year two for the total staff carryover in the absence of a workable fiscal and co-financing management plan during implementation.
- Through document review, the Project design did not require proof of a financial concept. The creation of a trust fund and the user fees were the only sources of increased revenues to be installed and, interviewees generally share consensus that the model was not proven but theoretical, it presented a risk to the Government. It was surprising and commendable that the Government did take over the staff budget through co-financing. Piloting the financial system and increasing revenues during implementation in two years was unrealistic. The improved financial management system, i.e. targets on increased user fees and subsidizing the regional trust fund, was expected to be established by the Project. In this sense, bringing the private sector and communities

into the implementation and showcasing improved PA management and innovative co-management approaches through PA pilots was a lesson learned. The stakeholders shared consensus that there might have been technically supported steering committee reflection on the prioritization of budget against the design and that while a focus on policy and enabling work was important, so was the community and private sector involvement. The idea that the Government would establish authority and take over the costs of all conservation workers in year two was an unrealistic design expectation.

- **Assumptions and Risks**

- The project design was thus premised on several critical assumptions including that there was urgent and sufficient will to support and create the PA authority and management model as outlined in the ProDoc. Initially, the ProDoc (2015) had highlighted critical organizational, regulatory and financial risks that never did disappear. From an organizational standpoint, the strategy was based on the idea that there were institutional capacity and resources to support managing protected areas contained in this proposed model. The project design faced significant bottlenecks and barriers at startup including the interest in as well as the fiscal context for a PA systems approach ( with a single management authority to be set up) as presented by the document and design. Additionally, the PA project system concept had started from a near-zero knowledge baseline and needed much more readiness work, i.e. environment coordination before starting PA work. Additionally, the implementing context had changed by the time the Project started. This really upset the assumption around the implementing and learning-by-doing arrangements.
- The project strategy aimed to support the environment coordination and then augment resources to establish a single protected areas agency with capacities and resourcing to manage an expanded and actively managed system of protected areas. The mitigation of this risk was through the idea that the Government would fully finance the scale-up during implementation including strengthening human resource capacities (staffing, skills, competence levels and knowledge) of the agency. This education assumption and risk was real. The fiscal case for supporting the project model was highlighted several times during the TE by the heads of departments. It was clear that the Project needed to work more on showcasing a fiscally viable system. This is further discussed below.
- Next, TE learned in interviews that the co-financial resources did not exist to sufficiently support an effective trust fund for the demonstration of protected areas planning and operations. The document pointed out that while several ongoing projects were working toward the development of additional financing resources for protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis, limited synergies were established. Here the project team also had the potential to pilot test the innovative financing linking the work on PA livelihoods and co-management and private sector investments at the site level. The PA financing work was found to be a critical area for making the case for the legal arrangement and the long-term institutional arrangements.
- Additionally, the Project dealt with the environmental risk as the basic problem to address as the marine and terrestrial ecosystems were not sufficiently resilient and their biological and physical integrity was incrementally compromised by the effects of global and regional climate change. Here the project strategy was to establish new terrestrial and marine protected areas. Combined with those already existing in the country, there would be a means to create a PA system that would encompass large areas of natural ecosystems, thereby increasing their likelihood of persisting in the face of climate change impacts such as increased temperatures and more frequent hurricanes and droughts. Four terrestrial PA sites were to be established and operational by the end of the Project, totaling 8,810 hectares or approximately 34% of the 26,100 hectares that constitute the entire land area of the country. This turned out to be unrealistic due to the project interventions.
- Finally, in terms of the regulatory risk, the project strategy was a focus to establish the PA legislation. The strategy toward results, however, was contingent on the legal arrangement and regulatory framework for both the environmental coordination and regulatory authority and PA management. This is a process, and the risk was noted that it would take a long time to get relevant legislation and regulations passed. The Project attempted to mitigate this work by establishing an alternative strategy for PA management by respective departments. The ProDoc assumed the work on the development activities within and near to PAs, including

tourism impacts within PAs and housing and other development in areas of influence around PAs. It built a strategy of work in the buffer zone with communities. This critical work was not prioritized by the PSC, but it was central to the demonstration of the socioeconomic case and is still a great need.

- **Lessons from other relevant projects (i.e. in the same focal area) incorporated into project design**
- The Project had been building on several ongoing initiatives, such as marine conservation-related projects. The former project, Improving the Management of Coastal Resources and the Conservation of the Marine Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region, a 5 million Euro (US\$ 6.76 million) project, was funded by the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) and executed by the Environmental Management Unit of CARPHA on behalf of CARICOM through Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions (CATS) Programme. In St. Kitts and Nevis, the Project was to be implemented from 2013–2017 by the Department of Marine Resources and Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions (CATS) with the primary focus of establishing and operationalizing the Narrows Marine Park (NMP).<sup>v</sup>
- **Planned stakeholder participation and partnerships arrangements**

Stakeholders	Anticipated Roles and Responsibilities in Project Implementation	Role Played
<b>National Government</b>		
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)	<p>The DPPE would act as the lead Executing Agency for the Project. It would coordinate the inputs of government agencies and other stakeholders in strengthening the legal, policy, institutional and financial framework for a national system of protected areas (Component 1 of the Project). The DPPE would also take direct responsibility for managing two of the PA sites targeted by the project (Central Forest Reserve National Park and Booby Island Nature Reserve) until such time as the Protected Areas Agency was formally established.</p> <p>The Senior Director, DEA-PSIP is the GEF-OFP.</p> <p>The DEA/PSIP, which functions as the GEF focal point office for the country, will work to ensure the collaboration of co-financing agencies and other national and international partners with the proposed Project. The DPPE and the DEA/PSIP will collaborate on the monitoring and evaluation of the day-to-day progress of the Project.</p>	<p>MoSD, lead Executing Agency and the Director of Physical Planning and Environment, was the Project Director and chaired the Inception PSC meeting before the Department of Environment was reassigned to the Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources Cooperative and Environment in early 2016.</p> <p>The DEA-PSIP continued to function as the GEF Operational Focal Point and a member of the Project Steering Committee. The DEA-PSIP provided financial oversight for the Project as stipulated by the Ministry of Finance in keeping with the Finance Administration Act (2007) and reported to the Sub-regional Office on the NEX Advances.</p>

<p>Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources (MAMR), including the Department of Marine Resources</p>	<p>The DMR was to play a key role in updating/strengthening laws, regulations and policies related to the management of marine resources and the establishment of official marine protected areas. The DMR, together with the NDF, would take lead responsibility for marine monitoring and conservation activities, including the establishment and management of three new marine protected areas in the country (Keys, Sandy Point, and Narrows Marine Parks), until the Protected Areas Agency was formally established.</p>	<p>After the Ministry reassignment, the DMR reported to the Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Cooperatives and Environment. In 2016 the Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Resources Act was enacted. The Nevis Department of Fisheries then became the Department of Marine Resources and a member of the steering committee. It established the Marine Management Areas and Conservation Zones (MMA-CZ), which included the proposed MPAs. It instructed the PSC that the country did not use the terminology MPA, and the Project adopted the use of the MMA-CZ instead of the MPA as the country's form of marine protection. DMR led the work in the marine inventory. The DMR provided supervision for two Beach Monitoring Officers and four Marine Conservation Officers. DMR was the custodian of the marine monitoring vessel and conservation equipment procured by the Project.</p>
<p>Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Human Settlements, Cooperatives and Environment – Department of Environment</p>	<p>The newly established department in the Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives.</p>	<p>The Director of the Department of Environment (DOE) was the Project Director and Co-Chair of the Project Steering Committee. The DOE was the lead executing agency for the Project and housed the Project Coordinating Unit. The DOE coordinated the inputs of Government agencies and other stakeholders in strengthening the legal, policy, institutional and financial framework for a national system of protected areas. It took direct responsibility for managing three of the terrestrial PA sites targeted by the Project (Central Forest Reserve National Park, Royal Basseterre Valley National Park and Booby Island Nature Reserve) but was unable to formally establish the Protected Areas Agency/Management Authority. The DOE coordinated the monitoring and evaluation of the day-to-day progress of the Project. The Forestry Officer in the DOE provided supervision of the three park rangers hired by the Project, now government staff. The DOE is the custodian of a public washroom at Central Forest Reserve, two vehicles and conservation equipment procured by the Project.</p>
<p><b>Stakeholders</b></p>	<p><b>Anticipated Roles and Responsibilities in Project</b></p>	<p><b>Role Played</b></p>
<p>Nevis Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (DPPNRE)</p>	<p>The DPPNRE was to oversee the implementation of all site-specific terrestrial activities on the island of Nevis and would coordinate with their national-level counterparts on the development of plans, policies and laws/regulations at both the national level and specifically for the island of Nevis. The DPPNRE would also take direct responsibility for managing the Nevis Peak Forest Reserve National Park, until the Protected Areas Agency was formally established.</p>	<p>The Department was renamed the Department of Physical Planning and Environment (DPPE). The DPPE was the focal point department on Nevis to oversee the implementation of all site-specific terrestrial activities on the island of Nevis. The DPPE coordinated with their national-level counterparts on the development of plans, policies and laws/regulations at both the national level and specifically for the island of Nevis. The DPPE was directly responsible for managing the Nevis Peak and Camps River Watershed. The DPPE was directly responsible for providing input and the approval of the development of the Nevis Physical Development Plan and provided supervision to the two park rangers hired by the Project, who are now employees of the Nevis Island Administration. The DPPE was the custodian of an interpretation center, one vehicle and conservation equipment procured by the Project.</p>

Nevis Department of Fisheries (NDF)	The NDF was to contribute to the updating/strengthening of laws, regulations and policies related to the management of marine resources and the establishment of official marine protected areas, particularly regarding the marine environment around the island of Nevis. The NDF, together with the DMR, was to engage in marine monitoring and conservation activities, including the establishment and management of three new marine protected areas in the country (Keys, Sandy Point, and Narrows Marine Parks), until the Protected Areas Agency is formally established.	The DMR in Nevis was no longer referred to as the Nevis Department of Fisheries. The DMR was a member of the Project Steering Committee and assisted in operationalizing the marine inventory.
Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs (MJLA)	The MJLA will share responsibility for ensuring that policy and legislative frameworks are in place to support all aspects of the Project, in particular the creation and strengthening of laws such as the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA) and the Marine Resources Act and the detailed regulations associated with those acts.	Through work on the legal aspects, this key ministry was involved in reviewing documents such as the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill and the Protected Areas Management Authority Bill and its regulations.
St. Kitts Water Services Department (WSD)	The WSD was to be a key stakeholder in providing technical information on the status of watersheds and information and water quality at sites where rivers and streams feed into the marine and coastal environment.	A member of the Project Steering Committee, the WSD collaborated with the Department of Environment to provide water at the Keys Marine Species Center site and supported activities at the Royal Basseterre Valley National Park.
Ministry of Tourism and International Transport (MTIT), including the St. Kitts Tourism Authority (SKTA)	The MTIT and the SKTA will help to develop a branding and marketing strategy for the PA system and to raise awareness among tour providers, cruise ships and tourists themselves of the ecological, adventure and cultural attractions of the terrestrial and marine protected areas and the new national system of protected areas.	The tourism partners were not active members on the PSC but collaborated with the Project on outputs from the various consultancies and raised some protected areas awareness among their stakeholders.
<b>Environmental NGOs</b>		
St. Christopher National Trust (SCNT)	The SCNT was to be a key partner in conservation activities at the newly established Keys Marine Park (which included the core marine zone of the MAB), and the Project would work to ensure clear modalities for collaboration between the PAA and SCNT. The SCNT would be an active participant on the St. Kitts PA Committee (subcommittee of the NEC), and would likely participate in other project activities.	The St. Christopher National Trust was a member of the Project Steering Committee; its membership participated in consultations with project consultants. The subcommittee of the NEC was not established. It provided some implementing to public education, awareness and outreach activities, utilizing outputs from biodiversity inventories.
Nevis Historical and Conservation Society (NHCS)	The NHCS was expected to be a key partner in the management of the Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed Area, in particular through active participation on the Nevis PA Committee (subcommittee of the NEC) and through education and outreach programs to local communities and schools, building on their experience with similar programs related to wetlands, beach and turtle monitoring, invasive species (lionfish), and recycling.	Like the St. Christopher National Trust, the Nevis Historical and Conservation Society was a member of the Project Steering Committee and provided some implementing support to public education, awareness and outreach activities utilizing outputs from biodiversity inventories. Nevis PA Committee (a subcommittee of the NEC) was not established as expected in the strategies/theories of change for this Project, which made many assumptions about this.
St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network (SKSTMN)	The organization would continue to have lead responsibility for turtle monitoring at the Keys Beach and other turtle nesting sites in the country. It would also participate in awareness-raising campaigns regarding the value of protecting turtles and in training local tour guides in safe methods for accessing and “watching” turtle nesting.	The St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network was a member of the Project Steering Committee. The SKNSTM guided the development of the Keys Marine Species Rehabilitation Center.
<b>Local Stakeholder/User Groups</b>		

Sandy Pointers Inspiring Real Improvement Throughout (SPIRIT)	This group was to participate in community education and awareness, identifying local knowledge useful to the Project (traditional uses of plants) and working with the Project to identify specific benefits to communities from the Project.	This part of the Project involving the community was conducted through a consultative approach with group participation on various stakeholder consultancies under the Project. The groups received public service campaign messaging and education. One criticism was that they were not more actively involved in implementation through learning by doing, giving input on policy work and supporting action research, especially in and around the PAs and in buffers.
Fahies Agricultural Women's Cooperative Society (FAWCS)	This group was to participate in small-scale reforestation initiatives and planting/cultivation of species used traditionally for medicine and food for potential processing and promotion of small businesses.	
Community Upliftment & Empowerment Team (CUET)	This group was to participate in community education and awareness, identifying local knowledge useful to the Project (traditional uses of plants), and working to identify specific benefits to communities from Project.	
Sandy Point Agriculture	This group would participate in community education on natural resource management.	
<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Anticipated Roles and Responsibilities in Project Implementation</b>	
Cooperative Society Ltd (SPACS)	This group would contribute knowledge on how forest assets were traditionally harvested and promote sustainable harvesting of resources.	Not involved. This sector was probably not prioritized because the main objective of this Project was the PA institutional system in place.
St. Kitts - Nevis Agricultural Youth Forum (SKNAYF)	The groups were to engage in awareness-raising of local youth on the value of natural resources (focusing on issues relevant to the protection of the Basseterre Valley aquifer) and in working with the DPPE to develop a strategy to address the problem of the invasive Vervet Monkey.	Received public education through public service announcements and videos.
Tourism operators	Tour guides/companies operating at terrestrial PA sites and dive/snorkel/yachting companies operating at marine PA sites, were to play an active role with government agencies in developing rules and protocols for their operations within PA sites, as well as in promoting visitation to the sites and safe practices among visitors.	Not involved substantively, This is a missed opportunity since this group is a key stakeholder in developing sustainable funding mechanisms.
Fishermen	Fishermen were to be involved in MPA planning and management decision-making, including the siting of fisheries no-take zones and/or restrictions on gear, practices and seasons. Fishermen associations (such as the Sandy Point Fishermen's Society and various groups in the village of Newcastle) would be encouraged to participate in monitoring of fishing activities.	These were consulted on aspects of the upstream work on financing and legal aspects. The fishermen participated in the implementation of the communication strategy outreach. Most of the input from this group was provided by the DMR, which consulted them extensively.
Private developers	The company Kittitian Hill Properties was to act as a partner in promoting visitation, encouraging low-impact behaviors in and around the Central Forest Reserve National Park and sharing information with residents on commercial organic food production techniques. The developers of the Christophe Harbour marina/villa development were to be sought out as partners in marine conservation and public education and outreach in support of the PA system.	Not involved substantively

- The stakeholder engagement was significantly more limited than was anticipated at the Project design stage. Proper stakeholder identification and analysis would have led to better stakeholder engagement. Currently, the UNDP-GEF social and environmental safeguards policy (SES) emphasizes this. The priorities changed, the context changed and the implementation strategies subsequently changed regarding the anticipated involvement of the stakeholders. At the design level, an in-depth stakeholder analysis took place. (The list of anticipated stakeholders is provided above.) Key selected participants participated. A recurring criticism from interviewees was that the civil society, private sector, education and productive sectors were less involved than they could have been in support of the case for upstream changes desired in the PA management system, in behaviors of the users of the PA resources and the improved management of the resources. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) served functionally as the project management and oversight board and as a platform for all relevant implementing partners and stakeholders. Changes occurred in the PSC, which was to be co-chaired by UNDP and MoSD according to the project design documentation. However, after Government reorganization, the Department of Environment became a co-chair instead of MoSD. The PSC included representation from several institutions and stakeholders. According to the ProDoc, 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 could also be included in the PSC as deemed appropriate and necessary.

Consequently, throughout the implementation process, other stakeholders and institutions were eventually added to the PSC. The MTR had highlighted that tourism was not included as a key stakeholder, but it did not make note of the lack of community-level engagement as critical implementation partners toward results and impacts. The document had weak inclusion regarding government administrative areas that deals with this productive sector, but as seen through the feedback coming from the context in other sections of this report, this productive sector would have been an 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-à-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 PAs, it was a considerable gap that they were not included at this point of the design stage in the stakeholder analysis. The TE learned the actual representation was dependent on responsiveness to serve on the PSC. The Stakeholder engagement plan does mention the Tourism sector as a stakeholder involved in some activities of the project TE learned they were consulted frequently but at the time of establishing the PSC they were not available to sit on the committee

- **Replication approach**

- The replication approach was based on the model outlined in the ProDoc as follows: At the site level, the Project would establish and/or operationalize four terrestrial PA sites and three new marine PA sites. The potential for replication at other PA sites in the terrestrial environment existed although future sites would likely be on a much smaller scale than the Central Forest Reserve and Nevis Peak National Park sites, each of which covers a significant percentage of its island's total land area and most of the extant natural forest cover. However, the expansion of the PA system to include coastal areas was perceived as an important priority for the country. This was in fact already accomplished before the Project started. The lessons from the improved marine sites would be scaled up to all seven PA sites included in the Project's newly established replication at other sites. The concept was that the lesson from the marine sector and the improved management practice piloted in work with the PA and with communities would be scaled up to all seven PA sites included in the Project's newly established replication at other sites.
- In the marine environment, the zoning and planning work done under the St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area plan had already identified numerous sites, in addition to those included in this

Project, for the establishment of various types of marine conservation zones. In addition to the areas of the three Marine Parks targeted by this Project, the SKNMMA plan also identified a fourth “conservation zone” in the coastal waters near Dieppe Bay off the northeast coast of St. Kitts. The SKNMMA plan also identified two “fishing-conservation” zones, one off the coast of each island, and seven “tourism-fishing-conservation” zones, including three off the southeast peninsula of St. Kitts and three around the island of Nevis and the Monkey Shoals area located several miles offshore of both islands. The lessons learned were that legal, policy, institutional and financing frameworks that would be established and technical and resource capacities that would be built by the proposed Project and fine-tuned at the seven PA sites included in the Project would greatly aid future efforts to replicate PA establishment and operationalization at these other sites. The potential for successful replication was enhanced by the variety of human uses and ecological conditions at the various selected terrestrial and marine PA sites and, in the case of the targeted marine sites, in particular, the fact that they consisted of a variety of management zones, including those for conservation, fishing and tourism use.

- It was assumed that by selecting sites with varied conditions, potential uses and management regimes, the Project would develop PA management models that could be replicated at almost all the other potential sites in the country. This analysis was not realistically a scale-up strategy but rather missed the point. The actual replication strategy was overambitious with the scale-up expected within the timeframe and dependent on the setup of the authority.
- The Project focus was, however, to build a new legal and management system grounded in the legal and financial enabling elements during the four-year implementation. The path taken via PSC was first to realize the National Environment Committee coordination of PAs together with DMR and the possibility for an independent authority sometime in the future to enable the expansion of PAs and improved management practices based on future scientific monitoring. As the basic model changed, the idea of having an independent authority changed the replication approach. In reality, by the time the Project started, the DMR had already established a management system for management of conservation zones. The Project then had two agencies, DMR and Department of Environment, each with its own system of financial oversight for management of the protected area in its jurisdiction. The consolidation of their systems for financial oversight and management has not been worked out. A key take away from this Project is that the management arrangement is key to making a model in which MMA and TPA coordination is central. If the institutions are separate and have their own funding sources and agendas, then integration and systemic thinking are slowed. If the Department of Environment under the MoSD or the Ministry of Agriculture manages the Project and its budget, then marine resources may not comply or work together as willingly with the Project.
- Additionally, TE learned in interviews there were stakeholders with sustainable financing components in place before the inception of this Project. One example is sea turtle ecotourism, which was developed and implemented in 2008/2009 with a full published outcome assessment in 2016. The interpretation is that it is also a component of this work and will function to maintain employment within the communities for sea turtle conservation. These projects were all components of GEF SGP funding and were not considered in the project development. Neither was the ongoing work for many years.
- **Linkages between the Project and other interventions within the sector**
- At the project inception and design stage, there were several government institutions with ongoing and planned activities relevant to strengthening the overall system of protected areas in the country. The Department of Environment (DOE) was expected to provide baseline spending for the coordination of PA management activities nationwide, administration of the National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act (NCEPA) and updating of relevant legislation and establishment of financial mechanisms, information systems and outreach and education programs to support protected area and the budget for these activities during the period of project implementation is US\$ 0.86 million.<sup>vi</sup>
- Notably, at the design stage, several marine conservation-related projects were ongoing on St. Kitts and Nevis and were leading on policy and practices. The project for improving the Management of Coastal Resources and

the Conservation of the Marine Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region was EUR 5 million (US\$ 6.76 million) project funded by the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) and executed by the Environmental Management Unit of CARPHA on behalf of CARICOM through Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions (CATS) Programme. It provided advice to local communities and relevant public and private stakeholders in selected member countries of CARICOM. The Project was implemented from 2013–2017 by the Department of Marine Resources and Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions (CATS) with the primary focus of establishing and operationalizing the Narrows Marine Park (NMP). The Project had implemented the following activities: legal establishment and demarcation, writing a management plan and a business plan, monitoring and assessing biophysical conditions and a communications strategy/awareness-raising, establishing offices and purchasing equipment (vehicle, dive gear, mooring buoys) and training and livelihoods activities including promotion of Fish Aggregating Devices and aquaculture. The CATS project also carried out extensive consultation and public awareness activities in support of the establishment of the NMP and the drafting of the management plan, expected to be completed and submitted to Cabinet by late 2015. The budget for project activities in St. Kitts and Nevis was estimated at US\$ 0.60 million.

- The Eastern Caribbean Marine Management Area Network (ECMMAN) project was implemented by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). It was a regional project that would run from 2013–2017 with an overall budget of EUR 4.2 million (a budget specifically for St. Kitts and Nevis that has been estimated at US\$ 0.45 million). At the regional level, the goal of the Project was to add to and strengthen MPAs in six OECS member states by establishing new and strengthening existing marine managed areas (MMAs) that were to contribute to the implementation of the Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI) commitment to effectively conserve and manage at least 20% of the near-shore marine and coastal environment by 2020. It was to build strong constituencies for sustainable livelihoods and ocean use, including MMA co-management with conservation at its core in all six countries, improving and updating an Eastern Caribbean Decision Support System that provides accessible decision-making tools and instituting sustainability mechanisms to support the MMA network, including regional political commitments and actions, regional collaboration mechanisms and follow-on funding. At the national level in St. Kitts and Nevis, activities were identified as assisting with zoning design and spatial planning and drafting of formal documents for the establishment of the SKNMMA, giving support for the design of sustainable financing mechanisms to help the Government of SKN to capitalize the National Conservation Trust Fund, sustainable livelihood activities for fishermen and outreach and education on marine protected areas.

#### **4.2 EFFECTIVENESS (MANAGEMENT, IMPLEMENTATION AND FACTORS INFLUENCING RESULTS)**

- **Project Management and Coordination, Implementation/Execution (MU\*) UNDP-GSKN Coordination and Operational issues**
- The consultant considered the following: whether there was an appropriate focus on results, the quality of risk management and the responsiveness to implementation problems.
- This Project is the first national implemented project on biodiversity in SKN. Interviewees expressed that there was a steep learning curve while implementing. The project management at start had start-up setbacks including the late recruitment of the Project Coordinator. Together with the design-to-implementation lag, this affected the momentum and in general, the coordination of activities and delegation of tasks critical for results. The TE learned that the new Project Coordinator was recruited shortly after leaving the Nevis Department of Environment (Department of Physical Planning and Environment) and needed time and some basic knowledge about UNDP-GEF to learn before implementing. Additionally, the recruitment turned out to be a limiting factor as the project coordination might have better been external to the sectors and the operating context. (Also see MTR on this point.) Additionally, for a new UNDP-GEF PA hire, the new Project Coordinator needed guidance and more time to learn GEF project operations before implementation begun with the inception. TE learned that before being hired, the new Project Coordinator sat in two physical meetings with project developers, and, while aware of the project concept, she was hired one year after the Project started in October 2015. The first Project Steering Committee took place just four days after her recruitment. In hindsight, the inception meeting is an especially important GEF milestone which required a good thorough walkthrough of the project

implementation strategy and expected results. The design was not adjusted at this point. The agenda was viewed to be ambitious, unrealistic and “not fiscally viable.”

- The UNDP program support and monitoring officer were located in Barbados. The stakeholders were critical about the UNDP responsiveness to the changes requested in the work plans. On the other hand UNDP has fulfilled its duties as an implementing and for fiduciary execution and supporting evaluations The NIM plus model however in SKN as in other countries under NIM modality require extra support with implementation including planning steering committee meetings and work plan advice on GEF project monitoring or possibilities for adaptive management. The RTA plays a critical oversight role in NIM plus situations and in hindsight could have been more involved. However, it was perhaps that this project did hire a CTA but that role was more task based and less well defined as providing technical oversight against the GEF plan and so presents a lesson learned on coordinating between these roles. The lesson was the need for UNDP support to the Project Coordinator on a number of management protocols and also more advice on task management and GEF suggested requirements including setting up a technical team for planning and work planning.
- *Steering Committee functioning*
- The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was the main oversight mechanism but joined this function with work planning and stakeholder debate. The committee comprised the relevant counterparts from the government and civil society. A lesson learned is that the PSC should be a high-level forum between partners, not in-country stakeholders. The Project should have had a technical committee for intersectoral work planning. Including both work planning and technical debates was not constructive for consensus-building and technical oversight. It needed task teams and a technical, intersectoral, multi-stakeholder working technical committee. This was not operationalized.
- *UNDP-GEF Technical and Program Support and Oversight*
- As highlighted throughout this report there was not an appropriate focus on the results as provided by the indicator framework. The quality of risk management was low. Many project steering committee interviewees clearly suggested the UNDP-GEF responsiveness -as managing parties to significant implementation problems was to stick closely to the GEF project rules. This resulted in some unfavorable back and forth on the project management interpretations of the budgeted outputs. The lack of communication on some of the issues led to a break down in the relationships and was stated to have harmed the implementation and collaboration overall.
- While UNDP provided day-to-day support to the implementation and technical oversight was provided through PIRs and some review of major work products, interviewees stated they could have had better coordination and a clearer separation of the technical support/oversight and day-to-day UNDP management support. These roles are legally separated and equally important to supporting the value added of the GEF investment in the country. In hindsight, better communication channels could have been set up between the UNDP and the government on the project oversight and the changes to the indicator framework. UNDP was active on the steering committee with participation in all meetings (Annex). UNDP provided technical monitoring support through the annual GEF PIR reviews and monitoring visits to project sites. The Project also had two CTAs. The first was replaced and the inputs of the second were delayed by guiding the work and were more task-based as opposed to a more optimal monitoring and oversight role with UNDP backing. According to interviewees, these groups needed more coordination.
- *Oversight and intersectoral work intertwined in PSC*
- The Project had a steering committee but chose not to set up a working overarching technical committee for intersectoral collaboration on technical work and work planning. Technical Task Committees were established early on for the legal work, financing mechanism and the standard operating procedures, but interviewees say that it was difficult to get them to review and provide feedback after that. Interviewees also reported that the private sector might have provided technical inputs. Participation on the steering committee was a matter of interest, and stakeholders listed in the original ProDoc were invited to the meetings.
- *Major conceptual issues with key partners during implementation: the vision of PAs between key counterparts in DOE and DMR-PA versus MMAs.*

- The TE learned that the Department of Marine Resources (DMR) was consulted during formulation in 2012. In 2015, DMR developed its conservation legal work with the support of USAID and the TNC marine zoning plan of 2010. They had the same terms and the same objectives. Additionally, as mentioned in 2015, when the Biodiversity Project started, a recurring issue was the development of legislation on marine resources. In 2014–2015, FAO helped with fisheries aquaculture and marine resources legislation. The legislation met the objective originally envisioned under the Biodiversity Project when it was conceptualized in 2012. The project team could not establish constructive working arrangements with DOE and DMR to start piloting financial work in communities with conservation zones mostly because the work did not advance beyond basic enabling or “readiness” for coordination and the start of baseline inventory work.
- 
- On several occasions, the Department of Marine Resources (DMR) demonstrated in documents its concerns with the coordination and ownership of certain tasks related to the management of marine areas as per the ProDoc. By the time the project started, the DMR had already legally established, with external support, marine management areas (MMA) which included conservation elements. Before 2010, the Department of Marine Resources was called the Department of Fisheries. It had been concerned with the production elements of fisheries rather than conservation, but this was changing with the establishment of the Department of Marine Resources. The DMR was thus leading DOE on management concerning marine conservation. In hindsight, interviewees say this was not an issue or conflict with the concept of PA, but all needed to come together around an ecosystem services approach and financial systems for managing funds collected. The marine conservation zones (MCZ) became the areas for the marine component work. However, there was a continued issue of the DMR refusal to work with the MPA concept and the project task management and work planning, given that the DMR had already discussed the MPA concept repeatedly with stakeholders in the past and was not able to agree on the usage of the term MPA. However, the DMR was able to make a compromise by using the term Conservation Zone with all stakeholders agreeing in the 2010 Marine Zone Plan. Conceptually, the coordination for constructive work planning and joint task management was low. This issue was picked up by the MTR but not resolved. The conceptual and semantics problem was adapted, and the project coordination team tried to integrate the DMR concept and move forward. The quality of the inputs then seems to have gotten in the way of constructive coordination and work processes. Interviewees said the issue of having the funding go through the Department of Environment MoSD was a bottleneck to be worked out. Additionally, interviewees said that if the DMR was not willing to work in coordination, this did not mean that the project implementation team did not make efforts to do so. In hindsight again, TE finds that more dialogue on implementation approaches and assigning roles/tasks was needed to build constructive work planning and bridges with the DMR. This is a lesson learned. An example of the need for communications and workable arrangements was said by interviewees to have occurred when the project coordination unit supported DMR with the task to develop its scientific baseline. It was developed with the support of the DMR, but there was a report that the terms of reference were changed by the DMR, and an externally recruited consultant team from England delivered an incomplete inventory result. It was not accepted.
- The relevant interviewees reported that the PC unit and steering committee did not have clear operating procedures from the onset. The PC, for instance, had limited access to the UNDP intranet at the start of the Project, and the country coordinating unit in Barbados was not always able to access the project template and policy documents concerning implementation. There was confusion as to how the Project would be implemented and according to what operating procedure, whether GEF, Government or the UNDP. The government counterparts state that the project management skills were not up to par and that the UNDP has been unable to adhere to the advice provided through the steering committee. The reality is that the project design is based on strict GEF standards, and more conversation was needed on the way forward between the UNDP in Barbados, the operational focal point and the PC.

#### **Risk Management Analysis**

- The risk management system was in place with risks identified, categorised and a mitigation strategy in place which were reflected in the ProDoc.

- The actual risk management was not rigorously flagged or followed up by UNDP and or the country partners. The explanation provided for this was that the project was monitored generally on a day to day basis by the Project Coordinator but with the radically changed implementation plan and the lack of formal follow up of the monitoring plan as well as a need to rearticulate the risks in the narrative for higher UNDP CO intervention as the context changed drastically between the time the project was written and the time the project started implementing was not coordinated for actions. Normally, the steering committee is the place for flagged risks to be discussed. Additionally, if this process goes smooth and the context is suitable UNDP CO may choose to hold meetings directly with the national GEF focal point to discuss issues with implementation.
- **Work planning**
- The Project prepared its initial 2015 work plan, which itemized the outcomes, their timeframes and an associated budget drawn from the ProDoc. Subsequently, a 2016 work plan, a 2017 work plan and a consolidated, multi-year work plan to the Project end were prepared. The MTR recognized some inconsistencies in the work plans and recommended that they should be addressed, including congruency on timing and completeness between the annual plans and the consolidated plan and interpretation of outputs in the ProDoc. Also, some key output expectations were not captured in the consolidated work plan. These include Output 1.2 Strengthen Policies-Support for NGO Involvement in PA management. The ProDoc references the establishment of general mechanisms and protocols to facilitate NGO participation in protected area management. These mechanisms usually include the 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 the component of the protected area in Outcome 2, Output 1.3 Financial Sustainability Framework. The Financial Management System sub-output, which includes a business plan for the protected area system, was missing from the work plans during MTR. This had been corrected.
- **Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (MU \*)**
- Monitoring was stipulated by the ProDoc M&E activities. While these were generally conducted, as already highlighted, the formal mechanisms for changing and adapting the Project were weak, including the required technical monitoring coordination. The project monitoring was conducted following established UNDP and GEF procedures. It was provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from UNDP-GEF and a full-time CTA. The Project Log Frame (Project Results Framework) and ProDoc provided the performance and impact indicators for Project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. TE noted that despite the written mechanisms in the GEF project for the adaptation of the logical framework and an adaptive management plan, the log frame and general pathways remained unchanged even though there was an issue noted with the project design from an early stage, i.e. the model of PA was not conducive to the fiscal reality. Such a change required a change in the project strategy. However, the new pathways toward change were not articulated. Additionally, the finding at MTR was that targets and indicators needed to be smarter, and work needed to be done with the log frame. Nothing had changed.
- The basis on which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System was developed included the Project start-up. However, the project inception workshop was held just four days after the Project Coordinator was hired. The TE key finding was that this was a crucial event for building ownership for the project results and to develop the first-year annual work plan. In terms of quarterly reports, the progress made was monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log was updated in ATLAS. The regulatory risks were deemed critical throughout as the impact and probability were high.
- The Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR) were prepared as per GEF UNDP project requirements. This key report monitored progress made since the Project started and for reporting periods (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. TE reviewed all these reports.

- Periodic monitoring had been done through site visits. UNDP-CO and the UNDP-RCU reported visits to the Project to assess progress. Generally, the visits corresponded with the steering committee meetings at the mid-term of the project cycle. The Project underwent an independent Mid-Term Review at the mid-point of project implementation (February 2016). The management response and the evaluation were uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) in particular. Some of the relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools were completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle. The financial scorecards were not completed, generally because the financing work was not being tested in pilot sites.
- The formal project mechanisms (inception, MTR and PSC minutes) were not used well to document changes in project strategies or targets. The MTR and CTA gave alternative pathways for monitoring expected results suggested in technical notes and reports. These were not formally reflected in the project documentation; for example, although the MTR suggested correcting outputs for measurement, there was no evidence of formal changes in the documentation. During the MTR, these outputs were recognized as generalized in their description and difficult to measure. Thus, it was difficult to demonstrate the progress of their components and the overall Project. MTR noted that in key inputs such as the 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. MTR recommended that attention be paid to itemizing each output, reviewing the 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. For capacity building, the deficit was noted, for instance, "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." The MTR is a formal exercise of the GEF used for reflecting on needed changes to support future monitoring for results. The lesson is to do this better in future projects.
- While the technical and monitoring support was extensive, with inputs from experts and consultants, the RTA, CTA and UNDP-CO, critically as mentioned, it was uncoordinated. The UNDP Country Office could have been more proactive ensuring links between the PC, the ME, PO, CTA and the RTA. The technical assistance to the Project from the UNDP was viewed by stakeholders as limited, but the Project did have the benefit of a CTA for oversight and monitoring but no monitoring role. This is a key lesson learned for future projects. The programme support portfolio was large and the tenure of programme associates was interrupted in more than two instances, creating lags in support of the team. The officers participated in the project steering committee meeting and thus were the go-betweens in communication and correspondence with the GEF-RTA officer and CTA and consultants. While the GEF-RTA provided assent in the PIR, they visited the project only once during implementation. The UNDP subregional office hired a Programme Associate in 2016 and the level of monitoring was intense and daily but not optimal as the associate was not technical in biodiversity and restricted the support to providing templates and support on reporting rather than on technical areas and strategic support for issues and relationships critical to the implementation. The newly hired CTA had no communication with the Regional Technical Advisor, and the establishment of these links might have fostered better technical support to the new implementing strategy. The CTA work was largely per outputs and not so much through oversight and technical assurance for project results on a whole.
- **Gender and Mainstreaming**
- The evaluation question whether the project including its design was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters and gender. The cross-cutting nature of the design work on biodiversity and protected area support these issues however, the failure of the project was to focus on the implementing through and with disadvantaged communities and to work plan in an inclusive manner. The appreciation of the nexus between biodiversity and sustainable human development is an opportunity for UNDP to garner greater results. The gaps in implementation on these areas are evident and the consultant tried to access the information but was

challenged to do assessment as the activities supporting women and disadvantaged economically groups did not proceed according to the project's original plan.

- Gender and SES safeguards monitoring based on an established baseline was not a requirement during design. In retrospect, interviewees share consensus that this area might have been monitored to support project results, for instance, through more work implementing PAs fiscal management working with vulnerable communities. The reason given for the lack of focus was a protraction on the upstream elements. The project did not set up protocols for inclusive work planning and or implementing through communities. This work showcasing the poverty – environment nexus did not proceed as the project plan was more ambitious and it was not fiscally viable. The project's community livelihoods work was not prioritized. This is where women would gain the most from an improved PA approach. While there were some gender results, they were counted more in training and staffing. Gender consideration was largely not monitored or integrated into the documentation or legal work. The project SES safeguards guidance was not a requirement when this Project was established, but some monitoring baseline might have been established at the MTR. It was not. While the Project had limited progress on gender mainstreaming observed in the training of PA managers, the entire Project needed a whole of project gender results-focused strategy with a good gender ratio. For example, during this target setting process, it should have also been noted that a minimum of 30% of beneficiaries should be women.
- Multiple training sessions took place in PA management functions with 7 staff (men) training on GPS data and resource cataloging; 20 (8 women, 12 men) in PA emergency response capacities; 15 staff (7 women, 8 men) on ecotourism; and 25 (6 females; 19 males) in database management and decision support tools.

### 4.3 EFFECTIVENESS - RESULTS

- **Overall results (attainment of objectives) \*Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**

Objective				
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				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Final Review of Indicator Progress, i.e. whether the target was met, partially met or not met	TE color rating
Area of terrestrial ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	5,260 hectares at 2 existing sites	8,810 hectares (3,550 ha. added at 2 new sites) by end of project	Partially met 5,260 With the enactment of the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill, the proposed Booby Island Nature Reserve would be automatically declared. The narrative and boundary delineations have been prepared by the Department of Physical Planning and Environment within the NIA and rest with the Minister responsible for the environment on Nevis to declare Nevis Peak National Park and Camps River Watershed.	
Area of marine ecosystems in St. Kitts and Nevis under official protection	0 hectares	11,693 hectares (11,693 ha. added at 3 new sites) by end of project	Met ( but as mentioned in text not linked to this project due to USAID project before this one started) 42,456.322 In 2016, The Department of Marine Resources designated the two-mile radius around St. Kitts and Nevis as a Marine Management Area (MMA) with Conservation Zones at Keys, The Narrows and Sandy Point. Since the writing of the ProDoc, a Marine Management Area measuring 42,456.322 hectares was legally established with the enactment of the Fisheries, Aquaculture, Marine Resources Act of 2016, and the Marine Protected Areas in the country are referred to as Marine Management Area-Conservation Zones (MMA-CZ) and include Monkey Shoals. Within that designation, the 11,693 hectares that were proposed as Marine Protected Areas through this project have been legally established within this MMA.	

Capacity development indicator score for protected area system: • Systemic • Institutional • Individual	50% 38% 48%	65% 55% 65%	76% 75% 75% Partially met While a capacity development strategy was developed, it focused on training and not on the systemic work that was needed either as learning through implementation approach or by a more holistic capacity development strategy that cut across the expected result strategy. Such a holistic strategy would outline learning work with individuals, organizational and institutional elements with indicators and measures for monitoring. For instance, it would target the public sector, colleges and the education ministry to support sustainable results.	
Improved management effectiveness of protected area units as measured by METT: • Central Forest Reserve National Park • Royal Basseterre Valley Park • Nevis Peak Forest Reserve National Park • Booby Island Nature Reserve • Narrows Marine Park • Keys Marine Park • Sandy Point Marine Park	39 28 30 6 14 25 15	60 40 60 40 60 60 60	No scores at TE - 40 38 - 78 Not met. (Awaiting final score)	
<b>The progress of the project objective can be described as Moderately Satisfactory MS</b>				

- **Overall Assessment of Project Objective: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**
- Overall results can be assessed at about 60%. The country became more cognizant of the need to declare and operate PAs, and the staffing and management of the areas have increased. However, all the additional PAs were not declared, and the finance model and the institutional structure were not achieved. The newly agreed to "interim structure" was not formally adopted by Cabinet. It needed proper stakeholder engagement within the Government undertaken to strengthen, create buy-in and demonstrate the financial models possible.
- While the country was more aware of the need to declare the site, there is minimal increase in management, insufficient to adequately manage the site both at an institutional and at a site level. This pertains only to terrestrial PAs. The Marine PAs were well managed.
- In general, the Project has met 60% of its expected outcomes based on the decisions made toward the end targets during implementation. The Project provided a general focus on sensitization and, through many steering committee deliberations, a limited understanding of what a PA management and system coordination might be. The Project provided significant contributions to the overall enabling environment through knowledge products. In terms of the targets, it was recognized early that the ProDoc targets were overambitious, especially regarding the assumption that the Government would financially support an independent authority and or finance coordination during implementation. The project strategy was duly adapted along the way by stakeholders during the steering committee meeting with the supportive work of the chief technical advisor. The project management and teams did not prioritize work with and through PA communities and, in hindsight,

this may have affected the overall expected results, including the buy-in for the approach and model being suggested.

- While DMR is very used to working with stakeholders, having their buy-in during the decision-making process was critical to the success of this Project. The DMR has been very successful against the project goals, but this was not as a result of the Project per se. The observation is not the case for DOE and the work on terrestrial PAs.
- The Project thus raised the bar on the science to policy and enabling environment for a PA system. In general, the Project was overambitious, and the country was not “readied” or prepared to work on a coordinated systems approach. The cross-sectoral work was very important as the consensus and vision for a common PA system needed to be in place. Additionally, while undertaking joint work on inventory and scientific baseline as a key output, it was only moving toward a full inventory near the Project end. It was also key for the PA system in the country, in terms of knowing what was at stake or an asset and what a key knowledge input was. This work is essential, and it is not complete. The TE assessed the view on the marine inventory and learned that some baseline information was missing, and the CTA has not yet reviewed the final reports. This information still needs to be consolidated in an economic, social, policy and legal document final report with a summary of what was done, what was learned and what is the way forward. There was dissonance on the expectation and the delivery. For example, component two included work on terrestrial and marine inventories. TE learned that the marine ToR needed more work. Although the project hired two CTAs, the initial CTA was switched one year into the Project. The transfer of expert personnel was purported to have resulted in setbacks. The new CTA helped to assess the gaps in terrestrial and marine inventories, and this helped correct some of the issues. However, there were problems with the methodologies and results counts. For instance, some of the areas were inaccessible, and the consultants did not deliver the full picture due to that issue. Researchers needed to go off trail (with military-for safety, in places also to be avoided) and needed support for trail clearing to key areas with possible unique biodiversity. To reach those species that are unlikely to be found in the more accessible areas, drones or military interventions are needed for support. The CTA helped to draft the marine assessment ToR in consultation with the DMR to bring them in line with the needs of the DMR. CTA had no input in the Terrestrial ToR. The TE, however, noted that the changes were not formalized in the MTR, but what was expected, prioritized and possible was well understood and commented on through the deliberation of the steering committee.

### ***Expected Outcomes via Outputs (See Assessed Log frame indicators in Annex)***

- **Component 1: Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities**
- Under this outcome, the PA laws and regulations will be strengthened through update and approval of the draft National Conservation and Environment Management Bill, strengthening of Protected Areas Policies, the establishment of Protected Areas Agency (PAA) and Capacity Building of PAA Staff, the establishment and operation of National Environmental Committee (NEC) and the provision of support for NGO Involvement in PA Management. Under this outcome, the financial sustainability framework for Protected Areas System will also be strengthened through the development of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms and Strategies for the PA system and the development of financial Management Systems to support cost-effective PA management. In support of data-driven decision-making, the Project focus was on the consolidation of an information system supporting PA management objectives through the development and operation of a Protected Areas Information System. Finally, under Outcome 1, the Project will seek to increase Awareness and Support for Protected Areas through a series of structured Public Education and Awareness Programs regarding the national system of protected areas.

#### **Output 1.1: Strengthened Protected Areas Laws and Regulations**

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 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

Outcome 1 Strengthened Protected Area System Framework and Capacities				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Target Met, Partially or not	TE Color rating
Legal authority in place for the collection and retention (within the PA system) of visitor/user/concession fees and other financing mechanisms for protected areas, including the proposed National Conservation Trust Fund (NCTF)	Only 1 PA unit (Brimstone Hill NP) has authority to collect or retain fees.	By end of year 2, legal authority established (under existing NCEPA and/or new NCEMA and Marine Resources Act) for all official PA units to collect and retain fees and receive allocations from the NCTF	Not met. No legal authority was established for fees and other financing alternatives. This was determined not to be the way forward and a bill was drafted. Regulations are the supporting mechanism to operationalize an Act. As a result, these are done by the responsible Minister, not by an Act of Parliament. The Protected Areas Agency model in the ProDoc was modified in keeping with the limitations of the GSKN. The work on the marine protected areas or conservation zones was advanced, but that work was not documented under this project's results.	
Consolidated and effectively functioning institutional management of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis	Existing PA units and sites of proposed new PA units are currently managed by multiple government agencies and nongovernmental organizations.	Protected Areas Agency (PAA) formally established and actively implementing functions across PA system (planning; financing; monitoring, enforcement) by end of year 3	Not met. An interim institutional structure for coordination and management was, however, developed as a solution. The coordination and work through that stature, however, did not advance. The Government's position is not to establish any more statutory bodies until they can prove their financial sustainability.	
Effective coordination between institutions/ personnel responsible for protected areas and adjacent/upstream areas of influence on PA units	No coordination or information sharing mechanisms among resource management agencies are currently functional on St. Kitts and Nevis.	National Environmental Committee (NEC) overseeing protected areas management throughout the country by end of year 1	No, not met. The Project changed the implementing pathway early, and this was not established. However, the steering committee, with a broad cross-section of Government and non-government participants, served as a platform during implementation.	
Number of PA staff with specialized training and/or skills development in the following PA management functions: • PA planning processes and tools • Creation/enforcement of PA regulations	0 2 (specific to fisheries) 0 0 0	6 6 6 6	Yes, capacity development aspects were significant but could have had a broader monitoring framework. The Project did very well with training and in general with public awareness activities.  7 (0 females; 7 males)  20 (8 females; 12 males)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecotourism development</li> <li>• Business and financial planning</li> <li>• Database management and decision support tools</li> </ul>			<p>15 (7 females; 8 males)</p> <p>0</p> <p>25 (6 females; 19 males)</p>	
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)	US\$ 0	US\$ 429,000/year (50% from the NCTF and 50% from the CBF) by end of project	Not established or met. There was Government resistance to the NCTF due to perceived loss of control of PA fees/financing collected. CTA worked with CBF to find an innovative way to ensure that PA fees stayed separate (within the fund) so “control” on how money was spent could be maintained. Though innovative ways were identified, resistance to the fund remained. No result.	

**Overall Assessment of Component One: Moderately Satisfactory MS**

- This component was largely concerned with the enabling and upstream elements of the original project strategy and model. The Project provided significant knowledge contributions to the overall enabling environment (see list of results of institutional work and financial summaries in Annex) and to capacity for public servants and broader stakeholders through the active steering committee deliberations and media campaign, i.e. public service announcements, etc. about the needs and reasoning for a functioning PA system through training (also see capacity development scorecard in annex). It failed to demonstrate and document for policy, the financial, legal and policy case to support the longer-term expected changes in the institutional and operational structures as related to the longer-term economic and social benefits of an improved PA management and systems approach to the country. The project design was overambitious, and the country was not ready to focus funding or strategy on the demonstration of the financial models possible, i.e. co-management, private sector engagement and focus on livelihoods work. The results, however, make a significant rationale for the further policy, institutional and legal work and community livelihoods, co-management and private sector work. The benefits from this Project were mostly contributions to the readiness. It was upstream and, while consultative with users, the productive sector and business were not so engaged. A major criticism was that the project implementation was largely conducted through external consultancies and lacked the local colleges and community and user input while doing it. Meanwhile, the marine conservation work (funded outside GEF funding) was reported to have been advancing. This work can be considered as phase one, and even the result of this phase needs Government follow-up and possible reflection on the policy and economic case made for the PA systems work. The Project contributed significant knowledge inputs to “enabling environment” and proposed a workable alternative institutional structure, i.e. 1.2.1 was deemed not fiscally feasible in the short term (also see results consultancies in annex).
- The operationalization of regulations is the supporting mechanism to operationalize an Act. This is done by the responsible Minister, not by an Act of Parliament. This Protected Areas Agency model presented in the ProDoc was modified in keeping with the limitations of the GSKN. From the inception period, it was indicated by the steering committee that based on GSKN’s fiscal limitations and the size of the country, it would be impractical to establish a Protected Areas Agency/Unit. Therefore, it was recommended that a mechanism be established by which existing personnel within the Department of Environment, the Department of Marine Resources and the island of Nevis could collaborate to execute the required duties and facilitate cross-institutional coordination in the advancement of the goal foreseen by the proposed Agency/Unit. The Project has achieved this.
  - For instance, in terms of upstream results, this Project concretely supported the following policies/legal arrangements:
    - Nevis Physical Development Plan, June 2020
    - Protected Areas Management Authority Act (draft), June 2020

- National Conservation and Environment Management Act (draft), June 2020
  - Protected Areas Standard Operating Procedures, July 2017
  - Protected Areas Financing Mechanism, February 2020
  - Protected Areas Institutional Structure, April 2018.
- Two, three and six above relate to the institutional structure and are not formally approved or operational by the Government. While the Project drafted an alternative institutional structure, and it was approved by the Permanent Secretaries on Nevis and St. Kitts, all this requires will, operationalization and capacity building (key follow-up) especially initiated by DOE. (See results of work on organizational structure and fiscal projections in annexes). The TE believes that the adoption of these items has to come from a recognized need at the leadership of the environment departments on both islands, and the Project can then consolidate this work (see list of consultancies Annex) and make the socioeconomic and policy case in a compelling, readable way. The related fiscal recommendations are outlined in the Financing Strategy on how to staff and operationalize the parks and to make them fiscally viable. The will to move forward on this post-project must come from the lead agencies involved.
- In terms of the rationale and workflow, the legislation that was sent to the Cabinet at the beginning of the Project did not have the technical inputs of a GEF project and included the recommendations of the legal consultant. It needed an alignment, and it was missing work on international clarifications. Also, the existing legislation did not include institutional structure, notes on species and schedules—all key inputs for legislation—nor did it realistically include the global classifications (IUCN, PAs, etc.). The first legal consultant wrote the specified pieces of legislation/regulations. A second legal consultancy was added to align and recommend changes to address omissions, needs of the legislation, etc. The scope of the subsequent legal consultancy was thus to align the legislation with the "agreed-to" organizational structure and to address gaps. The TE learned the CTA has not seen the final products and does not know if what was produced was accepted by the Government. Therefore, if these critical pieces still need to be consolidated and assessed for what was unfinished or left out and need further oversight and consolidation, they might be strategically put together, benchmarked and vetted with clear recommendations and the economic and fiscal legal case for moving the policies and legal arrangement forward. Regarding why some things were not carried out in the biodiversity monitoring of the Marine Area System, the consultancy was carried out but not accepted by DMR, including the monitoring plan. In the Terrestrial Area System, significant problems in completing the consultancy (significant delays with continued extensions provided) and the poor quality of reporting (for some chapters) were issues. Also, no bird census was carried out; only opportune sightings were documented. This was key for the ID of IBAs and often KBAs, too. Unfortunately, this was not accepted in the inception report. The development of a monitoring plan was not part of the ToR (written before CTA began work). Each chapter included only recommendations for conservation/follow-up.
- **Component 2: Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas**
- To achieve the terrestrial objectives under Outcome 2, the Project will support the establishment and operationalization of terrestrial protected areas (TPAs), including the operationalization of terrestrial protected area units, the development and implementation of terrestrial protected area management plans, updating, approval and implementation of the Nevis Physical Development Plan (NPDP), the development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for Terrestrial Protected Areas, and the development of systems for community participation and development in and around TPA sites. It will also support the development and deployment of ecological conservation and management programs at TPA sites. The marine-related interventions under Outcome 2 will take a similar course and will include the establishment and operationalization of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to include the operationalization of MPA units, the establishment and zoning of MPAs with attendant development and implementation of MPA management plans and the development and implementation of site-based financing mechanisms for MPAs. The Project will also support increased community participation and development in and around MPAs, ecological conservation and management programs at MPA sites and fisheries production and pressure reduction strategies.

**Output 2.1: Establishment and Operationalization of Terrestrial Protected Areas**

- 2.1.1 Establishment and Zoning of Terrestrial Protected Areas (TPAs)
- 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 TPAs
- 2.1.5 Operationalization of Terrestrial Protected Area Units
- 2.1.6 Community Participation and Development in and around TPA Sites
- 2.1.7 Ecological Conservation and Management Programs at Terrestrial Protected Area Sites

**Output 2.2: Establishment and Operationalization of Marine Protected Areas**

- 2.2.1 Establishment and Zoning of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)
- 2.2.2 Development and Implementation of Marine Protected Area Management Plans
- 2.2.3 Development and Implementation of Site-based Financing Mechanisms for MPAs
- 2.2.4 Operationalization of Marine Protected Area Units
- 2.2.5 Community Participation and Development in and around MPA Sites
- 2.2.6 Ecological Conservation and Management Programs at MPA Sites
- 2.2.7 Fisheries Production and Pressure Reduction Strategies

Outcome 2 Protected Area System Expansion and Strengthened Management of Existing and New Protected Areas				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Met, partially met or Not met	TE Color Rating
# of Protected Areas legally established and demarcated in St. Kitts and Nevis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial Protected Areas</li> <li>• Marine Protected Areas</li> </ul>	3 existing PA units 0 existing PA units	2 additional PA units by end of year 2 3 additional PA units by end of year 2	Not met (no change at the level of PA terrestrial)  3 (increase at the Marine sites) The marine conservation areas were established at the beginning of the Project through another project. Marine work established MMAs not an output of the Project.	
Conservation of critical habitat within the Protected Areas targeted by the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest health at 4 terrestrial PAs, as measured by # of hectares</li> <li>• Coral reef health at 3 MPA sites, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent live hard coral cover</li> <li>• Percent dead hard coral cover</li> <li>• Number of coral recruits (per m2)</li> <li>• Seagrass bed health, as measured by # of hectares</li> <li>• Health of selected reef fish stocks, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abundance per m3</li> <li>• Species diversity</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	8,790 hectares (forest)  TBD during Year 1 TBD during Year 1	No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project  No decrease by project end  No increase by project end No decrease by project end No net loss (in # of hectares) by end of project No decrease by project end No decrease by project end	Not met  The marine and terrestrial areas are unknown due to no baseline and/or monitoring.	

Increased PA management funds for PA units targeted by the project from visitor, user and concession fees	US\$ 0	US\$ 200,000/year for 3 marine PA sites and US\$ 35,000/year for 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of project (targets will be validated and possibly revised during the first year of the project)	Partially met  DMR may have collected user fees, but this was not an output or a contribution toward outcome by this Project.	
Number of site-level PA staff, with specialized training in PA management • Terrestrial PA Sites (enforcement, conservation, monitoring; community empowerment, outreach, etc.) • Marine PA Sites (ecological monitoring; deploying mooring buoys and FADs; enforcement, boat safety and navigation, extension/stakeholder engagement, etc.)	0 0	At least 5 trained staff managing 2 terrestrial PA sites by end of project  At least 6 trained staff managing 3 Marine Parks by end of project	Met  49 (17 females, 32 males)  7 (2 females and 5 males)  Met	
Reduced impact of invasive alien species (lionfish) at targeted PA units	Baseline population of lionfish (tbd in year 1 of project)	25% reduction in lionfish population at targeted sites by end of the project	Met but not as an intervention of this project – done before project began. The DMR has indicated that landings of lionfish have become insignificant since the 2012 culling exercise and, as a result, the agency has removed lionfish from the Invasive Alien Species project and advised that resources under the Project to combat should be redirected to other marine activities within the Project.  This change has been reflected in the notes and adaptive management by the steering committee.	
Conservation of priority endemic species at terrestrial protected areas (Central Forest Reserve NP and Nevis Peak NP)	Targeted species to be determined through biodiversity inventories during years 1-2 of project	No net decline in populations of selected species by the end of the project	Partially met The terrestrial ecological inventory began in late 2016 and due to various setbacks, including the prolonged illness of the lead researcher, numerous delays resulted. Due to low technical feedback from the main government stakeholder, the Department of Environment, alternative sources for the review of the feedback were enacted. The chief technical advisor's thorough review and feedback were shared with the consultants, and the consultancy concluded its findings and presented the database. This still needs to be reviewed or vetted by the CTA and experts in DOE.	

- **Overall Assessment of Component Two: Moderately Satisfactory MS**

- Overall, the expected changes based on the work involved in this component has been moderately satisfactory. In terms of the expected result concerning the PA sites established, while there were increases at the Marine Conservation Areas, these were already established at the beginning of the Project through another project. The Project however was reported by stakeholders to have benefited the DMR stakeholder through the supportive capacity building and inputs, including the staff inputs and a vessel to demonstrate better coordination and enforcement. In terms of the marine and terrestrial targets, these were unknown due to the Project's lack of a monitoring baseline. Monitoring of increases in PA finances, for instance may have been collected against useful indicators. These are lessons. The terrestrial areas were not established as PA sites, and the Project did not develop an implementation plan to make them fiscally better off, bring the U.S. dollar

number up. On a positive note, the capacity-building towards the outcome level was a good aspect. The testimonial provided by stakeholders on the broader mindset changes said it was evident that more children and youths were looking for jobs in marine conservation and asking for training in this area. TE also observed the impressive public awareness campaign conducted by the DOE (Annex). Many stakeholders agreed that the learning was substantive. For future projects, the project might design baselines to measure the transformative work on education more thoroughly for results. The Project provided training to the conservation staff it had instated at the DOE and DMR. The targets around lionfish were met even before the Project started, and the numbers had become insignificant since the 2012 culling exercise.

- As mentioned, the marine inventory was not accepted by the Department of Marine Resources. This will need more vetting and possibly a report on what is needed to complete. The inventories will need to be followed up with a monitoring plan that goes with the PA management work completed.
- Regarding Government resistance to the NCTF due to perceived loss of control of PA fees/financing collected, the CTA worked with the CBF to find innovative ways to ensure that PA fees stayed separate (within the fund) so “control” on how money spent could be maintained. Though innovative ways were identified, resistance to the fund remained. The general perception was that many did not understand how it works or in what possible ways it can benefit them and because it conflicts with operations by other stakeholders and NGOs, etc. that have already had sustainable financing mechanisms in place and would cripple some of them if everything were changed. Some Government officials were on the NCTF board in St. Kitts and Nevis. The NCTF was in the process of hiring an executive secretary to get momentum back. It is the view of TE that contributing/participating in the NCTF is key for continued financial sustainability. Otherwise, it will go into consolidation, particularly once the amount of funds from terrestrial user fees (see annex, Expert Ephrata information) starts to come in. In terms of the targeted capacity-building results, the Project was very successful to raise public awareness and build capacity through strong inputs on communication working with the department for environment and communication units as well as training initiatives (annex). A list of videos is attached.

#### **4.3 EFFICIENCY Moderately Satisfactory MS**

- *The Project was somewhat cost-effective/efficient toward the expected result.*
- Cost-effectiveness is a measure of the Project’s effectiveness and efficiency. While the Project has been somewhat cost-effective and efficient against its stated expected outcome, this statement and the perception of the efficiency per the ProDoc as a catalytic investment toward income gains has to be measured against the fact that, although the Project has had some notable successes, it has not fully benefited from the greater structural changes envisaged in terms of goals to establish coordinated or management “independent” authority with clear management protocols for financing PA and coordination of conservation staff across sectors. Nonetheless, cost-effectiveness is also a measure of efficiency and expected results. Concordant with the ProDoc, the PA system project was designed to be a catalytic investment through the development of key partnerships and cost-sharing approaches to expand the Protected Areas estate in St. Kitts and Nevis and to ensure that new PA sites are effectively managed for biodiversity conservation and the preservation of ecosystem functions. According to the project document, the Project was cost-effective by design for the following reasons:
  - The estimated initial capital expenditure and operating costs (during four years of the Project) to establish effective PA management at the seven targeted PA sites was US\$ 2,534,630, or approximately US\$ 634,000/year. Once basic infrastructure, equipment, baseline information collecting and capacity building are in place, however, the ongoing capital and operational costs to maintain basic PA management are significantly reduced to an estimated level of US\$ 245,000/year. Thus, a catalytic investment by the GEF in the initial start-up costs to operationalize these seven PA units was to have substantially reduced the recurrent costs of managing them over the long term.
  - The project’s investment in PA business planning and development of financial sustainability mechanisms was to contribute to increasing and stabilizing the funding of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis. As a result of

project investments (see GEF Tracking Tool, Financial Scorecard, Annex 1), it was projected that by project end, the revenues for the newly created Protected Areas System (excluding Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park (managed by an NGO and funded independently) would increase from a baseline of US\$ 0/year to approximately US\$ 250,000/year with significant new income from user and visitor fees. Also, it was envisioned that once the National Conservation Trust Fund is operational, financing from that fund and the regional Caribbean Biodiversity Fund would channel another US\$ 429,000/year to protected areas (and possibly climate change adaptation activities) in the country. This estimate is conservative in that it does not include any estimate of increased donor funding although the establishment of a Protected Areas Agency and the formal declaration of new protected areas, including the country's first marine protected areas, can be expected to increase donor interest in and support for PA management.

- The ProDoc was also premised on the idea that by improving the quality of baseline information on ecological conditions and establishing a Protected Areas Information System, the Project will help PA managers to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of their management decisions. The Project was to support cost-effectiveness by jointly implementing ecological baseline studies and conservation programs for PA sites on both St. Kitts and Nevis, thereby avoiding any duplication of effort and promoting the sharing of equipment, materials and other resources. Project capacity building of protected area management staff will ensure that the productivity and effectiveness of the human resources available to support each PA site are enhanced and optimally organized. Overall, the concurrent establishment and operationalization of the seven PA units will produce significant benefits in terms of the sharing of resources and expertise among the different sites.
- **Adaptive Management/Capacity Building Approach**
- The National Implementation approach was reported by interviewees as being somewhat effective. The cross-cutting support areas and the strategies toward change were not fully thought out or realistic, integrative and sustainable linking to the longer-term transformative expected outcomes and the model of PA system as presented to stakeholders by the ProDoc. To achieve the "mind-set changes," interviewees reported that more baseline analysis around behaviors was needed. The need expressed during the TE study was to show how to build capacity for conservation, livelihoods and community "stewardship" through co-management approaches. The approach taken toward this was the implementation by PSC, the main platform for prioritizing and discussing all technical and work plan activities. The focus by PSC and the work plan was on research and knowledge inputs for decision-making in terms of the legal and financial aspects and on training (for sectors and public). In the end, these results were output-based. Criticism was that the Project was implemented largely using foreign consultancies and that it missed the point to implement by doing, using local consultants and institutions to build internal capacities. This is sometimes not a choice, because the expertise may not exist locally, so the project has to procure international consultants. Interviewees stated it would have been better to engage and shadow some of the conservation and PA training and curriculum development with a local educational institution. For this first NIM project, the project design did not account for government needs to support building local capacity for project monitoring, results-based management and instilling a sustainable project learning process. Interviewees generally agreed that there might be a third budgeted component in future projects, entailing cross-cutting aspects, including knowledge management and learning in general, monitoring and results-based management and communications. UNDP does not have a direct role in capacity development other than Monitoring and Evaluation and through project activities. TE postulate that while a third knowledge management and monitoring, learning component could be useful, the success is about Government ownership of the project, and especially when it is a NIM project the lesson of close monitoring, learning and sharing need to be learned.
- In terms of the capacity-building approach, the ProDoc aimed to strengthen institutional and individual capacities in all areas critical to PA management, including management planning, developing and implementing sustainable financing mechanisms and business planning; enforcing PA zoning and habitat mapping, monitoring and conservation of coral reefs, seagrass and upland forests; and monitoring priority species (e.g. endemic reptiles, sea turtles, lobster, conch, seabirds, etc.), stakeholder outreach, education and community participation and conflict resolution. TE reviewed the capacity development strategy and observed its focus on

delivering the outputs for public awareness as not doing so much on the need to build long-term capacity for biodiversity conservation and PA management in the country. The capacity development scorecard was monitored by the project team throughout, and the results are attached as an annex. The work in this area was viewed as satisfactory and as having made contributions, according to interviewees.

- The primary recipients of the capacity building included the agencies/staff responsible for the areas of current and proposed PA sites (especially the DPPE, DOE, and DMR), partners such as SCNT, NHCS and SKSTMN and newly recruited staff (who would consist primarily of persons currently at DPPE, DOE and DMR). As noted above, in the work on the financing mechanisms for protected areas management, research was conducted, but it missed the opportunity to pilot or implement through pilot PAs and with PA communities and private sector as a strategy.
- The Project Steering Committee was the essential mechanism for monitoring and providing technical oversight. This mechanism was used to provide feedback and to adapt the Project. The work plan and priorities were set during these meetings including adjustment to budgets and activities. Interviewees stated that the PSC might have had more support and oversight on the strategies used toward results. Relevant changes or adjustments to implementation were integrated into project planning and implementation through the Project Steering Committee. The Project went through an MTR process that was approved. The MTR was critical on aspects of the design but did not formally provide an adapted project plan or narrative of the alternative pathway given the context. The TE learned that the CTA was not involved in the MTR process and was unable to provide substantive oversight toward the whole project result inputs at that point. The CTA, once hired, developed a project implementation gap analysis that assessed alternative pathways to make up for the design and context challenges. This gap monitoring document is attached as a separate annex to this report. It was provided to the Project Director for review.
- **Implementation Support provided by UNDP**
- The level of support provided by the UNDP was in keeping with the implementation modality NIM and the project monitoring agreements. The project held a MTR and TE and duly reported in PIMs on an annual basis. The project was also audited. The issue unearthed by the evaluation with the implementation support was coordination and clarity on the various roles that UNDP has in GEF project during NIM project implementation. This includes the clear delegation of roles in the coordination of the day to day program support to the PCU and in the technical oversight that ought to be provided regularly by the RTA and /or “an informed and empowered CTA. While UNDP has provided all the element of support it was largely uncoordinated which led to problems with GEF monitoring mechanisms built into the project for adapting the project. Technically led adaptation of this projects monitoring framework and targets was needed, and this was evident from day one of implementation. The GEF RTA normally would provide guidance on implementation strategies in the event these were deficient in line with the technical aims of the project. The actual implementation support was limited to deliberation in the steering committee but without the technical oversight needed to ensure a balance delivery between the outputs. This absence of consistent oversight led to many implementation issues including relationships with and in between counterparts (that needed higher intervention) and the project focus on the upstream knowledge work and less on the downstream, communities and the livelihoods which might have supported a stronger momentum and sustainable result.
- **Cofinancing**
- The Project had undertaken an incredible number of activities at the cost of the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis (GSKN). The actual co financing support the foundational outcomes which enabled cost-savings that may have been capitalized upon to advance the need for complementary activities inclusive of additional community-level engagement and involvement. This is an exemplary example of partnership and the interest to work which reflects results. By the time the Project actively started in 2016, the Government had become substantively invested in marine conservation areas through the Project, supported by USAID. This trend continued during the course of this project and strong country ownership is expressed through the actual co-financing put into the implementation. These cofinancing figures and examples are expressed below. These resources include that what was used for salaries, travel expenses, equipment, programs, subsidies and basic

operation and management expenses of the various project partner agencies participating in activities related to protected areas management. Additionally, the SKN government has concretely taken over some of the salaries of the conservation officers required by the program. The tables below reflect that co-financing is in keeping with original estimates with co-financiers actively engaged throughout project implementation. The UNDP numbers show some discrepancies in the two tables provided. This is an indication of a mistake made in these important tables during design. The actual UNDP cofinancing (provided by TE) is upward of US\$200,000 in kind support based on the TE validation with the UNDP CO concerning these numbers. The US\$300,000 grant was a design mistake.

- The Project's co-financing and certainly, that which represents the development of PA infrastructure and the adoption of the project-supported conservation staffing across departments demonstrate high country ownership to the PA and conservation efforts.

#### Conserving Biodiversity Project: Co-Financing – In-kind, Grant & Concessions

Co-financing (type/source)	GEF (mill. US\$)		UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	\$3,371,630.00	\$3,037,640.72			\$16,840,000.00	\$11,867,036.78		\$118,518.52	\$20,211,630.00	\$15,023,196.03
Loans/Concessions						\$185,661.04			-	\$185,661.04
In-kind support				\$300,000.00		\$1,415,073.33		\$164,200.00	-	\$1,729,273.33
Other									-	-
Totals	\$3,371,630.00	\$3,037,640.72	-	\$300,000.00	\$16,840,000.00	\$13,467,771.16	-	\$282,718.52	\$20,211,630.00	\$16,938,130.40

#### Conserving Biodiversity Project Co-Financing - Grants

Sources of Co-financing	Name of CO-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of TR Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount (US\$)
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	GEF	Grant	\$3,371,630.00	\$3,037,640.72	90%
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	UNDP Barbados	Grant	\$300,000.00		0%
Government of St. Christopher and Nevis	Ministry of Agriculture et al	Grant	\$4,000,000.00	\$3,388,000.00	85%
	Department of Physical Planning	Grant	\$3,240,000.00	\$359,100.00	11%
	Department of Environment	Grant	0	\$2,025,000.00	

	Ministry of Sustainable Development	Grant	0	\$16,000.00	
	Land Management Unit	Grant	\$260,000.00		0%
	Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs	Grant	\$100,000.00	\$101,049.24	101%
	Ministry of Health and Environment	Grant	\$1,760,000.00	\$1,700,000.00	97%
	St. Kitts Water Services Department & Public Infrastructure Dept	Grant	\$6,000,000.00	\$2,922,642.11	49%
Nevis Island Administration	Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources, and Environment	Grant	\$1,100,000.00	\$825,000.00	75%
	Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing, Cooperatives and Fisheries	Grant	\$380,000.00	\$533,333.33	140%
		TOTAL	\$20,511,630.00	\$14,907,765.41	73%

The Project has been somewhat efficient in that it implemented cost-efficient measures throughout its life. Such measures are as follows:

- Procurement of services and goods: To ensure the Project received value for money, detailed terms of reference were developed, published and advertised as widely as possible and then evaluated by counterparts with the expertise in the subject matter. Bids were evaluated and awarded following full compliance of policies and procedures. Items of lower value were procured by using the three quotes method, and the best quality and lowest price were selected. The Project team negotiated lower prices when possible.
- The Project Coordinating Unit was housed within the Department of Environment and used their in-house resources (printer, copier, etc.), which reduced the cost incurred by the Project as part of the Government co-financing arrangement. This also included the cost of office space and utilities.
- Experts and specialists within the various Government departments were utilized at no additional cost to the Project when necessary instead of procuring the services of such experts (such as architectural services for the Nevis Interpretation Centre and the Central Forest Reserve National Park Public Restroom) for procurement and financial management.
- Some communication materials were created by the Project Team, the Department of Environment, and the Department of Marine Resources staff to reduce expenses. (e.g. Graphic design of public awareness benches).
- Cost estimates: Request for information were carried out when necessary to provide accurate budgeting. Constant comparisons of forecast and actual costs, usually followed by reforecasting (or reprioritizing when necessary), were practiced, ensuring that the Project stayed within budget and received value for money.
- The use of the Royal St. Kitts Nevis Defence Force Coast Guard vessel helped transfer staff between St. Kitts and Nevis and assistance with marine assessment and conservation monitoring activities saved the project's cost on a few occasions.

#### **4. SUSTAINABILITY (Moderately Likely )**

- The sustainability is moderately likely, due to the absence of supportive evidence to show that the intervention unchanged (at MTR) targets to support the institutional, legal and structural changes or to operationalize the interim PA institutional coordination mechanism designed by the Project was met. This fact is somewhat countered by the fact that the government has indeed hired conservation officers and these new staff will have to be jointly guided and managed.
- The ProDoc set forth ambitious expectations for sustainability and outlined a dynamic plan based on the assumptions of the Project pathways including the legal and structural changes (legal and policy upgrades, etc.) expected to be initiated during implementation. The Project's strategy and results were premised on the institutional and financial sustainability that were to be achieved by establishing the Protected Areas Agency (PAA) as an independent statutory body during implementation and the revision and strengthening of financial mechanisms and resources so that the PAA could provide at least "basic" management functions for all PA sites. Relying only on its revenue sources (as opposed to ongoing government budget allocations), the Project was to create for the first time in the country an agency dedicated specifically to PA management and sufficiently funded to ensure its effectiveness. That was not the broader results but changed significantly between the conception of the idea and the start of implementation. While the original strategy and target around an independent authority was not met an interim agreement on coordination has been reached and now needs to be operationalized with DOE and DMR leading.
- Next, environmental sustainability was expected to be promoted through the Project by developing and implementing a coordinated, multi-stakeholder approach to expanding and strengthening the system of protected areas in St. Kitts and Nevis, set within the existing overarching strategies articulated in the St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area Plan and the Protected Areas Systems Plan. The assumption was that by establishing a Protected Areas Agency with dedicated staff enabled with sufficient financial and technical resources, facilities and equipment to actively manage, monitor and conserve seven PA sites, the Project would greatly increase the country's ability to protect critical marine and terrestrial habitats and preserve ecosystem functioning in areas that currently had no effective protection. Furthermore, by carrying out assessments and monitoring of key habitats and species and implementing conservation and protection programs based on that work, the Project would allow PA managers to greatly increase their ability to focus resources on the most important habitats and species and respond to the most urgent threats. This work is advancing, and there is indication is that it will pass.
- Additionally, social sustainability was to be achieved/primarily enhanced in the Project through the processes to plan for and implement conservation and sustainable development initiatives at protected area sites. Decisions about the zoning and resource use restrictions within terrestrial and marine protected areas, including zoning for tourism and fisheries activities, would involve numerous stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, CSOs and other community groups. In addition, private sector stakeholder groups, such as commercial fishermen, marine sports operators, tour guides and outdoor adventure operators, would be able to participate in decisions about PA boundary setting and zoning and the regulations adopted for conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources within terrestrial and marine PAs. The Project was expected to support PA managers in working with fishermen, tourism operators, farmers, and other residents to collaboratively seek solutions that balance the needs of these groups and the biodiversity conservation and ecosystem functioning objectives of the designated PA sites. The involvement of stakeholders in the ecosystem-wide processes and the operational protected area planning would be guided by stakeholder engagement plans, which would include provisions for conflict management with different user groups. This work never advanced. However, it can be advanced in a possible phase two of GEF support to SKN on biodiversity.

#### **5. IMPACT**

- In terms of the verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress that can be linked directly to project interventions, the project has made a limited contribution to improved ecological conditions including through reduced, expanded and improved management of protected areas mostly in terms of

component one knowledge projects and upstream work. For example, in terms of project overall impact level results, this Project concretely supported the following policies/legal arrangements:

- Nevis Physical Development Plan, June 2020
  - Protected Areas Management Authority Act (draft), June 2020
  - National Conservation and Environment Management Act (draft), June 2020
  - Protected Areas Standard Operating Procedures, July 2017
  - Protected Areas Financing Mechanism, February 2020
  - Protected Areas Institutional Structure, April 2018.
- Two, three and six above relate to the institutional structure and are not formally approved or operational by the Government. While the Project drafted an alternative institutional structure, and it was approved by the Permanent Secretaries on Nevis and St. Kitts, all this requires will, operationalization and capacity building (key follow-up) especially initiated by DOE. (See results of work on organizational structure and fiscal projections in annexes). The TE believes that the adoption of these items has to come from a recognized need at the leadership of the environment departments on both islands, and the Project can then consolidate this work (see list of consultancies Annex) and make the socioeconomic and policy case in a compelling, readable way. The related fiscal recommendations are outlined in the Financing Strategy on how to staff and operationalize the parks and to make them fiscally viable. The will to move forward on this post-project must come from the lead agencies involved.
- The impact on the readiness and enabling environment has been relatively substantive. However, the research and knowledge work for decision-making needs to be consolidated and more cleverly packaged for a higher policy audience. The impacts on education and public awareness are unquantifiable but seem to have been lasting. One indication is that young people are coming more to volunteer and inquire about the work of marine conservation according to the head of the marine resources. This is a significant indication of the occurrence of mind-shift changes. Impacts on the natural environment have been nominal. The impact on environmental change will come much later in this process after a management system is firmly established, more community stewardship and education, and a fiscally viable management model is established.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

- This projects intent and role in the PA system change process including, the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good b) demonstration c) replication d)scaling up can be summed up as a phase one “readiness project” toward the much longer-term work to be done to catalyze and establish the PA system for the benefit of St. Kitts and Nevis for national sustainable development. The vision is sound. This Project has helped establish the readiness and contributed significantly to the upstream enabling environment for the longer-term work. The enabling work, while almost completed, is not yet in good form for decision-making. It needs to be vetted for quality, benchmarked globally, consolidated and presented in short form in terms of the socioeconomic and institutional case and to showcase the upstream results of the work done as well as to point out the gaps in the fiscal and social business case and provide concise recommendations to policymakers.
- For a phase one project, the consensus by interviewees is that the way forward is to include more work on operationalizing the dual management model put forth during this project and focus on the downstream and a broader engagement on the fiscal PA management case together with education and productive sectors. This can now continue with a second GEF project that focuses on operationalizing the work, continuing to build the capacity of the newly established environment department and piloting the fiscal work by working through communities and engaging the private sector and getting deeper involvement of the sectors involved in the production, i.e. tourism. Insofar as being the institutional idea of an independent legal authority, this can be a longer-term goal once the system begins to generate revenues while making sure current stakeholders are incorporated and not expected to forego their operations and socioeconomic results.
- While the design is relevant, based on international and national committees and priorities, much more work on project implementation and institutional readiness as needed to establish the pathways toward changes. The design was holistic, with a good vision, but the expected results of this vision are far in the future. The

Project might be thought about as phase one of a much longer capacity development approach. During the interim, the environmental coordination was being established and this was a natural precursor to coordination and management of PAs.

- In terms of implementation and factors affecting implementation, while such a dynamic institutional context could not be anticipated, the Project could have been benefited from stronger adaptive management support by UNDP, technical oversight and coordination of technical inputs. This was a deficiency. While the Project had two CTAs, they were unable to sufficiently support the project adaptation along the lines of the expected result and/or adapted results. The technical oversight and expertise in the Project were substantive but needed coordination by UNDP to be firm on what was possible in terms of adapting the Project to fit the context especially after the design was deemed not fiscally viable. The Project was lacking good support to design stronger implementing strategies and support of adaptive management. A first NIM project, it required learning on the job to sustain project implementation.
- 
- The extent to which the project has played a catalytic role is mostly evident through the appointment of key staff members which had been instated at the DOE and the DMR as a result of this project. The institutional capacity built through addition of these staff members are clear indication of the governments' interest to improve the PA management and towards nature and sustainability outcomes. These staff will need to be coordinated and supported and as such are a clear indicator that this project had garnered traction and provided key inputs that will lead to future improvement and coordination of a PA systems approach .
- Overall results can be assessed at about 60%. The country became more cognizant of the need to declare and operate PAs, and the staffing and management of the areas have increased. However, all the additional PAs were not declared, and the finance model and the institutional structure were not achieved. The newly agreed upon "interim structure" was not formally adopted by the Cabinet. While the country was more aware of the need to declare the site, there was a minimal increase in management, which is insufficient to adequately manage the site, both at an institutional and at a site level. This pertains only to terrestrial PAs. The Marine PAs were well managed.
- In general, the Project has met 60% of its expected outcomes based on the decisions made toward the end targets during implementation. The Project provided a general focus on sensitization and, through many steering committee deliberations, a limited understanding of what a PA management and system coordination might be. It provided significant contributions to the overall enabling environment through knowledge products. In terms of the targets, it was recognized early that the ProDoc targets were overambitious, especially regarding the assumption that the Government would financially support an independent authority and/or finance coordination during implementation. The project strategy was duly adapted by stakeholders during the steering committee along with the supportive work of the chief technical advisor. The project management and teams did not prioritize work with and through PA communities and, in hindsight, this may have affected the overall expected results including the buy-in for the approach and model being suggested.
- While DMR is very used to working with stakeholders, having their buy-in during the decision-making process was critical to the success of this Project. The DMR has been very successful against the project goals, but this was not as a result of the Project per se. This observation is not the case for DOE and the work on terrestrial PAs.
- The Project has raised the bar on the science to policy and enabling environment for a PA system in the country. In general, the design was overambitious, and the country was not "readied" or prepared to work on one management authority and or had mechanisms in place for a coordinated systems approach. The cross-sectoral work was very important as the consensus and vision for a common PA system that needed to be in place. Additionally, while undertaking joint work on inventory and scientific baseline was a key output, it was only moving toward a full inventory near the project end. Such scientific work was key in terms of knowing what was at stake or an asset and what a key knowledge input was for the PA system in the country. This essential work is not complete. For instance, the TE assessed the view on the marine inventory and learned that some baseline

information had been missing, and the CTA has not yet reviewed the final reports. This information still needs to be consolidated and included in a consolidated economic, social, policy and legal document final report with a summary of what was done, what was learned and what is the way forward. There was clear discrepancy in the expectation and the delivery. For example, component two included work on terrestrial and marine inventories. TE learned that the marine ToR needed more work.

- The Project hired two CTAs, the first of whom was switched one year into the Project. This transfer of expert personnel was purported to have resulted in setbacks. The new CTA undertook an assessment of the gaps in terrestrial and marine inventories, which helped to correct some of the issues. It was reported that there were problems with the methodologies and results counts. For instance, marine areas were inaccessible, and the consultants did not deliver a full inventory. Researchers needed to go off-trail (with the military for safety, in places to be avoided) and needed support for trail clearing to key areas with possible unique biodiversity. For those species which are unlikely to be found in the more accessible areas, drones or military interventions are needed for support. The CTA helped to draft the marine assessment ToR in consultation with the DMR to bring them in line with the needs of the DMR. The CTA had no input in the Terrestrial ToR. However, the TE noted that the changes were not formalized in the MTR. What was expected, prioritized and possible was well understood and commented on through the deliberation of the steering committee.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- During TE, the Project was granted one more extension until November 2020 due to COVID-19 delays. The outstanding results that can be completed by then include:
  - The development of the Keys Marine Species Rehabilitation/interpretation Center on St. Kitts;
  - The PA management authority agreements, for which the legal work is drafted, presented and enacted. All need to be taken forward by the Government. The project contributed to policies and draft agreements but cannot do legislative approvals. This will depend on the processes that will not depend on the project. There were elections in June 2020 and changes in Government. The new Government will need a final brief on all types of legislation, not only PA legislation. TE suggests the completed work needs final vetting by the international chief GEF or CTA technical advisor;
  - The financial work plans and recommendations, which are there, but UNDP-GEF/DOE/DMR must take them forward undertake discussions with the Ministry of Finance;
  - The declaration of two terrestrial protected areas.

.....

### ✓ **UNDP-GEF Project finalize the outstanding outputs by November 2020**

- ✓ Outstanding outputs not yet finalized due to COVID-19 but are anticipated:
- ✓ The Department of Marine Resources and the St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network were anticipating the operationalization of the Keys Marine Species Rehabilitation/Interpretation Center which was halted by closures. The completion of the Center was viewed by stakeholders as highly beneficial to the Federation because it created a base for the treatment and rehabilitation of endangered marine species. This will be a first in St. Kitts Nevis and the wider Caribbean region and will provide education and training opportunities in the marine sector that were not previously available. The St. Christopher National Trust was in high gear with implementing its outreach and public awareness in the schools and to the public in conjunction with the Project, but this was also halted by the closure of schools. The completion of these public awareness activities will vastly help citizens to take a more active role in the conservation of their biodiversity.
- ✓ Plans were underway for the second reading of the National Conservation and Environment Management Bill in Parliament. This is now secondary to the urgent need for the development and revision of COVID-19

legislation. The automatic declaration of Booby Island Nature Reserve would have been covered in the passing of this Bill, which is a critical foundation for the implementation of many environmental protection activities.

- ✓ The Department of Physical Planning and Environment within the NIA, along with other stakeholders on Nevis, was looking forward to validating the Nevis Physical Development Plan. Travel restrictions and stay-at-home orders delayed the plan's finalization. Many draft policy guidelines for the island of Nevis have been on hold for years due to the lack of an updated approved Physical Development Plan. The completion of the plan will aid in better protection of the island resources. To ensure that the plan is completed at TE, the Department of Physical Planning and Environment within the NIA agreed to a series of online meetings to cover all policy areas. The consultancy had planned to wrap up in mid-May with the overall theme of planning for increased resilience to natural (and health) hazards, climate change impacts and economic vulnerabilities and challenges across all the topics.
- ✓ UNDP/RTA/CTA can vet the work completed for technical quality and produce a final fiscal policy and socioeconomic-oriented summary report. The Project's support to enabling work needs consolidation in good form for policy and decision-making. All the contributions need a final technical vetting report completed by the CTA for quality and benchmarking with global good practices to be consolidated and presented in a short and a longer form (executive summary and short report) in terms of the socioeconomic and institutional case. This final project report is needed by the end of the Project for UNDP-GEF to showcase the project support to upstream results and all the enabling work completed as well as to point out any remaining gaps, and including, to make the sound fiscal, institutional and social business case and to provide concise recommendations for policymakers.
- ✓ **SKN Government to follow up project results after project end in November 2020.**
- ✓ This Project's work and results can be viewed as a phase one "readiness project" toward the longer-term work that needs to be done to firmly establish a working PA management system for the benefit of St. Kitts and Nevis for national sustainable development. The vision is sound. This Project has helped establish the institutional and project implementation readiness and contributed significantly to the upstream enabling environment for the longer-term work. As it is in phase one of the Project, the way forward is to operationalize and continue to build capacity. A second phase might, therefore, focus on operationalizing the coordination mechanism agreed and attending to the downstream needs for change through operationalizing the work with communities (livelihoods), experimenting with co-management approaches (communities and private sector) and including broader engagement with productive sectors. This would focus on small holder farming and enable connection of the reasoning of links from terrestrial (agriculture) to marine (drainage/pollution from agricultural practices). So, the focus is not so strong on conservation but on "sustainable use of resources," making a case to incorporate small-scale farmers and private sector within PA models. The natural IP would be the Ministry of Agriculture, with the fisheries and department of environment within it. However, institutional coordination of an SLM/EBD project will be key. A follow-up phase might also focus on systematic education work.

## 8. LESSONS

- The seriousness of recognizing the time lag and differences between context and concept at formulation and project implementation and the awareness that things can radically change requires that the Project must have some flexibility to change targets. In this case, the assumption was the establishment during the implementation of legal and institutional foundations for a single management authority with financial oversight and control of funds for PA management. Alternative pathways and a clear ME plan were necessary.
- The project has clearly brought to light the following key lessons on design and implementation for results:

Design	This project was clearly designed with overambitious targets. The project document presented poorly informed design of indicators and baselines/M&E framework for the task at hand. The strategies and the PA model also lacked strong socio-political analysis and situational baseline especially in terms of the local knowledge and situations. The linkages between outcomes should have been stronger and the addition of cross cutting areas would have helped project management make the linkages in work plans. In the future, strategies towards results need to be better presented and a theory of change required. For new PA projects with near baseline zero knowledge, a PA systems project should be designed in phases to utilize the benefit of having a good vision but allowing for the time and care needed for learning pathways toward transformative changes; This country lacked 'readiness' for a coordinated systems approach. Additionally, the work on inventories and setting scientific baselines was under-budgeted.
	For new projects on biodiversity, it is critical that scientific, financial and social change and policy level indicators and baselines are well established and the implementation pathways are written into the project design research at the onset and that stakeholders are thoroughly assessed to make sure that new projects are not duplicating projects, functions, etc. already in process;
	This project clearly shows the issue of a substantive time lag between implementation and design. The model and financing strategy was found not to be feasible/financially viable at start and so a new project plan was needed from inception. This needed agreement from UNDP, SKN and GEF partners.
	For NIM plus UNDP support projects, it is a good idea to have a third component to support project implementation learning, results-based monitoring and knowledge management to enable learning/communications for results during implementation and sustainability and for results; Governments normally do not include budgets and strategies for this important softer work which is critical to results.
	All future UNDP-GEF-NIM projects require more incorporation of guidance on SES safeguards and knowledge/learning and as such will enable focused attention on working and implementing through women's participation and communities and for biodiversity project -possibly on future co-management in project implementation.
Implementation	Steering committees in GEF projects are intended for high-level partner (UNDP, SKN, and GEF) discussions and decision-making on technically vetted work plans. The projects might use other platforms for technical work planning and deliberations;
	This project clearly shows the disadvantage of having limited stakeholder engagement in implementation. The mechanism provided in the UNDP/GEF project were not used including technical committee for broader stakeholder engagements. Additionally, stance, tourism and education were key partners and not actively involved or engaged. The project relied much too heavily on steering committee for monitoring and decision making which has shown to be too broad a forum for decision making and technical work plan planning. Optimally a technical committee (s) might/may have been set up for broader work planning and debates/solutions on implementation.
	This project shows the importance of clarifying the rule in a NIM plus UNDP support project. The coordination between role and clarification of what is required and what is possible in a GEF project implementation required strengthening (UNDP execution of the project) rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
	This project shown a failure to document the financial and policy case clearly for the changes in institutional and operational structures during the ME and in PIMs.

<sup>i</sup> This project had an original closing date of May 2020. Due to COVID-19, it was granted a six-month extension. Although the extension was granted, it may be too short to achieve finalization of these outputs, as COVID restrictions are still in place for some elements that depend on travel, such as importing high tech machines for the Interpretation center. The non-achievement of some outputs is related to the sustained COVID-19 impacts.

ii

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution, Relevance</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings          5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings          4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)          3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings          2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems          1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability          3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks          2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks          1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>          Not Applicable (N/A)          Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

<sup>iii</sup> This project had an original closing date of May 2020. Due to COVID-19, it was granted a six-month extension. Although the extension was granted, it may be too short to achieve finalization of these outputs, as COVID restrictions are still in place for some elements that depend on travel, such as importing high tech machines for the Interpretation center. The non-achievement of some outputs is related to the sustained COVID-19 impacts.

<sup>iv</sup> Project Document. The 2008 Country Poverty Assessment (CPA) reported a poverty level of 21.8% and that a large percentage of the population (35.6%) is considerably vulnerable and affected adversely by economic and other shocks.

<sup>v</sup> Project supported eight countries (Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines) to address marine resources management and strengthen capacity of stakeholders through a common institutional framework for management of marine protected areas (MPA) in the Caribbean Region. Particular emphasis was placed on improving the resilience and adaptation capacity of communities by implementing biodiversity and ecosystem conservation measures as well as the promotion of mechanisms for sustainable use of natural resources.

<sup>vi</sup> The Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and the Environment (DPPNRE), which oversees environmental management and development control activities on Nevis, will work closely with the DPPE in revising laws, policies and plans for the PA system and in establishing financial mechanisms, information systems and outreach and education programs to support protected areas; the budget for these activities

---

during the period of project implementation is US\$ 0.25 million. The Marine Resources Department will provide baseline funding for the legal establishment of marine protected areas, development of financing mechanisms to support MPAs and revisions to existing legislation relevant to MPAs and to fisheries; the budget for these activities during the period of project implementation is US\$ 0.88 million. The Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs (MJLA) advises government departments and statutory bodies on civil and criminal matters, including all environment related legislation and regulations, and will provide critical support for the updating and writing of new legislation such as the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act (NCEMA) and the Marine Resources Act; the budget for these activities during the period of project implementation is US\$ 0.1 million. The Land Management Unit (LMU) will provide baseline spending to ensure that development and public sector investment programmes in SKN take account of environmental conservation; the budget for these activities during the period of project implementation is US\$ 0.24 million.