

United Nations Development Programme Global Environmental Facility

FINAL REPORT (28 February 2022)

Mid-Term Review of the UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Project

Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management



Invasive Alien Species control Demo (Bamboo)

GEF Project ID: 9577 UNDP PIMS ID: 4970



Erosion control Demo (Vetiver)

Country: Region: GEF Focal Area: GEF Agency: Project Executing Agency: Evaluation Time Frame: Evaluation Consultants: Grenada Latin America and the Caribbean Region Climate Change (GEF-6) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry (MALF) 15 October 2021 – 01 February 2022 Vincent LEFEBVRE, International Consultant Leyana ROMAIN, National Consultant

Acknowledgements:

The consultants wish to thank the project team for their availability as well as the support provided by the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry to facilitate interviews and the on-site visit

Table of Contents

| EXEC | UTIVE SUMMARY | V |
|--------|--|--------|
| Proje | ct summary table | v |
| Proje | ect description | v |
| Proje | ct's main achievements | viii |
| Evalu | ation rating table | ix |
| Sumr | mary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned | ix |
| LIST C | DF ABBREVIATIONS | XII |
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of the evaluation | 1 |
| 1.2 | Scope and methodology | 1 |
| | 1.2.1 Scope 1.2.2 Methodology | 1 3 |
| 1.3 | MTR limitations | 4 |
| | 1.3.1 Ethics | 5 |
| 1.4 | Structure of the evaluation report | 5 |
| 2. | PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT | 6 |
| 2.1 | Environment and development context | 6 |
| 2.2 | Problems that the project sought to address | 8 |
| 2.3 | Project description and strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites | 8 |
| 2.4 | Project implementation arrangements | 11 |
| 2.5 | Project timing and milestones | 12 |
| 2.6 | Main stakeholders | 12 |
| 3. | FINDINGS | 14 |
| 3.1 | Project design / Formulation | 14 |
| | 3.1.1 Relevance of project formulation | 14 |

| | 3.1.2 | Analysis of the Results Framework | |
|-----|--------------------|--|----|
| | 3.1.3 | Lessons learned from other projects incorporated into project design | 21 |
| 3.2 | I | Progress towards results | 22 |
| | 3.2.1 | Progress towards outcome analysis | 23 |
| | 3.2.2 | Obstacles to the achievement of the objective until the closure of the project | 29 |
| 3.3 | I | Project implementation and adaptive management | 29 |
| | 3.3.1 | Management arrangements | |
| | 3.3.2 | Work planning | |
| | 3.3.3 | Finance and co-finance | |
| | 3.3.4 | Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems – adaptive management | |
| | 3.3.5 | Stakeholders' engagement | |
| | 3.3.6 | Reporting | |
| | 3.3.7 | Communication and knowledge management | |
| 3.4 | 3.4 Sustainability | | |
| | 3.4.1 | Social & cultural risks to sustainability | 40 |
| | 3.4.2 | Financial risks to sustainability | |
| | 3.4.3 | Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability | |
| | 3.4.4 | Socio-economic risks to sustainability | |
| | 3.4.5 | Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| 4. | CON | CLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 44 |
| 4.1 | (| Conclusions | |
| 4.2 | I | Recommendations | 47 |
| | 4.2.1 | Recommendations to ensure impactful results (under option 2): | |
| | 4.2.2 | Recommendations to accelerate implementation: | |
| | 4.2.3 | Recommendations to improve the project governance system: | 51 |
| 5. | LIST | OF TABLES | 55 |
| 6. | LIST | OF BOXES | 55 |
| 7. | LIST | OF FIGURES | 55 |
| 8. | LIST | OF MAPS | 55 |
| 9. | ANNI | EXES | 55 |

Executive Summary

Project summary table

| Project Title: | Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| GEF Project ID: | 9577 | | <u>at</u> <u>endorsement</u> <u>(US\$)</u> | <u>at MTR (US\$)</u> | | | |
| UNDP PIMS ID: | 4970 | GEF financing: | 3.659.775 | 439.500 | | | |
| Country: | Grenada | IA/EA (UNDP) own: | 400.000 | No info | | | |
| Region: | South America and the Caribbean region | Government (in-kind): - Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | 684.650 | No info | | | |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other Co-financing: | | | | | |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | LD-1: Maintain or improve flow of agro- ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods LD-3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing for land uses in the wider landscape BD-4: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors BD-2: Reduce Threats to Globally Significant | Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development: Ioan from IFAD and CDB: Climate Smart Agriculture and Market Access Program Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development: Ioan from WB: OECS Regional Competitiveness | 8.215.800 4.792.550 | No info No info No info | | | |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 17.752.775 | 439.500 | | | |
| Other Partners | Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 13/11/2019 | | | |
| involved: | Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 13/11/2024 | Actual: 13/11/2023 | | | |

Project description

The project "Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscapes Management" is focusing on the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in production landscape and increasing the resilience of agricultural systems with the adoption of integrated landscape management. This is to be achieved with the adoption by farmers of more sustainable land use practices such as sustainable land management and climate-smart agriculture techniques.

The project's concept originates from the acknowledgement that the trend in agricultural land and biodiversity degradation is the result of several factors including (i) more extreme climate events, (ii) anthropic development spilling over natural resources, (iii) invasive species damage, (iv) farming systems little concerned with long-term land resource conservation, (v) fragmented land ownership making difficult integrated land use management and (vi) weakly enforced institutional frameworks that address these issues.

So, the project will address the conservation of biodiversity in areas with extensive agricultural activity through the strengthening of land governance systems and increased capacity for sustainable land management and the

reduction of land degradation impacts.

The project targets three watersheds on Grenada islands, namely La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed and the entire island of Carriacou.

This is a 4-year project with a budget of 4.4million \$, to be initially implemented by the Ministry of Finance under the National Implementation Modality. Co-financing is over 13.3 million \$ through two other Government-implemented projects with additional funding from the Ministry of Finance itself and UNDP. Project's details are under Box 1. It started in November 2019 and is due to be closed by the end of 2023.

| Objective: To operationalise integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of the agricultural system | Indicators: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for SLM/CSA solutions and for biodiversity and ecosystem services at national and/or subnational level by project end Number of direct project beneficiaries with increased livelihoods created through CSA, SLM and rangeland management in the project disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co- benefit prioritized landscapes disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co- benefit of GEF investment Number of integrated watershed management plans integrating biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA covering at least 50% of the 5 prioritized watersheds and operationalized |
|---|---|
| Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacity increased for integrated landscape management at the national level Outcome 1.1 - <i>Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices, and in the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes.</i> Outcome 1.2 - <i>Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM</i> Outputs: A central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystem and land use database and monitoring system to be assessed, updated and operationalized within the national land management policy in the national and legal regulatory framework. Regulatory, coordination and planning framework strengthened, integrating SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation. Biodiversity conservation and land use management capacities improved through training of personnel in biodiversity conservation and land use management | Indicators: Number of cross-sectoral collaboration/ agreements established for land use planning and management Change in the capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard Change in the level of awareness among stakeholders in St. David, St. Andrew and St. Patrick parishes and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA objectives as measured through the KAP/B Index |
| Component 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical and information services for CSA production Outcome 2.1 - Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level Outcome 2.2 - National level capacities enhanced for CSA production Outputs: - Operationalization of PA management on target islands and establishment of | Indicators: Financing for supporting SLM and CSA nationally Area (ha) within the watersheds of Great River, La Sagesse and St. Patrick where climate-resilient crops are Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties |

| designated priority Protected Areas. New potential MPA sites are identified and their representativeness and connectivity improved through biodiversity assessments around the marine shelf of target islands. Co-management of MPAs demonstrated in pilot sites based on the adoption of sustainable fishing practices by local communities. PA revenue generation mechanisms developed and piloted in conjunction with tourism sector stakeholders. Ecosystem monitoring supports the planning and management of PAs and related sustainable tourism activities. Information, Education and Communication (IEC) campaigns promote the importance of PAs and sustainable tourism. | |
|---|---|
| Component 3 : Operationalization of resilient agricultural practices | Indicators: |
| Outcome 3.1 - Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender Outcome 3.2 - Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha | Soil erosion rate (ton/ha/year) in steep and upland areas in three prioritized watersheds: La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed Income level (\$/year) of beneficiary households (disaggregated by gender) by project end |
| Outputs: | - Change in the area affected by major IAS species (hamboo and small Indian Mongoose) in six prioritized |
| CSA and SLM practices implemented in St. David, St. Andrew and St. Patrick parishes Biodiversity conservation expanded and integrated with CSA and SLM measures in La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed. CSA and integrated rangeland management system in Carriacou and Petit Martinique demonstrated | (ballboo and small indian interactivity provided sites by end of project: a) Bamboo removed in the midlevel strata/riparian zones of the La Sagesse Watershed b) Removal of Herpestes auropunctatus (small Indian Mongoose) annually from dry forest areas including KBAs (Mt St Catherine, Grand Etang, Levera, Perseverance, Mt Harman) Population of endangered species Changes in cover (ha) of key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds Indicator 15 (GEF7 Core Indicator 4): Area (ha) of landscapes under improved practices Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) |
| Component 4: Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation | Indicators: |
| Outcome 4.1 - Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices developed under this project Outcome 4.2 - Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation, outcomes and outputs ensure project effectively reaches outlined goals and objectives. | Number of documents on successful experiences about CSA, SLM and biodiversity conservation practices and gender mainstreaming disseminated in national institutions and among Ministry of Agriculture and Lands extension centres that serve farmers around Grenada Number of sub-national or local institutions that adopt |
| Outputs: | recommendations resulting from SLM, CSA and |
| Technical knowledge captured, experiences and lessons learned and incorporated in institutional strengthening and capacity Media products promoting outreach and increased public awareness / environmental education of SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation disseminated Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation conducted for adaptive management, including periodic field visits, core indicators assessments, mid-term and final evaluations of project | biodiversity conservation interventions by project end |

Box 1: Summary of project objective, components, outcomes and outputs

Project's main achievements

The project has 4 components on (i) institutional capacity building for integrated landscape management, (ii) increasing capacity for service delivery for CSA production, (iii) demonstrating and adoption of resilient agricultural practices and (iv) knowledge management for dissemination.

Overall, farmers' exposure to SLM/CSA/BD mainstreaming has been minimal so far and there has been little progress on formulating watershed management plans.

Under Outcome 1, discussions are ongoing on institutional partnerships with positive prospects on SLM/CSA mainstreaming but no agreement yet. A scoping assessment of Government capacity needs was done and some training sessions were conducted. However, the site selection and method did not follow a clear strategy (with some sites not adequate for the demonstration or little follow-up of trained farmers. The awareness assessment of local stakeholders has yet to begin.

Under Outcome 2, there are some good prospects with the setting-up of the Agriculture Challenge Fund as a strategy to fund farmers' transition to more sustainable agricultural practices. About 15% of the land target under improved management practices has been reached. Less than 10% of anticipated female beneficiaries have been supported with climate-resilient crops; however, a more pressing need addressed by the project is first to increase the production capacity of agricultural stations that would serve female beneficiaries.

As for Outcome 3, few activities were conducted but some demonstration techniques on soil erosion, A-frame building, chain-saw training or bamboo control and others were conducted but at a too small-scale level. Other activities are yet to be initiated (e.g., cover/species monitoring, mongoose control...).

Under Component 4, some press releases and messages have been divulged on SLM/CSA but there is insufficient farmer's exposure to draw lessons on the most promising / easily adoptable measures yet. On a positive note, the TAMCC seem to have integrated SLM training activities in its 2021 programme.

Constraints:

The project delivery is very low and it is at risk of not achieving any result. Obstacles include (i) unclear rules of engagement between PMU and the IP, (ii) insufficient HR resources within Government to support project operationalisation including delayed approvals, (iii) unclear role of Government institutions because of past institutional changes and (iv) PMU not engaging enough with local on-the-ground stakeholders.

There are several project management weaknesses including work planning, reporting and TORs drafting capabilities and an overall lack of knowledge of UN procedures for NIM projects. Adaptive management measures to accelerate implementation include clustering activities in a Performance-Based Agreement, then through a Request for Proposals following up GEF's rules. Stakeholders' engagement has been very low with little PMU support to facilitate activities operationalisation.

Last but not least, the project was signed four months before the COVID pandemic. There was little if any time to create a project dynamic. When the PMU was contracted, the country was soon going into the first lockdown that basically paralysed any implementation effort. Combined with the above including institutional changes, PMU was never able to engage fully key stakeholders that showed little project commitment.

Sustainability:

While institutional engagement is weak, there are signs of interest at local level despite limited outreach efforts yet. The apparent lack of documenting pilot demonstration so far combined with a lack of follow-up or scaling up (yet) is an issue, should these activities move later in high gear with large scale demonstrations. The financial risks

to sustainability are not negligible with poor community ownership meaning there might not be much interest in financing watershed management plans. The issue of SLM/CSA financing on an individual basis is ensured through potential collaboration with other interventions and the GDB but it remains to be seen whether advantageous financial products would remain available by project's end. The institutional framework and governance risks are highest: at institutional level, there is some good understanding in mainstreaming knowledge within the Ministry of Agriculture but transmission to farmers remains limited to external funding. Activities on land use databases and access are likely to be owned and upgrading/maintenance followed-up. As for watersheds, little is known as to what kind of watershed management modality would be selected; however, it can be anticipated difficulties in reaching agreements with the fragmented nature of land ownership and the fact that many land owners cannot be reached out (e.g., living abroad). Socio-economic risks may be high in case the project advocates SLM/CSA techniques that are reliant on a premium price but the project is lacking time to establish the relevant instruments and mechanisms to ensure product certification. The environmental risks are minimal. More discussion is necessary (e.g., within a new Technical Committee) on how to finetune the project activities to ensure results sustainability.

Evaluation rating table

| Measure | MTR Rating |
|---|---------------|
| Overall Objective: To operationalise integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming | U |
| biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of the agricultural system | |
| Outcome 1.1: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices and | U |
| in the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national | |
| institutional capacity for landscapes | |
| Outcome 1.2: Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM | |
| Outcome 2.1: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level | U |
| Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA production | |
| Outcome 3.1: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, | U |
| evidenced by increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender | |
| Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha | |
| Outcome 4.1: Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices | MU |
| developed under this project | |
| Outcome 4.2: Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation, outcomes and outputs ensure the project | |
| effectively reaches outlined goals and objectives. | |
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | U(U + MU) |
| | respectively) |
| Likelihood of Sustainability | U |

A summary of the evaluation ratings is provided in Table 1.

*Table 1: Evaluation ratings*¹

Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Conclusions:

¹ Rating scales in Annexe 4

The project is seriously behind schedule, the result of institutional and management problems compounded by external factors (COVID) and the weak absorption capacity of the main institutional stakeholder (Ministry of Agriculture).

The project is highly relevant with a strong theory of change but also a very much centralised implementation approach based on institutions, taking little advantage of non-State actors. Still, the project is very much innovative by taking a multi-pronged approach to address biodiversity and land resources conservation through the inclusion of the agricultural sector, government, agriculture service providers and also recognising the need for an integrated development approach at watershed level.

The project delivery is extremely low (less than 15% at MTR stage) with start-up affected by COVID and institutional changes that have resulting in ministerial functions reshuffling.

PMU has adopted several adaptive management measures such as the grouping of activities under PBA, later RfP or straight interactions with relevant stakeholders, as a strategy to accelerate implementation. It has initiated a series of discussions with the management of complementary interventions that could result as well in speeding up project implementation. However, the project has serious shortcomings that include (i) insufficient stakeholders' engagement, (ii) insufficiently experienced PMU on project management skills and understanding of UN procedures on performance-based agreements and requests for proposals, planning, reporting or TORs drafting, (iii) mixed-results MCO support, (iv) PMU management weaknesses and last but not least, (v) an overall inadequate IP response time to enable PMU to operationalise project activities.

By MTR, the project had managed to (i) initiate training sessions on SLM techniques and also some sessions on public service management, (ii) procure equipment to boost Government's provision of seedlings for agricultural recuperation, (iii) contract most, if not all planned external expertise, (iv) initiate contacts with agriculture services providers and visits to select SLM/CSA demonstration sites and (v) the successful launching of a call for proposal on SLM grants.

So, PMU is still in a learning curve on project management, the support provided by the IP has been limited and MCO support to PMU is mixed as for effectiveness.

With the agricultural nature of many activities (SLM and CSA demonstration techniques) that is season-dependent and several activities that should be sequential, there remains very little time if any to successfully implement the project as per original objectives and within the planned timeframe.

To ensure GEF value for money, one should consider (i) terminating the project and redesigning it at a later GEF cycle taking into account the implementation issues or (ii) pursue the project with a resizing/downsizing of its results framework combined with a much more proactive IP and closely supervised PMU.

Recommendations:

In case, it is decided not to terminate the project at this stage, it is recommended not to change the IP, keep the NIM and grant a 12-month no-cost extension.

| Rec | MTR Recommendation | Entity Responsible | Timeframe for |
|-----|--|-------------------------|-------------------|
| # | | | implementation |
| А | Category 1: ensuring impactful results | | |
| A.1 | Review the log frame and simplify several outputs including at least | PMU with MCO | 1 month |
| | deleting certification-related activities | support | |
| A.2 | Push for quick-win SLM/CSA techniques or long-term land | PMU | Project remaining |
| | improvement with a high return on investments within a | | timeframe |
| Δ3 | Consider watershed management interventions decentralisation | PMU and Ministry of | 1 month |
| / | with the support of on-site non-State actors for both watershed | Agriculture | 1 |
| | management plan formulation and (future) implementation | - | |
| В | Category 2: accelerating implementation | | |
| B.1 | Make PMU more effective with either team removal or CTA | Ministry of Agriculture | 3 months |
| | additional support | and MCO | |
| B.2 | Prioritise the finalisation of agreement with complementary | PMU with Ministry of | 2 months |
| 0.2 | Interventions | Agriculture support | 1 |
| B.3 | and farmers' follow-up (adoption) | Agriculture support | 1 month |
| C | Category 3: Improve the project governance system | Agriculture Support | |
| C.1 | Create a project Technical Committee to facilitate project's | PSC members | 1 month |
| | activities' operationalisation and ensuring project's outputs quality | | |
| | control | | |
| C.2 | Review and amend the stakeholder's engagement plan following up | PMU with MCO | 2 months |
| | Government's institutional changes | support (?) | |
| C.3 | Enlarge PSC membership (observatory role) with non-State actors to | PSC members | 1 month |
| | boost local ownership | | |
| C.4 | Reassess the role of civil society with a view to more project | PMU with Ministry of | 3 months |
| | inclusion (PSC, Technical Committee, activity delivery) | Agriculture support | |
| C.5 | Make use of existing Ministry of Agriculture's expertise with closer | PMU and Ministry of | 3 months |
| | control and Egrestry Division | Agriculture | |
| 6.6 | Connert the /we Meximize of an CLM detables with CIC information | Ministry of Aquinulture | |
| C.6 | support the (re-)designing of an SLW database with GIS information with a stronger alignment with the Physical Planning Unit | with PMII support | timeframe |
| C.7 | Reconvene within 6 months an extraordinary PSC session to assess | PSC members | 6 months |
| 0.7 | progress made on A, B, C recommendations and decide whether to | | |
| | close or not the project | | |

List of Abbreviations

| ART | Agency for Rural Transformation |
|----------|---|
| ASAP | As Soon As Possible |
| AWP | Annual Work Plan |
| BD | Biodiversity |
| CAO | Chief Agricultural Officer |
| CDR | Combined Delivery Report |
| CBA | Cost-Benefit Analysis |
| CSA | Climate-Smart Agriculture |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DETC | Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation |
| FFS | Farmers Field School |
| GDB | Grenada Development Bank |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIZ | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH - German Society for International |
| | Cooperation, Ltd. |
| GOAM | Grenada Organic Agriculture Movement |
| GRENCODA | Grenada Community Development Agency |
| HR | Human Resources |
| IA | Implementing Agency |
| IAGDO | Inter-Agency Group of Development Organisations |
| IAS | Invasive Alien Species |
| ID | Identification |
| IEC | Information Education Communication |
| IGA | Income Generating Activities |
| KAP | Knowledge, Attitude, Practices |
| LDC | Least Developed Country |
| MALF | Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MCO | Multi-Country Office (of UNDP) |
| METT | Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool |
| MTR | Mid-Term Review |
| MTRT | Mid Term Review Team |
| NAWASA | National Water and Sewerage Authority |
| NGO | Non-Government Organization |
| NIM | National Implementation Modality |
| PA | Protected Area |
| PAC | Project Appraisal Committee |
| PBA | Performance-Based Agreement |
| PGS | Participatory Guarantee System |
| PIA | People In Action |
| PIF | Project Identification Form (of the GEF) |
| PIMS | Project Information Management System (of UNDP) |
| PIR | Project Implementation Review |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| PPG | Project Preparation Grant |

| PRODOC | Project Document |
|--------|---|
| PS | Permanent Secretary |
| PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| RfP | Request for Proposals |
| SAEP | Climate Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme |
| SEA | Strategic Environmental Assessment |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing State |
| SGP | Small Grants Programme (of UNDP – GEF-funded) |
| SLM | Sustainable Land Management |
| SMART | Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound |
| SPECTO | St Patrick Environmental and Community Tourism Organisation |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats |
| TC | Technical Committee |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| ToT | Training of Trainer |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| US | United States |
| UWI | University of West Indies |

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the full-sized project entitled "Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management". The mid-term review was carried out by a team of independent consultants, on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

Pursuing the UNDP and Global Environment Facility (GEF) monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all UNDP-implemented and GEF-funded projects are required to undergo a mid-term review. Towards this end, UNDP has commissioned this evaluation by contracting two independent evaluators. It was carried out in accordance with the UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and facilitated by the UNDP Multi-Country Office in Barbados.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress made in achieving the project results and objectives defined in the project document and to evaluate the success or failure indices of the project in order to identify the necessary changes and/or reorientations to improve its implementation to achieve the expected results.

As per terms of reference (ToR), the team of consultants has assessed progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assessed early signs of project success or failure to identify the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR also reviewed the project's strategy, its sustainability risks.

To assess the progress of the project, the following four thematics were reviewed in detail:

(i) Project Strategy: project design and relevance in relation to climate change, review of log frame and results' framework including analysis of (SMART²) indicators and taking into account gender and externalities

(ii) Degree of progress of the project: review of the tracking tools and analysis of the achievement of results and effects and progress towards the objectives (colour code to complete the results matrix and scoring scale of project progress)

(iii) Project implementation and adaptive management: analysis of project management and implementation including work plans, financial planning and co-financing, monitoring and evaluation system, stakeholder involvement, reporting system and communication

(iv) Mid-term sustainability (analysis of risks that could affect the maintenance of project results and effects over the project's expected life span): analysis of financial, socio-economic, governance and institutional risks, environmental risks.

1.2 Scope and methodology

1.2.1 Scope

The mid-term evaluation focused on the implementation of project activities and analysis of the project's performance taking into account results, objectives and effects achieved and using the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and potential sustainability/impact.

² Specific, Measurable, Accessible, Relevant, Time-bound

The key areas that were assessed based on priorities identified within the context of the current project include Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management, Sustainability.



Box 2: Key areas to be assessed during the MTR

A more detailed analysis of implementation modalities and adaptive management included:

- (i) Management arrangements
- (ii) Work planning
- (iii) Finance and co-finance
- (iv) Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- (v) Stakeholder engagement
- (vi) Social and environmental standards (safeguards)

The long-term sustainability included assessing risks such as:

- (i) Financial risks to sustainability
- (ii) Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- (iii) Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability
- (iv) Environmental risks to sustainability

The project was reviewed according to the following evaluation criteria:

Relevance assesses how the project relates to the development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for climate change and is coherent with the main objectives of GEF focal areas. It also assesses whether the project addressed the needs of targeted beneficiaries at the local and national levels.

Effectiveness measures the extent to which the project achieved the expected outcomes and objectives, how risks and risk mitigation were being managed, and what lessons can be drawn for other similar projects in the future.

Efficiency is the measure of how economically, resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It also examines how efficient were partnership arrangements (linkages between institutions/ organizations) for the project.

Impact and potential sustainability examine the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It looks at whether the project is on the way to achieving the intended changes or improvements (technical, economic, social, cultural, political and ecological). In GEF terms, impact/results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects including on communities.

Using the above-explained evaluation criteria, the mid-term review covered all activities supported by UNDP, the

project team and the Government as well as activities that other collaborating partners including beneficiaries may have participated in.

With timing, the evaluation reviewed all activities of the project from project signature in November 2019 to December 2021.

The evaluation has been conducted in a way that provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

1.2.2 Methodology

The Evaluators adopted a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Multi-Country Office, the project team and any other stakeholder at national and community levels.

Several basic principles used to conduct the evaluation include:

- Effective participation of all stakeholders (government, agencies, donors, final beneficiaries)
- Crosschecking of gathered information
- Emphasis on **consensus and agreement** on the recommendations by the stakeholders.
- **Transparency** of debriefing

Overall, the evaluation tools used during the evaluation were the following: a review of key documents and literature, consultation and interview of stakeholders and field missions to any project site. The data collection tools included semi-structured questionnaires for key informants (checklists) and interview guides for focus group discussions with beneficiaries. The tools were developed by the evaluators focusing on the evaluation criteria and major outcomes planned. The interview guides and semi-structured questionnaires are presented in Annexe 3.

The adopted methodology is detailed in Annex 2.

As per GEF IEO³ (2017) and UNDP (2014) guidelines requirements for evaluations, specific Evaluation Rating Criteria were used in combination with the 5 DAC⁴ evaluation criteria: these are outcomes, quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E), quality of implementation and execution and sustainability (environmental, social, financial and institutional).

Project performance was evaluated and rated using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact using the standard rating scales (see Annexe 4 for a summary). The primary reference points for assessing the performance were the indicators and targets set in the Strategic Results Framework, with consideration given to contextual factors.

Ratings: In accordance with GEF guidelines for project evaluations, achievement ratings, as well as sustainability ratings, were assigned by the MTRT. The MTRT rated various aspects of the project according to the GEF project review criteria using the obligatory GEF ratings of: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U)and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

³ Independent Evaluation Office

⁴ Development Assistance Committee

A full description of these ratings and other GEF rating scales is provided in Annexe 4. The MTR team also rated various dimensions of sustainability of project outcomes using the GEF obligatory rating scale of Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU)and, Unlikely (U).

1.3 MTR limitations

Due to the COVID pandemic restrictions, the MTR was conducted in a hybrid way with the national consultant able to discuss in-person with stakeholders when required and able to visit any project site while the international consultant lead the MTR remotely using audio and video conference tools only.

Assumptions:

It was assumed that the presentation of initial findings would have included key government stakeholders such as the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and other key local technical experts who were evaluated during MTR Mission and Data Collection. However, the initial findings were shared only with GEF, UNDP and the project team. Still, their feedback and interventions would have been critical to understanding follow-up actions and the feasibility of some of the recommendations; These were, however, due to be shared at a PSC meeting scheduled in early 2022 – but without the Evaluation Team presence.

No comprehensive list of stakeholders was provided before the MTR. However, a brief list was handed over after the MTR began following up the initial meeting with the Project Coordinator. It however lacked stakeholders' diversity, possibly because the project is at an early stage of implementation.

Challenges:

The MTR Review was conducted shortly before the Christmas season making it difficult to schedule interviews. Obtaining feedback from Project Stakeholders was difficult due to the unresponsiveness of email communication, resulting in countless interviews' rescheduling.

Finally, formalities within the scope of stakeholder selection and identification limited the scope for diversity and inclusivity within the data collection process.

Strengths:

The MTRT encountered a fairly responsive project team and support unit which made it easier for adaptive management of MTR process. Concerns and questions were adequately taken on board.

Weaknesses:

While the MTRT was able to discuss with the main direct and indirect institutional stakeholders on Grenada island, there was no possibility to discuss with potential beneficiaries as the actual project-benefitting communities had yet to be identified and fully engaged with by the project team. Discussions were also at the very initial stages in the Carriacou and Petite Martinique islands, hence, no interviews were conducted as well.

There were very limited project activities and demonstration sites, evidencing a low level of implementation. There was not much strong evidence to make a case for how implementation modalities can be improved since activities had barely started.

Selection criteria for project site visits were unclear and circumstantial following up interviews with both project and Government staff. In some cases, the selection of stakeholders was prompted by the stakeholders themselves as opposed to the UNDP Management team. All this pointed towards a lack of clear direction and scope from the local project team office to maximize the usefulness of the MTR consultancy

As for mid-term evaluations, the allocated time to gather data did not enable the collection of any statistical data. All information was based on data crosschecking from different sources of information (documents, interviews and insitu assessments).

1.3.1 Ethics

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the UNEG⁵ Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators (Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement attached in Annexe 13).

The rights and dignity of all stakeholders were respected, including interviewees, project participants (project, UNDP, Government staff), potential beneficiaries (beneficiary institutions and communities) and other evaluation stakeholders including co-financing partners. The evaluators preserved the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants so that those who participated in the evaluation were free from external pressure and that their involvement in no way disadvantaged them.

The report of the evaluation does not indicate a specific source of citations or qualitative data to preserve this confidentiality.

The confidentiality of stakeholders was ensured and consultation processes were appropriately contextualised and culturally sensitive, with attention given to issues such as gender empowerment and fair representation for vulnerable groups, wherever possible. To provide stakeholders with uninhibited opportunities for providing feedback, project staff and UNDP representatives were not present during the interviews.

Whilst every effort was made to reflect the inputs of stakeholders fairly and accurately in the report, the evaluation ratings, conclusions and key recommendations are those of the sole evaluator, not binding on any individual or institutional stakeholder.

1.4 Structure of the evaluation report

The mid-term evaluation report is structured according to the guidelines provided in the "Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported GEF- Financed Projects" (July 2014).

This report is presented in five sections. It initially presents an *executive summary* of the mid-term evaluation, giving a brief background of the project and its design, a summary of its findings related to the activities, management and important aspects such as partnership and sustainability, conclusions and recommendations for future action.

It is followed by an *introduction*, which describes the context and background of the evaluation and gives a brief description of the purpose, scope and focus of the evaluation, the methodology used and the structure of the report. The next section presents information on the project, including project description, development context and strategy.

The *findings* section is dedicated to the results achieved towards the outcomes of the project, which is the core of the report, presented under three subheadings related to programme design, implementation and evaluation criteria. The final section considers the *conclusions* of the evaluation and *recommendations* for future action.

⁵ United Nations Evaluation Group

2. Project description and development context

2.1 Environment and development context

Environmental

The Tri Island State of Grenada comprises the islands, Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique with a few other islets and smaller islands most of which are privately owned. Together they form the state of Grenada, being 344 sq km in size, 121 km long in coast line and 200 nm of the exclusive economic zone. The state of Grenada is the southern most of the Archipelago of Islands known as the Windward Islands.

Located only 3685 km from the continent of South America, the island of Grenada is volcanic in origin. Unlike other continental islands like Trinidad and Tobago, the island is less biodiverse, however, due to its isolation, can be characterised as having some level of endemism that tends to be higher than continents and continental islands. Some endemic species include the Grenada Dove (*Leptotila wellsi*), the Grenada Piping Frog (*Pristimantis euphronides*) and the Grenada Blind Snake (*Amerotyphlops tasymicris*). According to Beard (1946) migration from nearby land masses such as South America and the Orinoco River allowed plant and animal material to arrive by natural elements and develop the island's unique biogeography.

From the tallest peak Mt. St. Catherine (840 m) to its lowest coastal point, the vegetation varies from Cloud Forest, Seasonal Deciduous, dry evergreen, lower montane, littoral wood land, scrub, mangroves, sea grass and coral reef. According to panorama solutions (2022) classification on ecosystems, Grenada's ecosystems can be categorized as follows: Agroforestry, crop land, pasture, deciduous forest, cloud forest, deep sea, open sea, lagoon, mangrove, sea grass, coral reef, beach, sea mount/ocean ridge, rocky reef/ rocky shore, coastal forest, lake, river, stream, wetland and green spaces within urban areas.



Figure 1: Grenada vegetation

According to Grenada's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, external shocks are one of the greatest threats to the island's biodiversity including changes in weather patterns and natural disasters. More particularly, the shift in human settlement patterns from rural to urban areas has led to changes in land use and an increase in built development along the coast and within urban areas. These changes have meant the loss of forest cover and deforestation leading to losses in biodiversity. Changes in agricultural practices through the use of pesticides and chemicals have led to a decline in environmental health and poor quality of water and soils.

Socio-Economic

The population of Grenada is 113,321 with a growth rate of 0.35% (Index Mundi 2000)

Being largely a tourism-based economy, Grenada depends on its ecosystem services for the provision of food, shelter, fuel, cultural, recreational and spiritual services. According to the World Economy Profile, the GDP composition for Grenada's economy is 9.1% Agriculture, 14.2% Industry and 76.7% Services.

Of the 344 km² of land within the State of Grenada, 32.3% is attributed to agriculture, 50% forest and 17.7% "other" which includes built-up areas, roads and transportation features (Index Mundi 2020). With a heavy reliance on tourism, Grenada's main source of revenue comes from tourism and tertiary education based on the development and growth of St. George's University. Due to the high rate of development in southern areas, access to good and services have increased and as a result migration and urbanization from rural areas. The impact of this is a steady decline in agricultural produce leading to high levels of import and underproductivity within the agricultural sector. According to World Bank Reports, Agriculture in Grenada is largely carried out on a small-scale level with 80% of the farmers occupying less than 0.2 hectares of land. Overall, the percentage of land use allocated for agriculture and the number of farmers has decreased with high levels of absentee ownership. In 2017, in an attempt to utilize the idle lands across the country, the Government launched a project entitled "Grenada Land Bank Project" to try and regularize the utilization and conservation of private lands left abandoned by private owners. It should also be noted that the majority of land in Grenada is also privately owned. Under the project, Grenadians interested in farming or agriculture-based ventures are encouraged to lease land from the Government in an attempt to manage agribusiness and productive outputs from the agricultural sector. Generally, high rates of unemployment (40%) and 38% of the population being below the poverty line means that more ways of increasing productivity and outputs from the agricultural sector are an important safety net for the economy and its people.

Institutional and Policy Factors

Based on Grenada's Biodiversity targets, Thomas (2016) reports that key strategic entry points include restoration and sustainable management focusing on areas such as forest biodiversity, agriculture biodiversity, freshwater biodiversity, and coastal and marine biodiversity as well as enhancing national capacity focusing on areas such as governance, education and public awareness, knowledge management and capacity building and institutional framework.

Generally, the management of ecosystems falls under the jurisdiction of various line Ministries, each responsible for some aspect of ecosystem management. For example, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience and the Environment, Ministry of Infrastructure Development, Transport and Implementation, Ministry of Sports, Culture, the Arts Fisheries and Cooperatives. Governed by separate pieces of legislation, the sectorial model portfolio gives a special legal mandate or responsibility that infringes upon separate ecosystems. For example,

Ministry of Agriculture and Lands with responsibility for natural resources, Forestry Division with responsibility for Parks and Protected Areas including watersheds, Environmental Division with responsibility for the Coordination of multilateral environmental agreements and policies, Land Use Division with responsibility for the management of Geographic Information Systems, Ministry of Tourism with responsibility for Protected Areas and Parks and the Physical Planning Unit with overall governance for physical development across landscapes. Unlike Trinidad and Tobago or Jamaica, which mimic a one-stop shop for environmental management and planning. The sectorial model establishes fragmentation between line ministries requiring high levels of coordination through the establishment of ad hoc committees.

Additionally, because land ownership in Grenada is majority private owners, the management of ecosystems is largely dependent on private owners seeing that only 10% of the land is state-owned.

Under the Forestry Act of Grenada, land under private ownership can be declared as protected forest areas and a private land owner may also request that his or her land be supervised by the Forestry Division, Conservation Easements may also be applied to private land by establishing covenants with the land owners.

Outside of protected areas and parks, the public is encouraged to conserve the vulnerable and fragile ecosystems of Grenada, through public awareness campaigns, donor-funded projects and Non-Governmental Organizations with specific inputs and interventions. Similarly, Grenada has also signed on to a number of Multilateral Environmental Agreements that establishes some level of priority given to biodiversity hotspots and overall environmental and resource management. This is coordinated by the Environment Division.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

It is understood that biodiversity and land degradation in Grenada is multifactorial but characteristic of small developing country island nations.

It includes:

- (1) Increasing frequency of extreme climatic events with severe environmental and economic impacts (e.g., more frequent cyclones, stronger storms, worse droughts with associated forest fires)
- (2) Inadequately-checked tourism and overall urban development with encroachment on natural resources (e.g., construction sites) and associated effects (solid waste, effluents, sand mining)
- (3) Continued extension/spreading of invasive alien species
- (4) A weak agricultural sector characterised by a lack of capacity to rebound after extreme events (cyclones) and insufficient technical support to promote environmentally-friendly land production/conservation techniques (with increasing agricultural runoff and pollution)
- (5) A land tenure system characterised by fragmentation of land parcels and a high number of land tenants/owners, making it difficult for Government to promote and advocate sustainable natural resources development and conservation at watershed or landscape levels, or even in PA buffer zones
- (6) Unchecked local fishing industry with technical resources focussing preferentially on reef resources
- (7) Lack of political will and insufficient institutional frameworks to address decisively these issues as possibly too socially-disruptive and/or highly absorbing in terms of human and financial resources

The agricultural sector has been severely affected by recurrent dry spells and two consecutive cyclones in 2004 and 2005 that affected its development and ultimately its recovery even until today with negative effects ranging from production changes (more oriented on annual crops, that are more input/water-intensive), abandonment of agricultural land with resulting invasive alien species expansion, agricultural extension in other cases with encroachment on riparian forests...).

In that context, the project chose a landscape approach to addressing biodiversity and land degradation by strengthening the agricultural sector to make it (i) more resilient to extreme events and (ii) more environment-friendly.

The project attempts to address the conservation of biodiversity within agricultural landscapes by strengthening land governance regimes and institutional capacity for sustainable land management and reducing land degradation impacts. More importantly, the project attempts to improve agricultural practices by adopting Climate Smart Agriculture and thus reducing pressures on biodiversity.

2.3 Project description and strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites

The project's objective is to operationalise integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing the resilience of the agricultural system. For this, it was designed adopting a multi-pronged approach:

- Enhancing stakeholders (mainly Government's) capacity building for SLM and CSA for managing (and/or providing support to managing) landscapes
- Provide capacity building and tools to both farmers and Government's technical staff to access/understand access in services for CSA production
- Provide actual support to farmers so they can transition towards CSA and SLM practices

- Finally, document success and failure and communicate on it.

A comprehensive theory of change was designed with clear project outcomes and impacts. The TOC has addressed a wide range of issues (see Annexe 6), providing several different solutions, but maybe placing itself at risk of losing sight of the actual intervention's focus on transitioning farmers from unsustainable agricultural practices to adopting SLM and CSA practices.

The project has 8 outcomes grouped under 4 components. The project details are in Box 1.

- (i) Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacity increased for integrated landscape management at the national level
- (ii) Component 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical and information services for CSA production
- (iii) Component 3: Operationalization of resilient agricultural practices
- (iv) Component 4: Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation



Figure 2: key project components

Objective: To operationalise integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing the resilience of the agricultural system.

Outcome 1.1: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices and in the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes.

Outcome 1.2: Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM

Outputs:

1.1 A central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystemand land use database and monitoring system to be assessed, updated and operationalized

within the national land management policy in the national and legal regulatory framework.

1.2. Regulatory, coordination and planning framework strengthened, integrating SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation.

1.3. Biodiversity conservation and land use management capacities improved through training of personnel in biodiversity conservation and land use management

Outcome 2.1: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level

Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA production

Outputs:

2.1. Financial support systems for incentivizing CSA, SLM and conservation-oriented agriculture practices are strengthened/established/operationalize including microcredit schemes and related certification of agriculture products with CSA criteria integrated

2.2. Soil and water quality monitoring and advisory programme enhanced.

2.3. National supply of climate-resilient crop varieties enhanced

Outcome 3.1: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender.

Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha

Outputs:

3.1. CSA and SLM practices implemented in St. David, St. Andrewand St. Patrick parishes

3.2. Biodiversity conservation expanded and integrated with CSA and SLM measures in La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed.

3.3. CSA and integrated rangeland management system in Carriacou and Petit Martinique demonstrated

Outcome 4.1: Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices developed under this project.

Outcome 4.2: Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation, outcomes and outputs ensure the project effectively reaches outlined goals and objectives.

4.1. Technical knowledge captured, experiences and lessons learned and incorporated in institutional strengthening and capacity building

4.2 Media products promoting outreach and increased public awareness / environmental education of SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation disseminated

4.3. Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation conducted for adaptive management, including periodic field visits, core indicators assessments, mid-term and final evaluations of project

Box 3: project objective, components, outcomes and outputs

> The Project Area

The project is to carry out activities in three watersheds on Grenada island (La Sagesse, Great River and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick watersheds) and also on Petite Martinique and Carriacou.

The selection of watersheds was based on the diversity of farming systems (rangeland, annual cropping, horticulture, cash crops) and previous exposure to other development projects (farmers supposedly easily mobilised, pre-existing farmers' groups).

The island of Carriacou and Petite Martinique were specifically selected because of previous little Government support in the thematic.

Annexe 5 includes the maps of the project areas.

2.4 Project implementation arrangements

The implementation period of the project was planned for four years from November 2019 under the NIM⁶ modality.

UNDP (through its Energy, Environment and Climate Change Unit) acts as **the Implementing Agency** for GEF. The Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation (DETC), Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development was designated as the **Implementing Partner**. This was later changed by mid-2021 to the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands.



Figure 3: Original governance structure

At the technical implementation level, the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands was the main recipient of project activities on the Government's side and designated as the main **Project 'Supplier'** together with the Grenada Bureau of Standards and the Ministry of Climate Resilience, Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Disaster Management (later disbanded with the Forestry department returning to the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands) and UNDP MCO.

The project includes two main **Institutional Beneficiaries**: the Inter-Agency Group Of Development Organisations (IAGDO) and the Division of Gender and Family Affairs under the Ministry of Social Development, Housing and Community Empowerment.

A **Project Management Unit** was to implement activities on a day-to-day basis supported by contractors, consultants and other suppliers.

A three-tier quality assurance system was ensured through UNDP MCO, Regional and Global Offices.

The **Project Board** comprises the Project Supplier, the Project Beneficiary and the Implementing Partner. Its main responsibilities are to provide policy and technical guidance and direction towards the implementation of the project, provide input/endorse/approve changes into work plans, budgets and implementation schedules, approve project implementation schedule, annual work plan (AWP) and indicative project budget, provide guidance and agree on issues to address specific project risks and/or raised by the Project Coordinator, monitor project implementation and provide direction and recommendations.

⁶ National Implementation Modality

Actually, this organisational structure will be reshaped after project start-up due to a reorganisation of ministries and transfer of functions from one ministry to another (see chapter 3.3.1 under adaptive management).

| Type of activity | Planned timeframe | Actual timeframe |
|--------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Project signature | November 2019 | November 2019 |
| Project start-up | November 2019 | November 2019 |
| Inception workshop | Before February 2020 | December 2020 |
| Periodic reporting | Quarterly basis | Quarterly basis |
| PIR ⁷ | Annual | June 2021 (1 st) |
| Mid-Term Review | Around November 2021 | October 2021 - February 2022 |
| | (Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR) | |
| Final evaluation | Before August 2023 | - |
| Project closure | November 2023 | - |

2.5 Project timing and milestones

Table 2: Project timing

2.6 Main stakeholders

The project made a comprehensive assessment of all planned and potential project's stakeholders in the sector under consideration (donors, governmental institutions, local and international NGOs, beneficiaries) including:

- Government:
 - Ministry of Climate Resilience, Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Disaster Management⁸ for leading the project implementation, chairing the project board and as beneficiary (Environment and forestry divisions)
 - Ministry of Finance on leading most project activities and facilitating coordination
 - Ministry of Agriculture and Lands⁹ as a direct beneficiary through many of its divisions or units (Land Use, Extension, Veterinary and Livestock, Pest Management...)
 - Ministry of Social Development, Housing and Community Empowerment to ensure gender considerations are taken into account
 - Final beneficiaries: (i) watersheds' farmers, cattle rangers
 - Community organisations:
 - producers' groups: e.g., N/W Farmers' Organization; NEFO; Grenada Federation of Agriculture and Fisheries Organizations; MAREB; Grenada Association of Poultry Producers [GAPP)]; Grenada Network of Rural Women Producers/GRENROP; Minor Spice Cooperative; and Carriacou Association of Small Agro-Processors (CASAP)
 - Agricultural statutory bodies as final beneficiaries of project's intervention (e.g., Grenada Cocoa/Nutmeg Associations; for marketing products of Tree-crop agriculture (Commodity Boards).
- Parastatal compagnies/institutions:

⁷ Project Implementation Review

⁸ The environment and climate resilience functions were transferred under a new Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience and Environment; the forestry function was transferred to the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry

⁹ Today, the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry

- Grenada Development Bank on easing access to finance to farmers engaged in SLM and CSA practices
- Grenada Bureau of Standards as a beneficiary in enhancing its capacity to certify for CSA/SLM produce
- National Water and Sewerage Authority (NAWASA) on providing assistance in water quality assessments within project's watersheds
- Other donors: GIZ and EU, World Bank with interventions active in similar areas or focus on similar issues and topics
- Non-Governmental Organisations:
 - University of West Indies (UWI) for the provision of technical advice
 - Inter-Agency Group of Development Organisations (IAGDO) as an NGO platform to support project implementation and linking with local farmers' groups and associations
 - Other NGOs that can facilitate PMU access to farmers and/or contribute to project's implementation as subcontractors such as St Patrick Environmental and Community Tourism Organisation (SPECTO), Grenada Organic Agriculture Movement (GOAM), Agency for Rural Transformation (ART), Grenada Community Development Agency (GRENCODA)

3. Findings

3.1 Project design / Formulation

3.1.1 Relevance of project formulation

> Design:

With climate change¹⁰, unsustainable agricultural practices¹¹ and poor management of forestry resources¹² affecting negatively Grenada agriculture production and biodiversity (together with many anthropic causes) and ultimately food security, the Government is stepping up support to the agricultural sector with the adoption of agricultural practices that are more resilient to climate change and more in line with biodiversity conservation.

At the time of formulation, the country was in the process of finalising the National Sustainable Development Plan 2020 - 2035 with a strong focus on Vision 2025 and its national goals on sustainable development, supporting climate and disaster-resilient infrastructures and environmental sustainability and security.

The project design took into consideration several key elements of this plan such as the need

The project's strategy is set out in the Theory of Change (see annexe Annexe 6). The ToC is useful because it sets out the causal pathways from intervention through to the long-term impacts, focussing on integrating (i) biodiversity conservation, (ii) climate-smart agriculture and (iii) sustainable land management into the agricultural sector as a strategy to enhance the resilience of agroecosystems at watershed level.

The ToC is comprehensive taking into account a series of key issues, postulating a 4-components intervention:

- (i) Improved understanding of land use and related data availability through a series of activities based on improving the current land data-sharing system and enhancing the capacity of related practitioners (mostly Government)
- (ii) Increasing/improving the availability of tools that can facilitate the adoption of more sustainable and resilient techniques (namely, SLM and CSA) through better access to finance, adapted vegetative material and technical advice
- (iii) Facilitating agricultural sector stakeholders in actually adopting more resilient/sustainable practices, mainly through capacity building and an improved enabling environment at watershed level, and
- (iv) Taking stock of lessons learned and good practices to be disseminated.

If the project has well-evidenced the key issues at stake (capacity building of stakeholders, need to technically and financially support farmers to transition to SLM and CSA farming systems in tune with BD), the project's centre of gravity, in terms of beneficiary activities, revolves much around Government: e.g., need to build Government's capacity (data sharing, training of staff), enhance agricultural infrastructures (stations) so as to provide adapted plant material (equally agriculture or forestry-related), formulation of watershed management plans to be overlooked if not piloted by MALF-related stakeholders...

Farmers seem to have been insufficiently put at the forefront of the project as the main beneficiaries.

¹⁰ e.g., more frequent extreme events like droughts and cyclones

¹¹ e.g., indiscriminate use of agrochemicals, unreasoned use of water resources

¹² e.g., continuous degradation of low-level dry forests ecosystems

This bias is an issue as it postulates that first, Government capacity building is necessary before reaching out to farmers; this is confirmed at implementation so far with PMU dealing primarily with MALF and indirectly with farmersand with MALF remaining the entry point into the agricultural sector.

Still, non-state actors - in particular sub-sectoral associations - were recognised as key to project success at the project formulation stage as they are viewed (under components 2 and 3) as service delivery providers and/or linkages between the project and individual farmers.

With regards to the actual project set-up, the project took advantage of several (at the time) new institutional changes such as the Ministry of Climate Change, Environment and Forestry that was designated as the Executing Partner. However, by the project's start-up, the ministry had already been dismantled and its sectors split between other ministries with the Ministry of Agriculture as the new Executing Partner. This lack of institutional stability would certainly not facilitate implementation.

The project design also took into consideration gender equality with the inclusion in the organisational structures of Government departments in charge of this aspect.

All in all, the project is well formulated taking into account key issues for mainstreaming the conservation of biodiversity and more adapted (CSA) and sustainable (SLM) practices into the agricultural sector. However, the project's approach is very much centralised around Government as the main recipient of the project's support (vertical configuration).

A greater focus on the farmers themselves would have been welcomed with Government's support of just one component along with many others like the private sector, non-governmental organisations, umbrella farmers' organisations (a star-like configuration with the farmers at its centre). In that configuration, the ministry of agriculture would have been one partner among several others and the project could have been less reliant on government structures for its implementation (and weaknesses). Interviews of formulation team members showed this setup was actually the approach sought when designing the project.

> Lessons learned from other interventions:

The project took into consideration the lessons learned from a large variety of interventions: GEF is already present in Grenada with the GEF5 Ridge to Reef project that serves as a concept testing on how to mainstream biodiversity and reduce land degradation into watersheds that combine PAs and agricultural land (e.g., Beauséjour watershed).

The Development of a National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan and Grenada's Country Report to the CBD supported by GEF are pillars that would steer Government's action in biodiversity conservation. Indeed, there are explicit references to the BD action plan, reflected in the project (see chapter on relevance).

The GEF project on Preventing COSTS of Invasive Alien Species (IAS), implemented in the region but not in Grenada has proved to be useful in addressing the issue of mongoose and bamboo control in the project design, although it might prove more useful during implementation through exchanges of information on how control is dealt with in other Caribbean islands

The project took stock of lessons learned and good practices of the now-closed GEF/World Bank-supported Grenada Dry

Forest Biodiversity Conservation Project (2001-2006). It also identified a number of non-state organisations that participated in this project and were already exposed to development cooperation and therefore very much attuned with government and donor's requirements.

The project took into consideration existing and new initiatives that are active in similar sectors or thematic such as projects (to be) funded by other donors, including the Japanese cooperation and World Bank on improved markets through more sustainable agricultural practices, the German cooperation on a ridge to reef project with a strong component on assessing soil and water degradation.

Co-financing:

The PRODOC shows substantial Government co-financing (in a ratio of one to four) in addition to the co-financing of UNDP.

Most of the co-financing originates from two projects/programmes financed by loans from IFAD and CDB on the one hand and from the WB on the other. The IFAD/CDB-funded project on climate-smart agriculture (SAEP), is of particular interest for this project as there is extensive room for close collaboration and complementarities. Around 5% of the co-financing comes as well from the Government's budget through the Ministry of Finance.

By the time of implementation though, other interventions would emerge as complementary interventions (GCREWS programme and others).

3.1.2 Analysis of the Results Framework

> Log framework:

The review of the log frame shows that the project is structured under as many as 7 outcomes shared between 4 components.

- Project objective, outcomes and outputs:

See Box 1 above for details.

Overall, the linkage between the project's overall objective and its outcomes is very clear.

This is not the case with regards to outputs and outcomes for the first 3 project components; This can be confusing because outputs can contribute to a single or both outcomes under a particular component. Indeed, there is no clear understanding as to what output contributes to which outcome. Outputs under component 4 on M&E and evaluation are irrelevant in the logframe as they are project cycle-specific and not linked to the project issues; these cannot be defined as outputs *per se*.

- Indicators and targets:

This project is characterised by a large number of indicators (18) and the fact that indicators are grouped per component and not individually linked to outcomes. This leaves the door open for interpretation as to how (relevant) indicators are linked to outcomes.

Most indicators are SMART¹³ but some of them do have issues:

- Indicators 1 and 4 are very similar if not redundant. Indicators are not commonly used both at objective and outcome levels. The difference, if any, is subtle with indicator 1 referring to partnerships that provide additional funding for SLM/CSA 'solutions', although the nature of these partnerships is not defined. Indicator 4 is clearer with partnerships that are facilitating land use planning and management.

¹³ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound

- Two indicators (1, 6, 13 and 14) are not clearly defined before project implementation; this is a recurrent issue of GEF projects due to the formulation process that does not allow sufficiently detailed analysis to set the bases for baseline studies. This is an issue as baseline studies are very often completed at mid-term stage or even later by project's end, hence their pointlessness.
- Indicator 7 is problematic as it implies that the project has a fund-raising or lobbying capability to ensure that external stakeholders would be interested in additional financing (as a multiplication effect); this sort of indicator is not relevant at PMU-level. Moreover, new donors' negotiations culminating with funding resources addition are handled at Government level and not at PMU level.
- Some indicators are over-optimistic or too loosely defined as to their contribution to the project: indicator 7 refers to project's incurred additional funding for SLM/CSA although indicator 14 refers to cover changes but these will likely occur many years after project's end, especially for forest-related activities; a more logical indicator would have been the area that is being targeted by the project for cover change regardless of its success; indicator 15 is similar as the area under improved practices is quite open to interpretation (project's area, farmers that changed practices for good or some seasons, or even one season at project's end?)
- Indicator 11 on income level is unlikely to be useful as it is neither specific nor measurable with precision as income generation even from specific activities is a combination of many factors and cannot be pinpointed to a specific intervention.

It is worth mentioning that the measuring of biodiversity change and conservation (indicator 13) is based on relatively short cycle species (birds/amphibians) or recurrent events such as annual turtle nesting; hence, in theory, easily measurable. This is worth mentioning as in many other projects, the emphasis is put on the most charismatic endangered species with often long life/reproduction cycles that are not relevant for 5-y projects.

| Description | Description of Indicator | Target Level at mid-term of the project | Specific | Measurable | Achievable | Relevant | Time-bound |
|--|--|--|----------|------------|------------|----------|------------|
| Objective: To operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through | (1) Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for SLM/CSA solutions and for biodiversity and ecosystem services at national and/or subnational level by project end | 0 | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of agricultural systems | (2) Number of direct project beneficiaries with increased livelihoods created through CSA, SLM and rangeland management in the project disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit prioritized landscapes disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | Male: between 245 and 319 annually Female: between 105 and 137 annually (Target will be validated during the first year of project implementation) | Ŷ | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| | (3) Number of integrated watershed management plans integrating biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA covering at least 50% of the 5 prioritized watersheds and operationalized | 2 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

| Component 1 Outcome 1.1: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices and the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes Outcome 1.2: Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM | (4) Number of cross-sectoral collaboration/ agreements established for land use planning and management (5) Change in the capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (6) Change in the level of awareness among stakeholders in St. David, St. Andrew and St. Patrick parishes and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLMand CSA objectives as measured through the KAP/B Index | 1 Forestry and National Parks Department 43% Land Use Division 38% Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 34% To be determined during the first year of project implementation | N Y N | Y N | Y Y Y | Y Y Y | Y |
|--|--|---|-------------|--------|-------------|-------------|---|
| Component 2 Outcome 2.1: | (7) Financing for supporting SLM and CSA nationally | 6,600,000 USD | Y | Y | N | N | Y |
| Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level | (8) Area (ha) within the watersheds of Great River, La Sagesse and St. Patrick where climate-resilient crops are | 180 ha over the baseline | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA | (9) Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties | Between 210 and 300 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Component 3 Outcome 3.1: Land area within 2,400 ha | (10) Soil erosion rate (ton/ha/year) in steep and upland areas in three prioritized watersheds: La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed | 6.57 ton/ha/year | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by and increased household income level with | (11) Income level (\$/year) of beneficiary households(disaggregated by gender) by project end | Farmers (crop and livestock production): 4,400 USD Five (5) women-owned agro-processing and agrotourism small business: X US\$ | N | N | N | N | Y |
| beneficiaries disaggregated by gender Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960ha | (12) Change in the area affected by major IAS species (bamboo and small Indian Mongoose) in six prioritized sites by end of project: a) Bamboo removed in the mid-level strata/riparian zones of the La Sagesse Watershed b) Removal of Herpestes auropunctatus (small Indian Mongoose) annually from dry forest areas including KBAs (Mt St Catherine, Grand Etang, Levera, Perseverance, Mt Harman) (13) Population of endangered species | X% reduction (Targets to be defined during the first year of project implementation) a) Bamboo: 15 ha b) Small Indian Mongoose: of at least 1,005 individuals removed Grenada Dove (<i>Leptotila wellsi</i>): 136 individuals Grenada Frog (<i>Pristimantis</i> <i>euphronides</i>): X Leatherback sea turtle (<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>): X Hawksbill sea turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>): X | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

| | (14) Changes in cover (ha) of key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds | Dry forest: X Cloud forest: X Mangroves: X Riparian forest: X Turtle nesting beaches: X | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (15) Indicator 15 (GEF7 Core Indicator 4): Area (ha) of landscapes under improved practices | 890 | | | | | |
| | (16) Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) | 0 | | | | | |
| Component 4 | (17) Number of documents on successful experiences | 5 | Y | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Outcome 4.1: | about CSA, SLM and biodiversity conservation practices and gender mainstreaming disseminated in | | | | | | |
| Increased adoption of | national institutions and among Ministry of Agriculture | | | | | | |
| practices as a result of | Grenada | | | | | | |
| the dissemination of | (18) Number of sub-national or local institutions that | No info | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |
| knowledge and best | adopt recommendations resulting from SLM, CSA and | | | | | | |
| practices developed | biodiversity conservation interventions by project end | | | | | | |
| under this project. | | | | | | | |

Table 3: SMART analysis of the logical framework

> Analysis of risks and assumptions:

An analysis of the risks and assumptions is presented in Table 4. The risks and assumptions identified in the PRODOC are part of the results framework and were not analysed in detail (neither indication of mitigation measures nor any rating of risks); still, PIRs are now assessing the risks of the project.

Under the risk log, a comprehensive analysis of risks was done and it appears that these are mostly technical. Some critical risks that significantly affect the project delivery were not mentioned because they were supposed to be addressed in the project design:

- Institutional instability: the implementing partner at project design was DECT within the Ministry of Finance and the project was due to work closely with the Ministry of Agriculture and the newly formed Ministry of Climate Change. However, it proved short-lived and by project start-up, the latter had been disbanded. Finally, by mid-2021, the Ministry of Finance was replaced by the Ministry of Agriculture as a bid to accelerate implementation (see chapter on adaptative management). So, by mid-term, the project has seen 2 implementing partners and one key stakeholder was no longer in the project although its functions were reshuffled among other ministries. This situation has much complexified the implementation and blurred the responsibilities of Government's institutions.
- A global pandemic was unheard of and never taken into account. Experience has shown that projects that were initiated before the pandemic were relatively easy albeit with numerous issues to relaunch after the initial shock of the pandemic. Projects that were due to be launched at the start or in the middle of the pandemic have had serious implementation problems with extensive delays including the difficulty to launch in the first place, to contract staff, to setup an efficient approach to meet with stakeholders and more broadly an overall lack of commitment from all parties for an intervention that did not start while people are already struggling with existing activities in a difficult context. The CRA project was in the latter category.

The pandemic has also drawn the attention of Government to other more pressing/short-term issues than development cooperation that came to a standstill, such as the health and tourism sectors and support to the economic sector

The analysis of risks shows that these are either linked to Government or the final beneficiaries. This is one more piece of evidence that the project design is very much centralised around state actors with a top-down delivery approach.

| Risk and assumptions | MTR comments |
|---|---|
| Extreme climatic events and hazards (e.g., hurricanes, tropical storms, prolonged drought) jeopardize the SLM measures introduced and consequently cause declines in agricultural production and livelihoods | This is not relevant for the project; actually, these risks could affect the project's delivery. |
| Landowners are reluctant to incorporate SLM or CSA activities on their private lands, in the lack of land use zoning and regulations | This risk is somewhat limited for human resources now with the operationalisation of UGAPs; it may prove to be high for co-financing; at this stage of implementation, posts remain vacant within the UGAPs for several positions due to staff contracting through the regular Government procedures for civil servants. |
| Knowledge drain and implementation capacity constraints at government due to the staffing limitations (overall staff reduction) and limited incentives among different Government agencies to work as a team | Interviews showed this is not a risk but a major constraint on the part of the Government. It appears that Government is not replacing its HR gone to retirement and is progressively deprived of experienced technical staff. This is however a structural issue that is unlikely to be |
| Limitations exist in the capacities of national governmental institutions to support biodiversity conservation, SLMand CSA in the target landscapes. There is a risk that those institutions will not be able to fulfil their roles in the project. | This is to be related to the lack of staff and lack of renewal of government production infrastructures (e.g., agricultural stations, Government nurseries) |
| Some farmers (landowners and landholders) who will be supported by the project are poor and vulnerable, with limited education. They might struggle to understand their rights in the context of the project and there could be tensions between farmers who implement CSA and sustainable management practices and those who do not | This is a typical issue: whether it is most relevant to target directly or indirectly the most vulnerable with project activities due to lower absorption capacity and often more resistance to change. This risk should be assessed and reviewed continuously through regular meetings with the targeted population |
| The project may not effectively incorporate gender considerations, thereby limiting women's participation in project implementation and access to benefits (CSA, incentives, training, etc.) | This is often high risk as within mixed-gender activities, women are often less represented, hence the need for the project to directly target specific women groups |
| The project may potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats and /or ecosystems (forests) and ecosystem services (water provision and soil productivity in prioritized watersheds) and critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas (including a forest reserve, national park and a proposed forest reserve) If proposed activities are not carried out correctly. | This is low risk; still, there can be cases when successful sustainable agricultural activities can have a negative impact if unchecked: they cause a swift adoption of good practices that result in an increased area under agriculture. This is probably not the case in Grenada as the project is supposed to target existing farmers and land owners/farmers with abandoned land plots |
| Shifts from current cultivation practices to sustainable agroforestry practices and CSA bears the potential risk of impacting habitats, ecosystems (including an adjacent forest reserve and a proposed national park) and/or livelihoods of the farmers participating in the project. | Private sector buy-in has been low, possibly because there is little involvement of the Ministry of Tourism with DNA the sole representative in tourism-related activities and results. |
| The project will support the reforestation of degraded riparian forests that, if done incorrectly, could affect biodiversity | This should not be considered a risk but an assumption that the project will provide quality capacity training and technically-sound solutions |
| The upgrading of five national propagation stations/shade houses may pose potential safety risks to local communities and potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical construction. | As above, this should be an assumption that any work should be carried out in accordance with the usual health and safety regulations |
| The establishment of a national park may result in temporary or permanent Physical displacement or economic misplacement. | The establishment of new PAs (e.g., covering dry forests) will very much likely impact the population as these degraded forests coincide with the highest population concentrations. Once the decision on this activity was taken at the design stage, this risk should have been turned into an assumption that any impact on the population or any economic activity would be dealt with in a participatory and respectful way |

Table 4: Risk analysis reviewThe Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) identified a number of risks. The main ones are: (i) low Government capacity to support project implementation, (ii) risks of conflicts between supported farmers and those who are not, (iii) risks to habitats if CSA and SLM are not implemented correctly or if the project achievements result in agricultural area extension, (iv) risks causing adverse effects on people because of a creation of a new Protected Area, (v) changes in land tenure. Most were rated as low but for (iv) – moderate -. The project has not monitored the SES risks, so the SES, safeguards have not been updated and no management plans have been developed.

3.1.3 Lessons learned from other projects incorporated into project design

The project concept is an evolution from the GEF5 'Ridge to Reef' project that was focussing on biodiversity conservation with a special emphasis on conservation areas and selected watersheds along with these areas.

This GEF6 project shifted its main area of intervention from pure biodiversity conservation to sustainable land management and mainstreaming biodiversity into agricultural landscapes, a logical approach as biodiversity degradation occurs mainly in agricultural landscapes that are negatively affected by unsustainable agricultural practices and climate change. This is reflected in policy, strategy and planning gaps (e.g., no drought policy, no management plans of watersheds, outdated PA plan).

Another lesson learned from that GEF5 project was the difficulty for the ministry of agriculture to steer the Ridge To Reef project probably because of HR shortcomings.

So, the design proposed a different executing agency covering the environment as more encompassing than just the ministry of agriculture.

3.2 Progress towards results

The tables below provide information as per 2021 PIR. Furthermore, although the information presented in the PIR is up to date, several MTR findings are drawn from a combination of observations, perceptions and anecdotal data (crosschecked). The progress ratings below are based on the existing indicators and targets as described in the Results Framework.

3.2.1 Progress towards outcome analysis

Progress towards Project Objective

As can be seen in Table 5 (below), the Project is not on course to achieve its overall objective by project end (within the next 20 months or so)¹⁴. MTR achievement ratings with the "traffic colour system¹⁵" are used in the tables below.

| Objective: To operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of the agricultural system | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator | Target mid-term / end of the project | Progress Level & Justification for Rating | Achievement Rating | | | | | |
| (1) Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for SLM/CSA solutions and biodiversity and ecosystem services at national and/or subnational level by project end | Mid-term: 0 End: A least 2 (Target will be confirmed during the first year of project implementation) 16 | Progress has been made through discussions with several existing interventions; these include projects that were mentioned in the PRODOC but also other (newer) complementary interventions; these preliminary talks have been hampered by the COVID crisis, focussing on both technical aspects and collaboration modalities; these include discussions with : (i) IICA and SAEP for backyard gardening and the identification of farmers in Plains by SAEP for SLM project, (ii) GCREWS- GDB for grant making on the best modalities to use – in particular, financing of water-efficient solutions in the agriculture and agrotourism sectors, (iii) GDB on its potential support to facilitate Resilient Agriculture Challenge disbursements and management and an MoU. These discussions have yet to materialise into any MoU or collaboration agreement to be effective. Back in October 2021, a technical committee was due to be established for review and award of grant proposals in the GEF/ SGP from this Resilient Agriculture Challenge. It has proved very difficult so far to bring committee members together for assessing proposals. No proposal was awarded yet any grant. | YELLOW | | | | | |
| (2) Number of direct project beneficiaries with increased livelihoods created through CSA, SLM and rangeland management in the project disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit prioritized landscapes disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | Mid-term: Male: between 245 and 319 annually Female: between 105 and 137 annually End: Male: between 700 and 910 annually Female: between 300 and 390 | So far, only a handful of farmers are benefitting from the project on bee-keeping. The project has made (and is due to make) available some equipment to upgrade agricultural stations so they can provide vegetative material to farmers; these include the rehabilitation of most agricultural stations (so far, 2 stations have benefitted from the project); a (soil) sterilizer was provided to Mirabeau station; it would facilitate the multiplication of clean Citrus Greening disease; irrigation and shading material is under underway to overhaul stations nurseries multiplication capacity. This is only one step among many others and there is still little evidence if any that the project is reaching out to final beneficiaries as it is still dealing with the technicalities on how best to introduce / with whom to deal with on SLM / CSA techniques to farmers. | RED | | | | | |

¹⁴ The pandemic has created an overall non-conducive environment for project implementation, resulting in significant delays; this issue is project-wide and will not be constantly repeated for each target; it is one of the key issues for implementation (but not the only one)

¹⁵ The Traffic Colour System used by GEF is Green = Achieved, Yellow=On target, Red=Not on target, Grey= Cannot be assessed or not being monitored.

¹⁶ Several targets were due to be confirmed during the 1st year of implementation; as they appear back in PIR, it is assumed that there was no change; they won't be repeated in the tables
| | annually | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|-----|
| (3) Number of integrated watershed management plans integrating biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA covering at least 50% of the 5 prioritized watersheds and operationalized | Mid-term: 2 End: 5 | The project lays far behind schedule with only preliminary on-site visits and discussions with farmers and Government technical staff. There was no evidence that the project strategy included phased management plans formulation. It is more likely that all 5 plans would be drafted at the same time To accelerate implementation, PMU went ahead with the proposal to subcontract UWI to develop these watershed management plans; ToRs were developed. However, the proposed modality (direct agreement) was invalidated by the GEF procurement unit as the project was under NIM. The only available modality was the request for proposal (RfP). New ToRs are being drafted. These back-and-forth discussions between PMU, MCO and GEF have lost precious project time in an already difficult environment, at least 6 months, all the more so that the RfP is a time-consuming modality with many administrative and the contracts are large (in value). This is evidence of inadequate PMU support by both GEF/MCO | RED |

Table 5: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Objective

Objective RATING: Unsatisfactory (U)

> Progress towards Project Outcomes

Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 show progress for all 7 outcomes by component.

| <i>Component 1:</i> Systemic and institutional <i>Outcome 1.1:</i> Biodiversity conservation and national institutional capacity for lan <i>Outcome 1.2:</i> Strengthened systemic and | l capacity increased for integr mainstreamed in land use pla dscapes institutional capacity for pro- | ated landscape management at the national level nning and management practices and in the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of impr moting SLM | roved systemic |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| Indicator | Target mid-term / end of the project | Progress Level & Justification for Rating | Achievement Rating |
| (4) Number of cross-sectoral collaboration/agreements established for land use planning and management | Mid-term: 0 End: 3 signed Memorandum of Understanding with three of following: Ministry of Education; Grenada Tourism Authority; Ministry of Works / Physical Planning Unit; and Solid Waste Management Authority | No cross-sectoral agreement for land use planning and management has been formally established. 1 MoU is under review by the Ministry responsible for Works/ Physical Planning Unit) for the design and development of a zero-grazing livestock facility as part of the rangeland management activity. Collaboration and partnership have been sought with the Grenada Land Bank Project that seeks to put idle agricultural land into productivity. There is more room for collaboration in the area of training in SLM. One of the pilot sites for CRA and Grenada Land Bank Project is overlapping. The Environment Division is the focal point for CBD, however, there is little evidence of collaboration. Private Land Owners have not yet been engaged under this project, nor has the Physical Planning Unit. Training with the Extension Division that is key in conveying messages on SLM and biodiversity has been conducted successfully. A steering committee for the project has been put in place with representatives from various line ministries. This collaboration is yet to be formalized and there has been minimum engagement through 2 PSC meetings only. Engagement with NGOs, private land owners and professionals has been limited. The potential MoU with the Ministry of Tourism seems to be out of place or at least very weakly linked with the project's thematic through the potential for certification of SLM/CSA agricultural products. This may be interesting but the project has yet to progress in virtually all aspects related to SLM/CSA | YELLOW |

| | | products accreditation | |
|--|--|---|-----|
| (5) Change in the capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard | Mid-term: Forestry and National Parks Department 16 (36%) Land Use Division 14 (31%) Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 12 (27%) End: Forestry and National Parks Department 51% Land Use Division 46% Ministry of Carriacou and Petite Martinique: 42% | The project underwent a scoping assessment of capacity needs and a capacity development plan was elaborated targeting most ministry of agriculture staff with a stronger emphasis on Extension Several training sessions were carried out ranging from technical areas (chainsaw training, bamboo control, climate-smart agriculture) to more organisational/administrative areas as recently as December 2021. Attendance was high as was interest, as per conducted interviews; still, technical sessions are not comprehensive enough to be impactful and need to be framed in a larger plan to support farmers). The site selection and project demonstrations did not follow a clear strategy and methodology as to why a specific site was selected to conduct training. For instance, the Grand Etang nursery site showed a poor selection of site selection techniques as per interviews Additionally, there was no evidence that the M&E system put in place had a feedback mechanism to assess whether the acquired knowledge is turned into behaviour change (e.g., the more effective working capacity of staff, changes in the way staff carries out their duties or interact with farmers). Furthermore, there is a lack of evidence that showed alignment to the Environment Division which is the focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity. | RED |
| (6) Change in the level of awareness among stakeholders in St. David, St. Andrew and St. Patrick parishes and Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA objectives as measured through the KAP/B Index | To be determined during the first year of project implementation | No KAP/B study has been finalized with the project developing preliminary questions - PMU - and a KAP/B investigation mechanism for undertaking KAP/ B study. The activity has since been reviewed and was to be integrated into the UWI contract, soon abandoned and now to be integrated into the RfP. At MTR stage, the value of this study still to come is to be questioned as there is yet any significant SLM/CSA activity to be undertaken or even planned with farmers. As these activities produce effects over several seasons and now that it is evident that any exposure of farmers to SLM / CSA techniques will occur in the last year of implementation or so, it will be too early to conduct any useful KAP by project's end | RED |

Table 6: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 1

Outcome 1 RATING: Unsatisfactory (U)

Component 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical and information services for CSA production *Outcome 2.1*: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level

Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA production

| Indicator | Target mid-term / end of the project | Progress Level & Justification for Rating | Achievement Rating for mid-term | Achievement Rating for end review |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| (7) Financing for supporting SLM and CSA nationally | Mid-term:6.6M\$ (10% increase) (+0.6M\$) End: 7.2M\$ (17% increase) (+1.2M\$) | As part of the co-financing, a 1M\$ commitment is being negotiated to support the financing of SLM and CSA activities nationally through collaboration with GIZ (GCF funded Project) through the SAEP Projects (IFAD funded Project). In the case of GIZ, equipment related to SLM and CSA through the Agriculture Challenge Fund will be subsidised and administered through the Grenada Development Bank. Limitations include a high percentage of co-funding, 50% being required by farmers. | GREEN | YELLOW |
| | (+1.2M\$) | SLM and CSA through the Agriculture Challenge Fund will be subsidised and administered through the Grenada Development Bank. Limitations include a high percentage of co-funding, 50% being required by farmers. This activity is ongoing but still at the negotiation stage with still MoUs to be formalised | | |

| (8) Area (ha) within the watersheds of Great River, La Sagesse and St. Patrick where climate-resilient crops are successfully implemented | Mid-term: 180 ha over the (140ha) baseline End: 300 ha over the (140ha) baseline | Over 50ha over baseline are being covered by the project with vetiver grass for slope stabilization, root tubers, cocoa, nutmeg trees since the contracting of the SLM specialist There was no information as to how successful the crops were after 6 months (production, die-out rate) | RED |
|---|---|---|-----|
| (9) Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties | Mid-term and end: between 210 and 300 | 19 women have already benefitted from demonstration activities and the distribution of seedlings; it is to be noted that there are no specific climate-resilient crop varieties as such as the stations still lack expertise and equipment to produce new varieties that in any case take years to develop; the stations are having their capacity upgraded thanks to the project and should be able in the near future to respond to the demand of regular seedlings that could increase thanks to SLM/CSA sponsored activities targeting farmers. | RED |

Table 7: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 2

Outcome 2 RATING: Unsatisfactory (U)

Component 3: Operationalization of resilient agricultural practices *Outcome 3.1*: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender

Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha

| Indicator | Target mid-term / end of the project | Progress Level & Justification for Rating | Achievement Rating |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| (10) Soil erosion rate (ton/ha/year) in steep and upland areas in three prioritized watersheds: La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed | Mid-term: 6.57 ton/ha/year End: 6.04 ton/ha/yr. | Soil monitoring erosion was initiated but stalled for several reasons including the extreme weather conditions in 2021. It was decided to put this activity under the Request for Proposals – hence subcontracting This indicator is only valid when there are SLM and CSA practices adopted by farmers; however, at this stage, there is not yet any large-scale involvement of farmers in the project as beneficiaries | RED |
| (11) Income level (\$/year) of beneficiary households (disaggregated by gender) by project end | Mid-term: Farmers (crop and livestock production): 4,400 USD Five (5) women-owned agro-processing and agrotourism small business: X USD End: Farmers (crop and livestock production): 5,500 USD Five (5) women-owned agro-processing and agrotourism small businesses: X USD | No survey was carried out as it is too early with no meaningful activities yet that could make a difference in income generation. The project initiated the Climate Resilient Agriculture Digital Challenge to award women-owned agro-processing and agrotourism small businesses. The initiative is currently underway but the grants have yet to be attributed. | RED |
| (12) Change in the area affected by major IAS species (bamboo and small Indian Mongoose) in six prioritized sites by end of the project: a) Bamboo removed in the mid-level strata/riparian zones of the La Sagesse Watershed b) Removal of Herpestes auropunctatus (small Indian Mongoose) annually from dry forest areas including KBAs (Mt St Catherine, Grand Etang, Levera, Perseverance, Mt Harman) | Mid-term: X% reduction a) Bamboo: 15 ha b) Small Indian Mongoose: at least 1,305 individuals removed End: X% reduction a) Bamboo: 40 ha b) Small Indian Mongoose: at least 1,305 individuals removed | So far, a training session on bamboo control was conducted by the SLM Specialist with inconclusive results, as per interviews. Site visits following demonstrations showed some level of ineffectiveness as new bamboo shoots were already emerging from demonstration plots. No activity was carried out concerning Indian mongoose control with the difficulty to contract international specialists able to work in-country due to COVID. | RED |

| (13) Population of endangered species | Grenada Dove (Leptotila wellsi): Up to 154 individuals Grenada Frog (Pristimantis euphronides): X Leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea): X Hawksbill sea turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata): X | This activity has not been initiated but contacts were made with Ocean Spirits (NGO) and St George's University (SGU) students engaged in conservation mapping and tracking activities to support the ongoing monitoring of the identified endangered species populations. This activity would fall under the request for proposal. | RED |
|--|--|---|-------|
| (14) Changes in cover (ha) of key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds | Dry forest: X Cloud forest: X Mangroves: X Riparian forest: X Turtle nesting beaches: X | Little activity was undertaken with access to LIDAR imagery but the lack of HR in the ministry of agriculture to perform ground-truthing sampling. The Project has also engaged with the UN Biodiversity Lab for a dedicated private space for hosting Grenada specific data and seeking support from its global spatial model in identifying areas of different forest cover within the selected watersheds | RED |
| | | As an adaptive management measure, the project had planned to engage with UWI to establish the changes in cover (ha) for the following: Dry forest, Cloud forest, Mangroves and Riparian forest but this activity will be carried out through the Request for Proposal | |
| | | In the meantime, the SLM specialist contributed to the establishment of baselines +/-31ha of mangroves (11 ha at Levera and 20ha in Carriacou) and the plan to increase the area by 9 ha by the project's end (in La Sagesse and Carriacou). | |
| | | All dry forest in Grenada is privately-owned and it remains to be seen how the ministry of agriculture will proceed in protecting dry forest pockets. | |
| (15) Indicator 15 (GEF7 Core Indicator 4): Area (ha) of landscapes under improved practices | Mid-term: 890 End: 2963 | 72.8 hectares are currently under improved landscape practices. There is much abandoned agricultural area that could be cultivated back with SLM/CSA practices including some Government-owned estates as a first step. One could question the feasibility of achieving this target in view of the little progress made so far. | RED |
| | | There have been discussions with Ministry of Agriculture divisions on how to relaunch agriculture in these areas but so far, there was no agreement on how to proceed | |
| (16) Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) | Mid-term: 0 End: 9512 | No measurement of greenhouse gas emissions mitigated has yet been undertaken as this is to be undertaken based on the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EXACT). Thus, the activity is intended to take place in the final year of the project in order to secure the end of the project target. | GREEN |

Table 8: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 3

Outcome 3 RATING: Unsatisfactory (U)

Component 4: Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation Outcome 4.1: Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices developed under this project Outcome 4.2: Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation, outcomes and outputs ensure the project effectively reaches outlined goals and objectives. Achievement Target mid-term / end of the **Progress Level & Justification for Rating** Indicator Rating project (17) Number of documents on successful 2 press releases on CSA, SLM and biodiversity conservation practices and gender Mid-term: 5 RED mainstreaming have been disseminated and the project participated in the June 21 National experiences about CSA, SLM and End: 10

| biodiversity conservation practices and gender mainstreaming disseminated in national institutions and among Ministry of Agriculture and Lande actancian contrast | | Farmers Symposium Overall, there is no conclusive lesson learned yet on SLM/CSA as there is no exposure of farmers to the project. This is not an issue in itself as these can be produced right by the project's closure as long as the project was able to divulge CSA SLM and PD concentration practices in the selected | |
|---|--|---|------|
| that serve farmers around Grenada | | watersheds. So far, the project is so much delayed that this is highly unlikely without a major restructuring of the project. Lessons learnt documents, especially on training that has already been conducted, is not visible. The practice of documenting lessons learnt may be low. | |
| (18) Number of sub-national or local institutions that adopt recommendations resulting from SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation interventions by project end | Mid-term: no info End: at least 5 (one per watershed) | The TAMCC Agriculture Sciences Programme has already included SLM training activities in its 2021 Programme through guest lectures and a formal MOU is under development to design a learning module within the Programme. This was not confirmed by the MTR team that did not interview TAMCC representatives. On the recommendation of the project, there are discussions to allow use by the ministry of agriculture of a ministry of health PCR machine to identify early on male nutmeg seedlings to cut nutmeg seed sex identification by several years | GREY |

Table 9: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 4

Outcome 4 RATING: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

3.2.2 Obstacles to the achievement of the objective until the closure of the project

The project delivery has been overall extremely low, of course, because of the COVID pandemic but also due to a lack of progress by PMU and institutional instability (3 IPs since formulation) that has resulted in insufficient stakeholders' engagement and low commitment from the Government's side. In addition, PMU has remained focussed for a long time in seeking close technical engagement with the ministry in charge of agriculture despite very thinned-out human resources before seeking out external support through UWI – although that modality was not feasible for the donor. Finally, PMU has largely ignored the potential of non-state actors in project delivery.

The main project obstacles are the following:

- (i) Unclear rules of engagement as to how PMU and the IP interact and steer the project roles and responsibilities
- (ii) Insufficient HR within Government institutions to contribute in implementation in a meaningful way
- (iii) Several Government institutions unclear about how they could contribute to the project despite their inclusion in the PRODOC
- (iv) PMU unable to engage on-the-ground, to seek out external support through non-state actors or the private sector in reaching out to final beneficiaries

At this rate of implementation and following-up on the current engagement of stakeholders, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the objective or any outcome will be achieved by project's end.

Lifting these obstacles will require (i) an overhaul of the project governance system, (ii) a profound redefinition of roles and responsibilities of project's stakeholders leading to engagement as per reviewed commitments, (iii) a project approach redefinition seeking out more straightforward activity delivery, possibly engaging more directly with final beneficiaries without the need for systematic Government support and (iv) additional time.

3.3 Project implementation and adaptive management

3.3.1 Management arrangements

➤ Implementation modality

The project of a duration of 4 years is being implemented under the NIM modality. However, the LoA between Government and UNDP specifies that external recruiting, procurement of goods and services and facilitation of training activities be provided by UNDP ("Assisted NIM").

This modified modality is often used when they are insufficient implementation capacities by IPs (e.g., insufficient HR or time-consuming procurement services) and/or institutional instability (security issues, political instability).

In this project, the agreed assisted NIM as per PRODOC may be the result of insufficient implementation capability of the Government, possibly, a consequence of civil service reforms, centred on downsizing through a freeze on hiring in public institutions.

Assisted NIM normally ensures adequate implementation through UNDP transparent procurement procedures. Nonetheless, the IP remains responsible for project implementation as full regular NIM with a PMU in charge of implementation.

Governance structure

The project governance structure is aligned with UNDP's rules for Results-Based Management and is composed of: (i) Project Steering Committee (PSC); (ii) Project Management Unit (PMU); (iii) Project Assurance; and (iv) Project Support.



The original governance structure is illustrated in Figure 4 as per PRODOC.

Figure 4: Original governance structure

The current project's organisational structure has remained the same but with time and institutional changes, a lot of stakeholders have changed or are not active in the project anymore (either absent in meetings or changed by other stakeholders) as under Figure 5.



Figure 5: de facto governance structure with staffing and Board members situation¹⁷

The project governance system is characterised by the absence of a technical committee. Hence, day-today implementation and operationalising decisions taken at PSC level remain at the hands of the PMU and sanctioned by the National Project Direct. This is not unusual for GEF projects but in the case of CRA, PMU is having difficulties in liaising and engaging with the Implementing Partner (Ministry of Agriculture). In particular, there was insufficient use of the PRODOC stakeholder engagement, starting with its update due to the institutional changes that occurred right before and during project implementation. This has resulted in a series of adaptation strategies, so far with little success (see adaptive management).

> Project Steering Committee

There have been extensive modifications in the roles and responsibilities of PSC members. This is the result of a cabinet reshuffling that occurred in October 2020 with (amongst other changes) the disbanding of the Ministry of Climate Resilience, Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Disaster Management and the integration of forestry in the Ministry of Agriculture and of environment and climate resilience within the Ministry of Tourism.

While the functions have remained the same but within different institutional environments, this has led to considerable changes in anticipated project participation, also due to own internal institutional changes;

¹⁷ Changes in red

it stands currently as the following:

- The Ministry of Agriculture that was designated as the new Implementing Partner by late 2020 (officially by June 2021) as a strategy to boost implementation in a gloomy COVID environment and to benefit directly from direct technical expertise and strategic guidance, has become *de facto* the main institutional project recipient and centre of gravity; DECT's role has become unclear with its representative still convened to PSCs
- IAGDO which participated in the inception workshop back in early 2021 declined to participate in the project as it was being restructured and with declined membership; its seat has remained vacant so far although SPECTO was proposed as the new non-state actor representative
- The GSB has been present at one of the two PSC meetings but its actual contribution to the project or value addition in decision making remains unclear as interviews confirmed
- The Gender and Family Affairs Division under the Ministry of Social Development is also present at PSC meetings to ensure that gender aspects are being taken into account
- The Environment and Climate Resilience Divisions were represented as well at one of the two PSC

Overall, it is clear that the weight of the decision-making process is shared between UNDP and the Ministry of Agriculture with peripherical support/comments only from the other members.

This may be due to the fact that Government, so far, share little (in)direct benefit from the project or activities that have yet to reach more direct /final beneficiaries.

The PSC is fully functional in the sense that it approves PIR and periodic reports and reviews AWP. Still, the PSC has been unable to address the slow project delivery with a difficult relationship between PMU and the Implementing Partner, resulting in/the result of (?) insufficient Government engagement and limited PMU effectiveness. This is quite odd as one of the key ingredients for project success is the need for a smooth relationship between the IP and a PMU that implements the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the IP.

> PMU staffing and actual implementation

The PMU was staffed within the unusual long inception period (by 12/2020) with:

- The Project Coordinator:
- Finance and Administrative Assistant
- Communication Coordination Assistant
- Stakeholder Engagement Specialist
- Sustainable Land Management Specialist

By the end of 2021, additional staff – as consultants – were integrated into the project:

- M&E Specialist: PMU support
- Gender Specialist: PMU/cross-component support
- Information Management Specialist: component 1
- Data Sharing Agreement Legal Specialist: component 1
- Data Sharing Agreement Policy Specialist: component 1

- Economic Competitiveness Specialist: component 2

More consultants are expected for early 2022 including the following: Information Management Specialist, Biodiversity Monitoring Expert, Protected Area Planning Expert, Financial Expert, Climate Smart Agriculture Expert, Protected Areas Expert, Socioeconomic Expert, most on a short-term basis

So, by early 2022, a fairly large team will be available to support project implementation. However, due to COVID constraints, most of the support is provided still on a remote basis (audio/videoconference). This is an issue as interactions with Government and even more so with final beneficiaries are limited. Still, key PMU staff is Grenada-based (SLM, Admin-Fin and Project Coordinator).

Furthermore, interactions between stakeholders, project staff have been very limited (mostly phone/video/email) and IP human resources constraints combined with tedious bureaucratic processes are resulting in inadequate support to PMU.

This situation is stressing PMU that seeks alternatives to operationalise activities (e.g., requests for proposals [that superseded direct award to third parties], bypassing bureaucratic procedures to speed up delivery) resulting in the IP feeling that it has little control over PMU.

There is a communication problem between the IP and PMU.

3.3.2 Work planning

The inception period was unusually long because of COVID constraints. During that time, the core staff was contracted. The inception workshop was held in December 2020 followed up quickly by the 1st PSC. There is no doubt that the 12-13 month-long inception period is impacting significantly the potential delivery of project activities.

Despite project signature by November 2019, it seems that project planning was initiated for year 2021 by the end of 2020 with a 1st version presented during the December PSC, then revised by March 2021 and further refined at PIR stage by June 2021.

These reviews as indicated in Table 10 are consequences of both a difficulty to plan project activities (insufficient knowledge of GEF/UNDP procedures for budget adjustments) and of insufficient stakeholders' engagement resulting in delayed implementation and budget reviews.

| Year | PRODOC (US\$) adjusted to | AWP (US\$) 12/2020 | AWP (US\$) 03/2021 | AWP (US\$) 06/2021 ¹⁸ | Yearly expenditure (US\$) | % Expenditure /AWP |
|---------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| | January 2020 | | | | | |
| 2019/20 | 872.293 | - | - | - | 219.151 ¹⁹ | 25 |
| 2021 | 1.274.995 | 1.235.058 | 1.245.058 | 404.974 | 220.326^{20} | 50 |
| 2022 | 892.244 | - | - | 1.542.307 | - | - |
| 2023 | 620.243 | - | - | 1.540.358 | - | - |
| Total | 3.659.775 | - | - | 3.487.239 | 439.500 | 10 |
| | | | | | | • |

Table 10: Annual work plan vs actual expenditure

Table 10 shows that there is an improvement in delivery against AWP (from 25% to 50%) but the overall delivery remains extremely low at 10% by MTR.

3.3.3 Finance and co-finance

> Finance

Table 11 shows a very low level of implementation. It appears that expenses related to Government support (outcomes 1 and 2) remained at low levels, evidencing that the bulk of capacity building efforts targeting the Government has yet to be initiated. Several consultants were hired in 2021; so capacity building activities should ensue in 2022. Still, capacity building activities targeting farmers remained at a minimum level. Although some activities were conducted in 2021, outcome 4 on communication is logically small as lessons learned from the other components need to be evidenced in the first place.

| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Total Allocated (GEF) (adjusted) | 145.382 | 939.410 | 1.211.203 | 846.911 | 516.869 | 3.659.775 |
| Total Expended (ledger expenditure) | 0 | 219.151 | 220.326 | | | 439.500 |
| Outcome 1 ²¹ Expended | 0 | 9.217 | 21.076 | | | 30.293 |
| Outcome 2 Expended | 0 | 41.820 | 23.922 | | | 65.742 |
| Outcome 3 Expended | 0 | 18.338 | 139.321 | | | 157.659 |
| Outcome 4 Expended | 0 | 0 | 14.168 | | | 14.168 |
| Project management costs Expended | 0 | 11.413 | 21.838 | | | 33.251 |

Table 11: Delivery over the years

It is noted that the project has already exceeded 50% of the planned time, however, only over 12% of the budget has been expended. It means that not only a major planning effort must be made but the implementation approach reviewed to accelerate substantially the execution of planned activities.

One encouraging adapting management measure - endorsed by GEF - is the use of calls for proposals to group activities and have them subcontracted. However, it was poised

> Co-financing

There is no record of actual co-financing by PMU.

2019/2020 2020/2021 2021/2022 2022/2023 Total

¹⁸ Does not take into account 2019/20 expenses

¹⁹ Source: Combined Delivery Report

²⁰ Source: PMU; as of 10/2021

²¹ This is actually per component as there can be several outcomes per component

| UNDP | 100.000 | 100.000 | 100.000 | 100.000 | 400.000 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development: loan from IFAD and CDB: Climate Smart Agriculture and Market Access Program | 2.053.950 | 2.053.950 | 2.053.950 | 2.053.950 | 8.215.800 |
| Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development: loan from WB: OECS Regional Competitiveness | 1.198.138 | 1.198.138 | 1.198.137 | 1.198.137 | 4.792.550 |
| Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | 171.163 | 171.163 | 171.162 | 171.162 | 684.650 |
| TOTAL | 4.395.544 | 4.798.246 | 4.415.493 | 4.143.492 | 17.752.775 |

Table 12: Planned co-financing

Both co-financed interventions are ongoing and there are discussions on how to best collaborate.

No information was available on Government's own co-financing although it is assumed that it covers expenses related to PMU office space and transport support.

The co-financing is an important condition for sustainability, effectiveness and impacts of GEF projects and programs. The GEF expected that the ratio of investment mobilized to GEF financing of at least 5:1 which is the case for CRA.

> Financial management

As an assisted NIM project, payments go through MCO Procurement Unit with no obvious signs of delays for both goods and services and human resources. These activities (including Atlas updates) are carried out by the Project Coordinator and Administrative and Financial Assistant.

Within the administrative procedures from TORs/CfP stages to final payments, it appears that bottlenecks include IP approval (e.g., Face Forms approval delays and back-and-forths because of TORs low quality) that delays delivery and therefore payments. Unless more expeditious procedures are adopted for endorsement of activities, the project financial management will remain hectic with a rush to provide the necessary documentation to MCO once IP-approved.

3.3.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems – adaptive management

➢ M&E mechanism

Project M&E is to be conducted using the following tools:

- Inception workshop (over a year after project signature)
- Quarterly progress meetings by PMU targeting UNDP and IP
- Periodic Monitoring through site visits although there was little evidence that monitoring was taking place as there are few if any on-site activities. Most visits were to discuss and assess potential project sites, preliminary discussions with beneficiaries and visits to agricultural stations that will be refurbished through the project
- Annual PIRs (one so far)
- Independent mid-term and final project evaluations

- Learning and knowledge sharing (under component 4)

A (remote-based) M&E Specialist was contracted on a short-term basis and a more comprehensive M&E plan was elaborated. It was surprising to hear that this plan was designed through discussions with PMU and contracted staff but no discussions were held with the IP.

This approach would not facilitate Government ownership.

➤ Adaptative management

In addition to the Ministry of Agriculture, PMU is engaging directly with other stakeholders (e.g., complementary donors, GDB...) as an adaptive management strategy to link up to existing interventions to speed up implementation; this has yet to be demonstrated with currently still discussions on how best to collaborate. Much more could be done, especially on the front of mobilizing non-State actors²² active in SLM/BD/CSA (selected interviews showed they are either unaware of the project or interested but not yet contacted).

PMU has 2 basic approaches to ensure implementation to assess the validity of products and operationalise activities through the Government:

- Engage directly on a case-by-case basis with relevant technical expertise within Government institutions
- Request official support through Minister/PS/CAO that would forward the requests to relevant divisions

Either way, this is a very inefficient working approach and interviews showed bypassing levels of responsibility creates confusion and hostility while formal PMU requests from higher levels through all the bureaucratic intricacies only slows down project implementation resulting in long delays or even activity rescheduling.

PMU effectiveness is also affected by insufficient knowledge of UNDP/GEF procedures. If some training on procedures was provided back in early 2021, it remains insufficient with (i) requests of clarification to UNDP on how to proceed with implementation, (ii) long delays in reporting and planning and (iii) long delays when designing TORs, (ii) and (iii) possibly due to inexperience and/or insufficient drafting skills.

Implementation delays have long been recognised by PMU that has tried to adapt management – actually implementation – with the go-ahead in early 2021 to fast-track activities through a PBA with UWI. After several months of negotiations with UWI and three TOR versions, GEF indicated formally by November 2021 this procedure was incompatible with NIM, hence had to be abandoned. PMU had to resort to seek another alternative, namely, a longer, more conventional Request for Proposals – still underway - and get back to the TORs drawing table²³. This is all an ineffective way of project implementation with both MCO/GEF bearing responsibility for these delays, evidencing a lack of communication between PMU and MCO.

The year 2021 saw initial on-site activities (COVID-permitting) led by the SLM specialist and Project

²² e.g., NGOs, community/farmer's groups

²³ One draft TOR version for the RfP was produced by MTR stage

Manager (bamboo control, chainsaw use, some equipment purchases for propagation stations, erosion control techniques...). Interviews showed training sessions are more of a trial/test nature than effectively designed to be impactful with limited participation and duplication, evidencing insufficient ownership.

It looks as if at this stage, PMU is just initiating the project with limited-impact activities that will be scaled up at a later stage.

There may be internal reasons within PMU (e.g., capacity, internal organisation) but also a lack of collaboration with the Implementing Partner with extensive difficulties and delays in agreeing on how to operationalise activities and mobilise thinned-out Government HR.

The MTR team thinks that a different implementation approach should be sought, less dependent on Government and more actively engaged with non-State actors (see recommendations).

Gender-based monitoring

The PRODOC included a detailed gender management plan with allocated resources.

However, with COVID and its potential higher impact on vulnerable people, PMU set in early 2021 on supporting the design of gender-responsive policy measures and adapt project activities to address the specific needs of rural women and men – in particular identifying vulnerable rural women and gender-specific organisations to prioritise their needs. Later by September 2021, a gender specialist was contracted to review the original plan and draft a new plan with an approach more based on equity (report approval pending) and the definition of SMART indicators by early 2022. Most interactions occurred with the project team and to a lesser extent with PSC members. The consultancy was remote-based.

All the basics for gender monitoring are ready. It remains to be seen how swiftly the project will engage with final beneficiaries to make full use of the gender plan.

3.3.5 Stakeholders' engagement

There are three kinds of stakeholders under CRA: (i) State institutions, (ii) local stakeholders (both organisations and final beneficiaries) and (iii) support/service providers (private sector, financial institutions) and also other donors.

A generic stakeholders engagement plan is included in the PRODOC followed up by a comprehensive stakeholders' participation plan. It is a strategy to address potential stakeholders' difficulties in project participation and ensure as much as possible ownership and empowerment. Despite being drafted at the formulation stage back in 2018, this plan retains the essence of stakeholders' (functional) participation notwithstanding the institutional changes that occurred within the Government in 2020, the governance structure changes of the project (see Figure 5) or the impact of COVID on effective participation in project discussions.

This plan has become problematic because it is outdated in terms of stakeholder's participation while it should be considered as an evolving document following up implementation progress and changes in stakeholder's involvement: ministries were restructured, local organisations are no longer active and there

is an overall serious HR shortage at Government level that limits drastically interactions with PMU.

At this stage, most project interactions are with state institutions and to a lesser extent to support/service providers while it is minimal with local stakeholders.

- State institutions: their engagement has been low with (i) ad-hoc support and (ii) a project focal point focal within the key divisions within the Ministry of Agriculture or other Ministries; there can good participation in project-supported capacity training sessions as long as there is enough planning in advance although it remains to be seen how the project can ensure that knowledge is put to good use afterwards (e.g., as ToT, trainers, implementers), hence the need for impact monitoring and a robust monitoring system within beneficiary institutions.

Overall, there is an inadequacy between what the project can offer as capacity building and the actual state institutions uptake. Overcoming this requires a clear understanding of limitations and closer relationships in order to optimise limited Government staff time constraints.

The case of the new IP is typical of overwhelmed²⁴ and HR-limited²⁵ state institutions with excessive response delays due to bureaucratic procedures or no response at all, a situation that impedes project implementation in a NIM project²⁶. There was a similar situation with the previous GEF-5 project; one should question why these projects rely so much on Government and do not make stronger use of non-Governmental resources.

There may be here a misunderstanding as to how a PMU functions under NIM: it should be embedded within the IP with direct access to all resources once the IP has endorsed activities; as for actual operationalisation, there needs to be a specific (hierarchy) commitment to collaborate with PMU - this is often achieved through the establishment of technical committees so that project activities can be integrated into a routine or extra Divisions' workplans.

- Support/service providers and donors: whenever PMU engaged with these stakeholders, there has been a good response with discussions on how best these can contribute to CRA.
- Local stakeholders: interactions have been limited so far with PMU still assessing demo project sites' location, identifying potential beneficiaries. There has been incidental final beneficiary (farmers) participation in initial on-site demo training sessions targeting the Government.

3.3.6 Reporting

Reporting is to be conducted on a quarterly (periodic UNDP reports) and annual (PIR) basis by PMU. Interviews show that there was a steep learning curve to achieve standard quality PIR with several backand-forth exchanges between PMU, MCO and GEF on PIR drafting.

One can highlight the following:

• The first PIR presents a realistic picture of the project. The ratings in the PIR are very low (ranging

²⁴ The Ministry is one of the main recipients of development aid within Government institutions

²⁵ Most experienced staff are in charge of several interventions (as focal points) in addition to their regular duties
²⁶ NIM projects require IP National Director endorsement for most if not all PMU actions; if activity operationalisation, purchases or quality product reviews takes weeks or even a month to be approved, the project is in a permanent stalling state

from Moderately Unsatisfactory to Unsatisfactory); this is justified as project delivery is very low and still does not pick up speed despite PMU attempts to accelerate implementation through adaptive management measures (PBA/RfP).

- PMU Quarterly Progress reports are combining results, outputs and activities, hence very selfexplanatory, but do not explain implementation issues; this is odd as it would be much more constructive to explain the (mostly institutional and not only COVID-related) reasons why results lag so far behind schedule.
- There is no evidence of notes for the file being made when the project team is on field visits

3.3.7 Communication and knowledge management

> Communication

Under the CRA project, most of component 4 funding is assigned to COM and knowledge-sharing. Furthermore, a Communication Assistant was contracted under PMU early on in 2020 (has left since)

Key activities including project launching, mainstreaming gender in CRA, demo training sessions on chainsaw use, upgrades of propagation agricultural stations were disseminated in the press (e.g., Grenada Now, Grenada Information Service, social media [Facebook] or directly through UNDP Web site –)

Visibility was raised through participation at the June 2021 National Farmers Symposium.

Additionally, incidental interviews of non-State actors not directly involved in the project showed that some rural organisations are well aware of the project, sometimes eager to contribute to /participate in the project as their areas of interventions coincide with the CRA project.

This is encouraging but the project spreading into rural areas (selected watersheds) has yet to materialise.

Knowledge Management

Under component 3, the project has done extensive public awareness raising related to the GEF/ UNDP Climate Resilient Agriculture Digital Challenges.

Under component 4, the TAMCC Agriculture Sciences Programme has already included SLM training activities in its 2021 Programme through guest lectures

There was no evidence that a comprehensive project documents repository was ready and accessible.

Project implementation RATING: Unsatisfactory (U)

Adaptive management RATING: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

3.4 Sustainability

Potential sustainability refers to the likelihood that the benefits of the intervention will continue after the end of the intervention. In this section, the evaluators present the risks likely to negatively impact the viability of the project on a medium- and long-term basis.

3.4.1 Social & cultural risks to sustainability

Generally, there seem to be low levels of stakeholder engagement and ownership – especially at the institutional level - though the project has been highly appraised as being important both on a national and community level. This lack of ownership lies in the insufficient compliance with the stakeholder plan and under-utilization of existing community structures to engage private land owners and informal groups within the selected watersheds.

Still, stakeholders see the benefits of the project in anticipation but were given few if any ways to engage yet. Additionally, interventions that have been made so far, e.g., pilot demonstrations at the Grand Etang Nursery, have not been documented and stakeholders have not been engaged for follow-up actions or even scaling-up in selected watersheds. This means that there is currently no way of advising or monitoring and evaluating interventions that have already been made.

If acceptability through the adoption of new techniques by farmers is very much dependent on the economics and perceived risks, divulgation needs to be as wide as possible to reach out to potential candidates. Grenada is at an advantage with extensive areas of abandoned agricultural land that could be easily used as demo fields with few if any risk for land owners. Once selected farmers adopt (successfully) new techniques, there can be either a straight copy effect or renewed interest from neighbours in project participation. Nonetheless, there is little evidence that demo farming has moved in high gear by MTR with still extensive discussions at local level and visits to potential project sites.

Socio-cultural sustainability RATING: Unlikely (U)

3.4.2 Financial risks to sustainability

At least two critical risks can be mentioned at watershed and individual levels:

- (i) Likelihood of watershed management plans implementation after the project has ended. Currently, there is a lack of community ownership or governance modalities at community level that can guarantee plans would be implemented after they are produced and not remain on paper. Sustainability and available resources would be highly dependent on local governance systems and community stakeholder participation to ensure ownership and empowerment to find solutions to ensure adequate implementation. Income-generating activities related to Outcome 2 is strongly advised to sustain activities in the future. Furthermore, institutional mainstreaming on landscape management within the government system should be identified to avoid duplication of efforts as a strategy for future support that could be garnered outside of the project. Limited human resources and capacity issues mean that outside of the project, it may be difficult to identify technical expertise capable of managing knowledge management systems. Support provided under outcome 1 should ensure that the relevant software to be updated by government and government expertise (e.g., extension network) can be sourced in house.
- (ii) Lack of (individual) funding opportunities (e.g., through GDB or any other financing mechanism): the project under outcome 2 basically, subsidies farmers' conversion to SLM/CSA agricultural

practices and BD mainstreaming; this is achieved through grants and GDB support that, as per interviews, would be predisposed to adjust its financial products, matching them with the project's objective. It remains to be seen whether by project's end, these financial products will remain viable or just die out for lack of profitability without project support. This perspective should be looked at and some time before project closure, an exit strategy devised so that facilitated access modalities could remain open after the project's closure.

Financial sustainability RATING: Likely (L)

3.4.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The top-down project implementation approach focussing on increasing Government capacity building as a strategy to generate SLM/CSA/BD mainstreaming knowledge in agricultural landscapes can be viewed as a long-term safeguard to ensure that ministries' technical staff can pass on a routine basis, information to farmers. This approach is valid as long as (i) there is a functional extension system and (ii) Agricultural policy is decisive in endorsing SLM/CSA. As for (i), interviews showed this system to perform at best poorly with most support depending on external support (e.g., through projects) in providing farmers' technical advice. For (ii) there is little evidence that a change of paradigm has occurred in Grenada with still subsidised agricultural inputs for conventional farming (e.g., chemical fertilisers) while subsidies could be applied as well to support the transition to more sustainable practices.

At project level, there is little doubt that upgrading the land use database and access (outcome 1) will significantly increase the Government capacity to plan and support more effectively, the farming sector.

As for staff capacity building, the project did not come up with a long-term solution to support extension staff working conditions, so knowledge transmission to farmers is expected to be successful within the project's timeframe and dependent on future funding afterwards. Still, one can assume that agricultural staff will continue divulging SLM/CSA techniques with new funding opportunities, once the project is terminated.

As for watershed management plans, little is known as to how the project will approach the issue as it seems to be new grounds for Grenada (e.g., governance structure model?). Potential difficulties in reaching consensus in managing a watershed would include the fragmentation of land ownership and the issue of abandoned lands. It would be wise to assess how this issue was dealt with in other neighbouring SIDS.

Governance sustainability RATING: Likely (L)

3.4.4 Socio-economic risks to sustainability

As mentioned under key factors that justified this intervention, the continuous land degradation occurring in Grenada due to unsustainable agricultural practices combined with the effects of climate change is eroding national food security. There are already effects with prolonged drought on depleted soils that require micro-irrigation and increased (chemical) fertilisation and crops that are more prone to disease resulting in increased pesticide treatments, all of which are compromising BD. In that context, there is a lot of sense in supporting the transition of the sector to more sustainable agricultural practices.

Now, as for benefitting farmers, the success of this transition depends essentially on (i) the level of investments required and (ii) the profitability using a different farming system.

This was well understood at the formulation stage with provisions under Outcome 2 to subsidise investments (e.g., grants) and to introduce certification schemes.

The project has advanced well on grants with a successful call for proposals – grants still to be awarded – but less so on certification. While there is (will be) capacity to certify agricultural produce from sustainable farming systems through support to GBS, certification funding achieved through PGS schemes, the marketing aspects were omitted altogether as with the actual definition of a sustainable production standard. These two latter aspects will require extensive discussions that may go way beyond the project's closure. Hence, there is a risk that farmers will be involved in testing new agricultural practices but neither standard would be defined nor marketing analysis would be completed by the project's end.

It appears that the project relied on borrowing the successful experience of organic farming. Still, SLM/CSA agriculture remains widely different from organic agriculture as it can still rely on chemical and pesticide use -. So, the questions are: is there a place (and demand) for another standard in Grenada and therefore a premium price between organic and conventional agriculture? Is the project actually, supporting farmers to transition to organic farming altogether? These questions need answer fast before the project can move forward – there is no clear-cut response on these in the PRODOC -; else, project success will depend exclusively on whether sustainable agriculture practices can economically compete with unsustainable methods. Experience in other countries shows that this is possible but only for selected techniques and in very specific agricultural environments.

Socio-economic sustainability RATING: Unlikely (U)

3.4.5 Environmental risks to sustainability

A priori, these are minimum if not irrelevant for the project as many activities target the reduction of these risks (watercourse pollution, soil runoff).

As for IAS, there are inherent risks due to the lack of project progress with just one training on bamboo control and no activities yet on mongoose control.

A negative side-effect of the project would be to engage farmers on SLM/CSA practices that may be beneficial to the environment but not economically viable, prompting a backlash effect with returning to traditional more harmful agricultural practices and resulting in credibility loss. Interviews of local organisations active with farmers have shown that farmers may be aware of accelerating agricultural land degradation and therefore, expectations may be high if the CRA project is to support them in the selected watersheds.

Environmental sustainability RATING: Likely (L)

Overall likelihood of project sustainability RATING: Unlikely (U)

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

On relevance:

The project is highly relevant and provides a set of solutions based on sustainable land management, climate-smart agriculture and biodiversity mainstreaming as a strategy to respond to ongoing land degradation and biodiversity loss because of direct anthropic action and climate change.

These are becoming serious issues that may lead to decreasing agricultural production and ultimately food insecurity. Unlike other sectoral interventions focussing on climate change adaptation or biodiversity or agricultural development, this project (i) is dealing with cross-(sub) sector-wide issues affecting the rural sector (protected areas, [non]productive agricultural land), (ii) is geographically coherent through supporting entire watersheds and (iii) is seeking service providers' support to ensure conditions are right for farmers to adopt more sustainable agricultural practices.

This approach is innovative in Grenada that has seen a number of sector-specific interventions in the past.

It also fringes on new institutional frameworks and governance structures as it relates to decentralization of management, which is new to Grenada. For example, though Grenada has had Forestry Management Plans, it has never implemented Sustainable Land Management Plans which includes the diversification of stakeholders like Private Land Users and NGOs and not just Government Ministries.

The project has the potential to make great impact on the ground.

The overall aim of the project is also to improve the quality of the soil in Grenada thus improving quality and productivity which will improve the farmer's income.

On design:

Project formulation was highly participative with a team of 5 persons from various sectors with local input and an international team lead resulting in good cooperation, feedback, support and input on the Ministry's side. However, there is a lack of a broad strategic directive in terms of overall land use development and planning that does not address issues of human settlement pattern, allocation of land and preservation of high priority biodiverse areas.

The project design is very conventional adopting a top-down approach with Government institutions at the centre of the intervention with farmers and their representative organisations as ultimate recipients of support once Government capacity building is ensured. This kind of approach is flawed when state institutions have weak outreach capabilities.

It also appears that the project makes insufficient use of non-state actors as active project promoters.

Still, interviews have shown that NGOs and the like dealing with farmers have great expectations as to how this project could reduce land degradation into productive rural areas. Outputs and lessons learnt

from demonstrations need to be fed into strategic development and analysis. There is little evidence of this in the PRODOC.

On implementation /activities operationalisation:

The project was affected by the COVID pandemic before it could be initiated. Ever since, it has had difficulties with implementation to proceed at cruising speed. This has resulted in an exceptionally low delivery by MTR (10-15%).

Still, PMU/PSC has engaged in a series of adaptive managements measures to speed up delivery including (i) change of IP from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Agriculture, as a strategy to get PMU and a more relevant national approval authority closer, (ii) accelerating delivery by clustering outputs and activities through a PBA, later RfP - so far, this has not improved delivery in any meaningful way -, (iii) PMU bypassing at times hierarchical decision-makers to ensure swifter and direct stakeholders' support.

If COVID has affected seriously the project's start-up phase and is still having a serious negative impact today²⁷, it appears that it is only an aggravating factor amongst a whole range of issues.

Implementation issues include the following:

- (i) Insufficient (institutional) stakeholders' engagement, the result of changes of responsibilities within the ministry of agriculture and change of IP, a centralised current IP decision-taking structure with insufficient HR for supporting PMU in project activities deployment,
- (ii) Limited interaction and alignment with key government ministries including Environment Division and Planning Unit
- (iii) Insufficiently experienced PMU unit in UN procedures and for some technical matters (e.g., drafting TORs) with PMU dependent on MCO for advice and support,
- (iv) Mixed-results MCO support, in particular on procedures (e.g., PMU training on procedures in early 2021 but poor advice on PBA option, only to be dismissed later by GEF as NIM noncompliant),
- (v) PMU management weaknesses: undecisive in initiating activities and engaging with final beneficiaries and local institutions
- (vi) PMU efficiency seriously affected by IP slow response to endorse PMU proposals

By late 2021, the project had managed to:

- Initiate several training sessions targeting primarily Government technical staff including some on-site demo sessions (Chain saw training, environmentally-friendly bamboo control, construction and use of A frame, Gully Plugging and Check Dams
- Develop selection criteria for beneficiaries within the watersheds
- Assessment and procure equipment for the rehabilitation of agriculture propagation stations (e.g., soil sterilizer)
- Contract a fairly large non-presential technical team of consultants (mainly on outcome 1)

²⁷ Grenada wen into lockdown in early 2020 for several months but additional outbreaks occurred much later in 2021, only to make any implementation efforts all the more difficult

- Initiate contacts with other complementary interventions, service providers (e.g., GDB) and field visits to potential demo sites
- A call for proposal on SLM grants was successfully launched but has been on hold for months on the issue of grant-awarding

These may be quite a number of activities but actually, these are to be completed within a few months after the inception period in a normal working environment.

On planning, M&E and reporting:

PMU has experienced difficulties in AWP drafting with quite different updated budget versions, possibly as a result of insufficient engagement with the IP and insufficient knowledge in UNDP/GEF procedures; an M&E specialist devised a new M&E plan but it was not drafted in close collaboration with the IP. Reporting has been problematic with quite several revisions needed to achieve standard quality PIR.

As a conclusion, it appears that (i) PMU is still in a learning curve on project management, (ii) the IP support to the project is limited for activity operationalisation and it has limited capacity to assist PMU efficiently, (iii) MCO support is not on up to par with both support to PMU on procedures but also insufficient attention to the way PMU is using administrative procedures (e.g., RfP in place of discarded PBAs).

All in all, the result is a project that is way behind schedule and at risk of operationalising activities at all costs to ensure delivery but not necessarily in a meaningful way, all the more since several outputs appear to be sequential: e.g., farmers' adjustment period (at a minimum one season !) to transition from testing to adoption of new agricultural practices and full-scale commercial production, certification standards definition before an effective certification scheme, only relevant if there is agriculture produce to certify, lessons learned assessed and knowledge management divulgation following up on (un)successful stories in the first place (demo sites, practices adoption...).

There is a lack of evidence relating to how the outputs of the project and demonstration sites can and will align to national strategic governance whether through the Land-use Division, Forestry Division or Environment Division.

So, to ensure value for money and avoid wasting resources in a project that would be half-completed by 2023 with few effective results, two scenarios should be considered:

Option 1: Terminate the project, redesign it taking into account its key weaknesses and start fresh on a new basis with the next GEF cycle; this could include a bigger emphasis on non-state actors, a change of implementation modality, a project approach more focused on the farming sector itself, with star-shaped support from Government, non-State actors, the private/financial sector as required.... While this may be politically a non-option for the Government, it may have the advantage of value for money *Option 2*: Pursue the project, simplify the intervention logic, delete no longer achievable outputs, review the governance mechanism and ensure proper PMU management under IP close supervision and MCO closer oversight.

4.2 **Recommendations**

Under option 2, some basic questions remain:

1. Should the IP be changed to another entity (e.g., back to DECT)

DECT was the initial IP. There is a consensus amongst most stakeholders that DECT is used to implement projects; hence, it is reactive enough to ensure a somewhat smoother implementation. Still, the IP entity was moved from DECT to the Ministry of Agriculture in a bid to accelerate implementation as most support was to transit through the Ministry of Agriculture and get PMU closer to the most relevant decision-takers. This decision eventually did not significantly improve it.

It is not recommended to switch the IP back to DECT or any other stakeholder. If the relevant sectoral ministry has difficulty in supporting a dedicated PMU, it is unlikely that another entity would fare better. It might be more relevant to question the current implementation modality in that case.

2. Should the implementation modality be changed from NIM to DIM?

There are several advantages of DIM to NIM including no need for Gov support/approval, more straightforward procedures (e.g., PBA within weeks) with large packages of the project implemented swiftly. Limitations include questioning the usefulness when activities involve Government support/participation and poor Government ownership and empowerment. A change of implementation modality could be recommended if there was a change of main implementers from Government-led to a more decentralised approach based on non-State actors. At MTR stage, this is no longer an option with insufficient time to restructure so deeply an intervention.

It is not recommended to change the implementation modality.

3. Should an extension be granted to the project?

The question is whether a no-cost extension will be meaningful in any way? With two agricultural seasons gone by out of four, a one-year extension might provide relief, should the project be streamlined, to, sort of, immediately engage with farmers on setting-up demo sites and mobilizing them to consider SLM/CSA transition (1 season), supporting the adoption of certain techniques (1 or 2 seasons) and engaging into full production (1 season at best or none at all). In that scenario, there is no space for certification, too time-consuming, too sequential to be effective.

A one-year extension is to be recommended, should all below-mentioned recommendations be adopted to take into account (i) COVID impact (over 6 months of lockdown by March 2020,

not to mention the impact of more recent stronger COVID waves in 2021) and (ii) 6 months to recover the GEF-rejected PBA option to accelerate implementation.

4.2.1 Recommendations to ensure impactful results (under option 2):

(A.1) Review the log frame and simplify several outputs:

With over 2 years of implementation out of 4 and taking into account the importance of seasonality in agriculture, there might remain at best 3 cropping seasons (with a 12-month no-cost extension) to convince farmers to switch to more sustainable SLM/CSA practices and other BD conservation measures. While it may be possible to engage in a process to set in place a certification scheme (e.g., for any future intervention that would analyse further the process), it is very likely that the project will be terminated by the time it is ready; hence, there is no project guarantee that farmers will be willing to engage additional resources and time for a speculative certification scheme; this has large-scale implications on the whole project as it was assumed that a premium price would be paid for production because farmers adopt a less profitable farming system. It is recommended to drop the output on certification. This approach on a step-by-step basis is more prudent and may be further refined and deepened to include certification in next-generation interventions.

In addition, Outcome 4.2 on project M&E should be deleted as not relevant as an outcome²⁸.

(A.2) Focus on quick-win SLM/CSA techniques or land improvements that have positive LT returns on investment but use conventional commercialisation channels

Avoiding labour-intensive techniques or new cropping systems that need extensive investments and that are economically viable only if a premium price is required; they will not be adopted by farmers.

Ultimately, a certification scheme may indeed prove to be the most logical solution to ensure the adoption of a wide range of SLM/CSA techniques and BD conservation measures in agricultural areas but the remaining project timeframe is not enough to assess consumer's interest and develop techniques that require vegetative growth over several years to produce any result.

(A.3) Consider watershed management intervention decentralisation:

²⁸ It is part of regular project implementation activities and has no meaning for inclusion as an outcome

The project has a strong bias towards activity operationalisation through the Ministry of Agriculture; this approach has limits with staff not necessarily fully available as this project is just one task among many others.

There may be an opportunity to analyse more in detail non-State actors' interests (primarily NGOs) in watershed management and in supporting (e.g., through MoU) relevant technical expertise (e.g., RfP consultants/company) in charge of watershed management plan formulation. This would facilitate the local transition from document planning to implementation (mobilising stakeholders) with at least one/some local stakeholders supporting the overall process to actual committee creation and operationalisation. In the St. Patrick watershed, SPECTO might be a prime candidate but others do exist including well-organised farmers' groups. The Grenada Land Actors Platform has a broader scope of mobilizing land actors in Grenada and might be well suited to facilitate this process, though, this group is currently facing challenges of capacity issues.

Key areas such as primary forests and preserving vegetation status is currently not being addressed although identified as being highly biodiverse areas

4.2.2 Recommendations to accelerate implementation:

(B.1) *PMU more effective:*

So far, PMU effectiveness is not on par with the usual project management expectations with a wide range of issues on administrative procedures knowledge, project operationalisation, in mobilising stakeholders and in relationship with the current IP. The options are to:

- (i) Beef up PMU to be more efficient in project management (UN procedures) and more effective in activities' operationalisation (drafting TORs, engaging with stakeholders, turning project outputs into sets of activities); a clear advantage is continuity but it is a bet on the future of the project as it implies a swift change in management capability; the main disadvantage is that any improvement in project management will be a staged process, depending on quality and timeliness of support, hence taking time.
- (ii) Change the PMU altogether and start from fresh with a more experienced team able to operationalise swiftly project activities; the main disadvantage is the risk to engage in a long recruitment process during these uncertain COVID times, ultimately wasting precious project time. Therefore, this option might also require project adjustments/simplifications at a later stage with even less time to implement the activities

So, both options have clear advantages and disadvantages.

Eventually, the PSC and more importantly the Government should weigh the benefits and risks of each option and decide. This decision should take place as soon as possible.

In the case of (i), the remaining below recommendations might not be necessary. In case of (ii), this would require the following:

- Additional (refreshing) training sessions on UN procedures by GEF/MCO.
- The contracting of a (preferably international) CTA with short-term inputs (3-4 months/year, preferably in-country, COVID allowing) over the entire duration of the project to provide technical oversight and administrative/procedural support; duties could include PMU support on reports, AWP, TORs, strategic options to operationalise project activities, technical advice on SLM/CSA based on his/her experience in other countries...).
- Set extra MCO time aside to ensure close PMU backstopping (e.g., once a week or twice a month for the next 6-12 months, then decreasing support as appropriate, ensuring that project time is not wasted on procedural misunderstandings or products quality issues that require back-and-forth communications.

(B.2) Prioritise the finalisation of agreements with other interventions:

PMU has to move faster on collaboration/cooperation agreements with other interventions that are complementary to CRA project objectives, in particular, SAEP and GCREWS in the area of training that focuses on CSA and lobbying with the government to institutionalise training approaches for sustainability. Specifically, the project should identify institutions that can assist with improving the supply chain between farmers and markets since there currently is no long-term strategy to foster collaborations with the market. There should be a clearer link between increasing productivity and access to markets by encouraging innovation on a community level. For example, encouraging the alternative use of bamboo for product making as strongly suggested by Forestry Division staff and/or encouraging organic fertilizers by looking at the cost of production and niche markets for organic products. The MoUs should be drafted in a way that enables as much as possible project resource mobilisation to pre-existing/ongoing SAEP/GCREW activities as well as other institutions that have not been identified related to market access and innovation. According to their stages of implementation, the CRA project should provide additional support, as required, as per its own project objectives.

(B.3) Consider NGO/non-State actors for SLM/CSA demonstration sites and follow-up of participating farmers

PMU needs to switch to a higher gear on outcome 3 and demonstration sites to involve on a larger scale potentially interested farmers in SLM/CSA transition; So far, on-site demo sessions have been somewhat confidential with limited participation (possibly on COVID grounds) and have yet to demonstrate operationality on a routine/regular basis. This means

that capacity building of Government extension staff has to accelerate drastically despite its operational difficulties through on-site FFS or in contained environments such as agricultural stations. Model farms may not be ideal since most farmers are located on small plots of land less than half an acre. Additionally, outputs from demonstration sites should be streamlined with Component 1 in the context of updating the current GIS platform within the Land Use Division.

NGO interviews have shown a somewhat high level of expectations on this project. There may be an opportunity to balance a bit, financial resources of outcome 3 towards NGOs as a complementary risk reduction strategy to conventional Government support through the Extension and Forestry services. Indeed, there may be an issue of Government staff competition with SAEP that deploys its own CSA component with Extension Assistants. There are existing NGOs active in the subsector including some that participated in the R2R project.

It is recommended to assess the feasibility of this option and consider Responsible Parties Agreements with selected CSO/NGOs on SLM/CSA demonstration techniques.

4.2.3 Recommendations to improve the project governance system:

(C.1) Create a project Technical Committee

PMU has no facility to get in touch with technical Government staff to discuss operational issues; it has to make time-consuming individual requests that overload the IP. Exchanges of information and technical discussions are limited mostly to email and phone calls with significant back-and-forth communications.

A more straightforward procedure used in many countries is the establishment of a Technical Committee that support PMU in reviewing the AWP before PSC approval, supporting activity operationalisation ("bypassing paperwork requests"), quality assessment of results (e.g., consultants' reports, works and infrastructures....) and technical options (advice on technical solutions) as well as endorsing in CRA project the gender, communication, M&E, stakeholders' engagement plans. This committee is primarily made of Government technical representatives (e.g., Division field staff or senior technical staff) with selected non-State actors (e.g., NGO with an ongoing contract, beneficiary representative, representatives from each watershed).

This option greatly reduces the National Director workload as PMU requests have already been technically cleared by the Committee and his role is limited to financial control and confirming what his staff has already reviewed during Technical Committee sessions.

This structure is also a means for the Government to control the actual project implementation rate.

Such a committee should be created asap until project closure, meeting once a month for the first 6-12 months, then at a lower frequency, twice a month or every quarter, as appropriate.

(C.2) Review and amend the stakeholders' engagement plan

There have been significant changes in the governance structure of the project. Several organisations are no longer active or have shown little interest in the project. There is a need to review completely the plan and assess the level of commitment and interest of stakeholders that were included in this plan, possibly including new ones that have interests in SLM/CSA.

This stakeholder plan should be reviewed by collecting and mapping stakeholders within each of the broad categories paying particular attention to identifying representatives in each watershed; it is needed to diversify stakeholders' basis by including Planning Unit, Ministry of Finance, Land Use Division, Forestry Division Watershed Officer, NGOs (from each watershed) and professionals in decision making by forming a Technical Committee that would act as a working group to support the project goals and objectives and to help institutionalise outputs. This Technical committee would also be responsible for reviewing the drafting of TORs. It should comprise officers in the field rather than department heads.

On a community level, one should take more advantage in utilising the skills and expertise of the land use division for site selection and their analysis capacity of training outcomes.

The role of DECT is no longer clear since it is no longer the IP. There might be no operational role for the GBS since certification is abandoned. The role of the Gender Division could be redefined since a consultant is currently reviewing and upgrading the original PRODOC gender plan, the Environment Division should be present in the PSC as in a Technical Committee...

It is recommended to redraft the stakeholders' engagement plan – interviewing each one and (ii) to present a new plan at a workshop or the new Technical Committee

(C.3) Enlarge the PSC with additional members to enhance local ownership

The original governance structure of the project included a non-State actor at PSC level. This position has been vacant because the initial NGO became dormant by project's startup. It may also reflect the need to include organisations that have high stakes in the sector.

It is recommended to fill up this gap asap and include an institution that is representative of final beneficiaries. This would increase local project ownership and secure local interest as a representative is included in the top decision-making committee.

(C.4) Reassess the role of civil society in the project with a view for more inclusion

The project is making insufficient use of civil society organisations that can support project implementation in mobilisation, M&E and for some instances make a valuable contribution on technical grounds.

As part of the review of the stakeholders' engagement plan, attention should be made to how non-State actors could contribute in operational terms to project implementation – in particular in local area management and local governance through MoUs, Conservation Easements...

(C.5) Make use of the existing Ministry of Agriculture's expertise

While it was difficult to assess remotely the technical staff's expertise, there were plenty of signs that they are/have been already engaged with most SLM/CSA techniques in the past (through previous interventions), albeit maybe not in such a systematic manner. Closer cooperation with Divisions would be beneficial as they have extensive on-the-ground experience. For example, the project could engage more closely with the Forestry Division on Bamboo Control since they have ideas and have participated in interventions on how bamboo can be used to create new markets for innovation.

(C.6) Support the (re-)designing of an SLM database with GIS information

Grenada Land information system has already been developed with a broad range of land resource information. Since a lot of this information is outdated, a priority for Component 1 should be to expand and update the current system with a stronger alignment to other line ministries, particularly, the Physical Planning Unit. They also have the legal mandate of producing local area plans. Information collected from demonstration sites should be used to (i) update the current system, (ii) promote citizen science and data on a community level through NGOs who already collect data, (iii) prioritize data collection and exchange between private land owners, (iv) create standards where data and software are transferable for use.

(C.7) Convene the PSC for an extraordinary session in 6 months to assess progress made and decide whether to close the project or pursue implementation

It is anticipated that the combination of these recommendations should improve substantially the project implementation. However, it also implies quite a bit of flexibility from key stakeholders: UNDP to provide additional PMU support, GEF to agree on revisiting project outputs, the IP to allow governance structure changes and last but not least PMU to be followed up more closely by Government and MCO. Should there be no significant improvements in implementation, it might be wiser to shut down the project and wait for the next GEF cycle.

5. List of Tables

| Table 1: Evaluation ratings | ix |
|--|----|
| Table 2: Project timing | 12 |
| Table 3: SMART analysis of the logical framework | 19 |
| Table 4: Risk analysis review | 21 |
| Table 5: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Objective | 24 |
| Table 6: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 1 | 25 |
| Table 7: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 2 | |
| Table 8: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 3 | 27 |
| Table 9: Rating Progress toward Achievement of Project Outcome 4 | |
| Table 10: Annual work plan vs actual expenditure | |
| Table 11: Delivery over the years | |
| Table 12: Planned co-financing | |

6. List of Boxes

| Box 1: Summary of project objective, components, outcomes and outputs | . vii |
|---|-------|
| Box 2: Key areas to be assessed during the MTR | 2 |
| Box 3: project objective, components, outcomes and outputs | .10 |

7. List of Figures

| Figure 1: Grenada vegetation | 6 |
|---|----|
| Figure 2: key project components | 9 |
| Figure 3: Original governance structure | 11 |
| Figure 4: Original governance structure | 30 |
| Figure 5: de facto governance structure with staffing and Board members situation | 31 |
| Figure 6: Methodological Design and Approach | 80 |
| | |

8. List of Maps

| Map 1: Grenada island areas of project intervention | 88 |
|---|----|
| Map 2: Carriacou island | 89 |

9. Annexes

| Annexe 1: Terms of Reference | 57 |
|---|----|
| Annexe 2: Methodological Approach | 77 |
| Annexe 3: Interview guides and questionnaires | 81 |
| Annexe 4: GEF MTR Rating Scales | 86 |
| 0 | |

| Annexe 5: Map of Project Areas | 88 |
|---|-----|
| Annexe 6: Project's Theory of Change | 90 |
| Annexe 7: Mission Schedule and Sites Visited | 91 |
| Annexe 8: List of Persons Consulted | 93 |
| Annexe 9: List of Documents Consulted | 94 |
| Annexe 10: Evaluation questions matrix | 96 |
| Annexe 11: Debriefing Presentation | 101 |
| Annexe 12: Brief Expertise of Consultants | 113 |
| Annexe 13: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form | 114 |
| Annexe 14: Evaluation Report Clearance Form | 116 |

Annexe 1: Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management in Grenada (PIMS 4970) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry and Fisheries and the Environment, which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project started on the 10th of December, 2020 and is in its first year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance Midterm%20Review%20 EN 2014.pdf*).

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in production landscapes and increasing the resilience of agricultural systems. This is meant to be achieved through the following four interrelated outcomes: a) Outcome 1: Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management at the national level; b) Outcome 2: National capacity to provide financial, technical and information services for CSA production; c) Outcome 3: Operationalization of resilient agricultural practices; and d) Outcome 4: Knowledge management for Sustainable Land Management, Climate Smart Agriculture and biodiversity conservation. The project area includes the whole island territory of Grenada (344 sq.km. of landscape) sitting on a volcanic-coralline island shelf raised from the depths of the Atlantic Ocean to the East and the Caribbean Sea to the West. The island is divided into small districts called parishes that include St. George, St. Andrew, St. Patrick, St. John, St. David, St. Mark and Carriacou/ Petite Martinique.

MTR PURPOSE

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

MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Programme Manager for Climate Change, Energy and the Environment, Project Coordinator, Project Assistant, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Grenada, including some of the existing and proposed marine and terrestrial Protected Areas.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other crosscutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

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

DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

Project Strategy

Project design:

Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.

Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?

Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of

Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timebound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?

Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see <u>UNDP Discussion</u> <u>Paper:</u> <u>Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results</u>, 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the <u>UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and</u> <u>Evaluating for</u> <u>Development Results</u>, Chapter 3, pg. 93.
Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sexdisaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of- project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶ | Achieveme nt Rating ⁷ | Justificati on for Rating |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Objective: To operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of agricultural system | Mandatory indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for SLM/CSA solutions and for biodiversity and ecosystem services at national and/or sub- national level by project end | 0 | | 0 | A least 2 (Target will be confirmed during the first year of project implementati on) | | | |

- ³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
- ⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document
- ⁵ If available
- ⁶ Colour code this column only
- ⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline | Level i | in 1 st | Midterm | End-of- | Midterm Level | Achieveme | Justific | atio |
|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------|------|
| | | Level ⁴ | PIR | (self- | Target ⁵ | project Target | & Assessment ⁶ | nt Rating ⁷ | n | for |
| | | | reported) | | | | | | Rating | |

| M in N di bo w liv cr th SI ra m in pr la di by re pr G G In N di bo gre | landatory dicator 2: fumber of arect project eneficiaries ith increased velihoods reated arough CSA, LM, and ingeland anagement the project rioritized indscapes, isaggregated y sex, as a sult of the roject <u>EF7 Core</u> <u>indicator 11</u> : fumber of rect eneficiaries isaggregated y gender as obsenefit of | 0 | Male: between 245 and 319 annually Female: between 105 and 137 annually (Target will be validated during the first year of project implemen t ation) | Male: between 700 and 910 annually Female: between 300 and 390 annually (Target will be validated during the first year of project implementatio n) | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| It N in w pl in bi cc SI C at of th pr w ar op d | Adicator 3: fumber of tegrated atershed anagement lans tegrating todiversity onservation, LM and SA covering : least 50% f teroritized atersheds ad perationalize | 0 | 2 | 5 | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1st PIR (self- | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of- project | Midterm Level & | Achieveme nt Rating ⁷ | Justificat ion for |
|------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | reported) | reported) Target Assessment ⁶ | | 5 | Rating | |

| Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacity increased for integrated landscape management at | Indicator 4: Number of cross-sectoral collaboration / agreements established for land use | 0 | 1 | 3 (signed Memor of Understandin three of followin Ministry of Educ | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| the national level Outcome 1.1: | planning and management | | | Grenada Touris Authority; Minis | | |
| Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices, and in | | | | Works/Physic al Planning Unit; a Solid Waste Management Au | | |
| the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes management for biodiversity conservation | Indicator 5: Change in the capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP | Forestry and National Parks Departme nt 16 (36%) Land Use Division 14 (31%) Ministry of | Forestry and National Parks Departme nt 43% Land Use Division 38% Ministry of Carriacou and Petit | Forestry and National Parks Department 51% Land Use Division 46% Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 42% | | |
| Outcome 1.2: Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM | Capacity Indicator 6: Change in the level of awareness among stakeholders in the St. David, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick parishes and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CSA objectives as measured through the | Carriacou and Petit To be determine d during first year of project implemen t ation | Martiniqu To be determine d during first year of project implemen t ation | To be determined during first year of project implementatio n | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self- | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of- project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶ | Achieveme nt Rating ⁷ | Justificat ion for Rating |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>Component</u> 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production | Indicator 7: Financing for supporting SLM and CSA nationally | 6,000,000 USD8 | reported) | 6,600,000 USD | 7,200,000 USD (17% increase) ⁹ | | | |
| Outcome2.1:IncreasedfinancingforsupportingSLMandCSAatthenational level | Indicator 8: Area (ha) within the watersheds of Great River, La Sagesse and St. Patrick where climate resilient crops are successfully implemented | 140 ha | | 180 ha over the baseline | 300 ha over the baseline | | | |
| enhanced for CSA production | Indicator 9: Number of women benefiting annually from demonstratio n activities and supply of climate- resilient crop varieties | 0 | | Between 210 and 300 | Between 210 and 300 | | | |

⁸ Local Funding: Support to Soil and Water Conservation; Grant Funding: a) Climate Change Mitigation & Sustainable Livelihoods Project (Forestry, b) GEF R2R Project, c) German GIZ Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies (ICCAS), d) EU GCCA/OECS Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Land Management Project, e) USAID Funded Climate Change Adaptation Program (CCAP), f) Moroccan funded Soil Fertility Mapping Project, g) World Bank Funded Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR/DVRP) Project, and h) IFAD/CDB Funded Market Access and Rural Enterprise Project.

⁹ New funding sources may include: a) World Bank Regional Competitiveness Project, b) IFAD/CDB Funded Climate Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP), and c) Annual local budget allocation for soil and water conservation activities.

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline | Level in 1 st | Midterm | End-of- | Midterm | Achieveme | Justification |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| | | Level ⁴ | PIR (self- reported) | Target ⁵ | project Target | Level & Assessment ⁶ | nt Rating ⁷ | for Rating |
| Component 3: Operationalizatio n of resilient agricultural practices Outcome 3.1: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by: and increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha | Indicator 11: Income level (\$/year) of beneficiary households (disaggregated by gender) by project end | Farmers (crop and livestock productio n): 4,400 USD Five (5) women- owned agroproce s sing and agrotouris m small business: X USD (Baseline and target will be determine d and/or confirme d during the first year of project implemen t ation; data will be disaggrega t ed by gender) | | Farmers (crop and livestock productio n): 4,400 USD Five (5) women- owned agroproce s sing and agrotouris m small business: X USD | Farmers (crop and livestock production): 5,500 USD Five (5) women-owned agroprocessin g and agrotourism small business: X USD | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline | Level | in 1 ^s | Midterm | End-of- | project | Midterm | Level | Achieveme | ntJustification | for |
|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----|
| | | Level ⁴ | PIR | (self- | Target ⁵ | Target | | & Assessn | nent ⁶ | Rating ⁷ | Rating | |
| | | | reporte | d) | | | | | | | | |

| T 1' / 12 | C 1 | C 1 | C 1 D | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------|---|---|
| indicator 13: | Grenada | Grenada | Grenada Dov | re | | |
| Population of | Dove | Dove | (Leptotila wells | D: | | |
| endangered | (Leptotila | (Leptotila | Up to 15 | 54 | | |
| species | wellsi): 136 | wellsi): 136 | individuals | | | |
| · r · · · · | individuals | individuals | | | | |
| | inch victuals | inen vierearis | | | | |
| | *Grenada | | _ | | | |
| | Erog | | Grenada Fro | g | | |
| | Distingunti | Grenada Frog | (Pristimantis | | | |
| | (Fristimunii s | (Pristimanti | euthronides): X | | | |
| | euphronides) | euthronides) | 1 | | | |
| | · V** | cupisioniucs) | | | | |
| | $\cdot \mathbf{A}^{(n)}$ | ·X | | | | |
| | Leatherbac k | | Leatherback se | a | | |
| | | | turtle (Dermochei | vs | | |
| | sea turtie | | coriacea): X | , , | | |
| | (Dermochely s | Leatherbac k | | | | |
| | coriacea): X** | sea turtle | | | | |
| | | (Dermochely | | | | |
| | | indinery J | Hawksbill se | ea | | |
| | Hawkshill see | coriacea): A | turtle (Eretmoched | ys | | |
| | i lawksbill sca | | imbricata): X | · | | |
| | turtle | | | | | |
| | (Eretmochel ys | Hawksbill sea | | | | |
| | imbricata): X** | turtle | | | | |
| | | (Entre hel a | | | | |
| | *Baseline and | (Eretmochel ys | | | | |
| | target to be | imbricata): X | | | | |
| | confirmed | | | | | |
| | during the | | | | | |
| | first year of | | | | | |
| | ancient | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | implement | | | | | |
| | ation; | | | | | |
| | baseline base | | | | | |
| | on Rusk, B, | | | | | |
| | 2017. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | ** Baseline | | | | | |
| | and target to | | | | | |
| | be determine | | | | | |
| | d during the | | | | | |
| | u uumig uie | | | | | |
| | first year of | | | | | |
| | project | | | | | |
| | implement | | | | | |
| | ation | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of- project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶ | Achieveme nt Rating ⁷ | Justification for Rating |
|------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Indicator 14: Changes in cover (ha) of | Dry forest: X | | Dry forest: X | Dry forest: X | | | |
| | key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds | Cloud forest: X | | Cloud forest: X | Cloud forest: X | | | |
| | watersheets | Mangrove s | | Mangrove s | Mangroves: X | | | |
| | | : X | | : X | Riparian forest: X | | | |
| | | Riparian forest: X | | Riparian forest: X | Turtle nesting beaches: X | | | |
| | | Turtle nesting beaches: X | | Turtle nesting beaches: X | | | | |
| | | (Baseline and target to be determine | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 15 (GEF7 Core Indicator 4): Area (ha) of landscapes under improved practices | 0 | | 890 | 2,963 | | | |
| | Indicator 16 (GEF7 Core Indicator 6): Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) | 0 | | 0 | 9,51210 | | | |

¹⁰ Carbon sequestration estimates have been calculated using the Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool (EX-ACT) Version 7 – Multilingual Edition, which was developed by FAO. The forest type selected for the calculations is Tropical Moist Deciduous Forest, building on a baseline of degraded land in a Wet Tropical climate. The soil type generally consists of fertile Clay Loams derived from volcanic materials, albeit degraded through prior deforestation activity and subsequent

overgrazing/ agriculture. The project involves the restoration of 40 ha of degraded forest using native species. Over a period of 10 years, approximately 9,512 tCO2-eq will be sequestered through the project's intervention (EX-ACT: 2. Land Use Change. 2.2. Afforestation and Reforestation). The FAO EX-ACT result sheet is included as Annex P.

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline | Level in 1 st | Midterm | End-of- project | Midterm Level | Achieveme nt | Justification for |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| , 82 | | Level ⁴ | PIR (self- | Target ⁵ | Target | & Assessment ⁶ | Rating ⁷ | Rating |
| | | | reported) | U | U | | U | U |
| Component 4 | Indicator 17 | :0 | | 5 | 10 | | | |
| Knowledge | Number of | E | | | | | | |
| management for SLM | documents or | 1 | | | | | | |
| CSA and biodiversity | successful | | | | | | | |
| conservation | experiences about | t | | | | | | |
| | CSA, SLM and | l | | | | | | |
| | biodiversity | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 4.1 | conservation | | | | | | | |
| Increased adoption of | practices, and | l | | | | | | |
| practices as a result of | gender | | | | | | | |
| the dissemination of | mainstreaming | | | | | | | |
| knowledge and bes | disseminated in | 1 | | | | | | |
| practices developed | Inational | | | | | | | |
| under this project. | institutions and | L | | | | | | |
| | among Ministry | 7 | | | | | | |
| | of Agriculture | 2 | | | | | | |
| | and Lands | 5 | | | | | | |
| | extension centers | 5 | | | | | | |
| | that serve farmers | 5 | | | | | | |
| | around Grenada | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | I 1 | NT .1 | | | A . 1 | | | |
| | Indicator 18 | None, as the | | | At least 5 (one per | 2 | | |
| | Number of sub- | project has | | | watershed) | | | |
| | national or loca | not yet begun | | | | | | |
| | institutions that | implement | | | | | | |
| | adopt | ation | | | | | | |
| | recommendati | | | | | | | |
| | ons resulting | | | | | | | |
| | from SLM, CSA | , | | | | | | |
| | and biodiversity | 7 | | | | | | |
| | conservation |] | | | | | | |
| | interventions by | 7 | | | | | | |
| | project end | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 1 | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.

Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?

What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?

What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning:

Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.

Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?

Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.

Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?

Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

| Sources | ofName | of | Co-T | ype | of | Co- | Co-financing | | Actual | Amour | tActual | % | of |
|-----------|---------|----|------|-------|----|-----|--------------|----|----------|---------|---------|----|----|
| Co- | finance | er | fi | nanci | ng | | amount | | Contrib | uted a | tExpect | ed | |
| financing | | | | | | | confirmed | at | stage of | Midterr | nAmoun | t | |
| - | | | | | | | CEO | | Review | (US\$) | | | |
| | | | | | | | Endorsement | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Т | OTA | L | | | | | | | | |

Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement:

Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any

revisions needed?

Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:

The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.

The identified types of risks¹¹ (in the SESP).

The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).

Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might

include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:

Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications & Knowledge Management:

Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?

Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

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

List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

Sustainability

¹¹ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

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

In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹²

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team.

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

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

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the project titled Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management in Grenada

| Measure | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Project Strategy | N/A | |
| Progress Towards | Objective Achievement | |
| Results | Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 1 Achievement | |
| | Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement | |
| | Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement | |
| | Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Etc. | |
| Project | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Implementation & | 5 | |
| Adaptive | | |
| Management | | |
| Sustainability | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

¹² Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a time period of 4 months starting from the date of contract signature and shall not exceed 5 months from when the consultants are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| ACTIVITY | NUMBER OF | COMPLETION |
|---|-------------------------|------------------|
| | WORKING DAYS | DATE |
| Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report | 4 days (recommended: 2- | October 5, 2021 |
| (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the | | |
| MTR mission) | 4 aays) | |
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | 15 days (recommended: | October 27, 2021 |
| | 7-15 days) | |
| NB: The mission is tentative and will depend on the sanitary restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. If it cannot be completed on-site, interviews will be carried out virtually. The stakeholder interviews, if done virtually, may require a longer than usual time period. Please adjust the number of days and completion date to accommodate this. | | |
| Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission | 1 day | October 29, 2021 |
| Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR | 10 days (recommended: | November 9, 2021 |
| mission) | 5.10 days | |
| Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from | 4 days (recommended: 3- | November 19, |
| feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving | 1 days) | 2021 |
| UNDP comments on the draft) (note: accommodate time delay in | T uuys) | 2021 |
| dates for circulation and review of the draft report) | | |
| | | |

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

MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------|------------------|
|---|-------------|-------------|--------|------------------|

| 1 | MTR Inception Report | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission NB: The mission is tentative and will depend on the sanitary restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. If it cannot be completed on-site, interviews will be carried out virtually. | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| 3 | Draft MTR Report | Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 4 | Final Report* | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

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

MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements Grenada for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will conduct interviews with local counterparts alongside the local consultant, be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and MTR report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings (alongside the local consultant), deduce key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports. The team expert will organize and conduct interviews/meetings with local counterparts, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, conduct site visits (if necessary) to verify the achievement of deliverables/completion of key activities, review all draft documents and provide detailed inputs and comments.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Annexe 2: Methodological Approach

The MTR process follows guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP Supported, GEF Financed Projects*



- Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles for conducting the Mid Term Review included:

- Evidence-based approaches including cross-checking of collected data, ensuring diversity of data collection sources
- ✓ Gender responsiveness
- ✓ Alignment to sustainable development goals
- ✓ Stakeholder input, participation and collaboration (circulation and feedback on findings)
- ✓ Strong communication and alliance with the project team (including joint decision making)
- ✓ Flexibility and organization

Data Collection Methods

Data Collection Methods comprised of:

- Literature/ desktop review of project data
- Interviews
- Site Visits

The main sources of information included:

- Project Documents
- Key stakeholders identified by the project
- Field data collected during site visits
 - Analysis and Review: MTR Evaluation Matrix

The data and information collected were analyzed based on the following criteria and indicators:



The Question and Evaluation Matrix were built upon the following key areas

Project design

- Adequacy of project design in relation to identified critical issues & resulting objectives
- Project design re. other donor funded-interventions
- Design changes over time according to changing conditions

Relevance

- Adequacy of thematic & sectors in relation to issues / national priorities
- Relevance re. final beneficiaries
- Level of consulting / participation of other stakeholders

Effectiveness

- Degree of progress towards achieving project's results
- Level of streamlining with UNDP Country Programme / GEF priorities
- How were risks and assumptions taken into account during implementation
- Communication and visibility including towards donors
- Lessons learned on implementation modalities/mechanisms

Efficiency

Project's results delivery:

- Effective operational & financial management of the project / RBM
- M&E system and mechanisms to discuss progress
- Quality of communication between stakeholders
- Promotion of joint activities for improved efficiency/partnerships

Adaptive management:

- Log frame changes and analysis of indicators
- Review of the procurement plan
- Responsiveness according to changing conditions / Ability to adjust to change

Impact

- Visible change re. final beneficiaries / GoG
- Contribution to change as per outcomes
- Partnerships/synergies to enhance the impact
- Added value of project for beneficiaries
- Communicating on project's results

Sustainability

- Level of participation of national stakeholders
- UNDP exit strategy options and appropriation of results by beneficiaries
- Level of ownership & empowerment of beneficiaries to follow-up / upscale / replicate

| Source 1: Project Docum | nents | | Analysis |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Detailed desktop and literature | Source 2: Stakeholders | | The data and information gathered |
| review | Stakeholder identificaiton and | Source 3: Project Sites | were analysed within the |
| | project office | Planning and selection in collaboration with project office | project phases that emerged from the |
| | Introduction and Scheduling | Observation and site visit of demonstration activitives | process: |
| | Execution of interviews | Interviews with receipients and organizers/ ground truth | Preparation Inception / Transition from Ridge to Reef to Climate |
| | | Recording and collation of data | Resilient Agriculture Project |

Figure 6: Methodological Design and Approach

- Presentation of initial findings

Initial findings were presented to the UNDP Project Team over Microsoft Teams Platform. The main objective of this presentation was to share initial findings, conclusions and recommendations to be incorporated as part of the final review process and to collaborate on joint decision making and feedback.

Annexe 3: Interview guides and questionnaires

1. Project coordination team (and UNDP)

Relevance & design:

- Design history
- What are the main issues that need to be addressed in relation to BD/SLM/CSA and sustainable agriculture in Grenada?
- What needs were identified to achieve the results (components 1, 2, 3 and 4) (instit. Capacity building on integrated landscape management, national capacity building for CSA production, operationalisation of climate-resilient agricultural practices & knowledge management)? Which ones were (not) taken into account in the project and why?
- Is there any relevant activity at the start of the project that is no longer relevant now? Is there any non-relevant /unverified activity at the beginning of the project that is relevant today? (e.g. COVID impact)
- What is the relevance of the initial project assumptions and potential risks / what was done to mitigate these risks? Was a risk mitigation strategy implemented at the start of the project?
- (Risks like the reluctance of farmers, extreme climate events, capacity constraints of farmers / within Gov, lack of gender, negative backlash on environment, deforestation & BD with increasing agric. activities)
- • Gov policy changes affecting project objectives/outcomes?

Efficiency:

- Implementation history / adaptive management
- What are the main problems of project implementation? Internal/ external factors & COVID? What measures have been taken to reduce their impact?
- Did funding gaps affect the overall implementation of the project?
- Availability of financial resources for implementation/timeliness?
- Clearly-defined roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in terms of planning, implementation, reporting (data collection and reporting), M&E? Improvements to consider?
- Are the indicators SMART (results/impact)?
- Is there a mechanism to coordinate project activities with other donor interventions (e.g., co-financing / parallel or competitive implementation)?
- What system of project governance and M&E has been established? How effective is it? Who's in charge – functionality of Steering Committee, Technical Committee; interactions with the project team?
- Degree of contribution of national partners and efficiency to ensure proper implementation of the project / What are the main limiting factors?
- What is the impact / added value of co-financing (issues) on the implementation and achievement of project results?
- What kind of adaptation measures are being done to improve implementation especially with COVID (e.g., interactions with Gov & final beneficiaries on capacity building, contracting experts? Any recommendations?
- Added-value of Gov co-financing / UNDP Regional Office

Effectiveness:

- What are the results (not) achieved? Why? Difficulties?
- Detailed review of each result/activity
- Component 1: institutional capacity building on integrated landscape management
- Component 2: national capacity building for CSA production
- Component 3: operationalisation of climate-resilient agricultural practices
- What are the main success factors/ failure of each outcome?
- What are the main constraints to project implementation? COVID & others
- Is the implementation strategy flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions in particular with GEF and Gov? Was it adjusted to maximize effectiveness?
- Gender mainstreaming: are you implementing the activities differently due to gender specificities?

Potential impact:

- Do you anticipate any (unintentional) positive or negative effects of the project?
- Does the project contribute to empowerment / strengthening the responsibilities and capacities of the institutions / final beneficiaries? Through what results? For what purpose?
- Do you anticipate any multiplicative effects (for which activities/results)?
- Impact on gender equity?
- Are activities contributing to improving BD / the socio-economic conditions of the final beneficiaries / increasing government capacity? Why (not) or how? What are the limiting factors?
- What behaviour change have you observed (day-to-day activities of trained/exposed Gov staff and final beneficiaries?

Sustainability:

- What results/ achievements are more / less sustainable? How to strengthen them?
- What outcomes are most appropriate for beneficiaries (including institutions); probability of sustainability after project closure / what should we do to improve sustainability?
- Is there any interest and support to implement similar interventions / some project outcomes in the future / by whom / how?
- What is the exit strategy for the project? What mechanism will be (should be) put in place after the project?

2. Institutional Actors

Relevance:

- What are the responsibilities of your institution in relation to BD / SLM / CSA?
- What are your institution's needs to strengthen BD/SLM/CSA in your sector?
- Did the planned project activities fit the needs of the institution/sector?
- Is the project design based on (i) contextual analysis, (ii) participatory needs assessment? Were you (or your institution involved in project design)?
- Are the selected areas/beneficiaries the most vulnerable or strategic for your sector? Would you have chosen other areas/beneficiaries instead and why?

Efficiency:

- Do activities effectively target stakeholders / respond to the needs of the sector?
- Are there activities that could be more effective in achieving the same results?

• What was your actual involvement (or involvement of your institution) in the project (as executing partner/beneficiary / in governance mechanism)?

Effectiveness:

- Are planned activities effective enough to achieve results/project outcomes?
- What benefit do you get from project participation?
- What could have been done to make the project more effective (add activities, increase outreach for activities, delete non-relevant/ineffective activities...)?
- Do you think the results to date reflect the amount of expenditure/effort made?
- Did the project take into account gender and vulnerable people? (Differentiated activities, gender adaptations, equity in support...)?

Impact:

- What changes +/- has the project made to date in the sector/institution?
- What change in stakeholders' behaviour (your staff or final beneficiaries) has been observed?
- Have you integrated (or do you plan to integrate) any / project activity into the institution's routine activities (if so, need for additional human resources, financial resources/state budget?)

Sustainability:

- Could induced changes be maintained over time?
- Are there mechanisms to adapt to change and maintain the benefits of results? Any suggestions on how to maintain the benefits of the project (fiscal/ financial mechanisms, additional activities...)
- How is your institution committed to achieving sustainable project results?

3. Partners / external actors / collaborating institutions and subcontractorsconsultants (co-financing / local implementing partners)

Relevance:

- What is your role in the project?
- What was your contribution to the project to date?
- Have you supported the design/formulation (even indirectly) of the project / have you improved (in)directly to its implementation?

Efficiency:

- Have you received financial /technical /other resources to carry out your activities?
- What are the limits/ problems you faced when implementing planned activities?

Effectiveness:

- Do the implemented activities contribute to the overall project goal / the issues at stake in your area?
- Do you need additional support (from your /other institutions) to improve the effectiveness of the activities you have been implementing?
- Should the project focus more on specific topics/areas?
- What still needs to be addressed to make the project more effective?
- What are the main problems of the project in relation to the issues at stake (CSA, SLM, BD conservation?
- Integration of gender and vulnerable people into the project?

Impact:

- What changes are the result of the support you have provided regarding beneficiaries (including Gov staff) / your activity
- Is more support needed? What for?
- What is different about the support the project provided?

Sustainability:

• What is the probability that beneficiaries will benefit from the changes induced by the project (with little or no additional activity) (need for follow-up, for other support to complement/consolidate results)?

4. Collaborating structures – local NGO/group/cooperative...

Relevance:

- What needs do beneficiaries express in relation to environmental/ technical (socio-economic) problems / what needs are not addressed by the project?
- Had there been changes in the way the project addresses beneficiary problems?

Efficiency:

- Opportunity to implement activities? Adaptation of calendars?
- Aligning your activities with project results/activities?
- What are the barriers/ limitations? How are they overcome?
- Organization of teamwork in the field? (Division of team tasks, preparation/time management, execution)? Adequacy of equipment in relation to workload?
- Logistics? Facilities / Difficulties?
- Procurement of goods/ services versus field situation?
- Coordination mechanism/communication with actors / local stakeholders?
- Backup support from the project team (visits, advice...)

Effectiveness:

- List the support provided /received by the project
- Do project activities contribute to improving the adoption of SLM, CSA, BD conservation
- Does the project take into account gender? (Differentiated activities, gender adaptations, equity in support...)
- Opinion on new technical/financial mechanisms to ensure results achievement (on mainstreaming CSA, SLM and BD conservation)? Some suggestions to improve

Impact:

- What change is the project bringing to the project areas / final beneficiaries? (Increased income, better working conditions, more leisure time, gender, Gov. involvement ...)?
- Positive and/or negative changes? How have the effects of negative changes been limited?

Sustainability:

- Can the changes brought by the project be sustained on a long-term basis? How to improve?
- Is additional support needed to sustain these changes on a long-term basis?

5. Focus groups - final beneficiaries (farmers, livestock farmers, representatives of community organisations)

Relevance:

- What type of problem/ practices lead to environmental degradation? Do these problems affect your activities?
- What are the advantages/disadvantages of you participating in this kind of project (in relation to your core activities)?
- What benefits are (still) expected from project activities (explain)?

Efficiency:

- Support received: list advantages/disadvantages of each support/practice/training... probability of adoption? examples
- Opportunity to implement activities following project recommendations
- What problems/ needs have not been addressed/satisfied by the project?

Effectiveness:

- Is the support received helping to resolve/ improve any technical issue?
- Do you think the project is addressing key (e.g., economic, environmental) issues of the final beneficiaries/your community (including women and vulnerable people)? With what degree of success?

Impact:

- What changes did the project bring to the final beneficiaries? (Increased income, better working conditions, additional leisure time ...) / What is done differently with the project any copying effect (e.g., neighbouring farmers, communities)
- Positive and/or negative changes? How to limit negative impacts?

Sustainability:

- Can long-term project activities or results/ adopted practices be supported?
- Is additional support needed? Why?
- How will this additional support contribute to improving your (environ/socio-economic) situation?

Annexe 4: GEF MTR Rating Scales

| Ratings fo | Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and the objective) | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of- | |
| | | project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the | |
| | | objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice". | |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project | |
| | | targets, with only minor shortcomings. | |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project | |
| | | targets but with significant shortcomings. | |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets | |
| | | with major shortcomings. | |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project | |
| | | targets. | |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its mid-term targets and is not | |
| | | expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. | |

| Ratings fo | or Project Implementation & Adaptive | e Management: (one overall rating) |
|------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

| Ratings fo | or Sustainability: (one overall rating) | |
|------------|---|---|
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved |
| | | by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable |
| | | future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be |
| | | sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm |
| | | Review |

| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes, as well as key outputs, will not be |
| | | sustained |

Annexe 5: Map of Project Areas

(Project sites in colour)



Map 1: Grenada island areas of project intervention



Map 2: Carriacou island

Annexe 6: Project's Theory of Change



90

Annexe 7: Mission Schedule and Sites Visited

| Date | Time | Location | Name/s of Person/s | Function / organisation |
|----------|-------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 23/11/21 | 16h30 | (remote) | Sacha LINDO | Monitoring and Evaluation Associate – UNDP Barbados |
| 26/11/21 | 08h30 | | Samuel HENRY | Programme Officer for Climate Change, Energy and the Environment Cluster– UNDP Barbados |
| 29/11/21 | 09h00 | | Rudo UDIKA | Project Coordinator |
| 30/11/21 | 10h00 |] | Anthony Jerry JEREMIAH | Head of Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry |
| 01/12/21 | 09h30 | | Nidhi TANDON | Gender Consultant |
| | 11h00 | | Robert MEDFORD | Director, Grenada Bureau of Standards |
| | 12h30 | - | Renata BLAIR | Project Financial and Administrative Assistant |
| | 15h00 | | Mohammad Rafik MS NAGDEE | Environment, Energy & Climate Change Cluster Head – UNDP Barbados |
| 03/12/21 | 08h30 | | Marion GEISS | Deputy Head, Adaptation Project GIZ |
| | 12h00 | | Aden FORTEAU | Project Sustainable Land Management Specialist |
| 06/12/21 | 09h45 | Ministry of Agriculture , Lands & Forestry | Trevor THOMPSON | Chief Agricultural Officer, Land Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry |
| 07/12/21 | 08h30 | (remote) | Glendon LANGAIGNE | Project IT Specialist |
| 08/12/21 | 09h15 | | Joseph NOEL | Land Use Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| | 10h30 | | Sebastian HURTADO | Project Data Sharing Agreement Policy Specialist |
| | 13h00 | | Aleanna WILLIAMS | Recreation Unit Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| 10/12/21 | 10h00 | | Joseph NOEL | Land Use Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| | 10h45 | | Kenton FLETCHER | Computer Systems Administrator, Land Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| | 13h30 | | Aria ST LOUIS | Environment Division Head, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience and Environment |
| 13/12/21 | 10h00 | Grand Etang nursery & project | Dillon CHARLES Imothep MAWUTO | Nursery Management Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry Watershed Management Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |

| | | activity sites | Aleanna Williams | Watershed Management Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry Recreation Unit Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
|----------|-------|-------------------|--|--|
| | 15h30 | (remote) | Maria-Cruz GONZALES | Ex Regional Technical Advisor, GEF |
| 14/12/21 | 09h00 | | Raymond BAPTISTE | Ex Land Use Division Head, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry and CRA Project Formulation Specialist |
| 15/12/21 | 09h00 | | Valentine DOUGLAS | Land Group President |
| | 11h00 | | Allison HAYNES | Mirabeau Propagation Station Manager, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry |
| | 14h30 | | Rudo UDIKA | Project Coordinator |
| 16/12/21 | 09h00 | | Lauren ST LOUIS | Chief Agricultural Officer, Extension Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry |
| | 12h00 | | Fernando PINEL | GEF Regional Programme Associate |
| | 13h30 | | Rudo UDIKA | Project Coordinator |
| | 14h30 | - | Claudia ORTIZ | GEF Regional Programme Advisor |
| 17/12/21 | 11h00 | - | Jody DANIEL | Executive Director, Gaea Conservation Network |
| 20/12/21 | 11h30 | | Rudo UDIKA Sacha LINDO Samuel HENRY | Project Coordinator Monitoring and Evaluation Associate – UNDP Barbados Programme Officer for Climate Change, Energy |
| | | | Mohammad Rafik MS NAGDEE Renata BLAIR Claudia Ortiz | and the Environment Cluster– UNDP Barbados Environment, Energy & Climate Change Cluster Head – UNDP Barbados Project Financial and Administrative Assistant GEF Regional Programme Advisor |
| 22/12/21 | 09h00 |] | Maxine WELSH | Climate Promise Project Officer, UNDP Barbados |
| | 10h00 | | Claudette PITT | SPECTO Director |
| | 10h45 | | Jose GALINDO | CRA Project Formulation Specialist |
| | 14h00 | | Natasha JOSEPH | Officer, Grenada Development Bank |

Annexe 8: List of Persons Consulted

| Name/s of Person/s | Title, Institutional Affiliation |
|---------------------|---|
| BAPTISTE Raymond | Former Chief Land Use Division Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry |
| BLAIR Renata | Project Financial and Administrative Assistant |
| CHARLES Dillon | Nursery Management Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands |
| | and Forestry |
| DANIEL Jody | Executive Director, Gaea Conservation Network |
| DOUGLAS Valentine | Land Group President |
| FLETCHER Kenton | Computer Systems Administrator, Land Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture, |
| | Lands and Forestry |
| FORTEAU Aden | Project Sustainable Land Management Specialist |
| GALINDO Jose | CRA Project Formulation Specialist |
| GEISS Marion | Deputy Head, Adaptation Project GIZ |
| GONZALES Maria-Cruz | Ex Regional Technical Advisor, GEF |
| HAYNES Allison | Mirabeau Propagation Station Manager, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry |
| HENRY Samuel | Programme Officer for Climate Change, Energy and the Environment Cluster – |
| | UNDP Barbados |
| HURTADO Sebastian | Project Data Sharing Agreement Policy Specialist |
| JEREMIAH Anthony | Chief Forestry Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry |
| JOSEPH Natasha | Officer, Grenada Development Bank |
| LANGAIGNE Glendon | Project IT Specialist |
| LINDO Sacha | Monitoring and Evaluation Associate – UNDP Barbados |
| MAWUTO Imhotep | Watershed Management Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, |
| | Lands and Forestry |
| MEDFORD Robert | Director, Grenada Bureau of Standards |
| MORAIN Elvis | Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| NAGDEE Mohammad | Environment, Energy & Climate Change Cluster Head – UNDP Barbados |
| Rafik MS | |
| NOEL Joseph | Land Use Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry |
| ORTIZ Claudia | GEF Regional Programme Advisor |
| PINEL Fernando | GEF Regional Programme Associate |
| PITT Claudette | SPECTO Director |
| ST. LOUIS Aria | Environment Division Head, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate |
| | Resilience and Environment |
| ST. LOUIS Lauren | Chief Agricultural Officer, Extension Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands |
| | and Forestry |
| TANDON Nidhi | Gender Consultant |
| THOMPSON Trevor | Chief Agricultural Officer, Land Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and |
| | Forestry |
| UDIKA Rudo | Project Coordinator |
| WELSH Maxine | Climate Promise Project Officer UNDP Barbados |
| WILLIAMS Aleanna | Recreation Unit Officer, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and |
| | Forestry |

Annexe 9: List of Documents Consulted

GEF 7 Core indicators PIMS 4970 Grenada Land Use Policy, 2017 Grenada National Agriculture Plan, 2015 Initiation Plan, PPG, 2017 List of Board members PRODOC, Gender Action Plan Project Annual Workplan, 2021 Project Annual Workplan, 2022 Project Board Terms of Reference Project Document, November 2019 Project Identification Form, 2nd submission Project Implementation Report, 2021 Project Implementation Report, reviewed Q4, 2021 Project Inception Workshop Report, January 2021 Project Steering Committee minutes, June 2021 Project Steering Committee minutes, December 2020 Quarterly Performance Report, Q1 2021 Quarterly Performance Report, Q2 2021 Quarterly Performance Report, Q3 2021 Ridge To Reef Final Evaluation Report, July 2021 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure template, July 2016 Summary project publications and communications TORs consultancy Communication and Coordination Assistant TORs consultancy Data Sharing Agreement Legal Specialist TORs consultancy Data Sharing Agreement Policy Specialist TORs consultancy Economic Competitiveness Specialist TORs consultancy Legal Specialist TORs consultancy Project Technical Assistant TORs consultancy Stakeholder Engagement Specialist TORs consultancy Sustainable Land Management Specialist **TORs Project Coordinator**

TORs Project Finance and Administration Assistant

TORs Project Sustainable Land Management Specialist

UNDP, Combined Delivery Report, 2020

UNDP, Combined Delivery Report, 2021

UNDP, Combined Delivery Report, project preparation, 2017

UNDP, Combined Delivery Report, project preparation, 2018

UNDP, Combined Delivery Report, project preparation, 2019
Annexe 10: Evaluation questions matrix

| Criteria | Question | Indicator | Source of information |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|
| Project Strategy: To wha | t extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country owr | nership, and the best route towards expected results? | |
| Relevance / design | To what extent are the project's objectives consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, national priorities and policies, global priorities and partners' and GEF policies and priorities? How suitable was the strategy to ensure the achievement of | Adequacy of activities in relation to policies and stakeholders' needs Degre of stakeholders' participation in project design and options selection Evidence of synergy between project strategy and | Policy documents Interviews of stakeholders/beneficiaries Interviews steering committee members Project team interviews (incl. |
| | expected results? Were the country representatives (e.g., governmental officials, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning? | SMART indicators | M&E, manager) - PRODOC & periodic reports |
| Progress Towards Result | s: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the proj | ect been achieved thus far? | |
| Effectiveness | To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved as per annual planning? To what extent did the project contribute to the Country Programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and Country Programme, GEF strategic priorities, and national | Planned vs. actual activities Activity sequencing Project's reviews (speeding up or delaying activities) / budgetary changes | UNDP/UN & periodic Gov reporting Documents Beneficiaries' interviews Project staff interviews |
| | development priorities? What factors have contributed to the achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs? Could the project include alternative strategies? | - (final/institutional) beneficiary behaviour changes signs - Validity of ToC | Interviews NGOs & private sector Interviews final beneficiaries |

| Criteria | Question | Indicator | Source of information | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | • Has the project produced unintended results -positive or negative? If there are negative results, what mitigation activities are in place? | | | |
| Project Implementation extent are project-level | and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficient monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communicatio | ly, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any char ns supporting the project's implementation? | nging conditions thus far? To what | |
| Efficiency | To what extent has the project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of global environmental and development objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned? To what extent were project funds and activities delivered on time? How did the project adapt to the new normality COVID-19? Did the project contribute to minimizing the socioeconomic effects of the Pandemic? | Activity modifications (removal / adding) Functionality of M&E system Implementation adjustments (e.g., remote training, more widespread use of technology for communication/decision-making | UNDP finance & project staff Project Director interview Annual reports Interviews project board members Interviews of activity implementers | |
| Financing and co- Financing | Are there variances between planned and actual expenditures? What are the main reasons? To what extent did financial controls allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget? How many resources have the project leveraged? How have they contributed to the project's ultimate objective? | Disbursement trends Follow-up and adjustments of the procurement plan Co-financing complementarities / substitution M&E system updates and annual/intra-year budgetary adjustments | UNDP finance & project staff Project Director interview Annual reports | |
| Implementation, Oversight and execution | To what extent has UNDP delivered effectively on activities related to project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion and evaluation? To what extent has the Implementing Partner effectively managed and administered the project's day-to-day activities? How were UNDP's overall oversight and supervision? | Changes in UNDP staff Periodicity of technical meetings with project team & relevant support/timeliness of recruitments Changes in project team staff Activity / staff / service payment delays | Annual reports / MTR report UNDP, ministry & project team interviews CDR | |
| Sustainability: To what | extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environme | ental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | |
| Sustainability and Ownership | What extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? To what extent are the project results impacted by institutional Were the country representatives (e.g., governmental officials, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project implementation? Do they maintain a commitment to the project and its results? | Level of autonomy/operationality of structures in place & their funding degree of buy-in of final beneficiaries actual economic feasibility of project technical solutions | annual reports interviews project staff, UNDP, final beneficiaries & private sector operators | |

| Criteria | Question | Indicator | Source of information |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | • How have the implementing partner and UNDP contributed to ensure national ownership? | level of institutionalization of project results (structures in place, follow-up, meetings) Degree of participation of all stakeholders in the formulation, & implementation of the project degree of transfer of responsibility of project results & subsequent empowerment | interviews national institutions (incl. municipalities) / UNDP and project staff |
| Contribution to impact | To what extent are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | - Likely behaviour changes | Technical reports Monitoring reports Interview of wetland users Interviews of NGOs & community representatives |
| Gender Equality and human rights | How were gender and human rights considerations integrated into the project's design, including analysis, implementation plan, indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and human rights of disadvantaged or marginalized groups? To what extent did women, poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups participate and benefit from the project? on gender equality, women's empowerment, disadvantaged or marginalized groups? If so, what can be done to mitigate this? | M&E system covering gender Activity adaptability as per gender and target beneficiaries' types Degree of project targeting of vulnerable people Number of women & vulnerable people that were direct beneficiaries from project's results Level of participation of vulnerable groups & women in activities' operationalization | Gender-specific & marginalized group interviews (focus groups) Project team interview Parishes interviews Annual reports |

| Criteria | Question | Indicator | Source of information |
|---|---|---|--|
| Other cross-cutting issues | How have the project activities contributed to poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods? To what extent has the project contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk, and/or addressed climate change mitigation and adaptation? To what extent has the project incorporated capacity development activities? Were results achieved? Are there any environmental risks expected to impede the long- term results of the project? | Increased resources through improved technology (& capacity building) / diversification Pilot-project appropriation and empowerment | Interviews project staff Interviews final beneficiaries Interviews community & committee members/representatives |
| Stakeholder engagement and partnership | To what extent do project stakeholders share a common understanding and are involved in the decision-making process of the project? To what extent did stakeholder's participation mechanisms in place lead to empowerment and joint ownership of the project? What should be done better to increase their participation and engagement? | Degree of active participation in project activities/capacity building training Project responsiveness re. final beneficiary/community needs Degree of participation of stakeholders in project (annual) planning | Project staff & ministry interviews Interviews of community representatives and municipalities |
| Results framework | To what extent the project's objectives and components are clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change? Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART? | Number of activities that were amended/terminated and reasons Follow-up of METT indicators Changes of indicators during implementation, nr of indicators not assessed Usability of baseline studies | Interviews project team Interviews of ministry Interviews project board members |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | To what extent did the Monitoring systems allow the collection, analysis and use of information to track the project's progress, risks and opportunities toward reaching its objectives and to guide management decisions? Were the budget and responsibilities clearly identified and distributed? | Level of functionality of M&E system; updating and effective integration into decision-making (planning + adjustments) | - Interviews project team |
| Risk Management, Social and Environment Standards and Adaptative management | To what extent were risks (both threats and opportunities) properly identified and managed? To what extent did the project maximize social and environmental opportunities and benefits and ensured that adverse social and environmental risks and impacts were avoided, minimized, | Updating of assumptions and risks realistic Relevant project implementation changes M&E system operationality | - Project team interviews, UNDP interview |

| Criteria | Question | Indicator | Source of information |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------------------|
| | mitigated, and managed? What "safeguards" did the project implement? Were the project's changes based on evidence? Were they properly managed? | | |

Annexe 11: Debriefing Presentation



Initial findings Relevance - Design

- +++ SLM and CSA key Gov priorities with previously insufficient support to farmers
- +++ 1st fullscale project dedicated to these areas (including geographically)
- complex project with (i) a lot of assumptions (key factors outside project's outreach) on several results (ii) project sites on 3 islands
- --- Project design initial IP not linked to technical areas
- +++ Participatory approach in project design (Agronomy + Land Use + Environment + Forestry) project responding to actual beneficiary needs (both institutional & final [farmer3])dual approach (Agric Min HR + farmers capacity building)
- Project design: very sequential top-down (capacity building →testing→ tech & fin support to farmers managementplans

More suitable : radial design (staike design): what is needed for farmers to use SLM/CSA & protec envir?

19/12/2021

Initial findings Relevance - Design

- +++ Exit strategy for Agric. Min. Appropriation/ownership: focus on institutional capacity building ; however, issue of HR thinning not addressed / taken into account. Little evidence of close collaboration with physical planning unit as it relates to mainstreaming SLM, more engagement with technical experts within the ministry e.g GIS specialist, Extension Divison, Envi Division.
- +++ Implementation modality: NIM
- --- design during GEF5 implementation ; still, focus only of technical issues ; some attention to Governance issues / lessons learned from R2R (e.g. IP switch out of Agri Min ; however, "false" good idea)

Initial findings Implementation / effectiveness

- Much delayed implementation: COVID + lack of oversight in 2020/1 (change of GEF RTAs & new MCO cluster team by 08-2020) → project reactivation by 2020's end with AWP drafting (finalised by mid 2021)
- +++ but --- adaptive management accelerated implementation through PBA (with UWI) prepared by Project Team; how ever, UNDP/GEF reverting on agreed procedure: change to RfP: > 6 months lost
- Evidence for insufficient (GEF) project management expertise: review ed drafting of TORs, PIR/reporting
 - \rightarrow This is evidence for a lack of UNDP AND GEF oversight / support to Project Team
- Inadequate mechanism for communication betw een Gov and project team:
 - no effective implementation channel for activity delivery (need for authorisations to travel, no fast tracking procedures when involving Gov)
 - Initiation of activities systematically based on a series of bureaucratic requests / provision of support /collaboration; no fluid relationship between project and Gov stakeholders
 - Activity delivery: on a case by case basis ; with time -consuming official requests of info/support. Lack of
 strategic direction e.g. site selection for trainings lacked justification. Operational guidelines needed
 especially regarding site selection of project sites. Insufficient use of spatial data in decision making as it
 relates to SLM and more engagement with trainings and interventions directed within selected
 w at esheds
 - Poor conducive implementation environment : isolated project team & insufficient stakeholders' engagement (+ COVID social distancing / procedures not helping either); little evidence yet of involvement of private land owners within watersheds

 \rightarrow This all points tow ards the lack of technical committee (or any other structure with a similar function)

Initial findings Implementation / effectiveness

Project's Governance:

- Project Board : functional for decision making ; not effective for resolving operational issues ; lack of final beneficiary representatives (to ensure on-site ownership and empowerment)
- Project team:

1 Coordinator + 1 Admin-Fin + external consultants: OK but no effective common platform for interacting with Gov

- --- Engaging with stakeholders on a case by case basis: inefficient
- --- remote assignments for several consultants
- M&E: PRODOC's M&E plan reviewed by consultant ; no consultation of Gov counterparts → risk of leading to poor project Gov ownership

31/10/2019

Methodology

Basic principles:

Participation of all stakeholders Crosschecking of information

Avialable data / documentary review

- Contextual review of the subsectors
- Data on actual implementation (Board meetings, periodic reports, consultants' deliverables...)
- Project timing, budget review

Consultations and meetings

- Project team & IP Director
- Gov. Institutions (Agriculture, Environment...)
- Other donors (GIZ)
- NGOs active in rural landscapes
- Project site visit (Grand Etang nursery)
- (Potential) beneficiaries (farmers)
- Data analysis → recommendations / Lessons learned

Initial findings Effectiveness – reporting on delivery

Overall: in-depth review of project results show ing a gap between project resources & what is actually needed to achieve project results: the project is likely to contribute to several results but unlikely to achieve them

COMPONENT 1: system at ic & institutional capacity increased for integrated landscape management will (BD conservation mainstreamed into LUP practices & (ii) increased capacity for promoting \$LM

Output 1.1 - centralised geospatial BD, ecosystem & land use DB & monitoring system operationalised

Underway through consultancies on 1. review ing and proposing an improved DB design system & 2. assessing legal challenges

How ever: this result is highly complex : not limited to consultants' reports ; requiring Gov approval on new mechanisms, inter-ministerial dialogue especially with Physical Planning Unit on w ho/how to access / update data / format of the data/w hat to update/upgrade and how to fund if... → legal challenges ahead

 \rightarrow Success doubtful by project's end; possibly output to be better bounded (?)

- SMARTindicators & w ater / land use baselines to be covered by RfP: not yet initiated. More qualitative and less qualitative data is expected
- Little evidence of using of spatial data as it relates to site selection and analysis . Area wide planning requires technical expertise in the area of GIS mapping and digitizing for ease of communication

Output 1.2 – strengthened regulatory / coordination / planning frameworks mainstreaming SLM, CSA, BD conservation

PASP update and management plans covered by RfP: yet to be initiated.

Stakeholder mapping within the watersheds should be initiated on the onset for ow nership. Decentralization of watershed management should be carefully looked at legally.

National drought policy : consultant to be contracted

Initial findings Effectiveness – reporting on delivery

Output 1.3 – Relevant HR capacities enhanced in BD conservation & Land Use management practices

Some training sessions by SLM Specialist (bamboo, check dams...): mostly testing ; no widespread activities yet at watershed level.

Additional sessions on M&E and overall self-work organisation: target: Agri Min staff

Land Use Division support: on remote sensing (consultant) / possibly UWI support (e.g. LIDAR data <> ground truthing

Extension Division support: irrig. material and training: quotes for equipment received

Mainstreaming SLM/CSA into national frameworks: not yet initiated ; only contacts ; possibly too ambitious ; need to assess what is really feasible (white paper first?) Collaboration with Physical Planning Unit to be enhanced

Environmental staff certifications: through RfP

Gender program: underway (consultant)

19/12/2021

Initial findings Effectiveness – reporting on delivery

COMPONENT 2: national capacity for delivering fin, tech and info services for CSA production with () increased financing of SLM/CSA & (ii) increased capacity for CSA production

Output 2.1 – fin support for adoption of CSA, SLM, BD conservationfriendly practices

- Negotiations with GDB on fundings facility for CSA/SLM ; draft MoU (on tech support to access loans) by legal consultant- to be discussed
- Potential collaboration with GCREWS (GIZ) on wateelated CSA practices

Output 2.2 - soil & water quality monitoring & advisory program

⁸LM specialist initiated some water quality tests

Plan for water quality included irRfP ; problem with soil analysis: no capability in Grenada ; activity on hold ; question: how costifiective to build incountry capacity on soil testing: more comprehensive assessment needed?

Support to youth NGOs: initial contacts (e.g. SPECTO) ; yet to design a call for interest for NGOs to div ulge SLM/CSA concepts/practices

Output 2.3 – supply of climate resilient crop varieties

Output only feasible if Gov is engaged on actual research of new varieties (timeframe too shore

Activities focussing on equipment delivery (PV,extrator, steriliser, shade material...) to improve nurseries production ; training yet to be initiated

Some potential on rebuilding Citrus germplasm (after Citrus Greening disease)

Initial findings Effectiveness – reporting on delivery

<u>COMPONENT 3: operationalisation of resilient agricultural practices leading) to</u> > 2.400ha managed with SLM/CSA principles & resulting increased HH outcome & (ii) BD conservation into > 960ha

Output 3.1 -SLM/CSA practices in St Patrick, St Andrew, St David parishes

- Site visits by SLM Specialist ; reviewing site selections ; material procurement for 1 Gov estate underway ; #ame training sessions
 - →Few if any activities as relying on previous outcomes

Output 3.2– BD conservation and SLM/CSA measures lievara/St Patrick, La Sagesse Great River watersheds

Tropical dry forest, IAS baselines & mongoose control, chytrid fungus assessment... through RfP

Sea turtle protection : still to be discussed with SPECTO/ Ocean Spirit NGO Bamboo control: sessions undertaken ; mixed results

Output 3.3- rangeland management system @arriacou& < Martinique Only discussions ; Intrecountry travel restrictions lifted by Q4 2021

Output 3.4- small business foggroprocessing agrotourism

Current consultant on market analysis on medical leave

9/12/2021

Initial findings Effectiveness – reporting on delivery

<u>COMPONENT 4: knowledge management for SLM, CSA & BD</u> <u>conservation resulting in increased adoption of practices</u> (multiplication effect)

Output 4.1 – Technical knowledge captured, experience and lessons learned shared

 Not yet initiated but a national symposium on financial management, marketing and digitilisation in agriculture by 06/2021

Output 4.2 – M&E for adaptive management

Only related to project implementation (e.g. PBA/ RfP)

Initial findings Impact and Sustainability

Too early to provide any conclusive finding

As for impact of capacity building on Gov HR, high risk of low impact due to HR thinning in Gov institutions

As for impact on farmers, interviews show (i) low adoption because of lack of funding opportunities (covered by the project) and (ii) donor fatigue (multiplication of projects) with little if any long-term follow-up (e.g. by Extension and / or specialised technical staff / other structures)

 \rightarrow Need to think out of the box (e.g. involve other stakeholders)

19/12/2021

Conclusion

- 1. Inadequate UNDP/GEF oversight
- 2. Insufficient project management capacity
- 3. Weak stakeholders' engagement
- = Perfect storm for project failure
 - Despite agreement on AWP at Project Board, the Project Team is unable to engage efficiently with IP for operational matters
 - IP Technical staff engagement is weak and mostly bound by bureaucratic procedures
 - IP exerts little if any control on actual project implementation (despite national execution modality)
 - Several outputs need finetuning as to what/how to contribute to the overall objective, hence held back by project management

Delivery is extremely low: <15% at mitterm

31/10/2019

What next?

Business As Usual : the project is highly unlikely to make any significant strides on SLM / CSA, even with swift implementation of RfP packages

Poor value 4 money

- → Need to reassess project implementation
- 1. Questioning DIM as opposed to NIM (Project Board)

DIM advantages: no need for Gov support /approval; more straightforward procedures (e.g. PBA within weeks); large packages of the project implemented swiftly

DIM disadvantages: most effective when activities do not need Gov support ; implementing partners/stakeholders are more likely to be non-State actors (NGOs, private 31/10/2019 sector...) as per original design

Recommendations

- → Need to reassess project implementation
- 2. Change of IP (to Min Fin) (Project Board)

Advantage: swift decision making to facilitate faster implementation for all non Agric Min-related activities

Disadvantage: additional administrative layer when interacting with Agric. Min. ; might slow down further, project activities

3. Ensuring (more comprehensive) stakeholders' ownership:

Broaden Project Board with the inclusion as observers of watershed community representatives / NGOs

- → Need to reassess project implementation
- 3. Improve project operationalisation

a. reboot / reassess the project with a workshop on assessing feasibility of completing outputs and project making revisions as required (participants: members of stakeholder's engagement plan, UNDP and project team)

b. Establish a technical committee that oversees and supports project team in project operationalisation (ensuring stakeholders engagement, facilitating liaising with relevant technical HR, reviewing technically deliverables (participants: members of stakeholder's engagement plan, project team and representatives of final beneficiaries; consider the inclusion of external (technical) resource persons

19/12/2021

Recommendations

→ Need to reassess project implementation

Project's Governance: Stakeholder Management Plan

- Stakeholder Plan needs to be updated and operationalized. Develop national database targeting beneficiaries and partners in each w atersheds, create national linkages, formalize coalitions across groups w ithin each w atershed to help strengthen governance
- Ex amples:

- Data Management / Monitoring and Evaluation: Forestry Division, Environment Division, Land Use Division NAWASA

- Physical Planning Unit function needs to be elaborated in the context of their legal mandate for guiding development on the island of Grenada. Safeguards within legalisation need to be enhanced for better communication across ministries meaning the responsibility of developing local area plans. How do we make the W atershed management plans implementable in the context of decentralization of local area management? Elaborate on their role in data management and regulation, inclusion in trainings and consultations

- Ministry of Social Development: Justification for alignment to PSC? Various individuals attend meetings

- Environment Division not present within project governance or PSC providing their key role in monitoring and evaluation and mainstreaming

- Civil Society- enhance their role in M&E, Model farms may not be ideal since most farmers farm on small plots of land less than half an acre. Interventions enhanced on a case by case basis

- NGOs – local area management and governance through MOUs, Conservation Easements. How can their w ork feed into project inputs? 19/12/2021

→ Need to reassess project implementation

Project management:

c1. Contract a project team with more experience in GEF procedures (and possibly project management) or

c2. Support the project team with (i) much closer UNDP oversight on GEF/UNDP procedures for assisted NIM, (ii) the contracting of a parttime international CTA (technical oversight of project and advice to support)

d. IP to review the stakeholders engagement plan (e.g. under a.) and facilitate the fast -tracking of activities with optimised availability of HR and minimum procedural rules (e.g. SOP for project team engagement with Gov HR/premises/support)

19/12/2021

Recommendations

→ Need to reassess project implementation

e. Engage non-state actors for project delivery and consider Responsible Parties Agreements with selected CSO/NGOs

4. Consider watershed management decentralisation:

The project is highly centralised with Min Agric at the centre of the intervention \rightarrow final beneficiaries' weak ownership

→ reassess the project approach with more focus on communities' ownership / consider legal aspects of watershed management decentralisation

→ strengthening community groups / local structures for watershed management (decision making) // with Extension follow-up for technical aspects

→ Need to reassess project implementation

- 5. Financial support of SLM/CSA:
- more focus on soil conservation techniques and value added products to promote soil quality
- bamboo potential for microenterprises
- 6. SLM training/initiation

GIS Maps and special areas should be prioritized for trainings and pilots (criteria to ensure adequate outreach)

19/12/2021

Recommendations

→ Need to reassess project implementation

If a, b, 3c1 or 3c2, d are implemented, request to GEF, at least, a 12 months extension (6 months COVID + 6 months on GEF/UNDP procedure mis-advice)

If there is no increased fin. delivery (e.g. +X% to be decided at project Board) within a specific time frame (e.g. 6 months), it is recommended to shut down the project.



Annexe 12: Brief Expertise of Consultants

Mr Vincent Lefebvre:

(lefebvrevinc@gmail.com)

- Programme management & coordination / project formulation & implementation, M&E knowledge of PCM, logical framework & ZOPP methodologies / equipment specifications.
- MA in tropical agriculture and post-graduation in business administration
- Programme & project evaluation / technical audit / institutional appraisal: analysis of relevance / effectiveness / efficiency / social, institutional & economic impact / political, social & cultural, technological, institutional & financial sustainability / cross cutting issues (gender, AIDS, environment & institutional capacity building); questionnaires design & interviews of beneficiaries.
- Data acquisition methods for evaluations: questionnaires drafting & interviews of beneficiaries; SWOT analysis; (semi-) structured interviews, focus groups.
- Knowledge of monitoring & evaluation methodologies (incl. Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool).
- Food security / Agronomy / agro-forestry / agro-industry / agro-climate and climate mitigation adaptation / horticulture.
- Cartography / remote sensing / mapping / GIS (Arcinfo, Mapinfo, Ilwis) / Database management systems (MECOSIG, COONGO).
- Land & water resources evaluation / crop potential analysis / participatory rural appraisals / natural resources management / mountain agro-ecosystems.
- Soil survey/soil conservation/soil fertility.
- Statistics including programming in SAS & Delphi.
- Renewable energies (wind, bio-diesel, rapeseed oil).

Mrs Leyana ROMAIN:

(leyanaromain@gmail.com)

- Msc. Urban and Regional Planning (current)
- Local Area Planning and Design Physical Development Planning
- Project Coordination and Management/ Monitoring and Evaluation/Proposal Writing/ Stakeholder Mapping and Facilitation
- Conservation Biology Coral Reef Restoration and Nursery Technology
- Quantum GIS/ Drone Mapping for Environmental Management

Annexe 13: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²⁹

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

Name of Consultant: ____Vincent LEFEBVRE__

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at Maputo on 08/03/2022

Signature:

²⁹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁰

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

Name of Consultant: __Leyana ROMAIN__

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

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

Signed at St George on 08/03/2022

Signature: _

³⁰www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annexe 14: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

| Mid-Term Re ID: 4970) | view Report for (Climate Resilier | nt Agriculture f | or Integrated Landscapes; PIMS |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Reviewed an | d Cleared By: | | |
| Commissioni | ng Unit (M&E Focal Point) | | |
| Name: Sacha | Hill Lindo | | |
| Signature: 🕂 | Holindo Date: March 28, | 2022 | |
| Regional Tec | hnical Advisor (Nature, Climate | and Energy) | |
| Name: Maria | Cruz Gonzalez | | |
| Signature: | Docusigned by: Maria Gonzalez | Date: | 28-Mar-2022 |