

# ***Capacity Development and Mainstreaming for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project***

## **Mid-Term Evaluation Report**



Prepared for: **UNDP Guyana**

Submitted by: **Stuart Black**

**Guyana  
January 2011**

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Glossary of Acronyms.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	11
1.1 Project Background .....	11
1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation .....	12
1.3 Key Issues Addressed.....	13
1.4 Methodology.....	13
1.5 Structure of the Report.....	14
2.0 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....	15
2.1 Project Start, Duration and Implementation Status.....	15
2.2 Problems Addressed by the Project .....	15
2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project .....	16
2.4 Expected Results .....	16
2.5 Main Stakeholders.....	17
3.0 ADEQUACY OF PROJECT DESIGN AND RELEVANCE .....	18
3.1 Project Design .....	18
3.2 Project Relevance .....	18
3.3 Assessment of the Project's Logical Framework .....	19
3.4 Project Financing .....	21
4.0 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS TO DATE.....	22
4.1 Project Objective, Outcomes, Outputs and Targets .....	22
<u>Outcome 1: Capacity Development</u> .....	23
<u>Outcome 2: Mainstreaming SLM</u> .....	25
<u>Outcome 3: Resource Mobilization</u> .....	28
<u>Outcome 4: Adaptive Management</u> .....	29
5.0 KEY FINDINGS .....	31
5.1 Project Implementation and Management .....	31
5.2 Stakeholder Involvement and Ownership.....	34
5.3 Results and Attainment of Objective (Summary of Section 4.0).....	36
5.4 Replication and Sustainability .....	37
5.5 Summary Assessment of Project Performance.....	39
6.0 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED.....	41
List of Recommendations.....	41
Lessons Learned .....	43

### Annexes

- Annex 1 – List of Persons Interviewed, Site Visits and Documents Consulted
- Annex 2 – Members of Project Steering Committee
- Annex 3 – List of Deliverables to Date
- Annex 4 – Terms of Reference for Mid Term Evaluation
- Annex 5 – Project's Strategic Results Framework

## **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank the many people from stakeholder organizations and government departments in Guyana who kindly gave their time during interviews, as well as those people who provided useful input to the assessment.<sup>1</sup>

The report, as well as the related preparatory work, could not have been completed without the strong support from GLSC and UNDP in Guyana, who helped to arrange meetings with a wide range of stakeholders.

The consultancy that led to this report was funded by UNDP Guyana. However, the views presented in this report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Government of Guyana or UNDP.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to Annex 1 for a complete list of people met.

## Glossary of Acronyms

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CHPA	Central Housing and Planning Authority
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GFC	Guyana Forestry Commission
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GLSC	Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission
GuySuCo	Guyana Sugar Corporation
GIS	Geographical Information System
GOG	Government of Guyana
GENCADP	Guyana Environmental Capacity Development Project
GGMC	Guyana Geology and Mines Commission
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
KMS	Kilometers
LCDS	Low Carbon Development Strategy
LDC SIDS	Least Developed Countries Small Island Developing States
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LUP	Land Use Plan (Policy)
LUS	Land Use System
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MSP	Medium Sized Project
MTE	Mid-term Evaluation
NREAC	Natural Resource and Environmental Advisory Committee
NDS	National Development Strategy
NAP	National Action Programme
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessment
NEX	National Execution Modality
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
N-LUP	National Land Use Plan (Policy)
NPC	National Parks Commission
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PMU	Project Management Unit
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
ToRs	Terms of Reference
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

---

## Executive Summary

---

This Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project is being implemented by the Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC) over a three-year period (2008-2011). Funded by GEF/UNDP and executed through UNDP's national execution modality (NEX), the SLM Project is part of a portfolio of projects being implemented in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The purpose of the UNDP/GEF SLM Portfolio Project is to enable each LDC-SIDS to strengthen its capacity for sustainable land management, under the guidance of the National Action Programme (NAP) prepared under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) – largely through the promotion of an integrated and cross sectoral approach to address land degradation issues within the framework of sustainable development. In Guyana's case, the SLM Project was designed to operationalize the NAP.

The Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) was undertaken between September 19 and October 2, 2010. The following report presents a review of the design, objectives, implementation and management arrangements of the SLM Project, and an assessment of the results achieved to date, measured against the planned outcomes and outputs. The criteria used in the evaluation involved assessing the Project's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The report concludes by making a number of recommendations to strengthen management and oversight of the Project to enable the Project Manager to better achieve the objective and outcomes during the remainder of the Project.

### Project Design and Relevance

Land planning and management is of great importance to Guyana, where natural resources represent the most valuable resources to the Government; and consequently most policy and strategic decisions are based on the use of land resources. The SLM Project was highly relevant in addressing factors that contribute to land degradation in Guyana, including loss of forest and vegetation due to clearing of lands for agriculture, inappropriate logging, irresponsible mining, urbanization, improper land management, and changing climatic patterns and coastal erosion due to flooding. Furthermore, having no single institution with responsibility for lands and no legislation specific to land degradation or land use planning, the SLM Project was needed to address a number of institutional, capacity and financial constraints.

Against this background, the SLM Project was expected to establish the groundwork for the widespread introduction of SLM principles and practices into a variety of organizations responsible for land management, including forestry, mining, agriculture, watershed management, housing, among others – thus integrating environmental, economic and social well-being into land use planning. The SLM Project is also intricately aligned with other national initiatives in the area of land management, particularly the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project, which is designed to strengthen the capacity of GLSC in land use planning and policy.

The Project was well-structured and very much aligned with national objectives. However, with a GEF investment of only US \$500,000, the Project design appears to have been quite ambitious. It was not realistic to assume that it would be possible to implement such a comprehensive approach to SLM, building capacity in 25 organizations in a 3-year period – particularly in light of the capacity constraints within GLSC, the policy development process and timely support involving other donor-funded projects.

This highlights a problem that is partly related to Project design and partly to implementation. The Project would have been stronger if greater activity was focused on building capacity to integrate SLM into institutions and ensuring SLM was incorporated into national and sector strategies. In addition, some of the SLM Project outputs were delayed as it was anticipated that

the EU-funded LUP Project would build the requisite capacities within GLSC. Thus, a delay in the start of the LUP Project has affected achievement of the outcomes on the SLM Project. As is unlikely that the SLM Project will achieve all that was anticipated in the given timeframe, the task of the MTE is to determine what the SLM Project can realistically achieve in the remaining time and budget.

### **Assessment of Project Results**

The Project has promoted innovative activities, particularly through the production of baseline studies, strengthening staff capacity and raising awareness among key institutions responsible for land management. Very importantly, the Project has succeeded in generating a great deal of concern, support and knowledge regarding SLM by engaging many fragmented institutions that previously had little knowledge of applying an integrated approach to natural resources management – one that embraces social, economic and environmental considerations. In this respect, the Project has introduced a new way of doing things.

Based on Project activity over the past 18 months (February 2008 to September 2010), the MTE has rated the achievement of the objective as “Marginally Satisfactory”. Outcome 1 has been partly achieved, involving baseline studies and training workshops, but more effort is needed to turn the training outputs into institutional capacity building outcomes. Outcome 2 has been delayed due to the delay in the national land use plan and policy. Outcome 3 has been delayed because of a delay in the recruitment of consultants. Outcome 4 has only partly been achieved. This rating could be improved to “Satisfactory” if the Project is able to meet all its targets and follow the recommended remedial actions.

The challenge now is to ensure that the Project can maintain the momentum to deepen the capacity building achievements, ensuring those trained will apply their knowledge in practice and, more importantly, to address the more strategic issues associated with national land use planning.

Recommendations on the Project objectives and outcomes are as follows:

#### **Project Objective:**

- *Clear policy guidelines need to be developed at the national planning/strategy level in order to provide leadership and guidance for SLM. In order to guide the remaining Project activities and ensure mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and to ensure a smooth transition to the EU-funded LUP Project, the SLM Project should convene a special planning meeting of Commissioners involving key SLM policy makers, using the National Land Use Policy and Plan as the convening context and the Office of the President as the coordinating group*
- *The Project’s capacity building interventions need to be deepened to ensure stakeholder organizations are able to integrate SLM into their operations; and the Project needs to strengthen the link between training, capacity building and integration of SLM into the national development planning process. These could be facilitated through the recruitment of a short-term Policy Advisor within GLSC.*
- *Consider requesting a further extension (of 6 months to December 2011) in order to give the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project time to get off the ground, and to work out a transition plan for the two projects to achieve their respective objectives*

**Outcome 1: Capacity Development**

The overall perception of Project interventions in preparing baseline studies, and organizing workshops and training sessions was very positive. With a bit more follow up in institutional capacity development, many of the training programs should result in measurable improvements to SLM.

- *It is essential to target appropriate personnel in training and capacity building exercises. More effort should be made to ensure the training and capacity building is directed at the right people. The Project should consider developing brief written materials to inform senior level staff too busy to attend formal training sessions, and adjusting the training model to reach hinterland users*
- *The Project should consider deepening of capacity building efforts and targeted training at key partner institutions, which could be facilitated through the establishment of a Technical Working Group (TWG) comprised of representatives from key stakeholder institutions*
- *The Project should consider greater outreach efforts targeting small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas*
- *GGMC has identified a need for capacity building assistance to develop a code of practice similar to forestry; by providing assistance to GGMC, the Project may uncover a good entry-point for mainstreaming SLM into the mining sector*

**Outcome 2: Mainstreaming SLM**

As the lynchpin for the entire Project, achievement of Outcome 2 is essential for catalyzing actions needed to integrate sustainable land management into the national planning framework, as well as consolidating the capacity building efforts within key stakeholder institutions (outcome 1), and mobilizing resources for SLM within an investment planning framework (outcome 3).

- *There is a need to ensure political will and commitment is transferred into policy and legal instruments through an understanding and appreciation of SLM at the national and local level and to integrate SLM concepts within the current land use planning arrangements*
- *Make certain the N-LUP provides for an SLM adaptive management and institutional coordination strategy*
- *Elaborate a detailed plan outlining what specifically will be undertaken by the SLM Project and the EU-funded LUP Project in relation to national land use planning*

**Outcome 3: Resource Mobilization**

The SLM investment plan will be very important. Even though there are synergies between SLM, LUP and LCDS, the issues regarding sustainable financing for SLM will likely not be completed until the National Land Use Policy and Plan and the LCDS are well underway.

- *The Project Manager should ensure that the Ministry of Finance is officially engaged in the SLM Project, as buy-in from Finance is critical for having SLM issues included in the national budget*
- *In order to increase the likelihood of resource allocation for SLM issues, the Project should try to ensure the financing objectives of SLM are integrated into the Government's resource mobilization process for LCDS*

**Outcome 4: Adaptive Management**

Policy guidance from the Government and leadership from the PSC and GLSC are needed to guide Project activities towards achievement of objectives.

- *The Steering Committee needs to be strengthened to enable it to provide GLSC more guidance on the strategic direction of Project interventions, and advice on financial and operational oversight and accountability*
- *In the absence of strategic leadership, a Technical Working Group the establishment to provide advice in monitoring outcomes and outputs and to better coordinate SLM issues among stakeholder institutions*
- *The mid term evaluation process may provide the opportunity to convene a special stakeholder meeting on SLM attended by the relevant Commissioners. Such a session could also contribute to the sharing of lessons learned at the national and rural levels and perhaps throughout the Caribbean region*

### **Implementation and Management Arrangements**

Reporting to the Office of the President, GLSC is strategically positioned to coordinate issues associated with land management and to integrate SLM concepts into the Government's national planning process and Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS).

During the remainder of the Project, the strategic delivery of outputs needs to be improved in order to mainstream SLM concerns and coordinate natural resources agencies on SLM. Greater guidance and leadership is needed from the PSC. In the absence of such leadership, it is recommended that GLSC appoint a Technical Working Group to devise a clear strategy and work-plan to deepen the capacity development activities, align the SLM Project with the upcoming EU Project and guide the Project towards a successful completion. Also, better coordination of SLM issues among stakeholder institutions could be facilitated by the appointment of a short-term Policy Advisor attached to the PMU to complement the administrative work being done by the Project Associate.

Although efficient financial management has led to cost savings on some activities, Project expenditure has been slow, and only 44% of the budget has been disbursed. With such a high percentage left to spend in such a short period, there is a danger of rushing new activities through in order to disburse the budget, which increases the risk that funds will not be well spent.

- *Consider contracting a short-term Policy Advisor within the PMU at GLSC to improve the strategic approach to implementation and complement the administrative work of the Project Associate*

### **Stakeholder Involvement and Ownership**

The Project has raised awareness of SLM's "integrated approach" to natural resources management (embracing social, economic and environmental considerations) among some 25 stakeholder institutions involved in a range of SLM activities such as land management, environment planning and regulation, water, civil defence, etc. However, apart from the organization of training sessions and workshops, few coordination mechanisms have been developed in an attempt to produce better institutional capacity building results. Also, in the absence of policy guidance, stakeholders seem to be taking a wait-and-see approach regarding the application of SLM in their institutions. Commitment and informed decision-making are needed to provide clear guidance to stakeholders. As noted above, this could be achieved through strengthening the PSC, appointing a Technical Working Group and by convening a special "meeting of Commissioners" comprising Lands and Surveys, Forestry, Mining, etc.

- *A special effort should be made to strengthen participation on the PSC (and through a TWG) in order to provide strategic direction for the remainder of the Project*



## Replication and Sustainability

The Project has enjoyed good success providing training and promoting awareness in several areas associated with SLM, namely land degradation, watershed management, resource valuation and early warning systems. In considering how to strengthen its replication approach during the remaining period of implementation, the Project should make certain that increased capacities are translated into action on several levels: (1) stakeholder institutions are applying SLM principles and practices in their organizations; (2) policy reforms result in on-going improvements in government management of SLM issues through the inclusion of SLM concepts in national land use planning and, (3) the skills of stakeholders benefiting from Project activities are continually improved and spread more widely throughout the system. Also, more outreach effort will be needed to target small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas. Greater replication and sustainability of Project activities could be facilitated through a Technical Working Group comprised of members from other projects and institutions such as the Guiana Shield Initiative and Iwokrama, which provide models for international best practice in timber harvesting and valuation of environmental services.

Guyana's SLM Project is one of the first UNDP/GEF LDC-SIDS Projects to be funded in the Caribbean. To facilitate replication and to improve information sharing among other Caribbean countries, the Project should consider sponsoring a conference to disseminate lessons learned throughout the region.

In terms of sustainability, although perhaps not fully appreciated when the project was conceived, the SLM Project ended up establishing the groundwork for follow-up initiatives in the area of sustainable land management, particularly those designed to strengthen GLSC, such as the EU-funded LUP. However, the issues of limited financial resources budgeted for SLM and limited capacity in GLSC will have to be addressed before sustainability can be achieved. In this case, the SLM Project should devise a "transition plan", detailing the transition to the EU-funded LUP Project, as well as an exit strategy following the end of GEF/UNDP funding. Such a transition plan is essential because some SLM outputs are to be achieved through the EU-funded LUP Project. As a way of bridging the two projects, the SLM Project and LUP Project should consider establishing a joint Steering Committee to promote cross-sectoral and inter-ministerial coordination on SLM at an implementation level.

- *The Project should develop a replication plan that outlines how the results of Project activities will be sustained, up-scaled, and/or replicated to maximize return on the initial capacity building investments; include some higher-level policy engagement and institutional capacity building options, such as measuring how national development policies have addressed SLM issues, and measuring how national institutional capacities have been strengthened*
- *More outreach activities are needed to broaden the awareness of SLM principles and practices among other stakeholder institutions and in hinterland areas; for example, Amerindian land tilting has been accelerated with 14% of lands now under their stewardship, yet few Project resources have been devoted to SLM in hinterland areas*
- *The Project needs an exit strategy and a plan for transitioning to sustainability that will take effect following the completion of the EU-funded LUP Project; GLSC should consider establishing a common SLM institutional oversight mechanism for coordinating the SLM and LUP Projects by merging the two PSCs into one*

## Conclusions and Lessons Learned

This is a well-conceived Project that is very much aligned with national objectives. There has been strong political commitment and country ownership, and a high degree of support for SLM issues among participating institutions.

The Mid-term Evaluation ratings for most Project outcomes and outputs are low, largely because of delays in some major Project outputs and activities, the most serious of which is the development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan, which is being financed by the EU. This delay has put the SLM Project in a difficult position, because some of its outputs are dependent on outputs from the EU-funded Project. Therefore, it is recommended that the SLM Project request another extension (an additional 6 months) to give the EU technical assistance team time to get the Project started, and to allow the SLM Project to work out a transition plan.

The SLM Project needs a clear strategy and work-plan to guide it towards successful completion, including deepening the training outputs into institutional capacity building results, and aligning the national planning outputs with the upcoming LUP Project. This plan will require strategic guidance and leadership from the Project Steering Committee with input from a Technical Working Group, and a special meeting of Commissioners.

The main **lessons learned** from the Project are as follows:

- ✓ Project Design: Medium Sized Projects are often ambitious in design and find it difficult to deliver on what they hoped to achieve. It is important to use realistic assumptions about the Government's policy development processes and timely support involving other donor projects
- ✓ Building Capacity: Capacity building projects, and particularly those based primarily on training, should be designed to make certain tangible products are developed that may be used by practitioners, and that activities link training to practical on-the-job mentoring.
- ✓ Institutional Development: In defining activities on projects where there is a high degree of institutional fragmentation, overlapping mandates and limited understanding of roles and responsibilities, it is important to develop coordination mechanisms to facilitate an improved institutional framework.
- ✓ Leadership: It is essential to ensure commitment is maintained from senior level stakeholders, particularly where strategic decisions, policy guidance and leadership are needed to catalyze inter-institutional coordination.
- ✓ Strategic Alignment: Predicating Project success on the timely adoption of policies is inherently risky, particularly on projects involving multiple sources of funding. Contingency plans and strategic implementation approaches should be in place to deal with delays, increase efficiency and enhance synergies.
- ✓ Capacity Issues: Capacity issues are a constraint to implementing longer-term projects. However, these capacity issues must be addressed in projects in order to solve the underlying development constraints.

---

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

### **1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

#### **Context**

Guyana is located on the South American mainland, sharing borders with Brazil, Venezuela and Surinam, with a coastline of 430 kilometers on the Atlantic Ocean. Geopolitically, Guyana is part of the Caribbean, yet unlike its small island neighbours, it has a land area of 216,000 square kms and is well endowed with natural resources including fertile agricultural lands, diversified mineral deposits, and an abundance of tropical rain forests. This endowment is threatened by a progressive pattern of land degradation from mining, agriculture, human settlements and timber harvesting. Another major threat stems from the low-lying nature of its sea coast, which makes it vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise and from intense precipitation.

#### **GEF Portfolio Project/Global Benefit**

This Medium-sized Project (MSP) was prepared under the UNDP/GEF “Least Developed Countries (LDC) Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Targeted Portfolio Project for Sustainable Land Management” (Portfolio Project). Guyana has been recognized as one of the last frontier forests in the world with biodiversity of renowned global importance. Global benefits are expected to accrue in terms of maintenance and protection of ecosystem functionality, goods and services and integrity of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems, protection of habitats for globally important species, and enhanced carbon sequestration.

Guyana’s Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project matches the GEF Portfolio Project goal by promoting effective SLM for global and local benefits. The Project responds to the GEF Portfolio objective by strengthening Guyana’s national and local level capacity development and mainstreaming SLM into national development strategies and policies, and by increasing individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM. In matching the Portfolio objectives, the project also qualifies under the GEF Operational Programme 15 within the strategic priority SLM-1 for targeted capacity building through the promotion of an integrated and cross sectoral approach to address land degradation issues within the framework of sustainable development.

The indirect global benefits listed in the Project document include the following:

- Indirect, long-term increase in carbon capture and reserves
- Reduction in land use discrepancies
- Maintenance of important and protective ecosystems and habitats

#### **The Project**

Guyana’s SLM Project was designed to catalyze actions needed to integrate sustainable land management into the national planning framework as well as to build capacity within key institutions and organizations, in keeping with the findings of the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA).

The Project officially commenced in February 2008 and was scheduled to end in February 2011, but an extension was granted until June 2011. The Project is executed under UNDP’s national execution mode (NEX) by the Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC) through a Project Management Unit (PMU) located at GLSC. The total budget for the project is US \$1,005,000

with GEF contributing US \$500,000 and \$505,000 in co-financing (cash and in kind) from NGOs, UNDP and the Government of Guyana.

The Project's immediate objective is: "To establish an enabling environment to combat and reverse land degradation through a participatory process of capacity building; mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes; broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for SLM".

The following are the specific outcomes of the Project:

- Outcome 1: Increased individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM at the national and regional levels
- Outcome 2: SLM mainstreamed and harmonised into the local and national development framework
- Outcome 3: To conduct investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM
- Outcome 4: Effective project management through learning, evaluation and adaptive management

The Project should result in more effective management and streamlined communication of SLM concerns across multiple stakeholders, projected investments in support of a medium-term plan, and through better developed and equipped human capital. The requisite capacities, policies and awareness will be strengthened through a series of studies and training programs; implementation of awareness-raising activities; the use of expertise for informed decision-making; improved policy and legal instruments surrounding the endorsement of a national land use policy, support to the development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan (NLUP), and support to incorporating SLM in three (3) regional plans; and mobilizing resources for an SLM investment planning framework. Capacities will further be developed through the generation of baseline land degradation assessments and associated monitoring activity.

## **1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

This mid-term evaluation is a requirement of the UNDP/GEF Project document, which stipulates that an independent external Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken 18 months after Project initiation. The focus of the MTE is to make recommendations that will assist in adaptive management of the Project and enable the Project Manager to better achieve the Project objective and outcomes during the remainder of the Project.

According to the UNDP/GEF Resource Kit, the MTE is primarily a tool to assess the progress of the Project, to ensure that it is proceeding on schedule and is on the way to achieving its results and impacts. The MTE provides an opportunity to identify deviations from the desired course, reassess assumptions, identify changing conditions and risks, and to initiate corrective action.<sup>2</sup> The UNDP/GEF monitoring and evaluation policy has four objectives:

- i) Monitor and evaluate results and impacts
- ii) Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) Promote accountability for resource use; and
- iv) Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned

---

<sup>2</sup> Measuring and Demonstrating Impact, UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 2), 2005, p.22

The evaluation was guided by a comprehensive terms of reference (ToRs) developed by UNDP Guyana (see Annex 4). According to the ToRs, the evaluation is designed to assist GEF, UNDP, GLSC Project Managers and other stakeholders to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and potential sustainability of Project activities to date in relation to the stated objective. The MTE is also intended to identify potential Project design problems, assess progress towards achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the Project. The MTE provides the opportunity to assess early signs of Project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The key outputs of the MTE include the following:

- Context of the Project, adequacy of the Project design, stakeholder involvement and ownership, evaluation of the outputs so far and findings and conclusions
- Recommendations for future implementation, identify barriers and how to address these, adjustment of M&E framework.
- Lessons learned: design of Project, engagement of stakeholders, management of Project, strategy for implementation

The evaluation is an opportunity for Project stakeholders to step back from their daily implementation efforts and critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. In this way, the evaluation process serves as an important learning experience for all participants. Both the assessment process and the resulting report should be considered as outputs of the evaluation.

### **1.3 KEY ISSUES ADDRESSED**

The key issues addressed by the MTE include the following:

1. Is this Project “on-track” to achieving what it set out to accomplish?
2. What improvements should be considered to increase the likelihood of success?

The measurement of Project performance was based on both quantitative and qualitative indicators. The evaluation considered issues related to management and implementation, including Project delivery, implementation and finances. Particular attention was given to the strategic approaches necessary to achieve the Project objectives.

### **1.4 METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation methodology was based on a participatory approach which used consultative methods to engage a range of stakeholders so that they could contribute to and learn from the evaluation process. The MTE was undertaken using a mix of tools including the following:

- (a) Document reviews
- (b) Interviews
- (c) Site visits
- (d) Comparative analysis of findings
- (e) Analytical report writing

An independent international consultant with extensive experience in Guyana and the Caribbean completed the evaluation. The consultant has completed several MTEs and has provided professional support in the design, implementation and evaluation on a range of projects,

particularly in small island developing states (SIDS) in the Caribbean, but also in Africa, Eastern Europe and Asia.

The consultant visited Guyana between September 19 and October 2, 2010 to undertake interviews with Project staff, UNDP and approximately 30 stakeholders. During this period, the consultant also visited representative Project activity sites (see Annex 1 for a detailed schedule of interviews and site visits). During the field mission, the consultant familiarized himself with all available project documentation and worked with Project staff to develop a strategic approach for the MTE, including identification of key stakeholders and evaluation topics/priorities.

Project staff organized interviews in a manner that promoted efficiency and effectiveness during the MTE consultancy process. Discussions with key Project stakeholders were highly productive. Frank discussions were held with Project staff and UNDP regarding Project progress, management, budget and design issues.

At the end of the mission, the consultant gave a de-briefing to key UNDP staff regarding preliminary impressions and findings.

After the mission, the consultant spent a significant amount of time comparing the project documentation, reviewing interview data, analyzing the results framework and incorporating the field mission findings into a draft report, which was circulated for comments. Through comparative analysis of findings, the consultant tried to let the facts speak for themselves as much as possible – this involved assessing Project progress relative to indicators and targets, determining efforts by Project management to address delays, etc. The MTE evaluation report is the result of this analysis and report writing process.

## **1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

The structure of the report follows UNDP and GEF guidelines<sup>3</sup>. Section 1 contains the Introduction; Section 2 presents the Project and its Development Context. Section 3 contains an Assessment of Project Design and Relevance; Section 4 presents an Assessment of the Project's Results to Date (Outcomes, Outputs and Targets); Section 5 contains an Analysis of Key Findings; and Section 6 presents the Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results" and GEF's "Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies for Conducting Terminal Evaluations"

## 2.0 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

### 2.1 PROJECT START, DURATION AND IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

The project started in February 2008. During the first quarter, a Steering Committee was established with six (6) members representing the Executing Agency and supporting organisations<sup>4</sup>; a Project Inception Workshop was held on March 17; and a Project Associate was contracted to work with GLSC (April 1). The Project was scheduled to end in February 2011, but an extension was granted until June 2011. The MTE was conducted during the 32<sup>nd</sup> month of operation. With the extension, there are 9 months of Project activity remaining.

### 2.2 PROBLEMS ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECT

The Project document lists several problems that the Project seeks to address. Factors that contribute to land degradation are listed as “loss of forest and vegetation due to clearing of lands for agriculture, inappropriate logging, irresponsible mining, urbanization; improper land management; and changing climatic patterns and coastal erosion due to flooding. Erosion and flooding are critical issues as most of the coast lies below sea level. Sea level rise, destruction of mangroves, and coastal subsidence add to the pressures on the coastal sea defenses”.

The Project document indicates that there is no single institution with responsibility for lands. Responsibility for lands, natural resources and environment planning, management and regulation is shared among at least eight institutions<sup>5</sup>. Since its establishment in 2001, GLSC has been coordinating sustainable land management through inter-agency collaborative agreements and a number of committees (eg., NREAC, UNCCD Steering Committee). Similarly, there is no consolidated or legislation specific to land degradation, SLM or land use planning in effect. A National Land Use Policy has been drafted and is before the Government of Guyana for consideration.

The SLM Project document presented a number of key constraints and barriers to SLM that have limited Guyana’s response in addressing root causes of land degradation. These include policy, technical capacity and financial barriers:

*Barrier 1: Insufficient harmonization of policies leads to overlapping mandates among institutions, institutional fragmentation and limited understanding of roles and responsibilities and stakeholder involvement as it relates to achieving overall objectives of SLM.*

*Barrier 2: Capacity barriers as a result of gaps and barriers at the individual, institutional, and system levels that impede the implementation of SLM policies, programmes and projects.*

*Barrier 3: Financial barriers include the lack of environmental economic analyses of land-use options in development planning and in preparing economic/development policies, the absence of the Ministry of Finance in decisions regarding land use planning, limited knowledge and capacity to develop payment schemes and markets for ecosystem functions and services related to sustainable land management, and insufficient harmonization of donor and government agendas to support the issues of SLM.*

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 2 for a list of Steering Committee members

<sup>5</sup> Guyana Forestry Commission, Guyana Geology and Mines Commission, Guyana Energy Agency, Guyana Natural Resources Agency, Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission, Ministry of Fisheries, Crops and Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency

The National Action Programme (NAP) prepared under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), recognizes key land degradation issues facing Guyana – floods, droughts and impacts of natural resource utilization in the mining, forestry and agricultural sector and proposes a number of actions to address these issues, principal among them being rationalization of the planning and management of land resources including legislation and institutional arrangements and synergies, promoting education and awareness, undertaking training and capacity building, securing financial resources and establishing financial mechanisms, developing early warning systems and utilizing local knowledge.

The SLM Project was designed to “operationalize” the NAP by addressing the above barriers through the provision of capacity development, mainstreaming of functions and sustainable financing.

### 2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The Project’s long-term **goal** is: *To promote global and local benefits through enhanced ecosystem health, integrity, stability and functions in the context of Guyana’s plans for sustainable economic development.*

The principal **objective** is: *To establish an enabling environment to combat and reverse land degradation through a participatory process of capacity building, mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes, broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for SLM.*

### 2.4 EXPECTED RESULTS

The Project’s expected results are summarized in four **Outcomes** and twelve **Outputs** that are designed to mitigate the above-mentioned barriers:

#### **Outcome 1: Increased individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM at the national and regional level**

*Output 1.1: Land degradation is assessed using a widely accepted methodology*

*Output 1.2: Key watersheds are analyzed and better understood*

*Output 1.3: Government Agencies are trained in relevant early warning systems and natural resource valuation*

#### **Outcome 2: Mainstreaming and harmonization of SLM into the development framework**

*Output 2.1: Government staff demonstrate awareness of SLM concerns at the policy, institutional and regional and local government level*

*Output 2.2: Improved policy and legal instruments for SLM*

*Output 2.3: SLM integrated and NAP priorities harmonized into national development strategies and action plans to achieve MDGs*

*Output 2.4: SLM integrated into land use planning at the national and local planning level*

#### **Outcome 3: Resources for SLM implementation mobilized within an investment planning framework**

*Output 3.1: Identification of funding needs for SLM priorities*

*Output 3.2: Identification of incentives to stimulate investment in SLM*

*Output 3.3: Development Medium Term Investment Plan for SLM*



**Outcome 4: Effective Project management through learning, evaluation and adaptive management**

*Output 4.1: Adaptive management through, monitoring and evaluation determines the next phase of regional and community development*

*Output 4.2: Project execution through adaptive management*

**Objective Level Targets:** The Project has three Objective Level targets:

- By 2010, capacity built in over 25 organizations with over 100 persons benefiting from skills training
- By 2010, SLM incorporated into 1 national, 2 regional and 5 local land planning systems and being implemented on-the-ground
- By 2010 1 financing mechanism to sustain SLM developed and implemented

## 2.5 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS

The main stakeholders are the institutions responsible for land management and regulation, natural resources management, water, and environment planning:

- **Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC):** Responsible for allocation of state lands. SLM Project: Responsible for Project Execution, coordinating the PSC, awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):** Responsible for environmental assessments and issuing environmental permits. SLM Project: Member of PSC, collaborator in awareness and skills training
- **Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC):** Jurisdiction over State Forests. SLM Project: Member of PSC, collaborator in awareness and skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC):** Jurisdiction over subsurface mineral rights. SLM Project: Member of the PSC, awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Civil Defence Commission (CDC):** Responsible for disaster risk reduction and response. SLM Project: Collaborator in awareness and skills training
- **Hydrometeorological Services:** Responsible for the provision of hydro-meteorological services. SLM Project: Collaborator in awareness and skills training
- **Central Housing & Planning Authority (CHPA):** Responsible for housing. SLM Project: Collaborator in awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Ministry of Agriculture:** Responsible for agricultural lands. SLM Project: Collaborator in awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Ministry of Amerindian Affairs:** Responsible for Amerindian lands. SLM Project: Collaborator in awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development, Neighbourhood, Municipal, Regional and Village Councils:** Responsible for regional development. SLM Project: Awareness, skills training, integrating SLM into LUP processes
- **Iwokrama International Centre, Community Based Organizations, GuySuCo, Farmers Groups, Saw-millers, and Loggers and Miners Associations:** Awareness, skills training

### **3.0 ADEQUACY OF PROJECT DESIGN AND RELEVANCE**

In order to provide a framework for the evaluation, the consultant reviewed the Project design, intervention logic and monitoring framework as outlined in the available Project documentation.

#### **3.1 PROJECT DESIGN**

This is a well-structured Project that is very much aligned with national objectives. The project design is well conceived, and the Project document is very comprehensive, particularly for a medium-sized Project with a GEF investment of only US \$500,000.

The SLM Project was designed to operationalize the NAP by addressing the 3 identified barriers to land degradation through the provision of: 1) capacity development, 2) mainstreaming of functions and 3) sustainable financing. This approach was presented in Guyana's Third National Report on the Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (2006), which recognized the key land degradation issues facing Guyana as "floods, droughts and impacts of natural resource utilization in the mining, forestry and agricultural sector". The NAP proposed a number of actions to address these issues, principal among them being "rationalization of the planning and management of land resources including legislation and institutional arrangements and synergies, promoting education and awareness, undertaking training and capacity building, securing financial resources and establishing financial mechanisms, developing early warning systems and utilizing local knowledge".

The key immediate and critical long-term actions of the NAP were identified as:

1. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of current land use practices and factors contributing to degradation.
2. Finalization of a National Land Use Policy and develop a National Land Use Plan
3. Harmonize and strengthen institutional arrangements for land planning and management.
4. Identify and Implement Early Warning Systems for disaster preparedness

The outcomes of the SLM Project are aligned with these principal actions identified in the NAP. The SLM project also supports the preparation of a National Land Use Plan (NLUP) and the government's Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS).

However, although the SLM Project was well conceived, it appears to have suffered from some unrealistic assumptions about the policy development process and timely support involving other donor-funded projects. Its outcomes and objectives may have been a bit ambitious for a Medium Sized Project. A key observation of the MTE is that the project is unlikely to achieve all that was anticipated because of an overly ambitious design and unrealistic time frame (3 years) to implement such a comprehensive approach to SLM. As a result, some of the outputs have been delayed. This is primarily due to delays in the drafting of the National Land Use Plan and Policy, which was scheduled to be undertaken through the European Union (EU) funded Development of Land Use Planning Project, the commencement of which has been delayed until early 2011. Consequently, in June 2010, GLSC requested a 6-month extension of the SLM Project.

#### **3.2 PROJECT RELEVANCE**

The Project is highly relevant. It was designed to operationalize the NAP and was based on the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA). Land planning and management is of great importance to Guyana, where natural resources represent the most valuable resources to the Government; and consequently most policy and strategic decisions are based on the use of land resources. The SLM Project was expected to lay the groundwork for longer-term initiatives in the

area of land management, and has strong linkages with other initiatives and activities in the sector, including projects funded by the EU, ITTO, FAO, NGO's and various Government departments. More significantly, the SLM Project is intricately aligned with the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project, which is designed to strengthen the capacity of GLSC with the development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan, database development, updating of topographic maps and harmonisation of planning laws.

The strength of the sector's coordination can be credited to the Implementing Partner (GLSC), which is strategically aligned with and reports directly to the Office of the President. The former Commissioner, who took a strong and active role in ensuring investments in the environment and development sectors were well aligned, is currently working at the Office of the President on the LCDS. This should provide an opportunity for mainstreaming SLM concerns and coordination of natural resources agencies on SLM – a current gap in the project that could be remedied if there were closer linkages between SLM and LCDS.

### **3.3 ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **Effectiveness of Outcomes and Outputs**

The Project's outcomes and outputs are well conceived, in the sense that they are directed towards achievement of the objective, as well as contributing to the operationalization of the UNCCD NAP.

The Project document provides a thorough description of the barriers affecting Guyana's response to land degradation, which was based on the National Capacity Self-Assessment exercise (NCSA):

- ✓ Outcome 1 responds to the NAP's Barrier 2: "Capacity constraints at the individual, institutional and system levels".
- ✓ Outcome 2 responds to Barrier 1: "Insufficient harmonization of policies, overlapping mandates among institutions and limited understanding of roles and responsibilities and stakeholder involvement in SLM".
- ✓ Outcome 3 responds to Barrier 3: "Financial constraints".

Similarly, the overview of policies, strategies, plans and legislation listed in Annex C of the Project document provides a comprehensive breakdown of the issues and constraints surrounding the policy framework, land-use policy and land tenure, along with the current sectoral objectives, strategy, planning, institutional, and legislative frameworks governing land use planning.

It is clear that the baseline situation, comprising land degradation issues and capacity constraints in land use planning, appropriately forms the basis of the project design. Capacity constraints, mainstreaming needs and lack of financing combine to form the principal objective of the SLM Project.

Similarly, the Project logic provides a clear link between outcomes/outputs and the identified root causes: "Guyana's response to these root causes has been limited due to persistent barriers that affect national and local responses. Amongst these are policy, technical capacity, and financial barriers". The Project's interventions are designed to address and assist in the removal of these barriers and the root causes. However, because some of the SLM outputs are dependent on other projects (namely, the EU-funded LUP Project), there are some difficulties with the logical framework in providing clear direction for project implementation and monitoring.

### Effectiveness of Indicators

The Project's indicators are adequate for measuring the Project's *quantitative* interventions – involving for example the “number of organizations participating in SLM”, and “number of persons trained”. However, measurement of the overall impact will be more difficult because few *qualitative* indicators have been identified.

This shortcoming is common among capacity building projects where it is easier to focus on “process” rather than “impact” indicators. The framework's usefulness as a monitoring and evaluation tool could be improved if some indicators measured “impact” – for example, measuring how the Project will result in improved capacity at the individual, institutional and policy levels. However, few of the Project's resources are focused directly on building capacity to address these issues.

The current objective level indicator is quantitative and measures the “number of organizations participating in SLM at the national, regional and local level.” This indicator is measurable by tabulating the number of participating organizations and the number of people trained. However, measuring capacity building efforts is more difficult. This indicator cannot measure the overall qualitative impact of the Project's capacity building outcomes aimed at addressing the lack of individual, institutional systemic capacity associated with SLM issues. In this respect, it is difficult to measure the Project's effectiveness.

An attempt at identifying a qualitative measurement is provided in the second objective level target, which measures the incorporation of SLM into national, regional and local land planning systems. Also, an attempt at identifying a qualitative measurement is provided in the indicator for Outcome 1: “Number of National, regional and local organizations *applying SLM within their institutional and operational context*” (emphasis added).

Under Outcome 2, the principal indicator for measuring mainstreaming interventions is the adoption of SLM into the national planning frameworks. The passage of the National Land Use Policy is another key indicator for mainstreaming and indeed appears to be the lynchpin for the Project as a whole.

However, apart from baseline studies, workshops and training sessions, there are few project activities directed towards capacity building interventions to facilitate the application of SLM in the institutional and operational context, and few activities that will ensure the persons trained are able to apply the training in their workplaces. This is the heart of the Project, and as it stands, it will be difficult to measure the extent to which SLM has been integrated into national and sector strategies.

This highlights a problem that is partly related to Project design and partly to Project implementation. Indicators were not devised to monitor these capacity building aspects of the Project. The logical framework would be stronger if greater Project activity was focused on building capacity to integrate SLM into institutions and ensuring SLM was incorporated into national and sector strategies. In addition, some of the SLM Project outputs were delayed as it was anticipated that the EU-funded LUP Project (a substantially larger project with a budget of € 3 million) would build the requisite capacities within GLSC. Hence, a delay in the start of the LUP Project has affected achievement of the outcomes on the SLM project. This is a risk that was not identified at the outset of the SLM Project.

This is not an unusual situation, as Medium Sized Projects are often too ambitious and cannot

deliver on what they hoped to achieve. For example, the target of building capacity in 25 organizations is very ambitious, whereas 5 or 6 would have been more realistic. At this stage, the main task of the MTE is to determine what the SLM Project can realistically achieve in the remaining time and budget. There are two options: a) allocate additional resources to GLSC (eg., by recruiting a Policy Advisor) to ensure there is enough substantive capacity in terms of institutional change to meet the Project's objectives, and/or b) request a further extension of the SLM Project to allow time for the EU LUP Project to deliver the required outputs.

- *Recommendations: Consider recruiting a short-term Policy Advisor within GLSC and directing more Project activity towards interventions that will result in a deepening of capacity building efforts within stakeholder institutions*
- *Consider requesting a further extension (of 6 months) in order to give the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project time to get off the ground and to work out a transition plan for the two projects to achieve their respective objectives*

### 3.4 PROJECT FINANCING

Table 1 shows the source of funds for the Project, including the GEF contribution of US\$ 500,000 and co-financing totalling \$ 505,000 provided by the Government, UNDP and key stakeholder organizations such as GFC through projects with the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and FAO.

**Table 1: Source of Funds (\$ US)**

Source of Funds	Amount	PDF-A	Total
GEF	<b>475,000</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>
Co-Financing			
- UNDP	25,000		25,000
- Government in-kind	95,000	15,000	110,000
- Government-NGO cash	370,000		370,000
Co-Financing Total	<b>490,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>505,000</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>965,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>1,005,000</b>

Table 2 shows the allocation of Project financing by outcome, with particular sources of funds dedicated to specific project activities.

**Table 2: Project Budget by Outcome ('000s \$ US)**

Outcome	GEF	Co-finance		Total
		Gov't	Other	
1. Capacity Development for SLM	250	10	370	630
2. Mainstreaming SLM	75	20	25	120
3. Medium-term investment plan	50	15	0	65
4. Effective Project management through learning, evaluation & adaptive management	50	50	0	100
M&E (allocated to Outcome 4)	50	0	0	50
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>965</b>
PDF-A (allocated to Outcome 2)	25	15		40
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>1005</b>

## 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS TO DATE

The following section assesses the results achieved by the SLM Project to date, providing an assessment of the Project's objective and the operational components – the outcomes, outputs and targets.

The rating system follows UNDP's standardized system for rating the achievement of the Project objective and each outcome and output:

HS	Highly Satisfactory
S	Satisfactory
MS	Marginally Satisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory

### 4.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS AND TARGETS

#### Project Objective

Project Result	Target	Results to Date and Rating	Comments / Justification
<b>Objective:</b> To establish an enabling environment to combat land degradation through a participatory process, capacity building, mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes, broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for SLM.	1) By 2010, capacity built in over 25 organizations with over 100 persons benefiting from skills training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partly achieved: 100 persons have received training, but little in the way of institutional change has been observed</li> <li>MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of capacity building needs to be deepened to ensure the process of institutional change leads to achievement of the Project objective</li> </ul>
	2) By 2010, SLM incorporated into 1 national, 2 regional and 5 local land planning systems and being implemented on-the-ground. (Regional/local target changed to 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partly achieved:</li> <li>SLM is being implemented in 2 pilot sites, but not yet incorporated into national plans</li> <li>MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been delays in the EU-funded LUP Project, which may affect achievement of the SLM Project objective</li> </ul>
	3) By 2010, 1 financing mechanism to sustain SLM developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Output not achieved</li> <li>U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultancy for SLM financing has been delayed</li> </ul>

#### Comments/Recommendations: Project Objective

The “Marginally Satisfactory” rating for achievement of the objective is an estimate based on the Project's current trajectory. Some of the targets have been “partly achieved” and some have not been achieved, due to delays. This rating could be improved to “Satisfactory” if the Project is able to meet all its targets and follow the recommended remedial actions:

- *Recommendations: Clear policy guidelines need to be developed at the national planning/strategy level in order to provide leadership and guidance for SLM. This could be achieved through the convening of a special planning meeting of Commissioners*
- *The Project's capacity building interventions need to be deepened to ensure stakeholder*

*organizations are able to integrate SLM into their operations; and the Project needs to strengthen the link between training, capacity building and integration of SLM into the national development planning process. These could be facilitated through the recruitment of a short-term Policy Advisor within GLSC*

### **Outcome 1: Capacity Development**

Project Result	Target	Results to Date and Rating	Comments / Justification
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM at the national and regional level.	By 2010, 5 organizations are applying SLM within their institutional and operational context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partly achieved:</li> <li>MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual capacity increased by training</li> <li>Stakeholders and organizations find it difficult to apply SLM</li> <li>Stakeholders are waiting for policy guidance</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Land degradation is assessed using a widely accepted methodology	By 2008, situation analysis of Land Degradation completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieved</li> <li>S</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land degradation report and workshop rated highly by participants</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Key watersheds are analysed and better understood	By 2008, analysis of watersheds completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieved</li> <li>S</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Watershed report and workshop rated highly</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.3:</b> Government agencies are trained in relevant early warning systems and natural resource valuation	1) By 2009, six training sessions and workshops in EWS and resource valuation completed 2) By 2009, resource valuation in a pilot area completed. 3) By 2009 over 100 personnel from national, regional and local organizations benefited and participated in SLM training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieved</li> <li>S</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Warning Systems and Resource Valuation reports and workshops rated highly</li> <li>2 training sessions completed on: early warning systems (EWS) and resource valuation (RV)</li> </ul>

### **Comments/Recommendations: Outcome 1**

The Project has made excellent progress in completing 4 technical baseline studies on important areas associated with SLM, and organizing 4 workshops and training sessions involving some 100 participants from 40 organizations. A complete list of training programs conducted is attached at Annex 3.

During the evaluation interviews, participants indicated that the baseline studies, workshops and training sessions were highly informative. However, many participants found there was too much material to absorb. The theoretical nature of the sessions made it difficult for trainees to apply the concepts in practice in their operations. Participants found it difficult to adapt the case studies to their specific needs. Also, it was evident that not all participants attending the training sessions were the most appropriate representatives from their organizations.

This is an indication that training and capacity building efforts need to be more appropriately targeted to the desired audience. Currently, training sessions are being designed for senior decision makers who send junior officers in their stead. This suggests that more effort should be made to ensure the training is adapted to the schedule and delivery modes of the targeted trainees. The composition of additional training sessions and the specific elements required for a deepening of capacity building efforts could be discussed at the technical level through the establishment of a Technical Working Group comprised of representatives from key stakeholder institutions.

For example, according to Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC), the mining sector is working on a code of practice similar to forestry, and GGMC will need capacity building assistance to move the process forward.

The Project to date has done an excellent job of building the capacity of junior to mid-level managers. However, the Project has not yet made significant strides towards exposing senior level decision-makers and small miners and hinterland users to best international SLM principles and practices. Senior staff often find it difficult to participate in the type of formal training programs implemented to date, involving full-day training sessions lasting two or three days. Senior level decision-makers will be exposed to SLM concepts through the development and deliberation of major policy documents such as the LUP and LCDS. Senior stakeholders will be better reached through brief written materials, which could be fairly easily generated from the Project outputs to date.

Also, senior staff in stakeholder organizations indicated that they are waiting for guidance from policy makers regarding the application of SLM practices in their organizations. This appears to be a bottleneck that needs to be sorted out.

Ideally, the efforts made with junior officers will eventually reach resource users in the hinterland areas. But while it may be easier to target large mining and logging companies through their associations, it is the small miners and loggers that will benefit most from SLM concepts. More outreach effort is needed to target small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas. Iwokrama provides a good model for international best practice in timber harvesting (the only FSC certified operation in Guyana), whose practices could be replicated in other areas of Guyana.

In spite of these few shortcomings, the overall perception of the baseline studies, workshops and training sessions was very positive. With a bit more institutional capacity development follow up, many of these training programs should result in measurable improvements to SLM.

- *It is essential to target appropriate personnel in training and capacity building exercises. More effort should be made to ensure the training and capacity building is directed at the right people. The Project should consider developing brief written materials to inform senior level staff too busy to attend formal training sessions, and adjusting the training model to reach hinterland users.*
- *The Project should consider deepening of capacity building efforts and targeted training at key partner institutions, which could be facilitated through a Technical Working Group (TWG) comprised of representatives from key stakeholder institutions*
- *The Project should consider greater outreach efforts targeting small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas*
- *GGMC has identified a need for capacity building assistance to develop a code of practice similar to forestry, which may provide a good entry-point for mainstreaming SLM into the mining sector*



**Outcome 2: Mainstreaming SLM**

Project Result	Target	Results to Date and Rating	Comments / Justification
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Mainstreaming and harmonization of SLM into the development framework	By 2009, SLM incorporated into 1 National Strategy, 5 Action Plans and 5 Community Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partly achieved</li> <li>MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mainstreaming of SLM has started at pilot sites</li> <li>Harmonizing delayed with delay of N-LUP, affecting achievement of outcome 2</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs</b>			
<i>Output 2.1: Government staff demonstrate awareness of SLM concerns at the policy, institutional and regional and local government level</i>	By 2009, over 100 central, regional and local government personnel are aware of SLM and incorporating into their policies and programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partly achieved</li> <li>MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders are more aware of SLM concerns</li> <li>Stakeholders need policy direction and N-LUP to apply SLM at the institutional level</li> </ul>
<i>Output 2.2: Improved policy and legal instruments for SLM</i>	By 2009, a comprehensive analysis of existing policies and laws as they relate to SLM completed, together with consultative workshop and focused stakeholder dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not achieved</li> <li>U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of policy and legislative analysis, which is needed to improve policy and legal instruments for SLM</li> <li>Delayed because of delay in N-LUP Project. Target should be revised.</li> </ul>
<i>Output 2.3: SLM integrated and NAP priorities harmonized into national development strategies and action plans to achieve MDGs</i>	1 National Strategy (PRSP) and 5 action/national Plans incorporate SLM by 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not achieved</li> <li>U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little evidence of integration or harmonization of SLM into national development strategies and action plans</li> <li>Delayed because of delay in N-LUP Project. Target should be revised.</li> </ul>
<i>Output 2.4: SLM integrated into land use planning at the national and local planning level</i>	1) National Land Use Policy endorsed by Govt by 2009 2) National Land Use Plan prepared by 2009 3) 2 Regional and 5 community bodies incorporate SLM in their planning by 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not achieved</li> <li>U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delays in national land use policy and plan have affected achievement of output 2.4</li> <li>This is expected to occur under a new 2 year EU-funded Project</li> <li>Targets should be revised</li> </ul>

**Comments/Recommendations: Outcome 2**

Achievement of outcome 2 appears to be the lynchpin for the entire Project. It is essential for catalyzing actions needed to integrate sustainable land management into the national planning framework, as well as consolidating the capacity building efforts within key stakeholder institutions (outcome 1), and mobilizing resources for SLM within an investment planning framework (outcome 3).

There is evidence of participation by a range of stakeholders in SLM and there is commitment at the political, institutional, and local levels. However, while key decision-

makers and lead agencies have been sensitized in SLM, there is little evidence of integration or harmonization of SLM into national development strategies and action plans. The process for incorporation and preparation of SLM into national plans has been delayed.

The timely achievement of outputs under this outcome has been affected by delays in the development of the National Land Use Plan and Policy. This was primarily due to a delay in the start of the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project, which will effectively build on the foundation established by the SLM Project through: 1) strengthening capacity in GLSC in national and regional land use planning, 2) improving interaction and linkages between GLSC and stakeholders, and 3) rationalizing planning legislation to achieve some harmonization and bring the conflicting and overlapping planning under a “one stop shop” for all planning and land matters. However, because some of the EU Project’s outputs are integrated with some of the outputs of the SLM Project, the following outputs and activities on the SLM Project have been delayed:

*Output 2.2: Improved policy and legal instruments for SLM:*

Activity 2.2.1 Policy and Legislative Analysis Exercise (stakeholder engagements and workshop) on the integration of SLM into the National Land Use Plan and Policy.

Activity 2.2.2 Endorsement of National Land Use Policy by Government.

*Output 2.3: SLM Integrated and National Action Programme priorities harmonized into national development strategies and action plans to achieve Millennium Development Goals:*

Activity 2.3.1 Participate with a view to integrate SLM in the review and further development of policies, strategies and plans.

Activity 2.3.2 Providing support and assistance to the development of a National Land Use Plan.

*Output 2.4 SLM integrated into land use planning at the national and local planning level:*

Activity 2.4.1 Providing support to regional and community bodies to incorporate SLM in planning.

Because the EU Project was delayed until late 2010, GLSC requested an extension of the SLM Project until June 2011. Furthermore, a request was made to utilize GEF funds to contract a consultant with policy-related experience to draft key sustainable land management elements into the draft national land use plan and policy and to incorporate SLM into regional land use plans.

Because a single agency is executing both the SLM Project and the Development of Land Use Planning Project, the expectation is that synergies will be created between the remaining outputs of the SLM Project and the new EU-funded Project. However, a plan needs to be elaborated to ensure these synergies are clearly laid out. The current plan to provide “support and assistance to the development of a National Land Use Plan” is too vague to be measured. Instead, a detailed plan needs to be elaborated outlining what specifically will be undertaken by the EU-funded Project and the specific contribution of the UNDP/GEF-funded Project to the draft National Land Use Plan and Policy. The same outputs cannot be achieved on both projects.

Discussions during the evaluation lead the consultant to believe that there may be further delays on the EU Project. This may prompt the SLM Project to request for a further extension (of 6 months to December 2011), in order to give the EU Project time to get off the ground.

Similarly, an extension will provide more time to implement SLM awareness raising activities (output 2.1: development of handbooks, use of media and national and local awareness fora), which has only just begun. A new activity, generated from savings on other activities, has been proposed involving the provision of awareness-raising materials for over 500 primary and secondary schools. However, this activity appears to stretch beyond the original beneficiaries of the Project (stakeholder institutions), and targets schools – which is more EPA's constituency.

There is a lot of sensitivity about changing outputs or diverting funds on GEF projects, which the GEF Secretariat gets concerned about. Although the Project followed the formal mechanisms to change the outputs and activities, in the absence of a strong Project Steering Committee or Technical Working Group, the RTA and UNDP should provide technical support and advice in the re-programming of funds and revision of outputs.

The SLM Project is working on harmonization and integration of SLM and NAP priorities into national development strategies and action plans. But because the National Development Strategy (NDS – 1999) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP – 2001) were prepared prior to the National Action Programme (NAP – 2005), SLM concepts will have to be added to the national planning framework after the fact, either by decree or by addendum.

A recent study identified the lack of institutional planning, regulation and enforcement as the principal driver threatening the natural resource base in Guyana<sup>6</sup>. The SLM Project should consider additional activities related to national planning specifically involving harmonization and integration of SLM and NAP priorities into national development strategies and action plans. These are major factors identified in the Project document that will persist in the future, particularly with the National Land Use Policy and Plan (N-LUP), the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) and the push to clear the backlog of lease applications on the highway corridor.

- *Recommendations: there is a need to ensure political will and commitment is transferred into policy and legal instruments through an understanding and appreciation of SLM at the national and local level and to integrate SLM concepts within the current land use planning arrangements*
- *In order to guide the remaining Project activities and ensure integration and harmonization of SLM into national development strategies and action plans, the Project should convene a special policy meeting on SLM involving key policy makers, using the Land Use Policy and Plan as the convening context and the Office of the President as the coordinating group*
- *Make certain the N-LUP provides for an institutional coordination strategy for SLM*
- *Elaborate a detailed plan outlining what specifically will be undertaken by the SLM Project and the EU Project in relation to national land use planning*

---

<sup>6</sup> Guyana Country Environmental Profile, Final Report, Atkins (EC), June 2006

**Outcome 3: Resource Mobilization**

<b>Project Result</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Results to Date and Rating</b>	<b>Comments / Justification</b>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Resources for SLM implementation mobilized within an investment planning framework	By 2010, strategy and plan for mobilizing resources and investment developed and implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not achieved</li> <li>• U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome has been delayed because of difficulties with finding qualified consultants with experience in the region</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs</b>			
<i>Output 3.1: Identification of funding needs for SLM priorities</i>	1 Funding Needs Assessment Report prepared by 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not achieved</li> <li>• U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation and selection of experts to undertake this activity is underway</li> </ul>
<i>Output 3.2: Identification of incentives to stimulate investment in SLM</i>	1 Incentives Report prepared by 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not achieved</li> <li>• U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation and selection of experts to undertake this activity is underway</li> </ul>
<i>Output 3.3: Development Medium Term Investment Plan for SLM</i>	1 Plan prepared by 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not achieved</li> <li>• U</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation and selection of experts to undertake this activity is underway</li> </ul>

**Comments/Recommendations: Outcome 3**

Activities and outputs under outcome 3 have been delayed due to delays in procurement of consultants. The advertisement for consultants has been completed and the Project Associate is in the process of evaluating and selecting the experts to undertake this activity. Because of time and managerial constraints, the preference is to select a single firm to undertake all three activities: 1) Funding needs assessment, 2) identification of incentives and 3) development of a medium term investment plan for SLM.

The Government is actively soliciting financial resources from key donors and partners for land-related issues through innovative approaches such as the LCDS. There are obvious synergies between SLM and LCDS. The ideas and principles of sustainability in the management of land and resources are embodied in the LCD strategy. Also, the Project Associate recently made a presentation of Guyana's SLM Project at the Canadian Institute of Planners Conference in Montreal, under the theme Climate Change and Communities – Planning for Climate Change, where the SLM Project was introduced as a sector activity in support of the LCDS. It will be important, therefore, to continue to include the objectives of SLM financing in the Government's financing process under LCDS.

The SLM investment plan will be highly important. However, the issues regarding sustainable financing for SLM will likely not be completed until the National Land Use Policy and Plan and the LCDS are well underway. At present, the Ministry of Finance has not been sufficiently engaged in the SLM Project, which is critical for success – as outlined in the Project document<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> The national budget does not make a specific allocation to sustainable land management. These allocations will depend on buy-in from the finance ministry, which at the present time is unaware of land

- *Recommendations: include the financing objectives of SLM in the LCDS resource mobilization process*
- *The Project Manager should ensure that the Ministry of Finance is officially engaged in the SLM Project, as buy-in from Finance is critical for having SLM issues included in the national budget*

#### **Outcome 4: Adaptive Management**

<b>Project Result</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Results to Date and Rating</b>	<b>Comments / Justification</b>
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Effective project management through learning, evaluation and adaptive management	A robust monitoring and evaluation system that will promote effective adaptive management of the Project and identification of lessons learned that can be widely accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partly achieved</li> <li>• MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little evidence of robust monitoring or adaptive management; there is need for a more strategic approach</li> <li>• Leadership and guidance from the Steering Committee has waned</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs</b>			
<i>Output 4.1: Adaptive management through, monitoring and evaluation determines the next phase of regional and community development</i>	1) All recommendations incorporated in the regional and community planning system within 3 months of receiving recommendations. 2) 5 events executed (1 per year – plus incorporation of SLM into regional plans for communities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partly achieved</li> <li>• MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to disseminate information and lessons learned from the Project; the MTE process could provide the opportunity</li> <li>• The Project could facilitate a special stakeholder meeting in conjunction with the Office of the President</li> </ul>
<i>Output 4.2: Project execution through adaptive management</i>	At least 70% disbursement rate of annual budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partly achieved</li> <li>• MS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expenditure has been slow, only 44% of total budget disbursed</li> </ul>

#### **Comments/Recommendations: Outcome 4**

The Project has benefited from using internal staff from GLSC to manage the implementation process, as this will help to institutionalize Project results, instead of recruiting external consultants. The SLM Project has helped to strengthen project management at GLSC for executing other projects coming on stream, such as the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project and possibly another GEF-funded project.

The Project Associate has been commended for doing a diligent job with project execution. However, the Project has made little progress on the key institutional capacity results and the essential national planning processes. This lack of progress has more to do with assumptions made in the design and external factors that have led to delays in project activities than with the performance of the team implementing the Project. Policy guidance from the Government and strong project management from the PSC and GLSC also appear to be lacking.

Leadership appears to be needed to drive the SLM Project forward as it is attempting to coordinate a variety of agencies involved in land use management, many of which are waiting for guidance from

the policy level. Dialogue and guidance are necessary while the government formulates a national LUP and charts the way for a LCDS. The extent to which this can be achieved through the current membership of the PSC could be determined through the convening of a special stakeholder meeting comprised of Commissioners. It is beyond the scope of the MTE to suggest changes to the composition of the PSC, but rather to point out weaknesses in the Project that need to be addressed by the GLSC, its Board and the PSC.

In the absence of this leadership, more technical advice in monitoring project outcomes and providing strategic direction could be provided through the establishment of a Technical Working Group, and through UNDP/GEF.

- *Recommendations: The Steering Committee needs to be strengthened to enable it to provide GLSC more guidance on the strategic direction of project interventions, and advice on financial and operational oversight and accountability.*
- *In the absence of strategic leadership, a Technical Working Group should be established to provide advice in monitoring project outcomes and outputs*
- *The mid term evaluation process may provide the opportunity to convene a special stakeholder meeting on SLM attended by the relevant Commissioners. Such a session could also contribute to the sharing of lessons learned at the national and rural levels*

---

## **5.0 KEY FINDINGS**

---

The following section assesses Project management and implementation arrangements, stakeholder involvement and ownership, and provides an overall assessment of Project results and sustainability.

### **5.1 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT**

#### **5.1.1 Execution and implementation modalities (GLSC and UNDP)**

This Project is nationally executed (NEX), which is the most appropriate modality for building capacity in national institutions. GLSC has provided coordination with implementing partners and stakeholders and UNDP has provided oversight. The support of UNDP's office regarding management has been effective. The office enjoys very close relations with the GLSC and all other project stakeholders. UNDP's Programme Analyst for the Environment Portfolio is very qualified and has a great deal of experience with UNDP Guyana. The assigned Programme Associate is relatively new to UNDP but has solid knowledge and training. Both regularly monitor the Project's activity and offer technical and administrative support. The relationship with the SLM Project is collegial and productive.

#### **5.1.2 Implementation approach**

GLSC is the Implementing Partner (Executing Agency) for this Project. In 2003, responsibility for the National Focal Point for UNCCD was transferred from the Hydrometeorological Services of the Ministry of Agriculture to the Guyana Lands & Surveys Commission (GLSC) after it had been established as a Commission with direct responsibility for land management and reporting to the Office of the President.

In its capacity as Executing Agency, GLSC is responsible for directing the Project, meeting the immediate objectives and anticipated outputs, making efficient use of the resource allocation and ensuring effective coordination between this MSP and other projects in Guyana which are addressing land degradation and sustainable land management.

The mid-term ratings for most Project outcomes and outputs are low because of delays in major activities and the overall Project achievement to date. If these delays can be overcome, it is possible that the Project will be able to produce most of the deliverables as anticipated in the Project document. The quality of some deliverables to date has been appreciated by stakeholders, namely the baseline studies and training sessions. However, the strategic delivery of outputs could be improved during the remaining delivery period in order to maximize leadership on SLM issues and synergies with other initiatives, particularly through greater guidance from the PSC and/or a Technical Working Group.

Project implementation benefited from recruiting a Project Associate from within GLSC, which will help to institutionalize the Project results. This may also help to strengthen synergies with other planned projects, such as the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project and another planned GEF project.

Early on during implementation, the Project experienced good commitment from government, donors and NGOs, primarily because the Commissioner at the time had an intimate knowledge of the sector, respect from stakeholders and familiarity with the Project's anticipated results. However, following a change in management at GLSC, attendance at Steering Committee

meetings and commitment from stakeholders appears to have waned. With a significant number of Project activities outstanding and a need to carefully align many of these activities with national priorities, and to build sustainability into the final outcomes, the Project will now require a clear strategy and work-plan to guide it towards successful completion. This will require strategic guidance and leadership. In this respect, the Project should produce a simple work-plan detailing revised activities, schedules, and responsibilities, which should be vetted by the PSC.

The work plan should consider the possibilities of replication and a sustainability plan for Project activities, including methods to extract greater value from outputs, for example, through the convening of a special stakeholder meeting, deepening the capacity development activities, and aligning the SLM Project with the upcoming EU Project designed to strengthen land use planning.

### **5.1.3 Management arrangements**

The lead executing agency for the Project is the Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC), which reports to the Office of the President. GLSC is directly responsible for the timely delivery of inputs and outputs and for coordination with the other stakeholder organizations. The Project is being managed out of a PMU, which has primarily been a one-person-unit, the GLSC Project Associate, who spends 80% of her time on the SLM Project. Her enthusiasm for the SLM Project and management of activities has been recognized as outstanding. In order to bolster support to the Project results thus far, there is a need for a short-term Policy Advisor to be attached to the PMU to complement the administrative work being done by the Project Associate. The work of the Policy Advisor will complement the activities of the EU-funded Project coming on-stream, because one of the main objectives of the EU Project is to build the capacity of GLSC in land use planning.

The lagging performance of the PSC, outlined above, is an indicator of weak adaptive management. The Project should take advantage of its strategic location close to the Office of the President to ensure the Steering Committee is more actively involved in taking a leadership role in guiding the Project toward achievement of the intended objectives. The PSC should meet regularly and provide guidance on the selection of additional activities and leadership in ensuring the Project remains on track in spite of delays in some of the outputs. A Technical Working Group should be established to ensure the Project is able to build the requisite SLM capacity in stakeholder institutions.

- *Consider contracting a short-term Policy Advisor within the PMU at GLSC to improve the strategic approach to implementation and complement the administrative work of the Project Associate*

### **5.1.4 Reporting**

The Project follows both UNDP's and GEF's reporting requirements. The reporting structure was devised to satisfy the reporting format and timeframe of both organizations. This includes submitting quarterly reports, annual reports and Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), of which two have been completed (July 2008 to 30 June 2009, and July 2009 to June 2010). The Ministry of Finance (MoF) had encouraged the SLM Project to attend monthly meetings and submit Bilateral Portfolio Review Meeting reports. However, MoF's reporting period and format do not align with either GEF's or UNDP's. As a result, it was not practical to submit an additional report to satisfy the MoF.



The Project's quarterly reports are very brief and contain updates of activities completed. The PIRs provide more detail on progress toward the achievement of deliverables including constraints, mitigation measures and lessons learned. However, it is not clear if the Project team is reporting on the LFA indicators. The final PIR should provide more information on the indicators, and should include an explanation of the impact of Project activity resulting from the delay in the development of the National Land Use Policy and Plan, and its impact on achievement of Project outputs and outcomes.

In general, project reports should include more reflection on the strategic alignment of the Project in addressing SLM issues. This may include a brief update on challenges encountered, such as delays in development of the National Land Use Policy and Plan, as well as alignment with related projects and government policies, such as the EU Project and LCDS. Also, difficulties encountered with capacity development outcomes or lack of guidance from the Steering Committee should be reported. This would assist Project stakeholders and evaluators to better assess the Project's strategic impact.

- *PIRs should document strategic alignment of the SLM Project with other related interventions and challenges encountered and overcome*

#### **5.1.5 Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)**

As noted, the quarterly reports largely contain an update of project activities completed. The PIRs do contain some information on achievement of deliverables, constraints and mitigation measures. However, there is no record of adaptive management, particularly the need for strong Project leadership bolstered by a more strategic approach to compensate for possible challenges presented by the delay in development of the National Land Use Policy and Plan. This delay will almost certainly lead to delays in Project implementation. This should be taken into account in the minutes of Steering Committee meetings, or addressed at the technical level through the establishment of a working group, and reported in the PIR.

#### **5.1.6 Financial management**

Financial management appears to be sound. However, expenditure has been slow, due to delays in recruitment of consultants. As of September 2010, the Project had spent: US \$228,868 – 44 percent of the budget.

The Project has been quite cost-effective and has achieved a great deal with relatively low expenditure. Substantial cost savings have resulted on some activities, largely due to a competitive process for technical studies where consultants proposed budgets below what was in the SLM budget. Savings can also be attributed to the involvement of a national institution (EPA) contracted to produce public awareness activities and materials.

Table 3 shows that significant expenditures remain – GEF funds amounting to \$286,762. After 32 months of Project activity, only 44% of the budget has been disbursed. With such a high percentage left to spend in such a short time, there is a danger of rushing new activities through in order to disburse the budget. This situation increases the risk that funds will not be well spent.

Also, the Project may face additional challenges with the delay in the development of the National Land Use Policy and Plan under the EU Project. There is no guarantee that once the EU-funded Project gets under way, the SLM Project will be able to get back on-track.

**Table 3: Project Expenditures by Funding Source to September 2010:**

Source of Funds	2008	2009	2010	Total to Date	Project Funds	Balance Remaining	Disbursement Rate
GEF	71,003	105,727	52,138	228,868	515,630	286,762	44%
UNDP					25,000		
Sub-total	<b>71,003</b>	<b>105,727</b>	<b>52,138</b>	<b>228,868</b>	<b>515,630</b>	<b>286,762</b>	<b>44%</b>

Tables 3 and 4 present Project expenditures to date using the Project funds listed in UNDP's Atlas system. The figures represent an approximate reconciliation of expenditures, as Atlas shows allocations of \$275,000 and \$90,630 for Outcomes 1 and 2, whereas the original Project budget had allocations of \$250,000 and \$100,000 respectively, yielding a total of \$515,630 versus the original GEF/UNDP budget of \$525,000. The assumption is there was a revision to the original budget. Table 4 shows that while 76% of Outcome 1 has been disbursed, only 25% of Outcome 2, 4% of Outcome 3, 5% of Outcome 4 and 10% of PMU expenditures had been disbursed.

**Table 4: Approximate Expenditures (GEF & UNDP) by Outcome to September 2010**

Project Expenditures	Project Funds	2008	Annual Rate	2009	Annual Rate	2010	Total	Disburse Rate
Outcome 1	275,000	64,031	47%	90,164	76%	42,022	196,217	76%
Outcome 2	90,630	2,002	13%	15,563	57%	5,652	23,217	25%
Outcome 3	50,000	0	0	0	0	2,098	2,098	4%
Outcome 4	50,000	2,469	27%	0	0%		2,469	5%
PMU	50,000	2,501	42%		0%	2,513	5,014	10%
Sub-total	<b>515,630</b>	<b>71,003</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>105,727</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>52,138</b>	<b>228,868</b>	<b>44%</b>

Table 5 shows that of the \$286,762 remaining to be spent, approximately \$169,250 has been budgeted, leaving \$117,512 to be reprogrammed.

**Table 5: Planned expenditures (GEF & UNDP) by Outcome from Oct 2010 to June 2011**

Project Expenditures	2010	2011	Total
Outcome 1 – Teacher's kit		37,000	37,000
Outcome 2	13,000	19,000	32,000
Outcome 3	30,000		30,000
Outcome 4	40,250	30,000	70,250
Other			
<b>Total</b>	<b>83,250</b>	<b>86,000</b>	<b>169,250</b>

## 5.2 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND OWNERSHIP

### 5.2.1 Partnership strategy

One of the main goals of the Project involves coordinating some 25 institutions engaged in a range of activities surrounding SLM issues such as land management, environment planning and regulation, water, etc. Activities undertaken within the Project framework have been coordinated and targeted at these direct beneficiaries as well as other stakeholders. In this respect, the Project has attempted to engage and strengthen meaningful links with the stakeholder organizations. However, apart from the organization of training sessions and workshops, few meetings and coordination mechanisms have been organized. Such meetings and coordination mechanisms may have been able to produce better institutional capacity building results. This is an important aspect of the Project and there is a need to facilitate formal and in-formal cooperation among SLM stakeholders and decision-makers. The challenge remains to increase the level of

cooperation in order to deepen the capacity building activities attained thus far. This will be especially critical in the lead up to the development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan.

The Project has developed some linkages and synergies with other projects in the sector, particularly the EU-funded Project designed to complete the National Land Use Policy and Plan, and other initiatives supported by the Government (Low Carbon Development Strategy - LCDS) and NGO's (Guyana Shield Initiative).

One sentiment often repeated during the evaluation interviews was the extent to which the Project was able to create synergies around SLM issues. Participants were very much interested in applying SLM's "integrated approach" to natural resources management, embracing social, economic and environmental considerations.

During the formulation phase, the Project benefited from good commitment from government, donors and NGOs. However, participation on the Project Steering Committee has since waned. Much needed leadership in facilitating Project coordination and policy guidance has been lacking. As a result, stakeholders seem to be taking a wait-and-see approach regarding the application of SLM in their institutions, and appear to be waiting for policy guidance, especially regarding the uncertainties surrounding the LCDS. Commitment and informed decision-making from key PSC members needs to be revived in order to provide clear guidance to all stakeholders. This could be achieved under the auspices of the SLM Project by convening of a special "meeting of Commissioners" comprising Lands and Surveys, Forestry, Mining, etc.

- *Recommendation: Consider holding a special stakeholder meeting to discuss the way forward, incorporating issues and coordination mechanisms that will be necessary to achieve the objectives of the SLM Project, the transition to the EU-funded LUP Project and to discuss how these projects will support the LCDS*

### **5.2.2 Stakeholder involvement**

The Project is designed to benefit stakeholder institutions responsible for land management in Guyana – these include agencies responsible for forestry, geology and minerals, energy, natural resources, state lands and surveys, environmental protection and regulation, water, agriculture and livestock. Involvement in Project activities is high from all stakeholder institutions and within several government ministries. Activities thus far have included technical baseline studies, training sessions and public awareness. There has been a limited amount of effort directed toward capacity building and national planning interventions. This is something the Project may want to address in the future. The Project did not budget for specific capacity building activities within stakeholder institutions. This would deepen the capacity development within the organizations – and could be organized through the establishment of a Technical Working Group.

Frequently, during the implementation of SLM projects, leadership and guidance from the PSC and/or working groups can catalyze inter-institutional coordination and can provide the basis for a sustainable institutional framework. The issue of stakeholder participation and guidance from the PSC should be addressed.

- *Recommendation: A special effort should be made to strengthen participation on the PSC in order to provide strategic direction for the remainder of the Project, and an exit strategy*
- *The Project should consider establishing a Technical Working Group to provide guidance on the capacity building efforts needed in stakeholder institutions*

### 5.2.3 Country ownership

The Project has benefited from strong political commitment and country ownership. Commitment and ownership is displayed in several fundamental ways: a) Project design is intricately linked to national development priorities, b) members of the Steering Committee represent the key institutions responsible for land management, c) many counterpart-funded project activities are being co-financed by the key stakeholder organizations, activities such as sustainable forestry and low impact logging, and d) the Government has firmly committed to establishing an SLM investment plan based on project activities.

Furthermore, the ideas and principles of the SLM Project, surrounding sustainability in the management of land and resources, have been embodied in the Government's LCD strategy.

## 5.3 RESULTS AND ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVE (SUMMARY OF SECTION 4.0)

Much work is needed to achieve the objective: "To establish an enabling environment to combat and reverse land degradation through a participatory process of capacity building; mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes; broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for SLM."

The Project has responded to the needs of the key stakeholder organizations by strengthening staff capacity in understanding and, hopefully, applying practical applications of SLM principles and practices. The Project has promoted innovative activities, particularly through the production of baseline studies and raising awareness among key institutions responsible for land management. Very importantly, the Project has succeeded in generating a great deal of concern, support and knowledge regarding SLM. This is a significant achievement, because the Project has been able to engage many fragmented institutions that previously had little knowledge of applying an integrated approach to natural resources management – one that embraces social, economic and environmental considerations. In this respect, the Project has introduced a new way of doing things.

The challenge now is to ensure that the Project can maintain the momentum in order to deepen the capacity building achievements and address the more strategic issues associated with national land use planning.

Summarizing the assessment of results in Section 4.0: Outcome 1 has been partly achieved, where the baseline studies and training has been undertaken, but more effort is needed to turn the training outputs into institutional capacity building outcomes. Under Outcome 2, the delay in the national land use plan and policy, is delaying the attainment of major outputs. Outcome 3 has been delayed because of a delay in the recruitment of consultants. Outcome 4 has only partly been achieved.

It is evident that attaining the overall objective within the current timeframe will require concerted effort not only from project staff but also key stakeholders in Government and on other projects (namely the EU-funded LUP Project). The Project must also make certain that all remaining activities are better coordinated so they are strategically aligned to deliver synergistic results. In other words, the Project Manager should make certain that the policy, action plan, monitoring/assessment, public awareness, technical inputs, financial plans, etc. compliment each other so that the objective is achieved and resources are not wasted. In light of the delay in the development of the National Land Use Policy and Plan, the SLM Project should consider

requesting an extension for another six months (to December 2011) to allow time to consider how it will work with the EU-funded Project.

The Project should consider specific interventions that will be able to build capacities in key stakeholder organizations. Future activity might include working more closely with FSC, Iwokrama and GGMC to identify priority capacity gaps. For example, assisting GGMC to develop and implement a code of practice similar to forestry; and replicating in other regions what Iwokrama has been able to achieve in forestry and community development through FSC certification and low impact logging.

- *Recommendation: Consider extending the Project duration by another six months to allow for the deliberation of a clear strategy for aligning the SLM Project with the Development of Land Use Planning Project, and completing Project activities.*

## 5.4 REPLICATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

### 5.4.1 Replication

The Project has had good success providing training and promoting awareness in several areas associated with SLM, including land degradation, watershed management, resource valuation and early warning systems. The Project should be able to use the National Land Use Policy and Plan and other policy development activities to scale up SLM and replicate lessons learned nationally and possibly regionally. Other tangible outputs such as the handbook of SLM reports being developed by EPA will also be helpful.

The Project should consider how to maximize the return on existing investments in training and capacity building. There seems to be a great deal of enthusiasm from participants for a deeper level of SLM training that can be applied in practical ways in their institutions. The Project should assist these stakeholder organizations to capitalize on this momentum. Much of the information required for strategic direction and institutional capacity building could be addressed through the convening of a special meeting of stakeholders. However, it may not be very effective to have too many SLM outcomes dependent on a single meeting of stakeholders. It will be necessary to include some higher-level policy engagement and institutional capacity building options, such as measuring how national development policies have addressed SLM issues, and measuring how national institutional capacities have been strengthened.

- *Recommendations: The Project should develop a replication plan that outlines how the results of Project activities will be sustained, up-scaled, and/or replicated to maximize return on the initial capacity building investments.*
- *Devise some higher-level policy engagement and institutional capacity building options, such as measuring how national development policies have addressed SLM issues, and measuring how national institutional capacities have been strengthened.*

The Project may wish to formally consider how it will strengthen its replication approach during the remaining period of implementation. One focus of this should be to make certain that increased capacities are translated into action on several levels, including: (1) stakeholder institutions are benefiting from application of SLM principles and practices in their organizations; (2) policy reforms result in on-going improvements in government management of SLM issues, through the inclusion of SLM concepts in national land use planning and, (3) skill sets developed within the existing cadre of stakeholders benefiting from project activities are continually improved and spread more widely throughout the system. Also, the SLM Project could consider

developing closer links with other similar projects in Guyana such as UNDP's Guiana Shield Initiative, for which Iwokrama is a pilot site, which is looking at the issue of valuation of environmental services. However, at present, GLSC staff is focused on technical surveys, land administration, and GIS, and does not have the capacity or financial resources to manage inter-ministerial coordination or public awareness activities. Over the longer term, the EU LUP Project may help to strengthen the requisite capacities at GLSC. But in the shorter term, the SLM Project could do more to bring Guyana's natural resource agencies into the national planning framework, perhaps through the recruitment of a short-term Policy Advisor and the appointment of a Technical Working Group.

- *Recommendation: For better coordination of SLM issues, GLSC should appoint a special Technical Working Group from among Guyana's natural resource agencies.*

This Project has generated a significant amount of training publications and other materials, which may facilitate replication of the Project's lessons learned. For example, the development of the SLM handbook can serve as a reference manual for resource managers and decision-makers. In this respect, a request for re-programming of funds for additional awareness-raising activities was recently requested by GLSC and approved by GEF. However, more outreach effort may be needed to target small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas. For example, Amerindian land tilting has been accelerated with 14% of lands now under their stewardship, yet few Project resources have been devoted to SLM in hinterland areas. Iwokrama provides a good model for international best practice in timber harvesting (the only FSC certified operation in Guyana), whose practices could be replicated in other areas of Guyana. In addition, GGMC has identified a need for capacity building assistance to develop a code of practice similar to forestry. If there are funds remaining, the SLM Project could help GGMC develop the code of practice, through the recruitment of a Policy Advisor.

- *Recommendation: More outreach activities are needed to broaden the awareness of SLM principles and practices among other stakeholder institutions and in hinterland areas; for example Amerindian land tilting has been accelerated with 14% of lands now under their stewardship, yet few Project resources have been devoted to SLM in hinterland areas*

The sustainability of project outcomes could be greatly enhanced with the development of a simple website managed by GLSC staff. The website could provide a downloadable PDF version of the SLM handbook available for small-scale loggers, miners and farmers; it could house and supplement the new "teacher kits" that could be accessed by interested stakeholders; it could contain information regarding pending SLM issues, international and regional best practices, etc. In this way, the website could be an additional resource for mainstreaming SLM. The results of planning and monitoring activities could also be posted on the site.

- *Recommendation: Develop a website to serve as an SLM information center for resource users, decision-makers and land managers. Include a downloadable SLM handbook for practitioners.*

This Project is part of the UNDP/GEF LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management. It is one of the first SLM projects funded in the Caribbean. To facilitate replication, and to improve information sharing among the other small island states in the Eastern Caribbean, the Project should consider sponsoring a conference to disseminate lessons learned among regional stakeholders.

- *Recommendation: The Project should consider supporting a regional SLM conference in the Caribbean.*

#### 5.4.2 Prospects of Sustainability

As noted, the Project has successfully elevated national awareness of SLM and is in the process of mainstreaming and harmonizing SLM into the national development framework. The outcome of the N-LUP and the SLM financing plan activities will likely determine the prospects for sustainability. The Project should consider some of the suggestions of the MTE for the development of more tangible products that will promote lasting effort beyond the end of the Project (i.e., website). In addition, the Project should carefully consider how to expand the breadth and depth of the Project's impacts, i.e., determining how to translate the Project's training activity into capacity building results for practical operational changes in stakeholder institutions. Finally, the Project should devise a "transition plan", detailing the transition to the EU Project, as well as an exit strategy for sustainability following the end of the SLM Project.

The Project has not yet clearly shown how it has promoted institutional changes that will lead to cross-sectoral and inter-ministerial coordination on an implementation level. Presently, the Steering Committee is providing this inter-ministerial function. However, both the SLM Project and the National LUP Project should consider if a more permanent institutional framework will be useful in the future and, if so, the most appropriate configuration. Rationalization of the conflicting and overlapping legislative framework is something that the EU Project will undertake, possibly bringing planning (urban and regional) under one umbrella. The SLM Project should also provide a transition plan, because some SLM outputs are to be achieved through the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project (outputs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5).

Although perhaps not fully appreciated when the project was conceived, the SLM Project ended up laying the groundwork for longer-term initiatives in the area of sustainable land management, particularly those designed to strengthen GLSC, such as the EU-funded LUP. However, the issues of limited financial resources budgeted for SLM and limited capacity in GLSC need to be addressed before sustainability can be achieved. One suggestion is to start the process of merging oversight for the two projects under one Steering Committee.

- *Recommendation: The Project needs an exit strategy and a plan for transitioning to sustainability that will take effect following the completion of the EU-funded LUP Project; GLSC should consider establishing a common SLM institutional oversight mechanism for coordinating the SLM and LUP Projects by merging the two PSCs into one*

### 5.5 SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

Key Findings	Rating	Comments / Justification
Project Design	S	A well-designed Project that is a bit ambitious for a \$ 500,000 MSP
Project Relevance	HS	Highly relevant and aligned with national objectives and other projects
Logical framework	S	More qualitative indicators needed to measure capacity development outcomes; major outputs are dependent on other projects
Project financing	S	Adequate co-financing provided by stakeholder organizations, donors and Government (in-kind)

<b>Project Implementation &amp; Management</b>	MS	Major project activities experiencing delays; weak adaptive management and weak leadership
Execution and implementation modalities	S	Relationship between GLSC and UNDP is collegial and productive, providing adequate support to stakeholders
Implementation approach	MS	Quality of deliverables to date has been adequate, but lacking in leadership and strategic delivery of outcomes
Management arrangements	MS	Project management should be more strategic by engaging the Steering Committee or a Tech Working Group
Reporting	S	Reports have been adequate, but need to report on LFA & more strategic results
Identification and management of risks	MS	Adaptive management needs improving. The risk of delay in N-LUP affecting project outputs needs to be addressed
Financial management	U	Expenditure has been very slow; but cost-effective due to savings
<b>Stakeholder Involvement &amp; Ownership</b>	S	Project creating synergies around SLM issues and partners are committed
Partnership strategy	S	Need more meetings and coordination mechanisms to deepen practical application of training to build capacity
Stakeholder involvement	S	All stakeholder institutions responsible for land management involved.
Country ownership	S	High degree of support for project activity and appreciation of results
<b>Project Results</b>	MS	Project has raised awareness of SLM, but a concerted effort is needed to achieve results
Attainment of objective	MS	Project has to be more strategic to achieve objective, especially with LUP
<b>Replication &amp; Sustainability</b>	S	Project has the potential to capitalize on the momentum created in SLM
Replication	S	Stronger replication strategy needed, including project “exit strategy”
Prospects of sustainability	S	Have to consider deepening project impact in capacity and national planning, transition plan & exit strategy

## Ratings

HS	Highly Satisfactory
S	Satisfactory
MS	Marginally Satisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory



## 6.0 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

This is a well-conceived Project that is very much aligned with national objectives. However, its design was a bit ambitious for an MSP, and some of its major outcomes were dependent on the activities of other initiatives, primarily those associated with strengthening the capacity of GLSC and development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan.

So far, the Project has been able to act as a catalyst among stakeholder institutions responsible for land management in Guyana. There has been strong political commitment and country ownership for the Project as a whole, and a high degree of support among participating institutions for project activities, which have included technical baseline studies, training sessions and public awareness activities. Furthermore, the ideas and principles of sustainability in the management of land and resources have been embodied in the government's LCD strategy.

The mid-term evaluation ratings for most project outcomes and outputs are low. This is not surprising considering the delay with some major project outputs and activities, the most serious of which is the development of a National Land Use Policy and Plan, which is being financed by technical assistance provided by the EU. This delay has put the SLM Project in a difficult position, because some of the outputs of the SLM Project were dependent on outputs from the Land Use Planning Project – namely, Output 2.2: “Improved policy and legal instruments for SLM”, Output 2.3: “SLM Integrated and National Action Programme priorities harmonized into national development strategies and action plans to achieve Millennium Development Goals” and Output 2.4: “SLM integrated into land use planning at the national and local planning level”.

The hope is that, once these delays have been overcome, the SLM Project will be able to produce most of the deliverables as anticipated in the Project document. However, there is the danger of further delays on the EU-funded Project, which will affect achievement of outcomes on the SLM Project. For this reason it is suggested that the SLM Project request another extension (an additional 6 months to December 2011), to give the EU technical assistance team time to get their Project started, and to allow the SLM Project to work out a transition plan.

Furthermore, because of this predicament, the SLM Project now requires a clear strategy and work-plan to guide it towards successful completion. This plan will require strategic guidance and leadership from the Project Steering Committee with input from a Technical Working Group, UNDP and GEF. This plan should contain a strategy for deepening the training outputs into institutional capacity building results, and for aligning the national planning outputs with the upcoming EU Project.

The primary **recommendations** are as follows:

### ***Project Objective***

1. *Clear policy guidelines need to be developed at the national planning/strategy level in order to provide leadership and guidance for SLM. In order to guide the remaining Project activities and ensure mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and to ensure a smooth transition to the EU-funded LUP Project, the SLM Project should convene a special planning meeting of Commissioners involving key SLM policy makers, using the National Land Use Policy and Plan as the convening context and the Office of the President as the coordinating group*

2. *The Project's capacity building interventions need to be deepened to ensure stakeholder organizations are able to integrate SLM into their operations; and the Project needs to strengthen the link between training, capacity building and integration of SLM into the national development planning process. These could be facilitated through the recruitment of a short-term Policy Advisor within GLSC.*
3. *Consider requesting a further extension (of 6 months to December 2011) in order to give the EU-funded Development of Land Use Planning Project time to get off the ground and to work out a transition plan for the two projects to achieve their respective objectives*

#### **Outcome 1: Capacity Development**

4. *It is essential to target appropriate personnel in training and capacity building exercises. More effort should be made to ensure the training and capacity building is directed at the right people. The Project should consider developing brief written materials to inform senior level staff too busy to attend formal training sessions, and adjusting the training model to reach hinterland users*
5. *The Project should consider deepening of capacity building efforts and targeted training at key partner institutions, which could be facilitated through the establishment of a Technical Working Group (TWG) comprised of representatives from key stakeholder institutions*
6. *The Project should consider greater outreach efforts targeting small miners and loggers in Amerindian communities and hinterland areas*
7. *GGMC has identified a need for capacity building assistance to develop a code of practice similar to forestry, ; by providing assistance to GGMC the Project may uncover a good entry-point for mainstreaming SLM into the mining sector*

#### **Outcome 2: Mainstreaming SLM**

8. *There is a need to ensure political will and commitment is transferred into policy and legal instruments through an understanding and appreciation of SLM at the national and local level and to integrate SLM concepts within the current land use planning arrangements*
9. *Make certain the N-LUP provides for an SLM adaptive management and institutional coordination strategy*
10. *Elaborate a detailed plan outlining what specifically will be undertaken by the SLM Project and the EU-funded LUP Project in relation to national land use planning*

#### **Outcome 3: Resource Mobilization**

11. *The Project Manager should ensure that the Ministry of Finance is officially engaged in the SLM Project, as buy-in from Finance is critical for having SLM issues included in the national budget*
12. *In order to increase the likelihood of resource allocation for SLM issues, the Project should try to ensure the financing objectives of SLM are integrated into the Government's resource mobilization process for LCDS*

#### **Outcome 4: Adaptive Management**

13. *The Steering Committee needs to be strengthened to enable it to provide GLSC more guidance on the strategic direction of Project interventions, and advice on financial and operational oversight and accountability*

14. *In the absence of strategic leadership, a Technical Working Group should be established to provide advice in monitoring project outcomes and outputs and to better coordinate SLM issues among stakeholder institutions*
15. *The mid term evaluation process may provide the opportunity to convene a special stakeholder meeting on SLM attended by the relevant Commissioners. Such a session could also contribute to the sharing of lessons learned at the national and rural levels and perhaps throughout the Caribbean region.*

#### **Implementation and Management Arrangements**

16. *Consider contracting a short-term Policy Advisor within the PMU at GLSC to improve the strategic approach to implementation and complement the administrative work of the Project Associate*

#### **Reporting**

17. *PIRs should document strategic alignment of SLM Project with other related interventions and challenges encountered and overcome*

#### **Stakeholder involvement**

18. *A special effort should be made to strengthen participation on the PSC (and through a TWG) in order to provide strategic direction to stakeholder institutions for the remainder of the Project*

#### **Replication**

19. *The Project should develop a replication plan that outlines how the results of Project activities will be sustained, up-scaled, and/or replicated to maximize return on the initial capacity building investments; include some higher-level policy engagement and institutional capacity building options, such as measuring how national development policies have addressed SLM issues, and measuring how national institutional capacities have been strengthened*
20. *More outreach activities are needed to broaden the awareness of SLM principles and practices among other stakeholder institutions and in hinterland areas; for example, Amerindian land tilting has been accelerated with 14% of lands now under their stewardship, yet few Project resources have been devoted to SLM in hinterland areas*
21. *Develop a website to serve as an SLM information center for resource users, decision-makers and land managers. Include a downloadable SLM handbook for practitioners.*
22. *The Project should consider supporting a regional SLM conference in the Caribbean.*

#### **Sustainability**

23. *The Project needs an exit strategy and a plan for transitioning to sustainability that will take effect following the completion of the EU-funded LUP Project; GLSC should consider establishing a common SLM institutional oversight mechanism for coordinating the SLM and LUP Projects by merging the two PSCs into one.*

The main **lessons learned** from the Project are as follows:

1. Project Design: Medium Sized Projects are often ambitious in design and find it difficult to deliver on what they hoped to achieve. It is important to use realistic assumptions about the Government's policy development processes and timely support involving other donor projects

2. Building Capacity: Capacity building projects, and particularly those based primarily on training, should be designed to make certain tangible products are developed that may be used by practitioners and activities link training to practical on-the-job mentoring.
3. Institutional Development: In defining activities on projects where there is a high degree of institutional fragmentation, overlapping mandates and limited understanding of roles and responsibilities, it is important to develop coordination mechanisms to facilitate an improved institutional framework.
4. Leadership: It is essential to ensure commitment is maintained from senior level stakeholders, particularly where strategic decisions, policy guidance and leadership are needed to catalyze inter-institutional coordination.
5. Strategic Alignment: Predicating project success on the timely adoption of policies is inherently risky, particularly on projects involving multiple sources of funding. Contingency plans and strategic implementation approaches should be in place to deal with delays, increase efficiency and enhance synergies.
6. Capacity Issues: Capacity issues are a constraint to implementing longer-term projects. However, these must be looked at in tandem with those projects, otherwise the risk of failure is greater.

## **Annex 1**

### **List of Persons Interviewed, Site Visits and Documents Consulted**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation / Division</b>
Guyana Lands & Surveys Commission (GLSC)	Mr. Doorga Persaud *	Commissioner of Lands and Surveys
	Ms. Andrea Mahammad	SLM Project Associate
United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	Ms. Patsy Ross	Environment Program Analyst
	Ms. Nadine Livan	Environment Program Associate
	Dr Patrick Chesney	Project Manager, Guyana Shield
	Mr Didier Trebucq	Deputy Resident Representative
	Mr Kenroy Roach	M & E Analyst
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Dr. Indarjit Ramdass *	Executive Director
	Ms. Juliana Persaud	Natural Resources Management
	Ms. Padmini Persaud	Education Division
	Ms. Teijvarti Persaud	Coastal Zone Officer
	Mr Damian Fernadnes	Natural Resources Management
Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC)	Mr. Chetram Ramgobind	Forest Officer
	Mr. Gavin Agard	Environmental Monitoring
	Ms. Darshini Rampersaud	GIS Officer
	Mr. Jagdesh Singh	Forest Officer
Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC)	Mrs. Karen Livan *	Manager, Environmental Div.
	Mr. Wendell Alleyne	Senior Environmental Officer
	Mr. William Woolford	Commissioner (ag.)
Civil Defence Commission (CDC)	Captain Kester Craig	Operations & Training Officer
	Mr. Paul Saunders	Disaster Risk Mgt Consultant
	Ms. Denise Fraser	Project Coordinator-DRR Project
Guyana Water Inc.	Ms. Savitree Jetoo	Scientific Services Manager
Hydro-meteorological Services (Ministry of Agriculture)	Ms. Odessa Shako	Ozone Officer
	Mr. Kelvin Samaroo	Meteorological Technician
Iwokrama	Dr. Raquel Thomas	Director of Training
Ministry of Finance	Ms. Audrey Nedd-Johnson	Project Cycle Management Division
Office of the President	Mr. Andrew Bishop *	Presidential Advisor on Land & Environment
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	Mr Peter Hutson	GENCAPD Project Engineer
	Mr Mortimer Livan	GENCAPD Consultant
European Union (EU)	Mr. Thorsten Strand	Program Officer, Infrastructure

\* Member of Steering Committee

### **Site Visits**

1. Visited various sites on the Soesdyke/Linden Highway, September 22
2. Visited Iwokrama's low-impact logging operations in the Rupununi, September 29

## **List of Documents Consulted**

### **Project Documentation**

SLM Project Inception Workshop Report, GoG/UNDP, March 2008

National Assessment of Land Degradation in Guyana: Diagnostic Report, Development Policy & Management Consultants, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, 2008

Report of Assessment of Land Degradation in SLM Pilot Area, Development Policy & Management Consultants, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, 2008

Manual for Land Degradation Assessment Training Workshop, Development Policy & Management Consultants, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, 2008

Situation Analysis of Watershed Management in Guyana, Spatial Systems Caribbean Ltd., GLSC/GEF/UNDP, December 2008

Watershed Bio-physical and Social Assessment Report of a Pilot Site, Spatial Systems Caribbean Ltd., GLSC/GEF/UNDP, May 2009

Watershed Management Plan: Stakeholder Consultation Workshop Report, Spatial Systems Caribbean Ltd., GLSC/GEF/UNDP, June 2009

Watershed Assessment Management Plan, Spatial Systems Caribbean Ltd., GLSC/GEF/UNDP, July 2009

Resource Valuation Study: Case Study Report, Lars Hein, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, June 2009

Resource Valuation Study: Stakeholder Consultation Workshop Report, Lars Hein, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, August 2009

Resource Valuation Study: Final Report, Lars Hein, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, October 2009

Early Warning System Study: Situation Analysis Report, Flasse Consulting, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, November 2009

Early Warning System Study: Stakeholder Consultation Report, Flasse Consulting, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, March 2010

Early Warning System Study: Final Report, Flasse Consulting, GLSC/GEF/UNDP, March 2010

### **National Planning Documents**

The Guyana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, 2001

Poverty Reduction Strategy – Progress Report 2005

Guyana National Development Strategy

Low-Carbon Development Strategy: Transforming Guyana's Economy While Combating Climate Change, Office of the President, May 2010

National Report on the Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, GLSC, First (April 2000) and Third (May 2006)

### **UNDP/GEF Documents**

Measuring and Demonstrating Impact, UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 2), 2005

Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results, UNDP, 2009

Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies for Conducting Terminal Evaluations, GEF, 2007

### **Other Documents**

Technical Assistance for Development of Land Use Planning, Terms of Reference, EU, 2008

**Annex 2****Members of the Project Steering Committee (and Changes)**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>DESIGNATION</b>	<b>(CHANGES)</b>
Mr. Andrew Bishop	Guyana Lands & Surveys Commission (GLSC)	Chief Executive Officer	Replaced by Mr. Doorga Persaud (April, 2009)
Dr. Indarjit Ramdas	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Natural Resources Management Division Director	
Mr. Tasreef Khan	Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC)	Deputy Commissioner of Forests	
Mrs. Karen Livan	Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC)	Manager-Environmental Division	
Captain Kester Craig	Civil Defence Commission (CDC)	Operations & Training Officer	
Dr. Paulette Bynoe	University of Guyana (UG)	Director- School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Guyana	

**Annex 3****List of Project Deliverables to Date**

1. SLM Project **Inception Workshop Report** (March 2008)
2. **Assessment of Land Degradation Study**: This exercise was undertaken on a national scale and in a pilot area between August and October 2008.
  - ✓ **Reports**: 3 reports were prepared in 2008:
    - a) National Assessment of Land Degradation in Guyana: Diagnostic Report
    - b) Assessment of Land Degradation of SLM Pilot Area
    - c) Manual for Land Degradation Assessment Training Workshop
  - ✓ **Training**: 22 key stakeholders representing 18 organizations involved in the management, monitoring and regulation of natural resources participated in a training session on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2008
3. **Watershed Analysis and Management Study**: This involved undertaking a situation analysis of watershed management in Guyana and a pilot study of the Demerara Watershed, a critical watershed on the Soesdyke/Linden Highway.
  - ✓ **Reports**: 5 reports were prepared:
    - a) Situation Analysis of Watershed Management in Guyana (Dec 2008)
    - b) Watershed Modeling Training Workshop (April 21, 2009)
    - c) Watershed Bio-physical and Social Assessment Report of the Pilot Site, the East Demerara Conservancy and the coast (May 2009)
    - d) Stakeholder consultation report (June 2009)
    - e) Watershed Assessment Management Plan (July 2009)
  - ✓ **Training**: 21 key stakeholders involved in water quality regulation, distribution and monitoring, weather and climate systems forecast and prediction, and spatial analysis, attended a two-day watershed modeling and management training program on April 20-21, 2009
  - ✓ **National Consultation Workshop**: 23 Participants from 17 institutions attended a National Consultation Workshop on May 9, 2009 to respond to the Draft Watershed Management Plan
4. **Resource Valuation Study**: A study was undertaken to provide practical knowledge of valuation methods for assessing environmental goods and services, eco-systems and resources.
  - ✓ **Reports**: 3 reports were prepared
    - a) Case Study on the value of resources in the Pilot area, Soesdyke/Linden corridor (June 2009)
    - b) Stakeholder Consultation Workshop Report (August 2009)
    - c) Resource Valuation Study (October 2009)
  - ✓ **Training**: 22 participants from 13 organizations with authority and management functions in valuation of resources, environmental management and protected areas systems attended a 5-day training session (Mar 2-6 2009).
  - ✓ **Stakeholder Consultation Workshop**: A consultation workshop was held on August 17, 2009 attended by 22 participants from 13 organizations
5. **Early Warning System Study**: An EWS study was undertaken to demonstrate the need for an EWS for disaster preparedness, and emergency plans to mitigate droughts, floods and other natural disasters in Guyana.
  - ✓ **Reports**: 3 reports were prepared:
    - a) Situation Analysis Report (November 2009) providing details on the key vulnerabilities and priorities for further disaster response & preparedness



- b) Training Materials & Report on EWS (January 2010)
- c) EWS Study Final Report (March 2010)
- ✓ Training: 38 stakeholders participated in a two-day EWS Training Workshop in January 2010, with representatives from 23 organizations.
- ✓ Stakeholder Consultation Workshop: A Stakeholder Consultation Workshop was held on February 17, 2010 to present a Draft Final Report on EWS.

**Table Showing Stakeholder Participation in Training Sessions and Workshops**

Participants, Organizations	Land	Watershed		Resource Valuation		EWS	
	LD	2-Day Training	Consult Workshop	5-Day Training	Consult Workshop	2-Day Training	Consult Workshop
GLSC	4		3	4	3	5	5
EPA	1		2	3	1	2	2
GFC	1		3	1	2	2	2
GGMC	2		1	1	1	1	1
CDC	1		1	1		5	
Uni of G	2		1				
Hydromet			1	1	2	3	1
CHPA				1	1		
MOAA				1	2	2	
GWI	1		1			1	
Local Gov't	1		1	1		1	
WWF	1						
GEA	1						
Iwokrama	1		1	1	1	1	1
Bosai Minerals	1						
RDC 4			1	1			
UNDP	1		2	3		3	1
NPC	1						
R10 AFPA	1						
MOA							1
GuySuCo	1			1	1	1	
Soils & Plant	1						
ND&IA			1			1	1
NARI			1			1	
Wildlife			1				
Fisheries				1	2		
GRA Project					2		
Env Health			1				
Min of Health						1	
Guyana Shield			1		2		
Min of Finance				1	2		
G Defence F						2	1
UNICEF						1	1
Fire Service						1	1
Sea & River						2	1
Map Action						1	
Red Cross						1	
Communication						1	
CARICOM							1
<b>Participants</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>No. of Orgs</b>	<b>17</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14</b>

**Annex 4****TERMS OF REFERENCE****Mid-Term Evaluation**

PIMS 3413 – Atlas Project ID 00047476

***Capacity Development and Mainstreaming for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project*****1. Background and Context**

Guyana has an area of 216,000 square kilometres and a multi-ethnic population of approximately 765,000. The country is well endowed with natural resources including fertile agricultural lands, diversified mineral deposits, and an abundance of tropical rain forests. Most of the population resides on the coastal plain where the Guyana's most fertile lands are located. The majority of the agricultural sector is concentrated within this area, a strip (430km long by 5 - 40 km wide) that lies about 1.4 meters below mean high tide level. Natural and man-made sea defences protect this region.

Within the last decade, Guyana has experienced unpredictable changes in weather patterns characterised by the severe drought, experienced in 1998-9 and extreme levels of precipitation on the coast in 2005 and 2006 resulting in breaches in the sea defence system and widespread flooding along the coast. Within the coastal zone, the issues of sea level rise, destruction of mangroves, and coastal subsidence add to the pressures on coastal sea defence system. Additionally, some of the vegetative cover on the coastal zone and the sandy plains further inland has been lost to competing activities such as mining, agriculture, human settlements, harvesting for fuel wood to make charcoal.

The Guyana National Action Plan (NAP) prepared under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) recognizes key land degradation issues facing Guyana -floods, droughts and impacts of natural resource utilization in the mining, forestry and agricultural sector and proposes a number of actions to address these issues, principal among them being rationalization of the planning and management of land resources including legislation and institutional arrangements and synergies, promoting education and awareness, undertaking training and capacity building, securing financial resources and establishing financial mechanisms, developing early warning systems and utilizing local knowledge.

The **overall goal** of this Project is to promote global and local benefits through enhanced eco-system health, integrity, stability and functions in the context of Guyana's plans for sustainable economic development. The **principal objective** is to establish an enabling environment to combat and reverse land degradation through a participatory process of capacity building; mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes; broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for sustainable land management (SLM). Realisation of the project objective will generate national benefits by more effective management and streamlined communication of SLM concerns across multiple stakeholders, projected investments in support of a mid-term plan, and through better developed and equipped human capital.

The following are the specific outcomes of the project:

- a. Increased individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM at the national and regional levels;
- b. SLM mainstreamed and harmonised into the local and national development framework.

c. Investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM.

**The total budget for the project is US\$1,005,000 corresponding to a GEF increment of US\$ 500,000 and \$505,000 in co-financing.**

## **2. Evaluation Purpose**

This evaluation is in keeping with the requirement of GEF project document which stipulated a midterm evaluation. The UNDP/GEF monitoring and evaluation policy has four objectives:

- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E.

The purpose is to assess implementation thus far, the project's relevance, efficiency, and potential sustainability. This mid-term evaluation should identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The results this evaluation would be used by the Implementing Partner (IP) Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This evaluation is included in the UNDP Country Office Evaluation Plan.

## **3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The Evaluation would consider the project objectives, inputs, outputs and activities during the first 18 months of the project workplan proposed in the project document.

The primary issues would be the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the outputs. This review should provide insights on the successes and weaknesses of the project thus far, and provide recommendations as to how to proceed and tackle issues in the next stages of the project. More specifically, this evaluation should consider the effectiveness of the project and the outputs it has produced, as well as the timeliness of implementation. Furthermore, a review of the management and decision-making processes should also be carried out. To establish the effectiveness and timeliness of the project, the activities and indicators in the project document will have to be reviewed. Where necessary, adjustments to the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework should be proposed for review by the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

## **4. Evaluation Questions**

### **Questions to be answered from this evaluation**

- Were stated outputs achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

## **5. Methodology**

This Evaluation would be carried out through:

**5.1** Review of reports and documents

**5.2** Interviews individual and group and key informants using predetermined questions to obtain in-depth information on impressions and experiences, explore opinions, about the initiative, their understanding, and collect information about tangible and non tangible changes wherever possible.

**5.3** On-site observations

## **6. Evaluation Products (Deliverables)**

**6.1 Evaluation inception report**—An inception report detailing the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and the deliverables, designating a team member (if applicable) with the lead responsibility for each task or product.

- **Draft Evaluation Report with the key outputs being:**

- Context of the project, adequacy of the project design, stakeholder involvement and ownership, evaluation of the outputs so far and findings and conclusions.
- Recommendations: for future implementation; identified barriers and how to address these; adjustment of M&E framework.
- Lessons learned: design of project; engagement of stakeholders; management of project; strategy for implementation

- **Final Evaluation Report**

## **7. Evaluator/Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

### **7.1. Profile**

The evaluator should have a minimum qualification of MSc. in a field closely related to the consultancy and demonstrate the following characteristics:

**TECHNICAL EXPERTISE** - Understanding of, and experience in, the required evaluation methodologies.

- **SECTORAL EXPERTISE** -Expertise in the sectoral area of the project being evaluated – sustainable land management or closely related area
- **IMPARTIAL** - No conflict of interest with any of the parties involved in the project evaluation.
- **GOOD COMMUNICATOR and INTERPERSONAL SKILLS** -Able to communicate the evaluation results in a manner that is easily understood by all parties. Able to interact with all parties in a sensitive and effective way.
- **AVAILABLE** -Be available to conduct the evaluation at the required level of depth in the specified timeframe.

Additionally, the evaluator selected should meet the following requirements:

- Know UNDP/GEF, its programmes, operations and evaluation procedures.
- Be available for intensive work within required timeframes.
- Always bring fresh perspectives, insights, experience and recent state-of-the-art knowledge.

- Be aware of constraints on feasibility of recommendations.
- Be free for full participation or intensive work

Familiarity with local political, cultural, and economic environment would be an asset.

The evaluator should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the project.

### **8. Evaluation Ethics**

This evaluation should be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The following and should be addressed in the design and implementation of the evaluation:

- 8.1** Evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data,
- 8.2** Provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and
- 8.3** Protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

### **9. Implementation Arrangements**

- Role of UNDP personnel – Recruit, select and approve evaluators in consultation with Lands and Surveys Commission. Approve Final Evaluation report and ensure the overall quality of evaluation
  - Role of Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (IP) – Provide logistical and documentary support to evaluators in the implementation of Evaluation. Finally, review evaluators' inception report and provide feedback on areas for strengthening, review and provide substantive feedback on the findings of the evaluation in the form of a management response to be submitted to UNDP Guyana. Organise and facilitate debriefing with relevant stakeholders on findings of the Evaluators Report.
  - Procedures to amend TOR – for amendments to this TOR, specific requests can be made to the UNDP Guyana. Consultations will take place between UNDP and the IP to arrive at a decision on proposed changes. Final responsibility for effecting a change to TOR resides with UNDP Guyana.
  - Reporting relationships – Consultants will submit evaluation deliverables to UNDP Guyana.

### **10. Time-frame for the Evaluation Process**

- Desk review -----2 days
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report -  
----- 2 days
- In-country evaluation mission (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires) -----  
-----4 days
- Briefings of/from evaluator(s) in-country -----0.5 day
- Presentation (in-country) of the preliminary findings to UNDP and GLSC ----.5 day
- Preparing the draft report ----- 2 days

- Incorporating comments after circulation of the full draft report and finalizing the evaluation report -----1 day

## **11. TOR's Annexes**

- **Key stakeholders and partners**—A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, together with an indication of their affiliation and relevance for the evaluation and their contact information. This annex can also suggest sites to be visited.
- See Annex 1 for list of stakeholders at a stakeholder consultation workshop and training workshop during the first 18 months of the Project.
- **Documents to be consulted**—A list of important documents and webpages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
  - Relevant national strategy documents such as the *National Action Programmes 2000, 2002 and 2006 prepared under the framework of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification*, the *National Development Strategy* and the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*.
  - Strategic and other planning documents (e.g. programme and project documents such as *SLM Project Document*, the *National and Pilot Site Diagnostic Land Degradation training handbook and Final Reports*, *Situation Analysis of Watershed Management in Guyana*, *Final Report on the Watershed Bio-physical and Social Assessment of the Demerara Sub-Watershed and Training Workshop of Watershed Modelling in a GIS using a Soil and Water Assessment Tool* )
  - Monitoring plans and indicators
  - UNDP evaluation policy, UNEG norms and standards, and other policy documents
  - Required format for the inception report

## SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK

**TABLE 14. STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK TABLE**

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Goal:</b> To promote global and local benefits through enhanced ecosystem health, integrity, stability and functions in the context of Guyana’s plans for sustainable economic development.					
Conceptual Framework	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective of the project:</b> to establish an enabling environment to combat land degradation through a participatory process, capacity building, mainstreaming of SLM into national development strategies and processes, broad stakeholder participation and resource allocation for SLM.	Number of organizations participating in SLM at the national, regional and local level	Limited capacity for SLM exists and is confined to 1 regulatory agency with no planning system for SLM or financial mechanisms for SLM integration	By 2010, capacity built in over 25 organizations with over 100 persons benefiting from skills training	Training workshops and seminars completed	Adequate political and social stability in the country.
			By 2010, SLM incorporated into 1 national, 2 regional and 5 local land planning systems and being implemented on-the-ground	Plans endorsed by stakeholders and available	Key stakeholders at the national, regional and local level maintain their support and involvement during project implementation.
			By 2010 1 financing mechanism to sustain SLM developed and implemented	Investment Plan prepared and being implemented	
<b><i>Outcome I: Increased individual and institutional capacity for planning SLM at the national and regional level</i></b>	Number of National, regional and local organizations applying SLM within their institutional and operational context	0 organizations applying SLM	By 2010, 5 organizations are applying SLM within their institutional and operational context	Project M&E Reports  Annual work plans of respective organisations	The risk is that organizations may not be able to retain trained personnel

<u>Output 1.1:</u> Land degradation in Guyana is assessed using a widely accepted methodology	Report on Land Degradation and other Information Reports completed	No determination of extent of land degradation across Guyana	By 2008 Situation Analysis of Land Degradation completed	Situation Analysis Report completed and available  Requests for information from diverse stakeholders	None
<u>Output 1.2:</u> Key watersheds are analyzed and better understood	Report on watersheds assessment and analysis completed	No comprehensive study or analysis has been done for the key watersheds in Guyana	By 2008 Analysis of watersheds completed	Analysis Report completed and available	None
<u>Output 1.3:</u> Government Agencies are trained in relevant early warning systems and natural resource valuation	Number of organizations involved in the developing and executing of the training  Number of persons trained that are working in their respective organizations  Number of organizations applying training into organizational activities	Limited in-house training done within GLSC but not specific to SLM, early warning systems or natural resource valuation	By 2009, six training sessions and workshops in early warning systems and resource valuation completed  By 2009, resource valuation in a pilot area completed.  By 2009 over 100 personnel from national, regional and local organizations benefited and participated in SLM training	Schedule of Training and Curriculum prepared Training Manuals and Reports available for each seminar/workshop  Pilot valuation report completed.  Stakeholder survey demonstrates that trainees are benefiting from and applying training	Organizations will maintain commitments for staff involvement to involving and allow staff to participate in training programmes



<b><i>Outcome 2: Mainstreaming and harmonization of SLM into the development framework</i></b>	SLM principals and NAP priorities integrated into national and sector strategies	No mainstreaming or harmonizing of SLM into policies and plans	By 2009 SLM incorporated into 1 National Strategy, 5 Action Plans and 5 Community Plans	Policies, strategies and plans which incorporate SLM	Political will by Govt to mainstream SLM is maintained at current levels.
<b>Output 2.1: Government staff demonstrate awareness of SLM concerns at the policy, institutional and regional and local government level</b>	<b>Number of government actions/decisions which demonstrate awareness of SLM</b>	<b>Some awareness exist through activities of the NCSA and the development of the NAP for UNCCD</b>	<b>By 2009, over 100 central, regional and local government personnel are aware of SLM and incorporating into their policies and programs</b>	Results of Project Annual Review Form  Mid Term Evaluation	GLSC along with other partner organizations will be able to retain trained personnel  The willingness of government personnel to be involved in SLM activities is assumed
<b>Output 2.2: Improved policy and legal instruments for SLM</b>	New and modified Policy and legislative instruments approved	No policy regarding SLM or LUP in place No legislation specific to SLM or LUP exists though there is a body or related laws	By 2009, a comprehensive analysis of existing policies and laws as they relate to SLM completed, together with consultative workshop and focused stakeholder dialogue	Report from workshop and stakeholder dialogue prepared and available  Policy Review prepared and available	
<b>Output 2.3: SLM integrated and NAP priorities harmonized into national development strategies and action plans to achieve MDGs</b>	Number of national strategies, action and sectoral plans which incorporate SLM criteria	No national strategies or plans include SLM criteria	1 National Strategy (PRSP) and 5 action/national Plans incorporates SLM by 2009	Reports from strategy meetings involving policy representatives and institutions  Annual PRSP Report indicates SLM activities  Copies of plans which incorporates SLM and criteria	Political commitment in incorporate SLM into strategies and plans is maintained  Effective inter institutional cooperation and coordination at the national level to review, update and in some cases finalise plans taking on board SLM criteria is achieved and maintained

<b>Output 2.4:</b> SLM integrated into land use planning at the national and local planning level	Number of agreements among sector and local government organization and GLSC for coordination and cooperation in land planning 2 regional authorities and 5 communities incorporate SLM in their planning approach	SLM criteria not included in LUP at national or local level.  1 National Land Use Policy drafted and 2 Regional Land Use Plans approved by Government	National Land Use Policy endorsed by Govt by 2009  National Land Use Plan prepared by 2009  2 Regional and 5 community bodies incorporate SLM in their planning by 2009	National Land Use policy available to stakeholders  National Land Use Strategy document available for stakeholder input  Plans prepared, endorsed and being implemented at the regional and local level	Political commitment to a land use policy is maintained.  Effective inter institutional cooperation and coordination at the national level for information sharing and the planning of land use is achieved and maintained  Political commitment at the regional and local levels in incorporate SLM into development plans
<b>Outcome 3: Resources for SLM implementation mobilized within an investment planning framework</b>	GLSC coordinating the implementation of the Investment Plan  Number of project proposals and concepts presented for funding  Government funding allocations for	No investment planning resource mobilization for SLM	By 2010, strategy and plan for mobilizing resources and investment developed and implemented	Project Concepts and proposal  Incentive strategy published  Investment proposals received from private sector	Govt, bi and multilaterals, private sector and donors prepared to commit resources and invest in SLM
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Identification of funding needs for SLM priorities	Assessment Report presented at stakeholder forum and endorsed	No baseline on funding needs exists	1 Funding Needs Assessment Report prepared by 2010	Funding Needs Assessment Report prepared and available to stakeholders	There is effective involvement of all institutions who have a role to play in SLM priority areas
<b>Output 3.2:</b> Identification of incentives to stimulate investment in SLM	Incentive regime approved and available to investors	No specific incentives for SLM exist	1 Incentives Report prepared by 2010	Incentives Report prepared and available to stakeholders	Willingness on part of Govt and other stakeholder to offer incentives for SLM investments  Willingness of private sector to invest in SLM

<b>Output 3.3: Develop Medium Term Investment Plan for SLM</b>	Final Plan approved by stakeholders and endorsed by Government	No Plan in existence	1 Plan prepared by 2010	Final Plan published and circulated to key stakeholders	Participation and information forthcoming from key stakeholders such as Govt, multilateral, private sector, NGO donors
<b><i>Outcome 4: Effective project management through learning, evaluation, and adaptive management.</i></b>	Lessons learned from project widely disseminated	0 evaluations to determine change in management systems	A robust monitoring and evaluation system that will promote for effective adaptive management of the project and for identification of lessons learned that can be widely accepted.	Final project evaluation describes replication aspects.  Systematization document distributed	The SLM project has had positive results to be replicated at both the national and regional level.
<b>Output .4.1: Adaptive management through monitoring and evaluation determines the next development phase of, regional and community development.</b>	Number of recommendations from evaluations incorporated into the regional and community Development Plans by 2009.  Number of events for dissemination of lessons learned to municipalities	Baseline is the condition established by the evaluations before adopting the recommendations.  0 events	All recommendations incorporated in the regional and community planning system within 3 months of receiving recommendations.  5 events executed (1 per year)	Reports to the national steering committee.  Press and publications	Authorities, politicians, and technicians commit to a second phase of regional and community development.
<b>Output 4.2: Project execution through adaptive management</b>	Delivery rate of the project	n/a	At least 70% disbursement rate of annual budget	Audited statements Quarterly Reports PIR	