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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Scope and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation**

The project document for the Dominica SLM project was signed on 4th April 2006 with expected closing date of December 30th 2009. The project was however seriously delayed which is reflected by the fact the mid-term evaluation (MTE) was conducted eight months after the originally planned closing date in August 2010. One of the main conclusions from the MTE is that the project can achieve significant outcome if allowed to continue until the end of 2011. A project extension to the end of 2011 is therefore strongly recommended.

This midterm evaluation consists of a desk review, in country field visit and several one on one interviews with UNDP staff, senior officers in the Government of Dominica, members of the project team, the steering committee and stake holders from civil society. See Annex for persons interviewed.

The evaluation will assess the reasons for the delay, the progress, effectiveness and impact of the project. The evaluation examines the relevance of the project to the current development of the nation state of Dominica, the quality of the outputs, the expectations and role of stakeholders, recognizable change in capacity for land management associated with the project and the sustainability of these changes. It assesses the achievements of the project with respect to the stated objectives and the overall expectation of the global targeted portfolio project on SLM in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Terms of Reference for the evaluation are outlined in the Appendix 1of this document. The evaluation also examines the management of risk associated with the project as outlined in the logical framework.

The overall SLM goal of the GCOD is “to ensure that agricultural, coastal, forestry and other terrestrial resource in Dominica are used in a sustainable manner, thereby allowing for the maintenance of productive systems that assure ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the people of Dominica.” The SLM project is expected to contribute significantly to this overall outcome.

**Project Objective**

The overall objectiveof this Project is “to develop capacities for sustainable land management in appropriate government, civil society institutions and user groups, and mainstream sustainable land management considerations into government planning and strategy development.”

**Project Outcomes**

The project is the national level slate of actions under the UNDP/GEF LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management. The expected outcomes of this project are consistent with those of the Global Portfolio Project. These were specifically outlined in the Logical Framework as follows:

**Outcome 1:** SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks.

**Outcome 2:** Individual and institutional capacities for SLM enhanced through (1) stakeholder training on SLM principles through workshops, seminars and technical exchange visits, (2) awareness raising activities around relevant national, regional, and international environmental events and (3) enhancement of national institutional structures and functions to better address SLM.

**Outcome 3:** Capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM developed through (1) installing a computerized land information system in a GIS Unit (2) the compilation of relevant spatial/attribute datasets and (3) the training of various government and other personnel in the use of land information systems.

**Outcome 4:** SLM planning and project execution through: (1) dissemination and utilization of knowledge products (tools, guidelines and manuals for capacity development and mainstreaming on selected topics in SLM), (2) facilitation of access to global and regional knowledge networks and communities of practice, linked to existing networks, such as CAPNET, CPF, etc.

**Outcome 5:** Adaptive management and learning through documentation and progress reports including lessons learnt.

**Progress Toward Results.**

While the project has done a considerable amount of good work, there is no clear evidence that the mainstreaming outcome, one of the key elements of the project, is being achieved as measured by the indicators of success. The target for this outcome is that ‘The Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning, Agriculture and Environment adopt SLM guidelines and best practices to support physical and economic development planning and formulating macro-economic policies by the end of 2010’. This MTE finds no evidence of a mechanism for incorporating SLM successes into macro-economic and development plans. One element of the capacity development, the training of farmers, has equipped persons for service that would increase employment and ultimately livelihoods. There is increased consciousness of the value of biodiversity and ecosystems value but this needs to be anchored in a regulatory framework..

There is clear evidence of increase in capacity of the government Planning Department and the Ministry of Agriculture. More detailed GIS maps are available and extension officers are better equipped to meet the increased demand for their services.

All of the project activities have started with the capacity building component (Activity 2 and 3) being the most advanced. Significant progress has been made in achieving the objectives for Activities 2 and 3. However, key indicators for Activity 1 and 4, relating to mainstreaming SLM into national development plans have made little progress to date. There is evidence that some of these indicators will be achieved but to what extent is uncertain.

**Project Management**

The management of the project has been examined relative to timely delivery of inputs and outcome, achievement of activities as per the time line and assumptions in the project document, financial management and interaction between UNDP, Environment Coordinating Unit (ECU) and the Steering Committee. The ECU is the environmental arm of the government of Dominica and houses the project managers and supporting staff implementing all projects related to Climate Change under the UNFCCC, Land Management under the UNCCD, Biodiversity under the UNCBD and the TPMP under the Montreal Protocol. The Steering committee for the SLM consist of senior officers from related ministries and Civil society organizations (see appendix --). Highly skilled persons were selected to undertake the activities and the process of selection was consistent, detailed and transparent. Communication lines between government agencies, implementing partners and stakeholders were clear and the messages unambiguous. Examination of the Combined Delivery Report from UNDP revealed that the finances of the project are well managed and financial reporting is consistent with UNDP’s rules. As a result of the quality of project personnel and the management of the resources the project has an overall satisfactory (S) rating althoughthe delivery was delayed. The project manager its Financial reports, Quarterly Reports, and output documentation to the relevant agency on a regularly basis. However there is not a designated officer charged with project monitoring, therefore, the only non staff monitoring comes from the periodic visit of the UNDP Programme Manager who conducted site visits three (3) times in the last eighteen months.

**Project Evaluation**

According to the project documents, the project should be subject to two independent external evaluations. One external *Mid-Term Evaluation* that would be undertaken 18 months after the project initiation, and one *Final External Evaluation* on completion of the project.

It is expected that this MTE will assist in adaptive management of the project and enable the project manager to better achieve the project objective and outcomes during the remaining life of the project.

**Recommendations**

**T**his MTE revealed that the project has executed several activities in keeping with the project document but the findings are not published or circulated in a sufficiently wide manner to create awareness or lead to change in behavior. Several stakeholders were unaware of outcome results and were therefore not in a position to comment on the success or failure of the project. From these observations the following recommendations evolved.

* The project should be extended to the end of 2011 based on clearly observed limited capacity to deliver in Dominica and the fact that it is already delayed.
* The project should have a structured, local monitoring system. The steering committee should institute a monitoring regime that requires them to provide quarterly assessment reports.
* There is need for an effective data dissemination process to share lessons learnt and record feedback from users of the data.
* Promised meetings of Senior Government officials and community level personnel should be carried out to ensure high level government involvement in the mainstreaming process.
* Commitment by the GCOD to fully own the SLM processes and mainstream them into its recurrent planning, budgeting and regulatory procedures has not materialized therefore the ministry of finance needs to become more involved in the project implementation. Funds committed as cofinance should be provided to hire additional staff and make the institutional adjustment necessary for the success of the project. More systematic public awareness and feedback processes should be designed and carried out as part of the adaptive management process in order to achieve maximum ‘buy in’ from all sectors of Dominican society.

**ACRONYMS**

CDR Combined Delivery Report

ECU Environment Coordinating Unit

GCOD Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica

GEF Global Environment Facility

GIS Geographic Information System

IA Implementing Agency

LRIS Land Resource Information System

MTE Mid-Term Evaluation

NEX National Execution

NGO Non Government Organization

OECS Organisation of East Caribbean States

OP Operational Program

SIDS Small Island Developing States

SLM Sustainable Land Management

SPACC Special Project on Adaptation to Climate Change

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

1. **REPORT**

1.1 **Evaluation’s Purpose**

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to examine the implementation of the SLM in Dominica over the past eighteen months to determine the degree of success in achieving the objectives of the project and provide feedback that would guide the implementation of the remainder of the project. Further, the evaluation will analyze the extent to which the outcomes are meeting the planned targets. In this regard the evaluation will consider the following:

* Project’s relevance to Dominica’s development and national priorities
* Global Targeted Portfolio Project on SLM in SIDS
* Gender Issues
* Expectations and role of stakeholders
* Recognizable change in land management
* Project performance in terms of achievements of stated objectives, indicators, targets project’s contribution to the outcomes as stated in the logical framework.
* Quality of outputs
* Sustainability of the changes
* Risk management
* Management of change
* Efficiency of resource use including finance

The aforementioned elements would be captured under the following subheadings 1) Project Description, 2) Evaluation Findings, and 3) Conclusions and Recommendations.

1.2. **MTE Methodology**

The evaluation consisted of desk review, two day in-country field visit and one on one interviews with UNDP staff, senior government officials, members of the project team, the project steering committee and civil society stakeholders. Information was collected from group discussion, one-on-one verbal communications, written questionnaires and electronic communication (internet and telephone conversations). The information from the various sources was compared and crossed checked against documented evidence and visual observations to allow for verification of data as well as to facilitate the persons from who information was being sought. For example, one of the main project consultants lives in Canada and could not be in the Caribbean at the time of the MTE hence he was interviewed via e-mail using predetermined questions in a questionnaire. The questions covered the areas of concern specified in the TOR. The interviews and questionnaires sought to obtain factual information as well as the subjective opinion of persons engaged in the execution of the project.

In order to understand the project design and the nuances behind the revised logical frame work, the following documents were reviewed:

* The Project Document
* The Annual Work Plan and Budget
* The Inception Report
* Minutes of the Steering Committee
* GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006
* UNDP’s Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
* Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation; approach to Sustainability
* Capacity Development for Sustainable Land management: UNDP-GEF

The project manager and staff reported that physical activities including training, public awareness activities, mapping, zone demarcation and farm improvement demonstration took place in three locations in Dominica. Two of the three sites were visited and GIS maps compared with visuals on the ground.

Information was recorded on computer as well as on handwritten sheets submitted by persons surveyed.. All of this information collected was reviewed side by side looking for similarity and consistency. At the end of the in-country exercise, debriefing meetings were held with the Permanent Secretary and the Project Manager. The consultant gave a brief verbal report of some of the findings and made some suggestions for improving project impact. However, the participants have expressed their desire to see the report in its entirety.

2.0 **Project Description**

**2.1 Project Partners**

It is the evaluator’s understanding and expectation that the MTE will be shared with strategic personnel and institutions critical to the successful completion of the project. These include the UNDP, ECU, the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministries responsible for Finance, Planning, Agriculture and Social Development, the Steering Committee, the Farmers and Community Workers and all civil society groups involved with the project. MTE information should also be disseminated to local leaders and opinion shapers at the community level. This is absolutely necessary in order to build on and secure the project’s gains.

All stake holders listed in the project documented are reported to be actively involved in the project. The Evaluator met with representatives from Ministries of Agriculture, Environment, Housing Lands and Surveys, Finance, and Legal Affairs. Other agencies participating in the meeting included the Water Authority, Dominica Banana Producers, the Soufriere, Scotts Head Marine Reserves and two community based organizations.

2.2 **Project’s Relevance to Dominica**

The project design responds to the current environmental challenges in the SIDS of Dominica, as a nation desiring to be the ‘Nature Isle,’ the version of a ‘green country.’

Dominica is a country highly dependent on agriculture which accounts for 70% of total export earnings and 60% of the nation’s food requirement but the country is plagued by natural disasters, landslides, floods, and coastal erosion. Capacity development addressing application of appropriate technology could help solve some of the problems faced by farmers in Dominica. In this regard, the project indicators in the logical framework speak to computerized land resource information system and the development of spatial information products for decision making. This is contingent upon co-financing above and beyond the amounts spelt out in the ProDoc given a baseline condition with no central land information system and only limited data sets existing in the Ministry of Agriculture. The assumptions were that partner institutions are willing to collaborate on the integrated approach to sustainable land management and sharing of access to land information, further, that the political climate remains favorable and political commitments materialized. Over the last three years however, the economic situation in Dominica declined causing some cutbacks by government (NB this project document was approved in 2006)

Output 2 has been repackaged. Instead of Ministry of Agriculture workers and NGOs providing policy guidance on SLM, they worked together to develop community resource maps, vulnerability Atlases and community resource management plans. Some activities in the original form proved obsolete due to changes in the development architecture of the country. Consequently, it was necessary to make minor adjustments to both the methodology and time frame. Instead of implementing the list of activities as they appear in the project document, an analysis of priority for action was undertaken. This assessment examined all national strategy documents regardless of focal area in order to identify activity not yet undertaken but with high implementation priority. It also examined all international and regional agreements to determined elements relevant to SLM that are of priority. For example, Activity 1.3 review of national legislation and regulatory instrument that incorporate principles of SLM was not identified as priority for action since this was done under an OECS framework environmental legislation. These minor adjustments were considered prudent and would very likely help the project achieve its planned outputs with the budget provided.

The capacity development component of the project saw over 200 farmers and extension officers trained in good farming practices and sustainable development techniques such as terracing, contour farming and drainage practices applicable to Dominica. This means that there is now a local cadre of persons more knowledgeable and empowered on SLM issues and certain practical details such as community asset mapping. This is an excellent foundation on which to build. The effects of these capacity building efforts should be visible in 2011 at the start of the new farming cycle. The project management team should therefore put in place a follow up plan to support those farmers using the techniques and encourage others to use the techniques.

2.3 **Global Targeted Portfolio Project on SLM in SIDS**

The Targeted Portfolio Approach to Sustainable Land Management furthers the objectives of the Operational Program 15 and Strategic Priority 1. Specifically, the portfolio approach outcomes are directly in line with the requirements for “Institutional and human resource capacity strengthened to improve sustainable land management planning and implementation and the strengthening of policy, regulatory, and economic incentive framework to facilitate wider adaptation of sustainable land management practices across sectors,” expected outcomes of OP 15.

The assumptions that the portfolio project will maintain close links with SLM related activities being supported by other IAs to minimize overlap and ensure maximum collaboration became a central theme in the implementation of this project. Early in the implementation phase, this project fostered links with all GEF funded and land management related activities in Dominica. See Annex 2.

The major risk as far as the global Portfolio Project was concerned was the possibility that the NAP will be created in a vacuum. The evaluator found that in the early stage, the NAP was indeed being developed in a vacuum. However, the all inclusive approach in the implementation of the SLM brought the NAP back on stage by utilizing some of its recommended strategies and approaches.

**2.4 Environmental and Social Changes**

The main objective of the project is to develop capacity for sustainable land management in appropriate government departments and civil society groups and to mainstream sustainable land management considerations in planning and strategy development. Progress towards achieving these expected results can be measured by the availability of public guidelines on soil conservation and drainage for agriculture and urban development, stakeholder survey to indicate that training is being applied on the ground and published revised legislative and policy instruments. These are outlined under Sources of Verification in the logical framework. Prior to the start of this project Dominica possessed a fairly comprehensive set of legislations governing ownership, use and management of the land and its resources. Included in these legislations are laws governing use of Crown Lands (state own), the Carib Territory (land ceded to the indigenous people) and water ways. Generally, these laws are respected and observed. However, there are squatters on crown lands whose sole interest is to eke out an existence. Several Civil Society Organisations exist but with no special connection to the land or its resources. There is however, a national desire to keep Dominica green and market it as the Nature Island of the Caribbean.

On examination, one finds draft legislations governing resource use, land use plans and maps and several communities with heightened awareness and interest in the land and its resources all of this compliments the SLM project. The most recognizable of these changes is the protection of the ecosystems in Layou Valley and Mariagot, two communities in which the project has been active.

The real success of this project depends on the duplication of these community training activities coupled with the entering into force of the draft legislation and the enforcement of these legislations.

It is still too soon to see evidence of significant change. The limited social benefits accruing to civil society are in the form of the increased awareness of SLM by some community local government personnel. This awareness needs to be translated into practical behaviour.

2.5 **Expectations & Roles of stakeholders**

Consistent with Dominicans’ desires to be considered the “Nature Isle,” persons at all levels of project involvement expect Dominica to have practical policy and legislation leading to greater control of the use of the land. Further, the promotion of community tourism at local village level has created expectations of an enhanced role in the decision making with regards to the use and management of community resources. .

The local village councils expect the asset maps and land use information developed by the project to be made available to the community so that they can be an integral part of the community’s program for protecting and preserving the environment. Villagers are also concerned about the current site of some buildings, for example, a hurricane shelter located in the coastal buffer zone along a known water way.

Also of concern to governmental and non-governmental stakeholders is the development of buffer zones for the two national parks. Stakeholders pointed out that there are strategic and significant privately owned parcels of land that they feel the GCOD will be unable to purchase in the immediate short term for one reason or another. Therefore interaction with the landowners is necessary in the immediate short-term. The purpose of these meetings would be to obtain significant “buy in” to the principles and practices of SLM. Stakeholders hope that increased awareness by these landowners will help in the SLM endeavour and contribute to mainstreaming.

All stakeholders agreed on the need for a national public awareness outreach so that locals can integrate and institutionalize SLM in their everyday activities and routines. This outreach can be a joint venture between the SLM project and the Physical Planning Department and may need to continue beyond the agreed life of the project. The necessity for local SLM advocates/champions was tabled as was the need to create terms of engagement for the Carib community.

There is also an expectation that the project time line will be extended and internal support from the GCOD will sustain and deepen the project gains.

2.6 **Partnerships**

UNDP and the GEF strongly recommend and support synergies between and among national projects especially when they are funded by UNDP and or the GEF. Additionally, south-south cooperation is encouraged with the hope that such relationship will result in cross fertilization of ideas, sharing of experts and more effective and efficient project implementation.

This project epitomized the model of synergies and partnerships encouraged by UNDP and the GEF. Following the inception workshop, a one day meeting was held with representatives of all Ministries of government to apprise them of the project, seek collaboration and to share expectations. The joint development of maps by the SLM project and the Physical Planning department is a direct outcome of this collaboration. Three months later, UNDP hosted a synergies workshop involving project managers of all projects being implemented in Dominica at that time. The workshop was designed to identify overlaps, opportunities for joint implementation of activities, and in general maximize the use of project funds. This meeting lead to the addition of one representative from the Ministry of Education to the steering committee thus improving the level of advocacy through school involvement. In addition to the partnerships at the national level, links have been forged with the other SLM projects in the OECS. The Canadian consultant hired by the project used ideas from New Zealand and the Pacific in the development of community vulnerability Atlas.. One practical example of collaboration is seen in the sharing of resources between the SLM and the SPACC (a GEF funded project). The SLM provided the training and the SPACC developed the maps using the training from the SLM. (Please see copy of communications between consultants for the two projects in Appendix 3.

**3.0 Findings**

3.1 Project performance in terms of achieving stated objectives, project’s contribution to the outcomes.

The goal of the land degradation focal area is to contribute to arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation as seen on the mountainous, volcanic island of Dominica. Here, indigenous peoples eke out an existence on steep slopes prone to landslides. The design of the SLM project responds favorably to these realities as spelt out in the elements of the log frame. The targets and indicators in the log-frame are realistic and remained unchanged during project implementation. The desire for capacity building such as farmers training is a necessity in a country highly dependent on agriculture but with a limited number of trained farmers and extension officers. The training and capacity building at the community level encouraged stakeholder participation and ownership. The project design is therefore considered highly satisfactory (HS)

The project has remained true to the activities spelt out in the project document. In this regard, the major activities of the project are each receiving specific attention though the impact visibility in all cases could be better. The land use maps and resource data sets are well designed but not well circulated. The Ministries of Government sharing in the development of GIS maps and data have benefited significantly from the partnership. This holds good prospect for mainstreaming and integration of the project outcomes into other ongoing processes.

The M&E activities listed in the project approval document have only been partially followed. This MTE found that although the management team is doing a satisfactory job, they could have benefited from more systematic adherence to the M&E plan. Project implementation is therefore rated as Satisfactory (S).

The risk and Assumptions identified during project formulation fell into three groups. 1. Sustained political support for the process; Dominica faced a national election and there were concerns that a change in government may result in shift in land policy however the government was returned to power so the risk of change was averted. 2. The realization of financial commitment to the project; will the government honour its co-financing commitment in the face of growing economic challenges? Some commitments were honoured but this evaluation did not have the means (time, resources or mandate) to quantify these. 3. The third group of risk dealt with the willingness of agencies to share information and to support the SLM initiative. From the information obtained during the stakeholder workshop, it was clear that this risk never became reality.

Outcome 1 speaks to mainstreaming SLM into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks. The key indicators are 1) SLM consideration incorporated into macro-economic policies and development planning strategies 2). The national land use plan structured around SLM and 3) Key national legislation regarding land management modified to incorporate principles of SLM. There is no evidence that work done on the project thus far speaks to indicator 1. The revised planning and policy document with SLM economic analysis set as the means of verification is not available. The Ministry of finance is currently conducting an economic analysis but this is to determine the country’s eligibility for further international funding and may not necessarily address land management. While this analysis includes land availability as economic resource, it does not address land management in a livelihood context nor is it geared to looking at economic benefits of sustainable land management.

An attorney was recruited to draft legislations in support of mainstreaming sustainable land management issues into the national development policies. The consultant has submitted the first of two documents to the Cabinet of Ministers for consideration and a national consultation was held to apprise civil society of the draft legislation. This document speaks to land tenure and the access of civil society to natural resources on crown lands. The second document currently being developed is intended to address the macro-economic policies. .The Physical Planning Department in collaboration with the SLM project is building on the work of the USAID funded (Caribbean Open Trade Strategy) COTS project updating the National Land use Plan. A series of new maps have been developed highlighting ecosystems and natural resources. These maps have been shared with all Ministries listed as stakeholders.

It is clear that progress has been made in achieving this outcome but there is much work to be done in ensuring that land management issues become an integral part of macro-economic policies and plans. There is need for a land management champion at the political level in order to raise the consciousness of politicians and senior public service staff. In this way, decision makers will be able to make informed decisions based on truth borne out of the SLM experience.

Outcome 2 seeks to address a major pillar of the project that of capacity development. The outcome targets 25 officers from Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works and Physical planning for training in SLM techniques. Much work has been done in this area. Extension officers, community members and farmers have been trained and provided with literature for continued learning and refresher training. Additionally, GIS and land use maps have been developed, and hard and soft ware provided to the Physical Planning Unit.

The outcome has been achieved beyond the target level with over 75 persons trained compared with the 25 intended. The means of verification, workshop proceedings, training manual, media reports and programmes, are all available. Verbal reports tell of a very elaborate and successful programme geared to both individuals and their institutions. The steering committee should include in its monitoring checklist some record of how the new knowledge is being used since during the brief visit the consultant was not able to identify any area where the training is being applied.

Outcome 3 addresses knowledge management in support of SLM development. The target seeks to put in place a computerized land resource information system accessible to users via inter and intranet exchanged protocols. The aim is to make information on land tenure, land zoning and land degradation available to policy planners, technical departments and land users.

This output ties in with the capacity development of output 2. GIS maps to support land zoning have been developed, and the GIS Unit is working jointly with experts from the SPACC project to prepare maps and data sets that support the Land Resource Information System (LRIS). The indicator of success is the presence of relevant special data sets compiled by 2009. While some data sets were compiled by the end of 2009, neither the indicator nor the means of verification specified the quantum or extent of compilation required. It is therefore only fair to say that the outcome has been achieved. However, the project should endeavor to conduct some GIS training for representatives of Ministries other than Planning so that greater use can be made of the evolving LRIS. There is no evidence of policy makers being aware of the evolving LRIS which is intended to be a tool for decision making. The project team should therefore ensure that an information system and possibly short training sessions be arranged for these policy makers.

Outcome 4 addresses an investment plan and resource mobilization. The indicator speaks to “major sector incentive regime that includes protocols for fiscal development reviewed and amended and payment for environmental services regime developed and effected”. The only resource mobilization activity presented to the evaluator was the community plan to raise funds through the development and management of environment resource. This, however, requires government approval which has not yet been obtained. The target for this outcome is ‘a proposal for payment of environmental services regime developed and approved by mid 2009’. Given the advanced stage of project implementation it is not likely that this outcome will be fully realized by the time of project closure without a modification of the implementation plan. The value of this outcome is not emphasized in the implementation process and the Ministry of Finance is not aware of any plans by the project to mobilize resources. This is a significant deficiency that needs immediate attention. The Ministry of finance represents the heart of national finance and should therefore ba a key player in the development of any fiscal measure. The low level of involvement by the Ministry of Finance may also be a reason that government co-financing has not met its promised target.

While the overall plan of the logical framework of the project remains intact, there were some modifications to the details (see appendix 2A1). The evaluator found that the goal, objectives and outcomes of the project are relevant and appropriate to improve SLM in Dominica. However, they are not well ventilated in the public domain and civil society groups do not have a sufficiently clear understanding of their role in achieving these outcomes. In addition, some baseline and targets are not sufficiently focused thus making it difficult to measure the degree of success of the various interventions.. For example, it may not be realistic to have an increase in soil organic matter by 10% over two years compared to the baseline values. It is difficult to verify the level to which indicators have been achieved where there is an absence of baseline and follow-up data. Also, under outcome 1, mainstreaming SLM, the baseline condition states that there is a low level of capacity within agencies with land management mandates and the target speaks to individual and institutional capacity built and knowledge management enhanced but there is no unit of quantification therefore the results are opened to interpretation as fully achieved or partially achieved.

However, the project is moving steadily towards its conclusion. It does have the potential to create significant change at both local and institutional levels but there is need for the development of information sharing techniques, specifically a system for passing on the lessons learnt.

3.2 **Output Quality**

Fundamental elements of this SLM project are legislative reform, empowerment of civil society, and a comprehensive land use plans with accompanying GIS maps. There is clear evidence of progress towards these. While some elements have been completed, for example the GIS maps, other elements such as the legislation are in progress. The draft legislation on Community Use and Management of State Owned Natural Resource has been submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers for review. Land use laws and zoning regulations are urgently needed. Progress towards community asset mapping has been made in three of the five targeted communities (Syndicate, Layou, Colihaut). One critical assumption at this stage is that the cabinet of ministers will approve the legislation and make the necessary arrangements to sign them into law. Based on the normal rate of legislation development and approval in Dominica it seems unlikely that these legislations would be passed during the life time of this project. It is therefore recommended that the legislation be made part of the government lead physical development reform. This way they have a good chance of being signed into law thus ensuring the sustainability and mainstreaming of project elements.

A Training Manual for farmers and extension officers has been produced and the accompanying training of trainers successfully completed. It is estimated that approximately two hundred community residents and farmers would be trained in the first phase. To date eighty of these persons have been trained.

The evaluator examined the Manual, Maps and workshop reports and spoke to a number of the trainees. Some trainees interviewed agreed that the training and the resources provided were adequate and of a high quality but felt that the training needed to be a long term on-going process. The evaluator examined the outputs delivered thus far and measured them against the target set in the logical framework as far as possible. It is highly likely that outcome 1 and 2 will achieve their target by the end of the project. While a quantity of data has been generated solely by the project and by the project in collaboration with other projects, a knowledge management system has not yet been considered. Given the history of poor collaboration among government agencies, a concerted effort would be needed to establish an interagency data management platform in the short time remaining. It is moderately likely that this will take place during the remaining lifetime of the project. It seems unlikely that outcome 4 will reach its target during the lifetime of this project. Dominica is facing major fiscal challenges that occupy the minds of the relevant authorities and from what the evaluator could ascertain SLM issues are not at the top of the agenda. However, the project management team should give greater attention to the development of the incentive instruments so that finance ministry has something to consider when reviewing the national fiscal measures.

Outcome 5 is on target and will very likely meet all of its targets. The project team is already prepared for the project audit that is expected in March of 2011. The PIRs, QOR, site visits and the associated reporting instrument are all in place. Overall, project is progressing satisfactorily and should deliver most of it output by the end of 2011.

3.3 **Sustainability of the changes engendered by the project**

Gains made by the project include greater awareness of SLM issues; recognition of the need for systematic planning and legislation on land use and management; the importance of collaboration and networks; the fundamental need for Dominica to have a national environmental policy backed up by organized data collection and analysis.

The gains made by this SLM project intervention can be maintained and extended if:

* The systematic village by village SLM awareness raised program is extended so that more persons integrate SLM into their everyday life
* GCOD designates land in Dominica for various uses and unwaveringly implements zoning decisions
* GCOD develops “an overarching national environmental policy”
* All the trained personnel use their acquired skills in training, data collection and collation
* Permanent networks are maintained between departments of Agriculture, Forestry, Land & Surveys, Physical Planning, Community Development, Local Government, Finance and the Water Company. Discussions with several partners indicate very good relationships between them. There is currently excellent basis for cooperation.
* There is a clear budgeted and annually resourced National Action Plan
* The respected role of the ECU as “technical focal point for all multilateral environmental agreements functioning as the coordinating facilitating, administering and collaborating body for all environmental and sustainable development management programs, projects and activities in the Commonwealth of Dominica” continues.

**4.0Management**

**4.1. Risk management**

Early in the implementation of this project the government of Dominica announced a general election. The election process had the potential to railroad the project, however, the project management team saw it coming and put measures in place to avert any extensive delay or political implications. In the end, there was minimal delay that could be attributed to the elections. The only real challenge that surface after the election was the fact that the UNDP national focal point became part of the new government cabinet. The replacement did not take long to get on board. His willingness to listen to the project manager and act on issues speaks to his confidence in the project teat and his familiarity with their work.

It is not yet clear that there is deep, continuing, political support for integrating SLM into national development planning. The expected presentation of information on the project’s progress and its expectations for sustainability has not yet been made to the senior policy and planning authorities. Because of the limited human resource base in Dominica these persons are busy multitasking and therefore special efforts have to be made to ensure that they are motivated to facilitate the process of integration of SLM considerations into sustainable development plans and strategies. If there is commitment by senior policy and planning personnel then it is very likely that continuous funding will be mobilized to implement agriculture rehabilitation and other strategically relevant projects to support SLM.

Furthermore, senior GCOD personnel will be in a position to make more informed decisions on staffing in key departments so as to ensure continuity and sustainability of the gains made.

To date there is some stakeholder consensus and buy-in to the process and there is willingness to participate. This enthusiasm should be maintained. At present partner institutions at the middle management level see the need to collaborate on integrated approaches to sustainable land management and to share access to land information. As was noted above this philosophy must become a part of the leadership mindset.

It is of critical importance that the investment climate remains favorable. The Private sector needs to understand SLM’s importance and be willing to commit to support of SLM in its productive processes and decisions.4.2 Adaptive Management

There are inherent redundancies in the SLM project design that makes it adaptable yet consistent. For example activities 1.1.2 and 1.2.2 are both designed to address land use policies so that when activity 1.2.1 was done in conjunction with the COTS project, it covered 1.1.2 making it unnecessary to undertake this activity under the SLM project This flexibility has allowed the project to remain true to its objectives in the face of a changing social environment and with limited staff.. The project has consistently found solutions to minimize the risks posed by weather conditions and institutional challenges.

This flexibility in management has at times been attenuated by UNDP/GEF regulations. In general the evaluator is satisfied with the ability and willingness of the project management to adapt to change.

**4.3 Mainstreaming**

4.3 **Gender Issues**

Despite the central role of land, land tenure, land management and land degradation in the economic development of Dominica, the project document did not speak specifically to the issue of gender. Several references were made to the importance of agriculture and the changing economic landscape but the gender dimension was not reflected.

The evaluator found that gender issues were not reflected in the project implementation. Although there was almost equal participation of males and females in the management and capacity development components of the project, this was clearly the result of chance rather than planning. It seems obvious that gender mainstreaming as a strategy has not worked in the context of Dominica or the Caribbean because of deeply ingrained values and mores. As a result, the role of women in development is still yet to be internalized by policy-makers. It is therefore not surprising that the project is running insensitive to gender issues but without significantly putting men or women at a disadvantage.

4.4 **Budget and Expenditure**

Based on discussions with both project management and UNDP, the project expenditure is within the allocated budget. Funds appear to be spent judiciously. Some expenditure requested by the project manager has been slow in arriving thus negatively impacting the progress of the project. While the UNDP staff appears cooperative and the relationship with the project and more specifically the ECU is good, the flow of funds is still challenging.

To date the project has not had a NEX audit but one is scheduled for the first quarter of 2011. Examination of the combined delivery report (CDR) provided by UNDP indicated consistency in financial management and reporting.

**5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

5.1 *General Conclusions*

The Project Management team, the Consultants and the Steering Committee all seem very knowledgeable, enthused and anxious to see the project succeed. The political directorate (Permanent Secretary and CEOs) interviewed were all aware of the project and wished it well. The farmers and civil society members wanted more from the project, more training, more resources and even seed funds. The demands are understandable given the economic climate of Dominica, however, this is not a realistic expectation given the budget and time constraint facing the project, moreover, this was not the intent of the project. The IA (UNDP) has a focus on keeping the project implementation process on track. However, UNDP must continue to provide clear leadership and logistical support through its interaction with policy makers and other technical persons not directly related to the project. While UNDP has demonstrated clear commitment to the project through co-financing and site visits, however, its impact seems very localized around the project management team and little upstream, policy type support or intervention..

The most important outcomes to date are those that address mainstreaming and capacity building the crux of the project.. The number of persons demonstrating their newly acquired skills on SLM and the level of awareness among civil society personnel about SLM issues are clear evidences of capacity building for SLM.. The detailed GIS maps and persons trained to develop and interpret these are further evidences of the contribution of the project to land management in Dominica.. However, more financial input will be needs in order to create enough momentum to sustain the gains of the project. Here, the co-financing promised by government can make the difference if provided.

The partnerships and collaboration developed between this project and other in the OECS is commendable. The local synergy process is certainly a plus that should be adopted by other projects. One consideration could be the use of the existing project steering committee as the as the designated steering committee for all projects dealing with land resource.

**5.2 *Main Recommendations***

Given the advanced stage of implementation of this project, the enthusiasm it has generated, the good will that surrounds it and the impact created, it is safe to say that the project will achieve most of it objectives. It is however more difficult to determine the longevity of the impacts. The following recommendations therefore are directed towards long term sustainability of the project.

1. There is need for an extension of the project timelines at least to December 2011. The basis of the extension should be agreed to between the local Project Management team and UNDP. The discussion should examine additional funding, volunteerism, community involvement.
2. The Project management team should work with the GCOD to ensure toe provision of the co-financing promised and to align the project with the development agenda of Dominica. Ownership of the mainstreaming process by government ministries coupled with a recurrent budgeting practice will help the process.
3. A more systematic public awareness program, especially at community level, should be designed and carried out to ensure buy in from all sectors of Dominican society.
4. The LRIS and GIS information developed under the project should form a part of the national planning and development process.
5. The synergy process that was established at the beginning of the process should be revisited to identify opportunities for the continuation and or extension of the SLM activities.
6. Any activity left incomplete at the formal closure of the project should become an element under other national projects to make the plans of this project truly successful. In this regard, the project management team should use its connections with other projects, especially government long term projects, to implant specific activities of the SLM into these other projects. This may be facilitated or encouraged by joint implementation of the remaining project activities with appropriate activities of other projects.
7. This project has benefited significantly from the inputs of the multidisciplinary steering committee. Through this committee the project was able to undertake joint implementation activities with the Planning Department, the COTS project and the OECS framework legislation. This coordination mechanism could be used to integrate or reposition elements of the SLM for longevity. This project was able to share its farmer training manual with other countries, this proved to be very rewarding for the other countries and a good reflection of South - South Cooperation. It is therefore recommended that there be a formal networking working among SLM project managers in the OECS or that countries follow the example of Grenada and establish a web site where information could be shared and connections built.

**APPENDIX 1**

**1.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Terms of Reference**

**Mid-Term Evaluation**

“Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Dominica, Saint Vincent and Saint Lucia.”

**Duration:** 24 working days

**Expected Start date: 1 August,** **2010**

**A. Background:**

Land degradation has long been recognized as a serious problem in Dominica. Since 1898 legislations were put in place to implement sustainable land use practices. However, the absence of a comprehensive strategy to tackle the problem has rendered the legislation ineffective by itself. Consequently, land degradation has seriously affected the integrity of the various ecosystems as well as the ability of Dominicans to extract a livelihood from the land. The long-term goal of the MSP is to assist Dominica in designing and implementing an effective land use plan that will enhance ecosystem health, stability, integrity, functions and services while enhancing sustainable livelihoods. The objective of the project is to improve institutional and individual capacity to ensure sustainable land management, improve knowledge on land degradation. The project has three outcomes, namely, (a) Mainstreaming of SLM principles and NAP priorities integrated into national policies, programs, (b) Systematic institutional and individual capacities for SLM developed, and (c) Resource mobilization improved to support SLM activities. The project will be implemented over a period of three years. The total cost of the project is US$1,332,450 of which US$ 487,500 is requested through the LDC/SIDS Targeted Portfolio Project. The project team came on board in November 2008 and the Inception Phase was completed in January 2009.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF 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 iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E.

**B. Objectives:**

The Project Implementation Unit is now seeking a Mid-Term Evaluation to review the project’s progress thus far and to provide guidance to the following stages of implementation. The project document calls for a Mid-Term Review so as to make any necessary adjustments for improved achievement of the projects’ objectives.

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. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

In addition to the above, this evaluation should include interviews and analysis of feedback with the key stakeholders of the project, namely with:

1. Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources;
2. Dominican Institute of Agricultural and Forestry;
3. UNCCD Convention Focal Point;
4. GEF Operational Focal Point, and relevant team members of the Ministry for Environment;
5. NGOs
6. Partners selected for implementation of Training of Farmers on SLM practices;
7. National consultants involved in previous activities;
8. Other development partners and implementing agencies working in the same field
9. UNDP Environment Programme staff;

**C. Scope of the evaluation:**

The Evaluation would consider the project objectives, inputs, outputs and activities during the first 18 months of the project work plan 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.

**D. Methodology:**

It is expected that the consultant will carry out this evaluation through a combination of desk review of documents, interviews and focus group discussions with key counterparts and stakeholders, and on-site observations where possible. Interviews should consist of predetermined questions to obtain in-depth information on impressions and experiences. Interviews will be held with key stakeholders to assess opinions about the initiative, and collect information about tangible and non tangible changes and impacts wherever possible.

The evaluation should also include review of project documents reports and other key documents or relevant reports and documents produced by Government such as:

* Project Document
* PIRs and QORs
* SLM Mainstreaming guidelines
* Report on SLM mainstreaming in Sectoral Policies
* SLM Trainers’ Manual
* Report on Institutional Mandates Strengthening for SLM
* Draft NAP
* National Strategic documents where available;

**E. Evaluation Outputs:**

The consultant will be required to produce a report with the following components as key outputs:

1. Context of project, adequacy of project design, stakeholder involvement and ownership, evaluation of outputs thus far; findings and conclusions.

2. Recommendations: for future implementation; identified barriers and how to address these; adjustment of M&E framework.

3. Lessons learned: design of project; engagement of stakeholders; management of project; strategy for implementation.

Additionally, the Final Mid Term Evaluation Report should include the following annexes:

* Terms of Reference for the MTE;
* Work plan for the Evaluation Mission
* A listing of the meetings and interviews carried out during the Mission;
* Listing of documents reviewed in preparation for the MTE;
* Any other relevant information or materials for the MTE

**F. Qualifications and Professional Experience:**

The evaluator should have a minimum qualification of Mac. 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 or natural resources 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, familiarity with UNDP/GEF, its programmes, operations and evaluation procedures will be an asset.

**G. The deadline for submitting applications is [15th July]**

Only short-listed candidates will be notified. Women candidates are strongly encouraged to apply.

**APPENDIX 2 A**

**2.0 Logical Framework**

**Dominica Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project**

**ANALYSIS OF PRIORITIES FOR ACTION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy Document** | **Priority Action Identified** | | | |
|  | Environmental Legislation/strengthened environmental management institution to support Integrated Ecosystem/Environmental Management | Land Use Plan to support Integrated Ecosystem Management and address critical environmental issues | Improved community participation and ownership in coastal/terrestrial resource management (including hazard mapping) utilizing traditional/local knowledge | Improved inter-agency coordination in support of Integrated Ecosystem Management |
| *Dominica’s Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2101-2005)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Dominica’s Climate Change Adaptation Policy and Action Plan (2002)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Dominica’s Biosafety Strategy (2204)* | ***✓*** |  | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Dominica’s National Implementation Plan (NIP) for Persistent Organic Pollutants (2006)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Report on Dominica’s National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA)(2006)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *National Action Plan (NAP) for Sustainable Land Management* (DRAFT) | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |  |  |
| *Initial National Communication to the UNFCCC (2001)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| **International and Regional Agreements** | **Priority Action Identified** | | | |
| *St. Georges Declaration (2001)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *OECS Environmental Charter* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)* |  | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |  |
| 1. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal.  2. UN Convention on Biological Diversity  Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety  3.Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean   * *Oil Spill Protocols* * *MARPOL Protocol Annexe 2 and 5*   4. International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage.  5. UN Framework Convention on Climate Change  6. Cotonou Agreement (Replaced the Lome Convention).  7. UN Convention to Combat Desertification  8. UN Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).  9. Third UN Convention of Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)  10. Convention on the Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims Relating to the Arrest of Sea Going Ships  11. Treaty for the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapon.  12. International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation  13. International Plant Protection Convention  14. UN Convention on the Prohibition and Use of, Stockpiling Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and their Destruction.  15. UN Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and (weapons of mass destruction)their Destruction. *(Chemical Weapons Convention)*  16. Geneva Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques.  17. Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.  18. UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.  19. International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling  20. Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against Safety of Maritime Navigation  21. International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea  22. Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)  23. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer London Amendment* | ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓*** | ***✓***  ***✓*** | ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓*** | ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓***  ***✓*** |
| **Situation Analysis** | **Priority Action Identified** | | | |
| *Legal, Institutional and Policy Framework for Environmental Management* (Caribbean Development Bank) (2005) | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Legal, Institutional and Policy Framework for Management of Solid and Ship-generated Waste* (World Bank/GEF) (1997) | ***✓*** |  |  | ***✓*** |
| *Ten Year Review of the Barbados Program of Action (SIDS + 10 Report)(2004)* | ***✓*** |  | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |
| *Review of the Policy, Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Protected Areas Management in Dominica (2006)* | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** | ***✓*** |

**Appendix 2A1 SLM Project Approach and Workplan**

Environmental Legislation/strengthened environmental management institution to support Integrated Ecosystem/Environmental Management

**Output 1**

* Comprehensive ***environmental and resource management legislation*** legally establishing environmental management institution and mechanisms for inter-agency coordination on resource management

**Output 2**

***Community Resource Maps*** and ***Vulnerability Atlases*** for all Dominica

* ***Community Resource Management Plans***

**Output 3**

* ***National Resource Management (Land Use) Plan*** with Community Resource Management Plans integrated into National Physical Planning Process

**OUTCOME**

* SLM mainstreamed into national resource management and physical planning
* Capacity for integrated resource management and SLM strengthened at community, district and institutional levels
* Knowledge base (community resource management plans and vulnerability atlases and National Land Use Plan) developed and management capacity to utilise LUP strengthened
* Investment Plan to effectively implement new legislation and Land Use Plan

🡾

Land Use Plan to support Integrated Ecosystem Management and address critical environmental issues

🡺

🡺

🡺

Improved community participation and ownership in coastal/terrestrial resource management (including hazard mapping) utilizing traditional/local knowledge

🡽

Improved inter-agency coordination in support of Integrated Ecosystem Management

**Dominica Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project**

**Workplan**

* February 2009 - Finalise proposed workplan and draft Terms of Reference for National Consultants and obtain approval of committee
* February 2009 - Advertise for National Consultants
* Late March 2009 – Consultant selection
* April 2009 - Hire national consultants
* **Output 1 - Comprehensive *Environmental and Resource Management Legislation***
* May 2009 – Committee, Project Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (PEO Specialist), National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) designs public awareness program (*Key elements* - objective, target audiences, message, mechanisms for delivery)
* May to June 2009 – National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) undertakes comprehensive legal, policy and institutional review through broad-based consultation (*detailed Terms of Reference to be concluded*)
* End June 2009 – Committee, Project Coordinator, International Consultant and National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) presents report on legal, policy and institutional review to National Workshop
* July 2009 – Outcomes of National Workshop presented to Cabinet in *Information Note* and approval obtained to initiate development of comprehensive environmental and resource management legislation through broad-based consultative process.
* August to November 2009 - National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) undertakes broad-based consultation on new legislation in collaboration with Committee.
* End of November 2009 – Committee, International Consultant and National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) presents outcomes from broad-based consultation on new legislation to National Workshop and obtains agreement on scope of proposed new environmental and resource management legislation
* December 2009 – Outcomes of National Workshop presented to Cabinet in *Information Note* and approval obtained to initiate drafting of comprehensive environmental and resource management legislation.
* January to March 2010 – Initial draft of comprehensive environmental and resource management legislation prepared for public consultation.
* April to July 2010 – Public consultation on draft legislation.
* September 2010 – Committee, Project Coordinator, International Consultant and National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) presents outcomes from consultation on draft legislation to National Workshop and obtains agreement on any proposed changes.
* September 2010 – Changes arising from national workshop incorporated into draft legislation
* October 2010 – Outcomes of National Workshop presented to Cabinet in *Information Note* and approval obtained to prepare Bill of new legislation for presentation to Cabinet and House of Assembly.
* **Output 2 - *Community Resource Maps* and *Vulnerability Atlases* for all Dominica**
* May 2009 – Committee, Project Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (PEO Specialist) National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) designs public awareness program (*Key elements* - objective, target audiences, message, mechanisms for delivery)
* May to June 2009 - National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) in collaboration with committee, National Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (PEO Specialist), National Consultant (GIS Specialist) and Special Program on Adaptation to Climate Change (SPACC) National Coordinator designs *Handbook for Development of Community Resource Maps and Vulnerability Atlas* (based on best international practices for community natural resource mapping, vulnerability assessments and community-based ecosystem management)
* May to August 2009 - National Consultant (GIS Specialist) undertakes assessment of existing LIS capacity, identify overlaps and gaps, determines needs (inclusive of integration/harmonization issues) and designs appropriate LRIS (GIS/mapping system) within National GIS Unit to geo-reference community maps and vulnerability atlases within national GIS data base, determines technology needs, procures and installs required equipment & establishes software.
* Early July 2009 – Committee, Project Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (PEO Specialist), National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) and SPACC National Coordinator present training-of-trainers program on use of *Handbook for Development of Community Resource Maps, Vulnerability Atlas and Resource Management Plans* to 30 (approx) extension officers from Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and from District Councils.
* August 2009 – Project Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (PEO Specialist), National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner), National Consultant (GIS Specialist) and SPACC National Coordinator oversee site testing of *Handbook for Development of Community Resource Map, Vulnerability Atlas and Resource Management Plans* with extension officers from Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and from District Councils.
* September 2009 - National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) undertake pilot integration of community maps into National GIS database.
* September 2009 to September 2010 – Development of Community Resource Maps, Vulnerability Atlases and Community Resource Management Plans by communities trained by extension officers from Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and from District Councils coordinated by Project Coordinator, International Consultant, National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner), National Consultant (GIS Specialist) and SPACC National Coordinator.
* April to August 2010 – Public consultation on mechanisms for integrating community resource management plans into National Resource Management Plan and draft legislation.
* September 2010 – Committee, International Consultant, National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) makes presentations to National Workshop on outcomes from consultation on mechanisms for integrating community resource management plans into National Resource Management Plan and draft legislation.
* October 2010 – Outcomes of National Workshop presented to Cabinet in *Information Note* and approval obtained to prepare Bill of new legislation and establish mechanisms for integrating community resource management plans into National Resource Management Plan.
  + **Output 3 - *National Resource Management Plan***
    - July 2009 - National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) undertakes evaluation of modalities for integration of Community Resource Management Plans/maps/atlases into National Physical Planning Process and to integrate/consolidate all spatial and relevant community maps and vulnerability atlases and resource management plans to establish *National Resource Management Plan*.
    - August 2009 to November 2010 - National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) integrates Community Resource Management Plans/maps/atlases into National GIS database to establish *National Resource Management Plan*.
    - September to October 2010 - Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) develop an interagency protocol/mechanism for information National Resource Management Plan access/sharing and develop data standards.
    - September to December 2010 - National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) develop training material (including system management protocols) and undertake training program on the use of the *National Resource Management Plan* and the use of LIS/GIS analytical tools and applications in support of the *National Resource Management Plan*.
    - November to December 2010 - Committee, International Consultant, National Consultant (Environmental Lawyer) National Consultant (Community Land Use Planner) and National Consultant (GIS Specialist) identify priority SLM investment needs and opportunities and develop a costed SLM Investment Plan including brief concept papers for priority investments to support inter-agency implementation and enforcement of *National Resource Management Plan*
    - Early December 2010 – Committee coordinate national workshop on financing for SLM projects

**ANNEX 2B**

**Agenda and Minutes of Selected Meetings**

**Meeting of Steering Committees of Second National Communications (SNC) and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Projects**

**Conference Room, Rosseau Fisheries Complex,**

Monday February 9, 2009

8:30 – 9:00 Registration

9:00 – 9:05 Opening Remarks (Lloyd Pascal, Director ECU.

9:05 – 9:20 Workshop Objectives and Overview – Dr. Reynold Murray (UNDP)

9:20 – 9:45 Listing of ongoing project in Dominica – identify status, implementing agency, location, and project goals

9:45 – 10:30 Coffee Break

10:30 – 11:00 Presentation of SNC Workplan – Colin Guiste

11:00 - 11:30 Presentation of SLM Workplan – Kongit Gabriel

12:00 – 12:30 Identification of Overlaps and potential for synergy

12:30 – 1:30 Lunch

1:30 – 2:30 Potential for support by FAO, IICA, UNDP Poverty Reduction, CRMI

2:30 – 3:30 Making it happen. How? Who? When?

3:00 End of Workshop

**ANNEX 2C**

**Report of Meeting**

**Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting**

**for:**

**‘Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the Commonwealth of Dominica’**

**Roseau Fisheries Complex**

**Dame M. Eugenia Charles Blvd.**

**Commonwealth of Dominica**

**Date:** 9th February, 2009

Meeting Convened:The meeting was called to order at 2:50 p.m Monday, February 09, 2009 by Mrs. Kongit Haile Gabriel, Project Coordinator.

Present were:

Reynold Murray – UNDP Representative (Barbados)

Kongit Haile Gabriel – Project Coordinator

George de Romilly – International Consultant

Bradley Guye – Asst. Project Coordinator

Hakim Dangleben – Public Works Department

Albert Gallion – Forestry, Wildlife & Parks

Adisa Trotter – Min. of Agriculture

Richard Allport – Min. of Agriculture

Magnus Williams – DOWASCO

Welcome remarks were made by the Project Coordinator, Mrs. Kongit Haile Gabriel, who thanked those present for their participation in the Inception Workshop held the morning of the 9th February 2009, and expressed her satisfaction at the progress achieved during the discussions and made reference to the fact that the continued support of the steering committee would guarantee the success and sustainability of the project.

She further went on to giving a briefing on the steering committee meetings held in 2008 and mentioned that the proposed 1 year work plan would be discussed and priority areas determined. She also gave a short introduction of the contracted members of the Project Management Unit and listed the position still to be filled under the PMU whom she mentioned would be hired before the end of the fourth quarter and thereon. She then went on to introduce Mr. George de Romilly who gave the complete overview of the Work plan.

**Overview of SLM Work Plan**

Mr. Romilly started by introducing the two documents that he was presenting. The first ***(Annex 1 - Analysis of Priorities for Action)*** highlighted the existing strategy documents on island along with the International and Regional Multi-lateral Agreements that have been signed by Dominica, and the Priority Actions that we can identify that these documents have specified. He mentioned that the objectives are met with the establishment of environmental legislation and improved community participation which needs to be developed and prioritized. He made reference to the fact that the E.C.U would have greater mandate over these Environmental issues if it was made a legal institution.

The second document (***Annex 2 - Proposed Approach and Workplan)*** provided the complete Work Plan for the SLM Project which showed the specific Outputs and time frame which would complement the Priority Actions that were identified taking into account that the desired outcome of this project would definitely serve as a model for other SIDS. Mr. Romilly gave an in depth overview of the 3 Outputs outlined under the project activities which included:

1. Output 1: Comprehensive Environmental and resource management legislation
2. Output 2:

* Community Resource Maps and Vulnerability Atlases for Dominica
* Community Resource Management Plans

1. Output 3: National Resource Management (Land Use) Plan

Throughout his presentation, Mr. Romilly expressed how important it is to get the communities involved and given the opportunity to take responsibility of their community’s affairs (community approach). He made mention of a few models for such an approach (including New Zealand`s *Resource Management Act*) and recommended that to avoid conflict in the process is to try and formulate the community maps and relevant legislation at the same time. He stated that the project seeks to help empower communities to give them a sense of ownership to their resources and help formulate strategies for sustainable development planning.

During his presentation a number of questions were put forward by the members of the steering committee and some important issues were captured. Some of these are listed as follows:

1. How are the communities brought on-board?

* Capacity training
* Work with local government (village councils)

1. How is the project going to be sustained?

* Community maps and vulnerability atlases
* Approved legislation mainstreamed into national development planning
* Improved institutional networking

Other issues;

* The community maps should include all lands owned by foreigners as these also add value to the community’s resources.
* The Community Resource Management Plan incorporates both terrestrial and marine/aquatic components of the communities.
* The vulnerability atlases should capture all internal and external factors and driving forces causing problems for sustainable land management planning.

**Recommendations**

The Steering Committee supports the proposed approach and workplan, and makde the following recommendations concerning implementation:

1. The project schedule should be able to work around the 2010 elections to avoid extended setbacks.
2. A national GIS steering committee should be created to coordinate the formulation of the community maps and vulnerability atlases to increase the coherence of those maps to national development planning and the national land information system (LIS).
3. The Project Management Unit should work closely with the Land and Surveys and Physical Planning Departments for formation of the comprehensive National Resource Management Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm with closing remarks made by Mrs. Kongit Haile Gabriel.

**APPENDIX 2D**

**Minutes of Project Managers meeting for:**

**‘Presentation of National projects and creation of synergies between those projects and the Sustainable Land Management initiative.’**

**Roseau Fisheries Complex**

**Dame M. Eugenia Charles Blvd.**

**Commonwealth of Dominica**

**Date:** 11th February, 2009

Meeting Convened:The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am Wednesday, February 11, 2009 by Mrs. Kongit Haile Gabriel, SLM Project Coordinator.

Present were:

Kongit Haile Gabriel – Project Coordinator: Sustainable Land Management (SLM) project

George de Romilly – International Consultant: Sustainable Land Management

Bradley Guye – Asst. Project Coordinator: Sustainable Land Management

Jeff Jno Baptiste – Project Coordinator: SPACC project

Collin Guiste – Project Coordinator: SNC project

Ronald Charles – Asst. Coordinator: IWCAM project

Jacqueline Andre – Project Coordinator: OPAAL project

Kelvin Rolle – Project Coordinator: Land Administration Reform Project

John Fontaine – Local Government Representative: Carib Community Capacity Building Project

Derrick Theophield – Fisheries ‘Caribbean Marine Atlas’ project

Welcome remarks were made by the SLM Project Coordinator, Mrs. Kongit Haile Gabriel, who thanked everyone present for attending this very important meeting on short notice and made it clear that the objective of the meeting was to try and create synergies between ongoing projects and the SLM project and in turn strengthen our inter-agency cooperation in national development planning. She then went on to welcome the SLM project’s International Consultant, Mr. George de Romilly, to introduce the project.

Mr. Romilly gave a very brief presentation of the project objective and went on further to discuss the desired Outcomes. He made mentioned that the SLM work plan would incorporate the results of this meeting to integrate the synergies identified and that a summary of the SLM project document would be made available to each participant. He then went on to invite the various project managers to give their presentations and from there the synergies would be identified.

Integrated Watershed and Coastal Areas Management (IWCAM) project: by Mr. Ronald Charles, Forestry Officer – Asst. Project Coordinator

* Project is GEF funded
* 5 year project, and entering 4th year of implementation
* Lab testing facilities assessed for testing of water quality
* Colihaut and Dublanc rivers were used as models for assess for a trainer-of-trainers workshop
* GIS training was conducted in July 2007
* Participated and part of a Regional Technical Steering Committee. Meetings are being hosted integrating countries with the IWCAM project and associated issues
* Dominica doesn’t yet have a model project developed for IWCAM
* P.S. of Agriculture is Project Coordinator

Synergies:

1. Development of the SLM trainer-of-trainers handbook (to include integrated water management)
2. Formation of the community maps and vulnerability atlases
3. Regional representation by presentation of the IWCAM-SLM synergies at the Regional Technical Steering Committee meetings

OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihood (OPAAL) project: by Ms. Jacqueline Andre, Forestry Officer – Project Coordinator

* Funded through the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
* Launched in 2005 in Dominica
* Focused on management strategies and livelihood opportunities around the Cabrits National Park and in particular the Marine component of the Park.
* There is a National Implementing Entity (Forestry, National Parks, Fisheries, etc.)
* There is a Site Implementing Entity
* Livelihood assessments done and component for zoning of area
* Communication strategy and Protected Areas Action Plan for the island
* Awaiting endorsement of draft Marine Management Plan
* Consultant to be hired to conduct a ‘Protected Areas Financing study’ before end of 2009
* Conducted training in Project Proposal Writing

Synergies:

1. Community mapping of Cabritz marine area (community resource maps and vulnerability atlases)
2. Individual (community) capacity building
3. Communication plan involving all stakeholders(Government agencies, NGO’s, CBO’s)
4. Formation of the SLM Trainers Handbook building on lessons learned from community mapping of Cabritz Marine Park

Carib Territory Community Capacity Building Project: by Mr. John Fontaine, Local Government Representative

* Objectives include:
  + - Community capacity training
    - Assessment for small scale business enterprise
    - Improved legislation to govern community needs
* Launched in February 2009
* Funded by Caribbean Development Bank
* Consultant to be hired to develop a Community Local Area Management Plan
* Component for road building and relocation of dwelling houses
* Component for mapping of community and establishment of habitants databases
* Stressed that the institutional and individual capacities were weak and need serious strengthening

Synergies:

* Community mapping/vulnerability atlases
* Community Management Plan
* Conflict Management (through model of new road development/relocation of dwellings)
* Development of Community Resource Management Plan for Carib Territory
* Strengthening local institutional and individual capacities
* Formation of the Trainer Handbook for use in Carib Territory

Special Adaptation to Climate Change (SPACC) project: by Mr. Jeff Jno Baptiste, ECU – Project Coord.

Synergies:

* Development of National Resources Management Plan (focus is Morne Diablotin National Park and Morne Trois Pitons World Heritage Site)
* Formation of Trainer Handbook
* Community hazard mapping/vulnerability atlases and community resource management plans
* Scientific forum to be held this year (SLM principles presented)

***Note:*** Mr. Ronald Charles mentioned that A National Task Force was formed to address the issue of Crop depredation in the National Park, set up in December 2008 with members from; Local government, Legal affairs, Min. of Finance, Forestry, Agriculture, Land & Surveys, and Farmer representatives. He noted that this task force could participate in the proposed SPACC Scientific Forum and present the social and economic element of the crop depredation issue.

Second National Communication (SNC) project: by Mr. Collin Guiste, ECU – Project Coord.

GEF- funded project that will be completed in 2009.

Synergies:

* Development of vulnerability atlases/community maps
* Public awareness/education
* Creation of Trainer Handbook
* Development of National Resource Management Plan
* The SNC final document should be completed before end of 2009 and can provide valuable input into the proposed SPACC Scientific forum, including the Chapter on vulnerability assessment for Dominica’s forest areas (including National Parks) and climate projections.

Land Registration Reform Project: by Mr. Kelvin Rolle, Physical Planning – Project Coord.

* Objective is to create a technological network between the Physical Planning Department and the Land & Surveys Division to database all land registration and associated issues island-wide and make the information more accessible institutionally.
* The project hopes to control all land registration and sale of lands island-wide

Synergies:

* Community mapping/vulnerability atlases
* Incorporation of digitalized Resource Management maps within National GIS Units
* Institutional strengthening

Caribbean Marine Atlas project: by Mr. Derrick Theophield

* Funded by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission **(I**OC) International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange (IODE)
* Established to enhance marine research, exploitation and development
* Create a greater database information sharing on the marine components of the Caribbean
* GIS workshop was held for institutional capacity building in marine information gathering and storage

Synergies:

* Formation of the Trainer handbook
* Development of community maps/vulnerability atlases (marine components)
* Institutional and individual capacity building (institutional strengthening)

Note: it was mentioned in the meeting that the Dominica Red Cross will be conducting a project to develop Community Hazard Maps for the country, which can guide and be integrated into the development of the SLM handbook on Community Mapping and Vulnerability Atlases, and the training of trainers and communities that is to be undertaken under the SLM project.

All project managers agreed to send an electronic summary of projects. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am with closing remarks made by Mr. George de Romilly.

(Minutes compiled by Bradley Guye)

**APPENDIX 3**

**Partnerships: Communications between consultants of SLM and SPACC**

Dear Marie-Jose,

Thank you for your note and copies of the maps that you have developed for the SPACC project utilising GPS equipment and training provided under the SLM project.  You are to be complimented for the high quality of maps that have been produced. We are very pleased to see the SLM equipment and training that you received being applied in this manner, and resulting in a GIS dataset which is of considerable value to Dominica and the National Parks Service, and which provide essential information to support climate change adaptation planning for the two national parks under the SPACC project.

 By copy of this note I would ask Kongit Gabriel in the ECU, who is the SLM Focal Point, to:

 (a)    once permission to distribute these maps has been obtained from the CCCCC, please ensure that copies of these maps are passed on to Annie Edwards in the Department of Physical Planning to ensure that they are lodged on the **SLM Central Database**;

(b)   please collaborate with her to obtain from the Department of Physical Planning (and the Department of Lands and Surveys) any outstanding GIS data that you require to complete your work under the SPACC program, in particular the names of land owners abutting the National Parks' boundaries;

(c)    please collaborate with Kimisha (SLM PEO Consultant) to arrange for the community consultations that are required to discuss the proposed national parks buffer areas, resource management issues, and community adaptation plans.

 I would also request permission from Shyla (CCCCC) for permission to forward copies of these maps to Dr. Reynold Murray in the UNDP (Barbados) who is Program Manager for the GEF-funded SLM program in the Caribbean. These maps are a noteworthy example of what can be achieved through collaboration between two GEF projects, and are a significant demonstration of the benefits that are already being achieved through the SLM program in Dominica.

Regards,

 George de Romilly

**APPENDIX 4**

**3.0 List of Meetings & Interviews**

**Dates:** Monday & Tuesday August 9 &10, 9:00 am to 12:00 noon

Kongit Haile-Gabrel Project Manager

Bradley Guy Assistant Coordinator

Project Steering Committee August 9th @ 1:00 pm

Samuel Carrot PS Ministry of Environment August 10th @ 1:00 pm

**E-mail Interviews**

George de Romilly

Lennox Daisley

**4.0 List of Questions**

**Questions for Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).**

1. What activities have been completed under the project to date?
2. What is the proposed date for the completion of other activities?
3. Which community organizations (NGOs) were involved in the project so far and what were their roles?
4. How would you define mainstreaming?
5. To what extend has SLM been mainstreamed in Dominica?
6. What would you consider as the greatest achievement of the project to date?
7. Capacity development is a major component of the project. What capacity has been developed a) At the national institutional level?

b) At the national policy level?

c) At the individual and community level?

8. What is the status of the National Action Plan (NAP)? How is the NAP being factored into the SLM?

9. What impact has the SLM made at the national level? Is the public aware of the project?

10. What other national projects (specifically GEF projects) are being implemented jointly or in synergy with the SLM?

11. Have the GEF funds been used specifically to support this project? Are the GEF funds adequate?

12. Have government co-financing been forthcoming?

13. Is there a financial plan to support long term mainstreaming of SLM?

14. List all visible changes/impacts that are occurring in Dominica as a result of the implementation of the SLM.

15. How could the impacts of the SLM be improved?

16. Is the implementation methodology of the SLM effective? How could it be improved?

16. What are the main successes of the SLM? What are its greatest failures/weaknesses?

17. How will you rate the quality of work delivered by (a) the local consultants (b) the international consultants.

18. Has time management on the project been an issue? Explain.

19. Has the steering committee functioned? Are there meeting reports/minutes?

20. Has UNDP been helpful? Explain