

## **St. Kitts and Nevis Enabling Activity**

### **Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities.**

#### **Terminal Evaluation**

**Project Funded by:**

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF)

**Implementing Agency:**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

**Prepared by:**

Varsha Persaud

**October 2011**

## Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	4
2. Introduction .....	8
3. The Project and its Development Context .....	10
4. Findings.....	12
<b>4.1 Project Formulation</b> .....	12
<b>4.2. Project Implementation</b> .....	14
<b>4.3. Results</b> .....	20
5. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	22
6. Lessons Learned .....	24
7. Annexes .....	26
<b>7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE MID-TERM EVALUATION</b> .....	26
<b>7.2 TERMINOLOGY USED</b> .....	39
<b>7.3 ITINERARY</b> .....	43
<b>7.4 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED</b> .....	44
<b>7.5 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR</b> .....	45
<b>7.6 QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS</b> .....	46
<b>7.7 LIST OF WORKSHOPS</b> .....	47

## Acronyms

AOP	Annual Operational Plan
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GEF	Global Environment Fund
HACT	Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer
IA	Implementing Agency
IWCAM	Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessment
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OPAL	OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods
PIR	Project Implementation Report
QOR	Quarterly Operation Report
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

## 1. Executive Summary

St. Kitts and Nevis ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on January 7, 1993. In 1998, the country was awarded US\$104,000 from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) to support an enabling activity under the Convention. The enabling activity resulted in the development of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), a partial inventory of biodiversity resources and the establishment of a public awareness programme on biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis. Information on traditional knowledge and biodiversity conservation was not compiled in a comprehensive manner at that time. The letter delegating authority to UNDP Barbados and the OECS for the St Kitts and Nevis Add-On Enabling Activity: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities, was dated March 26, 2008 and the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis signed the agreement with UNDP on March 17, 2009. Actual work on the project commenced in June 2009, and the project is to be operationally closed in December, 2011.

Working in tandem with the national development team, the project team was expected to deliver the following outputs:

- An Assessment Report Identifying *In-situ* and *Ex-situ* Conservation Strategies, Mitigation Strategies Against Threats to Biodiversity and Incentive Measures to Preserve Biodiversity-related Traditional Knowledge,
- The Second National Report on Biodiversity for submission to the COP,
- A web-based biodiversity information system linked to other biodiversity networks, and
- Increased public awareness of the value of biodiversity and increased national capacity for biodiversity management and conservation.

A Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project was conducted near the point of operational closure of the project. The TE was conducted between September 12 and October 31, 2011. The mission to St. Kitts took place from September 21 to September 23, 2011. The TE was conducted in accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy. It therefore assessed the achievements of the

project in terms of outputs, lessons learnt and the sustainability of the impacts created by the project. It also assessed the relevance of the project activities to the national development reality, and the efficiency and effectiveness with which the project activities were delivered.

To facilitate project implementation, a Project Consultant was contracted to drive implementation and the work of the project was undertaken mainly by external project consultants. To offset potential challenges created by this, the Project Consultant identified government agencies that should be involved, what their roles should be, and the benefits that would flow from their involvement with the project, the agencies themselves, and the nation as a whole. The principal limitation to their participation was primarily time availability to participate, given their significant responsibilities in their principal posts. Nevertheless, the harmony fostered through this collaborative effort has helped significantly in the achievement of the project's goals. The Project Consultant also attempted to involve civil society in project implementation, but their principal role was as providers of traditional knowledge on biodiversity rather than a leadership role in driving the project. Given the collaborative approach with government agencies identified above, and the fact that the calibre of consultants used was high, the project delivered on its outputs and objectives in a high quality and effective manner.

The evaluation found that about 90% of the targets of the project have been achieved to date. The principal outcomes are:

- The Environmental Impact Assessment training that targeted the government and private sector and gave both groups the capacity to identify threats and take protective actions, both in construction and land management. This was accompanied by the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) tool to evaluate and mitigate threats to biodiversity;
- The sharing of information on potential livelihood opportunities within the communities. This has raised awareness of biodiversity and its economic value and has generated tangible outputs in the form of projects in livelihood initiatives; and

- The generation of the *In-situ* and *Ex-situ* Conservation Strategies. If these can retain flexibility in the face of changing land use patterns, they can serve the country well in the context of conservation and management of biodiversity.
- Increased awareness of the value of traditional knowledge, particularly as it relates to biodiversity value, conservation and management, and the development of a database in this context.
- The preparation of the Second National Report on the status of Biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis and its submission to the COP.

The principal project deliverable that was not realised as envisaged in the project document is the Clearing House Mechanism. Financial constraints required that this be modified to become a repository of information housed in the Ministry of Sustainable Development. However, it is proposed that in the near future this will be transferred to a government information system which is more readily accessible by the public.

The principal lessons learned through the implementation of the present project are:

- Inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination is essential for the successful implementation of projects at a national level, since it allows all sectors of government and civil society to share information and share views.
- Projects that have relevance to livelihoods and poverty alleviation readily gain the attention of stakeholders and government and are good vehicles for transposing knowledge, attitudes and skills intended for sustainability.
- The involvement of local persons, particularly technical experts, in all phases of the project cycle results in stronger project outputs that bear meaning and significance to national

development and the way of life of the people. Future project development should consider a heavier use of local personnel.

- Current policies, legal frameworks and institutional arrangements for biodiversity management are inadequate in St. Kitts and Nevis. There is a significant need for upgrading the legal framework within which biodiversity is managed and conserved.

<b>Table 1- Main Project Ratings</b>		
		<b>Rating</b>
<b>Project Formulation</b>	Conceptualization	Satisfactory
	Stakeholder Participation	Moderately Unsatisfactory
<b>Project Implementation</b>	Implementation Approach	Satisfactory
	Monitoring and Evaluation	Satisfactory
	Stakeholder participation in implementation	Moderately Satisfactory
<b>Results</b>	Attainment of outcomes Achievement of objectives	Satisfactory
<b>Sustainability</b>	Financial resources	Moderately Likely (ML).
	Socio-political:	Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
	Institutional framework and governance:	Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
	Environmental:	Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that are likely to affect this element of sustainability.

## 2. Introduction

St. Kitts and Nevis ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on January 7, 1993. In 1998, the country was awarded US\$104,000 from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) to support an enabling activity under the Convention. The enabling activity resulted in the development of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), a partial inventory of biodiversity resources and the establishment of a public awareness programme on biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis. While the public awareness programme is credited with engaging civil society in biodiversity management, no information management and data dissemination plan, as typically found in a Clearing House Mechanism (CHM), was developed for St. Kitts and Nevis. Information on traditional knowledge and biodiversity conservation was not compiled in a comprehensive manner at that time.

The generation, management and use of data on biological diversity is important to St. Kitts and Nevis but these activities were very poorly managed and developed. To help address this and to address some issues identified in the National Biodiversity and Action Plan (NBSAP), St. Kitts and Nevis received additional funding from GEF in 2009 for the project entitled 'Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities', which was essentially an Add-On Enabling Activity pursuant to the original grant. The project was scheduled to close in June 2010, and local government authorities have cited human resource challenges for the delays. The present document is a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project and comes at the point of operational closure of the project when all slated project activities have been completed and reports submitted. This TE was conducted in accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy. It therefore assessed the achievements of the project in terms of outputs, lessons learnt and the sustainability of the impacts created by the project. It also assessed the relevance of the project activities to the national development reality, and the efficiency and effectiveness with which the project activities were delivered. The intent is to promote efficiency in accountability of resources used and to document, provide feedback on and disseminate the lessons learned to facilitate the development of other



UNDP/GEF projects. The TE was conducted between September 12 and October 31, 2011. The mission to St. Kitts took place from September 21 to September 23, 2011.

The evaluation was conducted by a single independent evaluator who had no previous contact with the project but was acquainted with the GEF, UNDP and St. Kitts and Nevis. It was therefore necessary to use as many sources of information and as many methodological approaches as possible in the execution of the evaluation. To facilitate this, the evaluator had early discussions with the UNDP Programme Manager for Energy and the Environment on the intent and process of the evaluation. The evaluator used both qualitative and quantitative methods for the evaluation. The qualitative aspects included a desk review of: the project document, the project annual work-plans, the project implementation reports (PIRs), progress reports, the final project report, UNDP–GEF guidance policies on the evaluation process and the project outputs (including the conservation strategies, the Environmental Impact Assessment Toolkit and the Traditional Knowledge Report).

Interviews were conducted with the Head of the Physical Planning and Environment Department in the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the UNDP Programme Manager and selected consultants who had worked on the project. Questionnaires were sent to relevant persons who were unavailable to participate in the interviews or to attend an individual meeting. Having completed these activities, the evaluator convened a discussion session with the Project Manager and the UNDP Programme Manager. The Project Manager provided an overview of the project execution and lessons learnt. The Programme Manager clarified issues that had arisen during the evaluation process.

Having completed the qualitative analyses and conducted the interviews indicated above, the indicators in the project document were quantitatively analysed to assess the relevance and efficiency of UNDP-GEF support and the overall project performance.

At the end of the mission to St. Kitts and Nevis, an exit interview was held with the Head of the Environment Department, where clarifications on some issues were sought and provided by both parties. All parties agreed that the evaluation exercise had been conducted in an atmosphere of cordiality and that the preliminary findings were fair and accurate.

### **3. The Project and its Development Context**

The letter delegating authority to UNDP Barbados and the OECS for the St Kitts and Nevis Enabling Activity: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities, was dated March 26, 2008 but the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis only signed the agreement with UNDP on March 17, 2009. This meant that the Project, whose duration was to be twelve months, was already twelve months delayed. Actual work on the project commenced in June 2009, and by November 2010 there was only one outstanding report, i.e. the Use of Traditional Knowledge, and one other outstanding component, i.e. the development of a Clearing House Mechanism. The consultant failed to deliver on time with respect to the report, and negotiations were held to ensure that the activity was completed. The final report was submitted in July 2011, two years after the initial start. The project is now expected to be operationally closed by December, 2011.

The project sought to address some issues identified in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) as priorities but for which no local funds were available. These problems were also identified in the National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act and the Physical Development Plan. The main issues were: 1) measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources, 2) methodologies to evaluate and mitigate threats to biodiversity, 3) the design of approaches relevant to implementation of incentive measures for the protection of biodiversity, and 4) the preservation and maintenance of traditional knowledge on biodiversity.

The immediate objectives of the project were the preparation of the Second National Biodiversity Report, the assessment of capacity building needs of St. Kitts and Nevis relevant to biodiversity management and the development of a Clearing House Mechanism for biodiversity information. It was expected that, if these objectives were achieved, the capacity at the national and individual level, i.e. the institutional and systemic framework, to manage biodiversity in keeping with national and international obligations, would have been greatly improved.

Achieving the objectives outlined in the project document required the involvement of government departments such as Fisheries, Forestry, Agriculture and Planning, along with civil society

and private sector organizations. The main civil society organizations in St. Kitts and Nevis include the St. Christopher Heritage Society (now The National Trust), the Nevis Historical and Conservation Society and the Farmers Cooperative.

Working in tandem with the national development team, the project team was expected to deliver the following outputs:

- An Assessment Report identifying *In-situ* and *Ex-situ* conservation strategies, mitigation strategies against threats to biodiversity and incentive measures to preserve biodiversity-related traditional knowledge,
- The Second National Report on Biodiversity for submission to the COP, and
- A web-based biodiversity information system linked to other biodiversity networks.

In addition to these physical deliverables, it was expected that the capacity to service the database and understand and use the assessment report would be developed in all stakeholder groups. Overall, the national understanding of biodiversity and the desire to protect the resource was expected to improve.

## **4. Findings**

### **4.1 Project Formulation**

Under the GEF Enabling Activity support provided in 1998, St. Kitts and Nevis developed a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which produced a partial inventory of biodiversity resources and conducted a public awareness programme. On completion of this phase, several weaknesses in the country's biodiversity management plan were identified and 'Add-on' funds were therefore sought to address these weaknesses and make biodiversity management an economically sustainable activity. The Project, which was entitled 'Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities' had a strong focus on capacity assessment, with the intent of filling capacity gaps and creating national awareness to drive biodiversity management and use in St. Kitts and Nevis. This would involve recognition of the economic value of biodiversity, the collection of information on traditional knowledge and the involvement of civil society in the management and protection of biodiversity.

The design of the project indicated above is consistent with biodiversity concerns long held in St. Kitts and Nevis. For example, the Environment Department of the government has been seeking the establishment of protected areas for some time, as this is the central pillar of the National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act. The staff of the Environment Department argue that very little is known about the species composition of the forested areas and other natural habitats. They claim that human activities, such as physical development and deforestation are doing more damage to biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis than natural phenomenon like droughts. Groups such as the St. Christopher Heritage Society emphasise coastal development and erosion as threats to biodiversity, while farmers and land owners are more concerned about the increase in the monkey and wild donkey populations and the resulting threat to food security.

There were two successful national consultations conducted during the formulation of this project. On both of these occasions, NGO groups, such as the St. Christopher and Nevis Heritage Society, participated, but it was difficult to determine whether they had any meaningful impact on the final project design. The involvement of farmers and land owners in project formulation could not be ascertained. The principle player in the national consultations, and hence in project formulation, was clearly public sector, particularly the Environment Department and the Planning Department. Given the limited participation and impact of NGOs and CSOs in the final project design, stakeholder participation in the Project, outside of the public sector is considered only Moderately Satisfactory (**MS**).

There were two other issues particularly relevant to project formulation. The first is that, in approving funding for the Add-on project GEF was sensitive to their Council Decision which sought to ensure consistency in the structure of projects funded. The structure of the current project is therefore very similar to the enabling activities in other countries funded by the GEF with similar objectives. The logical framework for these projects is therefore relatively similar across projects. The implementation phase of this project adhered rigidly to its logical framework. This was possible because the logical framework listed achievable targets that were of national significance.

The second issue of relevance to project formulation was that UNDP, as the Implementing Agency (IA), was very instrumental in the formulation of the project. Having supported the development and implementation of the NBSAP and the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA), the IA was very aware of the challenges facing St. Kitts and Nevis and was able to select the appropriate responses, including professional personnel to fashion the Biodiversity Add-On project. In so doing, UNDP ensured linkage and synergy among the group of biodiversity-related projects it implemented. The synergies went beyond grouping of project activities to data dissemination and sharing of lessons learnt. The development of the Clearing House Mechanism under the Biodiversity Add-On project made provision for including the data developed under the NCSA and the NBSAP. In addition, the Biodiversity Add-On project expanded the Traditional Knowledge element initiated under the NBSAP and further identified the threats to biodiversity conservation in St. Kitts and Nevis. These combined outputs were possible as the IA had the necessary background information, the confidence of the

local authorities and the technical expertise to bring it all together. Further, UNDP was able to use its knowledge base and the lessons learnt from the implementation of the NBSAP to guide the Add-On Project, specifically the choice of conservation strategy and the public sectors to be targeted for EIA training and conservation education.

Given the heavy involvement of the Environment Department and the Planning Department in project formulation, the significant role of UNDP as Implementing Agency, and the quality of the project's logical framework and its consistency with national priorities, the overall conceptualization of the project can be rated as Satisfactory (**S**).

If country ownership of this project was measured only by public sector involvement and the inclusion of issues considered by these agencies to be of national significance, then project ownership by stakeholders could be considered very high. However, a sense of ownership of the project by civil society is almost certainly weaker, given their much more limited role in project formulation.

#### **4.2. Project Implementation**

The 'Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities' Project was implemented through a series of training sessions, demonstration exercises, information exchanges, workshops for verification of data, and data dissemination initiatives. These activities followed the plan set out in the logical framework for the project, with each activity following sequentially and building logically upon the other. No changes in project design were made during project implementation.

There were some initial challenges that had to be overcome at the onset of the Project. One of these was that the information in the project document at the time of project design did not perfectly match the national needs at the time of project implementation. This was due to significant delays between the conceptualisation of the project and the commencement of implementation, and the fact that the country was moving out of sugar production over this period, with no identifiable

alternative for use of the sugar lands. The project design, which quite heavily reflected the requirements of the GEF and the UNCBD, did not capture this aspect of the changing economic landscape in St. Kitts and Nevis. A potential risk created by this was that some agencies whose responsibilities had become relevant to biodiversity conservation were not formally accommodated in the project document's approach to implementation.

Partly to address the above challenge, the Project Consultant provided a workplan at project inception. This plan set out the flow of work and highlighted the Project Consultant's understanding of the project and his Company's role in its execution. The workplan also identified other agencies that should be involved, what their roles should be, and the benefits that would flow from their involvement with the project, the agencies themselves, and the nation as a whole. As part of this process, the consultant met with Ministry officials and sought to establish their role in national biodiversity management. As a consequence, the workplans of the various agencies did incorporate some elements of the biodiversity programme. The Ministry of Sustainable Development's resources were used to facilitate workshops and training sessions, and disseminate information where necessary. The harmony fostered through this collaborative effort has helped significantly in the achievement of the central project objective, i.e. "the assessment of capacity building needs of St. Kitts and Nevis". Through the joint implementation of project activities, the strengths, weaknesses and gaps among agencies was determined.

The local authorities agreed to let the Project Consultant drive the project with a minimal lead role from the Environment Department. The recruitment of consultants for the implementation of the project was done in accordance with the government recruitment process and was acceptable to UNDP. With very few exceptions, the calibre of the consultants used was exceptional, and their availability for execution of the project was well suited to the timeline of the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis. An appropriate staff member from the government was detailed for periodic consultation with the consultant to ensure adherence to the project document and the expectations of the government and people of St. Kitts and Nevis. The consequence of this was that the project delivered on its outputs and objectives in a high quality and cost effective manner. The sole significant exception was with the production of the report entitled 'Preservation of Traditional

Knowledge Important to Biodiversity'. The submission of this report was delayed by almost one year and, indeed, the report has only recently been submitted.

One of the challenges created by the fact that the work of the project was undertaken mainly by external consultants (non-governmental) is the limitation this may place on technical capacity development or technology transfer to St. Kitts and Nevis government institutions during the project. Cognisant of this, the government forged links between this project and two other GEF funded projects with strong biodiversity elements. These are the Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) Project and the OPAL (OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods) Project. These linkages did help to enhance the biodiversity management skill and education of technical staff of the Ministry and associated NGOs.

Given the strengths and challenges with project implementation identified above, the overall approach to project implementation can be considered Satisfactory (**S**).

A necessary aspect for effective project implementation is the availability of funds to support project activities. The US\$175,000 provided by the GEF seemed adequate at the time of project approval. However, the land use changes which occurred after project approval created additional challenges for biodiversity conservation and management in the context of economic development. It therefore took considerable co-financing from government to make the project successful, even though co-financing was not a requirement of the project. As indicated previously, government's resources were used frequently to facilitate workshops and training sessions, and disseminate information. In addition, the administrative costs of the project were borne by the government. However, it would be difficult to quantify the use of government resources in project execution and administration, as these were not itemised and documented separately, but were lumped together with the general expenses of the Department supporting the project. The major project activity which was constrained by limited funding was the development of an electronic Clearing House Mechanism in which data on biodiversity can be posted for public use. Despite the challenges indicated above, no additional funds were sought from the GEF for project implementation.



Compared to other regional activities of a similar nature, the delivery of this 5-year old project at current cost speaks to the cost effectiveness and financial management provided by the project team. Funds were disbursed to the consultants and the government of St. Kitts and Nevis through the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), which provides for direct payments to consultants and advances to the national government as requested by the government. In all cases, the appropriate request and reporting forms were duly signed by the government and submitted to UNDP for payment. All of these forms and requests for payment were in line with the annual work plan submitted to UNDP by the government. Government personnel and the Project Consultant did raise concern about delays in the disbursement of funds. This evaluation found that, on a number of occasions, the consultants' banking information posed challenges to UNDP and there were communication constraints between UNDP and the government in this context. This suggests a need for more dialogue between UNDP and the government of St. Kitts and Nevis to better understand the characteristics of each other's financial procedures and systems.

A sense of ownership of a project is an important prerequisite for the sustainability of project activities on project completion. As indicated previously, the Project Consultant did attempt to involve other agencies in project implementation from the onset, and workplans of the various agencies did incorporate elements of the biodiversity programme as a consequence. Moreover, the considerable co-financing provided by the government does indicate a strong element of ownership. However, there were challenges in the extent to which personnel from the different agencies could participate. As is to be expected in a small developing state, there is a human resource challenge in St. Kitts and Nevis. This evaluation found that there are many skilled and capable persons in St. Kitts and Nevis, but most of these persons are overwhelmed with issues in their current post and cannot make a significant contribution to every project that is referred for their attention. Moreover, capable persons may be attached to a Ministry or Department that is not specifically involved in the project or is involved in a time-demanding post in the private sector.

The role of civil society in project implementation was limited despite the fact that a key factor in the collection of information on biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis is extracting and documenting the knowledge of the local people. Much of the information generated under this project was the result

of local stakeholder interaction with the consultant team, given the wealth of knowledge on biodiversity which locals possess. However, although local stakeholders were the providers of information, they did not implement any part of the project or drive this initiative.

Given all of the above, it is felt that stakeholder participation in the project can be considered to be Moderately Satisfactory (**MS**).

There are two other factors that may jeopardise the sustainability of project activities. The first is that, since the work of the project was undertaken mainly by external consultants, there was limited technical capacity development or technology transferred to government institutions. The second is that the electronic Clearing House Mechanism could not be developed due to financial limitations. The Government's position on sustainability is that there was not enough project funding to support initiatives that would facilitate sustainability, and that there is no dedicated government resource for this purpose. However, to facilitate sustainability, it is the intention of government to create an electronic data repository within the Ministry of Sustainable Development to house all national data relating to biodiversity and land management. At some future point this data will be transferred to a government information website which is currently under development. Apart from the creation of a biodiversity electronic data repository, there are other recommendations from the Project Consultant which will not be realised until after the project is completed. One of these is the need for legislation that would ensure that persons pay for environmental services received or national biodiversity used.

While government has established a protocol for monitoring and evaluation of programmes in the national budget, it has not formally established monitoring and evaluation protocols for projects implemented by external agencies. There was no internal monitoring and evaluation system created specifically for this project. The general national monitoring system was therefore used, which is not project specific. This includes accounting for the progress of the project in national and sectoral work programmes, and involves submission of contracts and payment requests to a senior accounting officer, who can check these against the project's annual operation plan and time lines. However, in the case of this project which was consultant-driven the consultants had to produce frequent reports, and project progress could therefore be monitored by both government and UNDP. The lack of a

robust monitoring system for the project by government was compensated by the monitoring and evaluation conducted by UNDP.

The project followed the standard UNDP project cycle and reporting guidelines. The UNDP requires quarterly operation reports, annual operation plans and project implementation report. These, and the frequent reports by the Consultant are the written records of the project's performance. Given the availability of these, this evaluation finds that the monitoring and evaluation component of the Project can be rated as Satisfactory (**S**).

### 4.3. Results

Activity	Status	Comments
Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities	Completed as planned	Report available
Implementation of General Measures for <i>In-situ</i> and <i>Ex-situ</i> Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity	Completed as planned	Report available
Methodology to Evaluate and Mitigate Threats to Biodiversity	Completed as planned	Report available
Design Approaches Relevant to the Implementation of Incentive Measures	Completed as planned	Report available and Legislative Framework drafted for approval
Preservation and Maintenance of Traditional Knowledge Important to Biodiversity	Recently completed	Report submitted but not yet reviewed
Preparation of the Second National Report for Submission to the COP	Submitted to COP	
Development of a Country-Driven CHM for Biodiversity	Not done	A modified approach is proposed by government.

Consideration of the Table above suggests that about 90% of the targets of the project have been achieved to date. The review of the report not yet conducted and the development and operationalisation of the CHM will take some time, but are expected to be completed by the time of operational closure of the project in December, 2011.

The two principal project components which were designed to ensure sustainability of project activities are the *Ex-situ* and *In-situ* Conservation Strategies and the Clearing House Mechanism. However, there are some socio-political risks associated with sustainability of the conservation strategies. The conservation strategies, while good in themselves, will only be applicable and relevant under the existing patterns of land use and the existing land tenure system. The closure of

the sugar industry has left large tracts of land uncultivated and unprotected, creating the potential for erosion and misuse (squatting) or conversion to land use that is adverse to conservation and protection of biodiversity. This situation of changing land use patterns is aggravated by the fact that the majority of the land in St. Kitts and Nevis is owned by the State. This can create uncertainty in a democratic political system in that a change in the government can bring a change in land policy which can greatly affect land use.

The Clearing House Mechanism also has some sustainability challenges. As indicated previously, the CHM, as envisaged in the project document, was not developed due to financial constraints, but has been modified to become a repository of information to be housed in the Ministry of Sustainable Development. This limits access to the information and hence its general usefulness, as it is confined within the Ministry of Sustainable Development. However, the proposed transfer to a government information system should help to address this constraint.

There were no environmental risks associated with the outcomes of the project, rather there are positive elements that can guide or support environmental management at the national and institutional level.

Given that the objectives and outcomes of the project were apparent to all parties, and that about 90% of the targets of the project have been achieved to date, this evaluation found that the project outcomes were satisfactory (**S**), despite the delays in project implementation, the fact that the CHM has not yet been operationalised, and the fact that there are some socio-political risks associated with sustainability of the conservation strategies.

## 5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Project formulation and implementation did not perfectly match the county's development agenda at the time of project implementation because of the lengthy delay between project conceptualisation and implementation and the significant changes in land use patterns over this period. Despite this, the project has achieved some significant outputs that have the potential to shape the future of biodiversity conservation and protection in St. Kitts and Nevis. Noteworthy among these are:

- The Environmental Impact Assessment training that targeted the government and private sector and gave both groups the capacity to identify threats and take protective actions, both in construction and land management;
- The sharing of information on potential livelihood opportunities within the communities has raised awareness of biodiversity and generated tangible outputs in the form of projects in livelihood initiatives; and
- The generation of the In-situ and Ex-situ Conservation Strategies, if these can retain flexibility in the face of changing land use patterns, can serve the country well in the context of conservation and management of biodiversity.

Having reviewed the project lifecycle, the following recommendations are made as a way to build on successes gained while supporting future projects in biodiversity:

- There is a need to translate the traditional knowledge on conservation into practice and to make it people oriented. An important example is the best way to harvest product from the forest, i.e. to harvest in a sustainable manner which does not destroy plant biodiversity in the process.

- There is need to engage the wider society in public awareness programmes on traditional knowledge, and to create a repository for this information that is readily accessible.
- There is a need to maintain and expand the involvement of civil society groups and local consultants in biodiversity management and programming.

## 6. Lessons Learned

There are several significant lessons that can be learned from the implementation of the current project. These include:

- The realisation that environmental benefits from a project may be critical at the island level but not be considered globally significant. For example, while the project outcomes will not have a global environmental impact, the project set the stage for the preservation of the former sugar lands of St. Kitts and Nevis and the creation of awareness on livelihood challenges to the people.
- There is a limited awareness of the value of biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis, even among senior government officials. One consequence is that government significantly underestimates the economic benefits that can be derived from biodiversity. A second consequence is that biodiversity conservation has a low priority in St. Kitts and Nevis. This emphasises the need for significant public awareness programmes on biodiversity in the country.
- Current policies, legal frameworks and institutional arrangements for biodiversity management are inadequate in St. Kitts and Nevis. There is a significant need for upgrading the legal framework within which biodiversity is managed and conserved.
- Inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination is essential for the successful implementation of projects at a national level, since it allows all sectors of government and civil society to share information and share views.



- Projects that have relevance to livelihoods and poverty alleviation readily gain the attention of stakeholders and government and are good vehicles for transposing knowledge, attitudes and skills intended for sustainability.
- The involvement of local persons, particularly technical experts, in all phases of the project cycle results in stronger project outputs that bear meaning and significance to national development and the way of life of the people. Future project development should consider a heavier use of local personnel.
- Education programmes targeting youths and children are vital to ensuring the preservation of traditional knowledge and the transfer of knowledge on conservation across generations.

## **7. Annexes**

### **7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE MID-TERM EVALUATION**

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

##### **1.1 UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy**

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;
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

##### **1.2 The project objectives and its context**

The project will support the mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through institutional, individual and systemic capacity building. The institutional capacity building will be directed at creating synergies to facilitate maximization of resource in the effective delivery of technical support to government agencies, the private sector, community based organization and civil society groups.

The project objective is to strengthen and develop capacity for sustainable land management in relevant government ministries, the private sector and civil society organizations, and to mainstream sustainable land management into national development planning. The project will realize five outcomes: (1) SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks (2) Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed, (3) Capacity for knowledge management in support of SLM developed, (4) Investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM interventions are elaborated (5) Adaptive Management and Learning. The three year project will be implemented by the Environmental Services Unit in the Ministry of Health and the Environment using the multi-stakeholder participatory approach involving public, private and non-government organizations.

#### **2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP CO in Barbados. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures

for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

The overall objective of the MTE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

The main stakeholders of this MTE are the Ministries of Health and the Environment, Agriculture and Fisheries and Finance and Planning. Other stakeholders include the Steering Committee and the NGO community.

The MTE must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project to date by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. MTEs have four complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues, for example in the mid term evaluation.

### **3 PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP CO before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination Unit (RCU) and project team electronically within 2 weeks after the evaluation mission has been concluded. These parties will review the document and provide feedback to the evaluation team within 1 month after the evaluation report draft has been submitted. The evaluator will address these comments and provide a final report within a period of 1 week. In case of discrepancy between parties and the evaluation team an anNIM should be included at the end of the document explaining the discrepancies.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centered bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.

- Length: Maximum 50 pages in total excluding anNIMes
- Timeframe of submission: first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

#### 4 METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in line with international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group<sup>21</sup>. Any change must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

- (i) **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in AnNIM 2. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Project Team and by the UNDP Country Office. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, project reports, Project Steering Committee minutes and decisions, project budgets, project workplans, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP guidance documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful. The National Project Coordinator will also provide a report of the project’s accomplishments and lessons.
- (ii) **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum: The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health and the Environment, The Director of Finance (UNDP’s focal point), the Environmental Director/Coordinator, members **from the project Steering Committee and the National Project Coordinator**.
- (iii) **Field Visits** should be made to any site where there are demonstration activities.
- (iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team
- (v) **Questionnaires**
- (vi) **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

#### 5 EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation will be undertaken by a single consultant who must be familiar with the subject matter as well as the local conditions in St. Kitts and Nevis.

#### 6 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

##### 6.1 Management Arrangements

---

<sup>21</sup> [www.uneval.org](http://www.uneval.org)

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by UNDP Barbados and the OECS as project Implementing Agency. The UNDP Sub-regional Office for Barbados and the OECS has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements. Briefing sessions will be scheduled as necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by UNDP Sub-regional office. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF- RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

## **6.2 Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines**

The total duration of the evaluation will be **24** days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: (4 days including travel time)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, Mid term Evaluation report and other evaluation report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP-Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.

Mission: (10 days-)

- Meeting with UNDP Country office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in St. Kitts and Nevis
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site
  - Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
  - Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft report (8 days-): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, Project team.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO
- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 1 month

Final Report (2days-)

- Presentation of final evaluation report

## 7 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The scope of a MTE will depend upon project type, size, focal area, and country context. In all cases, the TE should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. In most cases, the TE will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It also analyses the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of the country.

In general it is expected that evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria<sup>2</sup>:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
- **Sustainability.** The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The following should be covered in the TE report:

### ***General information about the evaluation.***

The TE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. More details are provided in the template of Terms of Reference (**ToR**) in AnNIM 2.

### ***Assessment of Project Results***

TEs will at the minimum assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outcomes were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the TE will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document, and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator- together with the Project Team- should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional

capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes in behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. **For GEF 4 projects it is required**, and for GEF 3 projects it is encouraged, that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant Tracking Tools.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives following three criteria will be assessed in the TE:

- **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluators should also assess the extent outcomes specified in the project appraisal documents are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- **Effectiveness:** Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio, project outcomes will be rated as follows:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the

evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

### ***Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes***

The TE will assess, at a minimum, the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. More details on the sustainability assessment are provided in the Template for ToR provided in AnNIM 2.

### ***Catalytic role***

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

### ***Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems***

The TE will assess whether the project met the requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. Project Managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Given the long duration of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans to measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. The TE reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

## **Final report Outline**

### **1. Executive summary**

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Table summarizing main ratings received

### **2. Introduction**

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

### **3. The project(s) and its development context**

- Project start and its duration



- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

#### 4. Findings

In addition to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency assessment described above, a descriptive assessment must be provided. All criteria marked with **(R)** should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see AnNIM 2 for an explanation on the GEF terminology.

##### 4.1. Project Formulation

This section should describe the context of the problem the project seeks to address. It should describe how useful the project conceptualization and design has been for addressing the problem, placing emphasis on the logical consistency of the project and its Logical Framework. This section should seek to answer the following questions: *Was the project well-formulated? Were any modifications made to the Project's LogFrame during implementation, and if so, have these modifications resulted or are expected to result in better and bigger impacts?*

- Conceptualization/Design (R): This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy was the best option to address the barriers in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.
- Country-ownership/Driveness: Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.
- Stakeholder participation (R): Assess information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation in design stages.

- Replication approach: Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
- Other aspects: to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches, the comparative advantage of UNDP as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

#### 4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R): Independent from the issue of whether the project was well designed or not, the NIMt question should be *how well has the project been implemented?* This section should include an assessment of the following aspects:
  - (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.
  - (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic workplans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management; and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
  - (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
  - (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
  - (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.
- Monitoring and evaluation (R): Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports. For evaluating this, it is proposed that evaluators use the following criteria: i) to evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system to follow up the progress towards achieving the project result and objectives ii) to evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used, i.e baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages (results and progress indicators). iii) to evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place and also if the M&E system has been utilized for adaptive management

- Stakeholder participation (R): This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:
  - (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
  - (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.
    - (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
    - (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.
- Financial Planning: includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE. See more details and explanation of concepts in AnNIM 3 This section should include:
  - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
  - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements (has the project been the cost effective?)
  - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
  - (iv) Co-financing Apart from co-financing analysis the evaluators should complete the co financing and leverages resources table provided in AnNIM 3.
- Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and the Government and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project. This section should seek to answer questions such as: *Was the project's implementation done in an efficient and effective manner? Was there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Were the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?*

### 4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective (R): This TE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective were achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine achievements and shortfalls of the project in achieving outcomes and objectives. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators, with the Project Team, should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This analysis should be conducted based on specific project indicators.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed. Each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as shown in footnote below<sup>3</sup>:
  - Financial resources: Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
  - Sociopolitical: Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
  - Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.

---

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The MTE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. Please complete the relevant columns of the management response Table provided in AnNIM 4 with main recommendations made. This section should include:

- *Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;*
- *Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;*
- *Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;*
- *Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;*
- *Proposals for future directions that reinforce the main objectives.*

## 6. Lessons learned

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant in the MTE report. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives and results, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Some questions to consider are:

- Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
- What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
- To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to national / local efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.
- Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

## **7. Evaluation report Annexes**

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

## 7.2 TERMINOLOGY USED

- **Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
  - Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.
- **Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable.

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

- **Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

#### Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns
- Consultation and stakeholder participation
- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

#### Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.
- **Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:
  - Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy
  - Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
  - Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector
  - Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives
  - Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
  - Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.)
  - Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)



- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities
  - Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.
- **Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:
    - Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
    - Expansion of demonstration projects.
    - Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
    - Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.
- **Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.
 

Effective financial plans include:

    - Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
    - Due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- **Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:
    - Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
    - The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
    - The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts). A benchmark approach in climate change and ozone projects measures cost-effectiveness using internationally accepted threshold such as 10\$/ton of carbon equivalent reduced, and thresholds for

the phase out of specific ozone depleting substances measured in terms of dollars spent per kg (\$/kg) of each type of ODS reduced.

- **Monitoring & Evaluation.** Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

### 7.3 ITINERARY

September 21, 2011

2:00 pm Meeting with the Head of Environment Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development

September 22, 2011

1:00 pm Meeting with the Head of Environment Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Project Manager

September 23, 2011

9:00 am Meeting with the UNDP Programme Manager

#### **7.4 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

- Dr. Reynold Murray, Programme Manager (Energy and Environment), United Nations Development Programme
- Mr. Randolph Edmead, Head of Environment Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development

## **7.5 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR**

- The Project Document of the Add-On Enabling Activity – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities.
- The Project Implementation Report (PIR)
- The Project Inception Report
- Quarterly Operational Reports (QOR)
- Project Workshop Report
- UNDP and GEF guidance policies on the evaluation process
- The country's National Physical Development Plan
- National Legislation relevant to the Project

## 7.6 QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS

### Questions for the Terminal Evaluation (TE).

1. What activities have been completed to date under the project?
2. What is the proposed date for the completion of other activities (Closing date of the project)?
3. Which community organizations (NGOs) were involved in the project so far and what were their roles? Comment on Civil Society engagement.
4. What would you consider as the greatest achievement/worst experience of the project to date?
5. Conservation is a major component of the project. What efforts were made to this end at the: a) national institutional level?; b) national policy level?; c) individual and community level?
6. What is the status of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)? How is the NBSAP being factored into the biodiversity development plan?
7. What impact has the project made at the national level? Is the public aware of the project?
8. What other national projects (specifically GEF projects) are being implemented jointly or in synergy with this project?
9. Have the GEF funds been used specifically to support this project? Are the GEF funds adequate?
10. List all visible changes/impacts that are occurring in St. Kitts and Nevis as a result of the implementation of this project.
11. How could the impacts of the project be improved?
12. Is the implementation methodology of the Add-On Project effective? How could it be improved?
13. What are the main successes of the project? What are its greatest failures/weaknesses?
14. How will you rate the quality of work delivered by (a) the local consultants (b) the international consultants?
15. Has time management on the projects been an issue? Explain.
16. Has the steering committee functioned? Are there meeting reports/minutes?
17. Has UNDP been helpful? Explain
18. What will be your overall rating of the project?
19. What are the lessons learnt from this project?

## **7.7 LIST OF WORKSHOPS**

### **Workshops for the Add-On Enabling Activity – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities Project for St. Kitts and Nevis.**

- Stakeholder Consultation on the Development of Incentive Measures for the Promotion of Biodiversity Conservation in St. Kitts and Nevis, held in October, 2010.
- EIA Review Training Workshop Focusing on the Protection of Biodiversity in Project Development. Two workshops were conducted involving stakeholders in both St. Kitts and Nevis, these were held in November, 2010

## **7.8 LIST OF OUTPUTS**

### **Outputs for the Add-On Enabling Activity – Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities Project in St. Kitts and Nevis**

1. Second National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity.
2. End of Project Report: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs and Country Specific Priorities for Biodiversity Conservation in St. Kitts and Nevis.
3. Implementation of General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in St. Kitts and Nevis.
4. Incentive Measures for Promotion of Biodiversity Conservation in St. Kitts and Nevis.
5. Management Framework for Biodiversity Threat Mitigation in St. Kitts and Nevis.
6. Preservation and Maintenance of Traditional Biodiversity Knowledge, Innovations and Practices of Local Communities Embodying Traditional Lifestyles.